

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL**

**At a Meeting of the**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Held on Monday, 11 June 2012 at 9.30 am in  
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

**PRESENT**

Mr S.G. Bambridge  
Councillor C Bowes  
Mr T R Carter  
Mr C. S. Clark  
Mr P.D. Claussen  
Mr T.J. Lamb

Mrs J A North (Vice-Chairman)  
Mr W. R. J. Richmond  
Mr M. S. Robinson  
Mr F.J. Sharpe  
Mrs P.A. Spencer  
Mr N.C. Wilkin (Chairman)

**Also Present**

Mr K. Martin (Ward  
Representative)  
Mr J.P. Cowen (Ward  
Representative)  
Mr A.C. Stasiak (Ward  
Representative)

Mr R.G. Kybird (Ward Representative)  
Mr S. Askew (Ward Representative)

**In Attendance**

Paul Jackson  
Heather Burlingham  
John Chinnery  
Jane Osborne  
Jeff Upton

Lindy Warmer  
James Stone  
Mike Brennan  
David Higgins

Planning Manager  
Assistant Development Control Officer\*  
Solicitor & Standards Consultant  
Committee Officer  
Interim Planning & Building Control  
Manager\*  
Senior Development Management Officer  
Senior Planning Policy Officer  
Principal Planning Officer\*  
Norfolk County Council Highways  
\* Capita Symonds for Breckland Council

**53/12 MINUTES**

With regard to Minute number 48/12 Deferred Application, Attleborough, page 4 of the Agenda, the first paragraph of the second paragraph should read, 'it was one Councillor's belief that to place additional traffic lights at Connaught Plain together with existing lights outside the Post Office would create a worse situation than at present, and that traffic would back up even more'.

With regard to Minute number 49/12 Item (j) of the Schedule of Planning Applications, Old Buckenham, page 9 of the Agenda, the penultimate paragraph should read, 'some properties in Fen Street had suffered flooding and to build on more land, would take away drainage'.

Subject to the above, the Minutes of the meeting held on 14 May

**Action By**

**Action By**

2012 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**54/12 DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

Cllr Sharpe declared a personal interest in Agenda Items 8 (b), Deferred Applications, Attleborough, and Agenda Item 9, Schedule of Planning Applications Item No. 1, Snetterton by virtue of being the Executive Support Member for Assets & Strategic Development.

Cllr Claussen declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 9, Schedule of Planning Applications Item No. 2, Mattishall by virtue of close family members owning property in Mattishall.

Cllrs Robinson and Kybird declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 9, Schedule of Planning Applications Item No. 4, Thetford by virtue of being Members of the Moving Thetford Forward Board.

Cllr Bowes declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 9, Schedule of Planning Applications Item No. 1, Snetterton, by virtue of a relative owning one of the companies who had submitted a letter of objection.

**55/12 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Cllrs Claussen and Bambridge were welcomed as Planning Committee Members, as was Cllr English as a substitute. Farewells were accorded to the former Chairman Cllr Gould, and Cllr Wassell.

**56/12 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (STANDING ITEM)**

Following further consultation with regard to TAAP, the Council had received recommendations from the Inspector on 30 May 2012, who found the TAAP sound, subject to minor amendments as shown on the website. The Policy Team had started to produce documents for adoption, with a report scheduled to go to full Council on 5 July 2012. If adopted, it would be part of Breckland's LDF.

**57/12 DEFERRED APPLICATIONS**

57.1 Thompson : Demolition of Existing Detached Dwelling & Construction of Replacement Dwelling : Reference : 3PL/2012/0150/F

The demolition of an existing detached dwelling and construction of a replacement dwelling was proposed outside the Settlement Boundary. The application had been deferred from the Planning Committee held on 14 May 2012 to enable negotiations to take place in respect of the siting and design of the proposed replacement dwelling.

The applicant was not prepared to amend the proposal further, and

Action By

he had asked Members to consider factors as detailed in the report.

Mr Cowen, Ward Representative advised that since the deferment he had spoken to both Thompson Parish Council and the applicant. He said that the property was of a very urban design in a very rural location and was not appropriate for the location. Whilst the Parish Council did not object to the site being developed, their concern was about the form and layout.

**RESOLVED that the application be approved subject to conditions as listed in the report and an additional condition removing permitted development rights in relation to curtilage buildings.**

**58/12 ATTLEBOROUGH : PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL/EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT, LONDON ROAD : REFERENCE : 3PL/2011/0528/H**

Cllr Sharpe declared a personal interest by virtue of being the Executive Support Member for Assets & Strategic Development. Members had received correspondence with regard to the application.

David Higgins of Norfolk County Council Highways was in attendance to answer questions.

The proposal was deferred by the Planning Committee on 11 April 2012 to enable further consideration to be given to transport matters, in consultation with the applicant and the Highway Authority. Concerns about the potential amenity impact of 2½ storey houses on London Road were also raised. The application was deferred again by the Planning Committee on 14 May 2012.

Revised plans had since been submitted which proposed an extension of the traffic management measures further eastwards along London Road towards the town centre. Speed reactive signs and enhanced cycling links were also now proposed. The number of 2½ storey houses on the London Road frontage had been reduced from seven to five. The remaining units would be interspersed evenly amongst the 2 storey houses.

Mr Hall, Objector and representative of the Attleborough Community Team, questioned the public consultation, and reasons for refusal were the severe impact on the Town Centre and a cycle way that went nowhere. He asked the Committee to support local democracy, the residents of Attleborough, the Town and District Councillors and refuse the application until it was included in ASHAAP.

Ms Taylor, Attleborough Town Council, stated there had been no consultation and despite strong representation by the Town Council and Ward Members no changes of substance had been made to the proposal. The Town Council was not against the development but as

**Action By**

it was outside the Settlement Boundary it should be part of the ASHAAP.

Mr Osborn, Agent advised that they had listened and acted on all matters of concern.

Cllr Stasiak, Ward Representative commented that if the scheme was not viable, then it should not go ahead, as the people of Attleborough did not want it in its present form. He was still of the belief that it was a "cheap fix". He questioned if any surveys had been done on air quality and air pollution. If there was a need for higher storey houses, they should go in the middle of the development so they overlooked the new houses, and not the residents who currently had private gardens. It was outside the Settlement Boundary.

Cllr Martin, Ward Representative stated that as the application was prior to ASHAAP the totals should come off the proposed 4000 units, and that Attleborough needed assurance that the long term affect on the town, traffic and infrastructure would be taken into account.

In answer to a Councillor's concerns about the safety of the fast London Road, what part of it would be narrowed particularly from the south west, and there being no mention of New Road on Highway's plans, Mr Higgins of NCC Highways believed that whilst there would be more traffic, with the speed reduction features taken down to the full extent of the site and past the employment land, he did not think there would be any significant problem. A balance would need to be arrived at with regard to the positioning of the 30mph sign. He felt it would be difficult to impose a 40mph limit from the A11 roundabout.

When questioned whether a public consultation meeting had taken place, Mr Osborn confirmed that one had been held at the beginning of the process, but the latest proposals had not been discussed, although the Town Council had been copied in to the letter received by Members.

A Councillor asked that weight be given to the comments made by Norfolk Landscape Archaeology.

At New Road there was a blind bend with a 40mph limit, so either end of the development would come into blind bend situations, and as such, a Councillor believed that more thought needed to be given to that access. Added to that, if the development which was outside the Settlement Boundary was approved, she requested that all the hedgerows were carefully dismantled outside of the bird nesting season.

Views from Councillors covered the heavy traffic the employment site would accumulate, could traffic be re-directed to the roundabout rather than into the town, the cycle lane went nowhere, views of the many people upset about the proposal had not been taken into consideration, lack of consultation, and that a meeting should be held

**Action By**

in the town before the proposal went ahead. The viability of the site was the concern of the developer, the scheme did not reach the Council's standards and it was premature.

The Planning Manager advised that consultation requirements had been met, with the Council going beyond its statutory duty. People had engaged but agreement had not been reached.

The recommendation for approval was not supported.

Members were given advice by the Solicitor and Principal Planning Officer but despite that, a new proposal was made and seconded to refuse the application on the grounds that it was outside the Settlement Boundary and that the highways aspects had not been properly assessed.

**RESOLVED, that contrary to the recommendation of Officers, the application be refused.**

**59/12 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

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

- (a) Item 1 : Snetterton : Erection of a 40MW renewable energy biomass power station and associated works : Applicant : Icen Energy Ltd : Reference : 3PL/2012/0029/F

Cllr Sharpe declared a personal interest by virtue of being the Executive Support Member for Assets & Strategic Development.

Cllr Bowes declared a personal interest by virtue of a relative owning one of the companies who had submitted a letter of objection.

Members had received correspondence about the proposal.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer presented the report, which was for the erection of a 40MW renewable energy biomass power station and associated works. The main structures which would form the development would be the turbine and boiler house, two fuel storage barns, wood storage barn, stack and an air cooled condenser. It would also include smaller structures as identified in the report. The total area of the proposed site that formed the application would be approximately 9.0 ha. The site was outside the Settlement Boundary.

Many letters of support and objection had been received from local residents and the areas they referred to were outlined in the report.

**Action By**

The proposed power station would accord with both local and national planning policies which encouraged the development of renewable energy projects. By addressing current energy problems in the locality, the proposal would also help to promote the development of the Snetterton Heath employment area. Careful consideration had been given to anticipated environmental impacts, and it had been concluded that the scheme would not result in significant adverse effects. Accordingly, the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Mr Napier, Shropham Parish Council, stated that there had been overwhelming concern despite the need for electricity, by those who attended a meeting at Shropham Village Hall in February 2012, as the proposal fell outside the core strategy along with other reasons for objection detailed in the report.

Mr Skinner, Snetterton Parish Council, was concerned the proposal was in the wrong place and outside the development area for the village and should be on industrial development land. Local agricultural community would be adversely affected.

Mr Foster, Objector, believed that the application was not a biomass plant but an incinerator and was not on Snetterton Heath, with the River Thet being about a mile from the site. The application was the wrong technology in the wrong place.

Mr Hilton, Icen, stated all limitations and restrictions were covered in their Environmental Statement. Guarantees would be provided with regard to particulates and emissions from the chimney would be caught by filtration. Anglian Farms had given assurances that they could provide all the fuel, would enter into a 15 year agreement and would not use farmers who were not members of Anglian Farms.

Cllr Cowen, Ward Representative, believed there were errors and omissions in the report. He was concerned about the Snetterton and Thetford Area Action Plan. The level of scale of the proposed development would affect future growth of Snetterton as a development area. Volume of straw, location and scale of plant, along with the application being premature were all areas of concern, and there had to be a better alternative than that proposed.

Cllr Askew, Ward Representative believed the proposal was too big a risk to entertain on economic reasons alone. The supply of straw was governed by climate. He believed the applicant's statements raised more questions than they answered. He queried the green credentials. It was the wrong type of system in the wrong place and urged Economic Development to search for a more credible solution.

**Action By**

Lindy Warmer, Senior Economic Development Officer stated that Breckland's Economic Development Service was in full support of the application, which they had driven since October 2006, during which time they had carried out a number of reviews and studies on energy supply options. It would open up the opportunity for future skills and employment and generate investment into the area.

In answer to questions raised by Members, the applicant advised that there would be no HGV movements along country roads, water used would be for damping down the ash, the current overhead connection would be reinforced. He explained how the electricity went into the National Grid and how the small sub station would allow other connections to be made for other users in the area. They would avoid widening roads and causing hedgerow deprivation.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer advised that they had consulted with numerous wildlife bodies and the Environmental Statement gave details, to which a Councillor requested that if the application was approved, any loss of hedgerows should be done outside the breeding season.

Further questions were asked of the applicant, to which he advised the road structures had been looked at at Snetterton Heath, but they felt they were too difficult to get traffic through the roads, therefore the site proposed seemed to be obvious. Noise pollution would likely be less than currently recorded as background noise.

**Subject to confirmation from the Secretary of State that the application would not be called in, the application be Approved, as recommended, subject to conditions in the report with the additional condition of facilitating a local provision for an electricity supply.**

- (b) Item 2 : Mattishall : Retention of 1 static home, 2 touring caravans, laundry room, 2 sheds, fences, access/splays parking, c/u ag land to res : Applicant : Mr Michael Cawley & Miss Mary-Lou Cawley : Reference : 3PL/2012/0080/F

Cllr Claussen declared a personal and prejudicial interest by virtue of family members owning property in Mattishall.

The application had previously been referred to the Planning Committee on 14 May, 2012 at which time the resolution had been that the planning permission be approved as recommended. However, the comments of the Ward Representative were not available at that time, and the application had been referred back to allow further consideration of local concerns.

**Action By**

Five further letters had been received from members of the public but no new issues of concern had been raised apart from devaluation of local properties.

The Principal Planning Officers reminded Members of the requirements of the NPPF.

Mr Mason, Agent, stated he was concerned the application had been brought back, as the Committee had approved the application on 14 May 2012, and requested that Members repeated their previous decision.

Cllr Claussen stated that Enforcement Officers had been warned off the site. He asked that attention be paid to the early engagement between the settled and traveller communities, as he believed in this instance there had been a lack of it which had driven a wedge through both communities. He commented on the NPPF and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. Cllr Claussen left the meeting.

Members did not feel that comments received from the Ward Representative included any further new information.

**Approved, as recommended.**

Candy Sheridan had provided training to the Authority in the past, and the Chairman wished to arrange further training as soon as possible, and urged all Planning Committee Members to attend.

Cllr Claussen returned to the meeting.

- (c) Item 3 : Thetford : Erect 3 storey hotel annex, single storey extension to restaurant, alterations to car park and relocate play area : Applicant : Whitbread Group PLC & Kier Homes : Reference : 3PL/2012/0321/F

Members had received correspondence with regard to the application.

The application sought full planning permission for the erection of a three storey detached building (holiday annex) which would provide 36 additional bedrooms to the existing Premier Inn Hotel, a single storey extension to the front of the existing public house to provide additional space for the restaurant and alterations to the on-site car park and relocation of a play area. A previous application (3PL/2011/0715/F) was refused by the Planning Committee on 3 October 2011.

It was considered that the scheme had not addressed the concerns raised by the previous refusal relating to the loss of part of a TPO Woodland Order and the loss of part of an open

**Action By**

space and, as such, the proposal was considered to be unacceptable and therefore it was recommended for refusal.

Two letters of objection had been received.

Mr Benning, Objector, was the joint owner of a house opposite the proposed development site, and believed the 3 storey building was unacceptable as it would be about 30m from his property and deprive him of mature woodland, affect his privacy, reduce the desirability and value of his property, along with odours produced by the restaurant kitchen. He did not believe the proposal would assist the Thetford town centre regeneration.

Mr Thackeray, Agent stated that they had listened to what had been said in the past, and had compensated for open space, dealt with overlooking and reduced the loss of trees.

Concerns raised by Members covered the play area, the mis-management of the woodland and community access to the open space.

**Refused, as recommended.**

- (d) Item 4 : Thetford : Construction of concrete skatepark (228 sqm) : Applicant : Breckland Council : Reference : 3PL/2012/0479/F

Cllrs Robinson and Kybird declared a personal interest by virtue of being Members of the Moving Thetford Forward Board.

Full planning permission for the construction of a Skatepark was sought. The site was approximately 14m by 15m and consisted of a concrete area of ramps, curbs and walls. The structure would be less than 1.4m in height. It would be intended that a fence be erected around the site and lighting installed. No specific details had been submitted as part of the application.

2 letters had been received with regard to noise and disturbance. Other concerns covered hours of operation, access, surface water drainage and litter management.

The Principal Planning Officer advised, that if Members were minded to approve the application that it be deferred to Officers, as Thetford Town Council were not scheduled to discuss the application until Tuesday, 12 June 2012.

Cllr Kybird, Member of Moving Thetford Forward Board, advised that the application was regarded as a key piece of infrastructure for young people on a site adjacent to Thetford Sport Centre.

**Action By**

Whilst some Councillors did not feel the need for an acoustic fence as CCTV should be sufficient, others felt it would be essential.

**RESOLVED** that the application be deferred and the Officers be authorised to approve it as recommended, subject to conditions, if no further objections are received within the consultation period and Thetford Town Council do not object.

**Notes To Schedule**

Item No.	Speaker
1	Mr Napier – Shropham P C Mr Skinner – Snetterton P C Mr Foster – Objector Mr Hilton – Icen Mr Askew – Ward Representative Mr Cowen – Ward Representative
2	Mr Mason - Agent
3	Mr Benning – Objector Mr Thackeray - Agent
4	Mr Kybird – Member MTF

**Written Representations Taken Into Account**

Reference No.	No. of Representations
3PL/2012/0029/F	49
3PL/2012/0080/F	2
3PL/2012/0321/F	
3PL/2012/0479/F	

**60/12 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE DIRECTOR OF COMMISSIONING**

Noted.

**61/12 APPEAL DECISIONS (FOR INFORMATION)**

Noted.

**62/12 ENFORCEMENT ITEMS**

Noted.

**63/12 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL (FOR INFORMATION)**

Noted.

The meeting closed at 2.43 pm

CHAIRMAN