

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Held on Monday, 7 July 2014 at 9.30 am in
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

PRESENT

Mrs S Armes	Mr T.J. Lamb
Councillor C Bowes	Mrs J A North
Mr T R Carter	Mr M. S. Robinson (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor M. Chapman-Allen	Mr F.J. Sharpe
Mr P.D. Claussen	Mrs P.A. Spencer
Mr P.J. Duigan	Mr N.C. Wilkin (Chairman)

Also Present

Mr W.P. Borrett	Mr R. R. Richmond
Mr R.G. Kybird	Mr B. Rose

In Attendance

Heather Burlingham	Assistant Development Control Officer*
Chris Curtis	Team Leader Planning Enforcement*
Chris Gordon	Locum Solicitor
Gary Hancox	Principal (Major Developments)*
Paul Jackson	Planning Manager
Helen McAleer	Senior Committee Officer
Phil Mileham	Deputy Planning Manager
Jason Parker	Principal Development Management Planner*
Martin Pendlebury	Director of Planning & Business Manager *
Sarah Robertson	Planning Policy Officer*

* Capita for Breckland Council

65/14 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)

The Minutes of the meeting held on 9 June 2014 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**66/14 DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED
(AGENDA ITEM 3)**

Agenda Item 9a (Billingford) – All Members had received additional correspondence.

Agenda Item 10:

Schedule Item 2 (South Lopham) – For transparency Councillor Chapman-Allen declared that she had represented Councillor Nunn (the Ward Representative who had been unable to attend) at a public meeting held to discuss the application but she had taken no part in the discussions.

Schedule Item 3 (Weeting) – All Members had received direct representation.

Schedule Item 5 (Mattishall) – Councillor Claussen declared that he was a Mattishall Ward Representative.

Schedule Item 6 (Croxtan) – All Members had received correspondence from Thetford Town Council. Councillors Armes, Lamb and Spencer all declared that they were Thetford Town Councillors and as such they would exercise their right to speak on the application and then leave the room. Councillor Kybird noted

Action By

that he was Ward Representative of the immediately adjacent Ward and also a Thetford Town Councillor. For transparency Councillor Robinson declared that he lived very close to the site.

67/14 LOCAL PLAN UPDATE (AGENDA ITEM 7)

The Planning Policy Officer provided a brief update.

E-mails had been sent out to all the Parishes asking them for information for the review of Open Space in the District, which would form part of the evidence for the Local Plan.

At the Cabinet meeting on 1 July 2014 it had been decided that work on the Community Infrastructure Levy should be halted for the time being. That decision would be reviewed if further changes were published. In the meantime the Council would continue to use S106 Agreements.

The Croxton, Brettenham & Kilverstone Neighbourhood Plan had been formally designated. It included the land for the Thetford Sustainable Urban Extension.

There would be a Local Plan Working Group meeting held towards the end of July to look at the first section of the Issues & Options document.

68/14 ASSESSMENT OF BRECKLAND'S FIVE YEAR HOUSING LAND SUPPLY (2014) (AGENDA ITEM 8)

The Planning Policy Officer presented the report and full statement which was updated annually.

The assessment looked at how many houses had been built in the last year and how many would be built in the next five years. Every site with planning permission was included in the assessment but only the houses which could be expected to be built within the next five years could be counted, therefore only some of the Thetford Sustainable Urban Extension housing had been included.

The District had failed to meet the required number of houses for the previous year and so the shortfall had been added to the total for the next five years. There was the potential for 4428 houses to be built in the next five years, giving the Council a 3.7 year supply. Unfortunately the NPPF required a 20% buffer to be included in the figures, which reduced the supply to 3.29 years.

The housing target had only been met twice since 2001.

Councillor Claussen asked about the definition of 'sustainable' which he felt was an insult to Norfolk – implying that the whole area was basically unsustainable. He felt that the definition was suitable for urban districts not rural ones and he asked how much flexibility there was to provide a sustainable definition suitable for Norfolk. He suggested that Members needed training to improve their understanding.

The Deputy Planning Manager advised that when matters were considered at Committee Members needed to take the Officers' assessments, National and Local Planning Policy and the Housing Implementation Strategy into consideration.

The Director of Planning & Business Manager thought that there had to be an element of consistency for Officers to be able to advise Developers how the

Committee would interpret sustainability. There had been a policy in place for some time and there was an opportunity with the new Local Plan to reinterpret that.

Councillor Duigan asked whether there might be a necessity to provide housing sites for adjacent authorities.

The Deputy Planning Manager advised that there was a duty to co-operate and some other authorities might seek assistance but the expectation was that each area would meet its own needs.

RESOLVED to note the contents of the report for information and for any implications for decisions on relevant Planning Applications.

69/14 DEFERRED APPLICATIONS (AGENDA ITEM 9)

The Chairman noted that the application for a smoking shelter at Breckland Business Centre, Dereham had been withdrawn. A new application would be submitted using different materials.

69 .a **BILLINGFORD: Elmham Road: Recreation and agricultural facilities with visitor centre: Applicant: Mr B Todd: Reference: 3PL/2014/0056/F**

Members were given a brief recap of the application which had been deferred for a second time at the May meeting.

Additional information from the Applicant had been included in the report and Members had received direct correspondence. Members were informed that a formal letter of objection had been received from George Freeman MP.

The site history was extensive and had been set out in the report. A summary of the recent Appeal decision regarding the site had been provided in a Supplement to the Agenda. The Inspector had found that the existing building was not necessary and harmed the character and appearance of the area and the need for the building had not been justified. That decision was material to the Application and therefore the Officer's recommendation had been changed to one of refusal. Any future submission should include a scaled back version of the visitor centre and more robust evidence of need.

Mr Davies (Billingford Parish Council) raised concerns about loss of public access, noise, the affect on existing tourism businesses, obstruction of use and the playground near open water.

Mr Wood (Hoe Parish Council) pointed out that the appeal decision referred to a smaller area and the much larger proposals in the current application would cause even greater harm to the protected river valley. He asked Members to refuse the application and authorise further enforcement action.

Mr Atterwill (Swanton Morley Parish Council) acknowledged that many of their concerns had been addressed by the latest report, but not all. Four points needed stronger conditions: 1) swimming should be supervised at all times and suitable lifesaving equipment provided; 2) No visitor traffic should use the Swanton Morley / Worthing Road; 3) Secretary of State contact regarding the Common Land should be required; and 4) prior approval regarding the design of any chicken houses should be required. He concluded saying they still strongly objected to the application.

Action By

Mr Howell (Chairman of Norfolk Fly Fishers Club and speaking on behalf of Dereham Angling Club) drew attention to their submission of 14 April and reiterated their concerns about security, noise and light pollution, rights of way and liability.

Mr Labouchere (Objector) reiterated his previous concerns about the damage to the site and loss of habitat and amenity. He was concerned that other applications would follow and said that no mitigation could justify approval. He asked Members to reject the application and enforce removal of the building.

Mr Moulton (Agent) pointed out that the site was suitable for agriculture and could be ploughed and cropped including the Scheduled Ancient Monument and open access land. Pigs, sheep and chickens could also be brought onto the land which would support the agricultural building. However, the Applicant wanted to use the site for recreational purposes and some of those uses had been accepted by the Appeal Inspector. The current proposal was a reduction in scale of the application refused by the Inspector.

Mr Todd (Applicant) advised Members that although the Appeal had been rejected and he had been told to take the building down he would still need a building on site for storage of machinery and equipment and the hanging of nets. He had a site for another building but thought it would be a waste of money to take one down only to put another up elsewhere.

Councillor Borrett (Ward Representative) was not against development in the countryside as it kept communities alive and vibrant but there were rules and the Applicant had totally disregarded them. No agricultural use had been proved and the building was illegal. The Inspector had said it had an unacceptable impact on the landscape. The Committee had the power to refuse the application on those grounds. Their previous refusals had been vindicated by the Inspector.

Councillor Carter asked about Enforcement. The original Notice had given the Applicant three months to remove the building but that had been extended to nine months by the Planning Inspector.

Councillor Sharpe asked if the other building on site was covered by the Enforcement Notice. He was advised that it was not but further action would be considered.

RESOLVED that:

- (1) the application be refused on grounds of impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and the failure of the Applicant to justify the extent of built development proposed and extent of uses on site; and
- (2) authority be given to Officers to take any enforcement action necessary.

70/14 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS (AGENDA ITEM 10)

RESOLVED that the applications be determined as follows:

- (a) Item 1: SWANTON MORLEY: Land off Rectory Road: Erection of 52 residential dwellings with associated open space: Applicant: Hopkins Homes Limited: Reference: 3PL/2014/0083/F

This application had the support of the Parish Council. However, they

Action By

had requested an upgrade to Harkers Lane. Norfolk County Council had the legal powers to upgrade the Lane and had indicated that such works would cost around £8000. If Members were minded to approve the application authority was requested for Officers to negotiate the upgrade if feasible.

Mr Atterwill (Swanton Morley Parish Council) explained that Harkers Lane would provide a safe route to the school but it got very muddy in winter. Any upgrade should be completed before the first occupation of any dwellings. Other suggestions were for a tactile crossing for pedestrian safety; Open Space to be laid to grass and transferred to the Parish Council after 12 months; street lighting to be approved by and transferred to the Parish Council; and affordable homes to be offered to local people first.

Mr Carrick (Objector) did not object to the development but was concerned about the method of disposal of surface water. He suggested porous surfaces or piping the water through the Church car park which he owned.

Mr Smith (Agent) had discussed Mr Carrick's proposals but had to satisfy EA requirements. The Officers would condition the drainage scheme. He had no problems with the upgrade of Harkers Lane and funds could be found from the S106 contributions. Details of offsite highway works had been agreed in principle but if a tactile crossing was required by NCC that matter would be revisited. Parish Council approval for street lighting would be sought.

Councillor R Richmond (Ward Representative) said there were no major issues with the application although it was apparent that Harkers Lane was important. Flash floods could be serious and he was pleased the EA had suggested a SuDS system.

Members discussed the flooding issue and it was noted that the SuDS system was for surface, not foul water but that drainage details would be a pre-commencement condition.

With regard to Harkers Lane it was clarified that as a public byway it could not be a 'trod road' and a Type 1 finish had been suggested.

It was also noted that the Council had a policy to allocate affordable housing to people with a local connection first.

Councillor Lamb was surprised that the village welcomed such a large development which he thought was urban in style. Mr Atterwill explained that as part of the LDF process villagers had identified the site as the best place for future development. The critical thing was to see the Lane upgraded but it should not be tarmac. It was clarified that the Lane would not be lit.

Deferred, and the officers authorised to grant approval, subject to the conditions listed in the report and additional conditions concerning surface water drainage details and the surfacing of Harkers Lane, on completion of the section 106 agreement.

Delegated authority was granted to the Council's Planning Manager to refuse planning permission if the legal formalities in respect of

the S106 were not completed within three months of the date of decision or such other timescale as deemed appropriate for the completion of the legal agreement.

- (b) Item 2: SOUTH LOPHAM: Land south of A1066 Thetford Road: Installation of a 10MW solar farm and associated infrastructure: Applicant: AVIC-PCI Ltd: Reference: 3PL/2014/0143/E

The report had originally been prepared for the June meeting but had been withdrawn from the agenda at the request of the Chairman in conjunction with the Planning Manager. Further supporting information had been submitted by the applicant along with a Legal letter which argued that there was no requirement for a sequential test. However, due to the impact on good quality agricultural land the application was recommended for refusal.

Ms Crossley (North Lopham Parish Council) said they were unanimously opposed to the application. She complained about the lack of pre-application consultation and said there was plenty of low grade land available. There would be no benefit to the local community. The Government did not support such developments.

Mr Barnet-Lamb (Blo'Norton Parish Council) had not been consulted yet their residents were the closest to the site and would be affected by shine, noise and the view which screening would not disguise. Noise from the converters could affect the horse stabling business nearby causing the loss of some jobs.

Mrs Martin (South Lopham Parish Council) said the development would ruin an area of unspoilt countryside with far reaching views. Policies should encourage effective use of the land and local community concerns should be taken into account.

Mr Bedford (Objector) was representing the views of local residents who were unanimously opposed to the application which would blight the landscape. The site had been chosen because it would provide an easy connection to the grid. The land was not poor quality and over 25 years more than 7000 tonnes of food production would be lost. It was not an appropriate site for an industrial power plant.

Ms Van de Pieterman (Agent) noted that the application should have been presented in June when it was recommended for approval. Undue weight had been given to one appeal decision. They had been requested to provide a sequential test and had given reasons for their site selection. It was the only site in a 20 mile radius. Other sites were on protected land. The scheme was appropriate and did not conflict with national policy.

In response to the views expressed by the Agent the Planning Manager clarified that whilst the application had originally been recommended for approval the appeal decision referred to was but one of a number of factors which had led to the change in recommendation. The earlier report had been withdrawn from the agenda because of concerns that it did not present a property balanced judgement and that too much focus had centred on the positives whilst not fully rehearsing the negatives. The thrust of government guidance was clear in that large scale ground mounted solar arrays should ideally be sited on roofspace, previously

Action By

used (brownfield) or low grade agricultural land. The appropriateness or otherwise of utilising high quality (BMV) agricultural land was an issue which needed to be considered in the round and assessed against both the scheme's positives and negatives in light of the thrust of prevailing policy and guidance.

Councillors Armes and Claussen spoke in support of retaining the land for food production.

Councillor Chapman-Allen raised concerns about light pollution and cumulative effect.

Councillor Carter was not a supporter of wind turbines or solar farms, but he had one near his home and there had been no complaints since it was completed. The panels did not cause glare or glow in the night. The cameras were inward facing and not intrusive. The farmer still grazed his sheep under the panels.

Refused, as recommended.

- (c) Item 3: WEETING: Lynn Road: Change of use from Agriculture to sports & recreation (D2e) including changing rooms/toilets (temporary building): Applicant: Weeting Football Club: Reference: 3PL/2014/0310/E

This was a resubmission following a previous refusal on a nearby site. Comments had been received from Councillor Childerhouse, Ward Representative. For transparency he had declared that he was related to the landowner but that he had no financial interest in the site. He was pleased that there were no Stone Curlew issues with the site and thought it was the Council's duty to support local initiatives. The club had an increasing following and currently with only one pitch for four teams they were having to travel to other facilities. NCC had offered the portacabin as there were no funds to build a permanent building. The majority of residents lived near to the site and the distance from the south of the village was 1600m.

Mr Green (Agent) and Secretary of the football club said they had been promoted to the first division and if they were promoted again they would need improved facilities which the proposals would support. More people were showing an interest in joining the club. There was a need and the site was available.

Councillor Sharpe asked why so many pitches were needed and Mr Green explained that they ranged in size from five-a-side to full size pitches and there were also aspirations for a cricket pitch.

Councillor Robinson was concerned that there was no need for seven pitches and it might draw people from other areas which already had their own pitches.

It was explained that the current site had only one very small football pitch and had a fenced play park so the size of the pitch could not be increased.

In response to a question it was confirmed that nets and equipment would be stored in the changing rooms and if required the goal posts could be taken down and secured for safety. A good quality track would be put in

to provide access if permission was granted. A gravel car park would be provided for parking. The portacabin had toilets which would operate on a septic tank and water would be sourced from a standpipe.

The Chairman asked if there had been negotiations about any other sites and was advised that one next to the village hall might be available, but no negotiations had taken place.

Refused, as recommended.

- (g) Item 4: MUNDFORD: Land adjacent Post Office, 62 St Leonards Street: Erect 2 No three bedroom semi detached houses, parking and amenity space and erection of garage ancillary to the PO: Applicant: Mr & Mrs P Codd: Reference: 3PL/2014/0350/F

It was considered that this proposal would result in a visual improvement to the area and would also improve traffic circumstances. Further comments and photographs had been submitted since the report was written. The photographs were shown during the presentation. An e-mail had also been received from Councillor Steward, Ward Representative. She raised concerns about traffic and parking issues particularly in relation to an adjacent complex of housing for the elderly.

Mrs Grace (Objector) asked if the braille letter submitted by her blind daughter had been included in the report and was advised that it had. Church Lane provided access to 14 properties and the church. There was a history of parking and access problems with people parking partially on the path which caused problems for her daughter and other elderly and disabled pedestrians. She urged Members to visit the site. The garages were in good repair and their demolition could damage her mother's house. She also raised concerns about access for emergency vehicles, overlooking and the sewage plant being close to properties.

Mr Codd (Applicant) said the proposal would improve the appearance of the area and make the cottage detached. There were no parking problems. Delivery vehicles only visited infrequently. The hedge had been cut back to improve visibility. The Party Wall issue was a civil matter.

Councillor North asked about the part of the shop/Post Office to be demolished and it was explained that it was currently used as the sorting office. Internal rearrangements would allow its relocation within the building. The new garages would be used for one car and storage of garden equipment, etc.

The Planning Manager suggested an additional condition to ensure the making good of the party wall once the existing garages were demolished. Also, due to the concerns raised, a condition could be added to control the parking arrangements of construction vehicles, etc.

Approved, as recommended, with two additional conditions concerning a construction traffic management plan and the making good of the party wall.

- (g) Item 5: MATTISHALL: 10 All Saints Walk: Proposed bungalow: Applicant: Mr Matthew Davison: Reference: 3PL/2014/0429/O

Action By

This application came to Committee due to local concerns about the proposal to sub-divide the garden to provide an additional bungalow. The siting of the bungalow had been amended to move the new bungalow back from the road.

Mr Reeson (Objector) represented residents in the vicinity. They were concerned about 'garden grabbing'. The property was too big for the site and did not sit well with surrounding properties.

Councillor Rose (Ward Representative) agreed with those comments and urged the Committee to take residents' views into account.

Councillor Claussen noted that he was also a Ward Representative for Mattishall and at their Parish Council meeting 100% of residents present had objected to the proposal. The turning head of Vasser Court should not be used for access.

Members discussed the application and were concerned that it represented over-development of the site. However, the Planning Manager advised that as it was an Outline application the size of the dwelling was not yet known.

Refused, contrary to the recommendation, on grounds that the proposal was inconsistent with the present form and character of the area and insufficient information had been provided to prove that a bungalow could be suitably accommodated on the site.

- (g) Item 6: CROXTON: Off Croxton Road: Skatepark with associated lighting, CCTV and sound proof fencing on two sides: Applicant: Mr Maurice Howard: Reference: 3PL/2014/0458/F

All Members had received correspondence from the Town Council. Councillors Armes, Lamb and Spencer declared they were Town Councillors and would speak and then leave the room.

This was the resubmission of an application which had been withdrawn. The new application included details of a new access path to Joe Blunts Lane to improve accessibility to the site.

Additional representations had been received which included four letters of support. Councillor Childerhouse had raised the following concerns: it was the wrong site and should be more central; the CCTV was reliant on the Academy; and the site was isolated and heavily screened.

Mr King (Croxton Parish Council) noted that when standing in the site the adjacent car park could not be seen as it was on higher land. The proposed footpath would be constructed by NCC and they did not have funding for it and it would not support emergency vehicles. The CCTV system would not provide a fast action response and the Academy would not take monitoring responsibility. There were safety concerns. Removal of trees would invalidate the Academy's landscaping conditions. The previously proposed site was more central and more suitable.

Ms Fulford (on behalf of the Applicant) had worked to address concerns. They had strong support. The proposed path would provide safe access and could be adopted as a cycle way. Thetford Academy offered many out-of-hours facilities up until 10pm and the car park was in constant use.

Action By

Permission had been given to use the car park during construction. Anti social behaviour was not related to the application.

Councillor Kybird (Ward Representative of the immediately adjacent Ward) noted that 25% of Breckland's youth lived in Thetford. The skate park delivery was a priority for Moving Thetford Forward. 90% of the perimeter of Thetford was in Wildlife Protected areas. There had been multiple attempts to deliver the skate park and this site avoided detriment to residential amenity. A Thetford slogan was Historic Past Healthy Future. With regard to safety he pointed out that mountain bikers used Thetford Forest which was much more screened and remote. Infrastructure should precede development and this would be an example of that.

Councillor Armes thought that the requirement for the site to be soundproof and visible was contradictory. Castle Park was not a suitable alternative as it was a Heritage Site. The Leisure Centre site had no access permission. Anti social behaviour already occurred as young people used areas of the town as a skate rink.

Councillor Spencer noted that the Thetford Area Action Plan had a vision for recreation and cycle routes and the skate park area could be reached by them.

Councillor Lamb said that they had been searching for a suitable site for a number of years and this was the last resort. The Leisure Centre site had seemed ideal but there had been objections. He hoped that Members would be mindful that the Town Council was trying to create this facility.

Councillors Armes, Spencer and Lamb left the room.

The Director of Planning & Business Manager summarised a letter received that morning from the Town Council referring to inaccuracies in the report. They clarified the size of the site and that there were only trees to the boundary with Joe Blunt's Lane; a petition had been hand delivered to the Council; the Leisure Centre site had had access issues with all neighbouring businesses refusing to allow access. The site had therefore been used as additional car parking for the Healthy Living Centre; the new path was outside the Academy fence; only the first part of Joe Blunt's Lane would be resurfaced; CCTV was not manned 24/7 but would be monitored during Academy hours; the current Principal's concerns had all been addressed but had now been reinstated and the Town Council did not know why; emergency access was available from the existing footpath, the Academy car park and the proposed footpath.

Councillor Chapman-Allen was confused by the lack of details about the new footpath. She also had concerns about safety issues and the effects on Joe Blunt's Lane.

Councillor Claussen asked for confirmation that the previous site was no longer available. He thought that 90% of the Academy users would use the facility and that lone users were unlikely.

Councillor North was concerned about emergency access for vehicles if the car park was shut.

Councillor Sharpe asked who would be responsible for the skate park as

Action By

it was in Croxton and he was advised that it would belong to Thetford Town Council but be open to all users.

Councillor Robinson was surprised about the anti-social behaviour comment. He lived very close to the site and knew that Joe Blunt's Lane was a well used thoroughfare and not isolated. The site was on the edge of the town at the moment but with the Thetford Sustainable Urban Extension approval it would sit in the hub.

Councillor Duigan agreed that it was clear that the community wanted the facility but secure access arrangements needed to be clarified before permission could be granted.

Councillor Chapman-Allen did not think that the concerns of the Academy were being taken into consideration. She asked Mr King, as a member of the Moving Thetford Forward Board, whether the previous application was 'dead'.

Mr King believed it was still alive and thought the point needed to be clarified. He acknowledged that there had been concerns about access to the Leisure Centre site but he did not believe them to be insurmountable.

Ms Fulford explained that the Town Council had inherited the old planning permission and then found that they could not access the site. They had held several meetings to try to overcome the issues without success and had therefore moved on to look for another site.

The Planning Manager thought that the discussions had raised more questions than answers and felt that the Committee was not in a position to grant consent. He advised that the application should be treated on its own merits and should not be influenced by the other site. He suggested that the application should be deferred until the questions had been answered.

Councillor Claussen thought that more delay was unacceptable and a proper conclusion needed to be reached.

Deferred for further information.

Councillors Armes, Spencer and Lamb returned to the room.

- (g) Item 7: GRESSENHALL: Woodstock Rectory Residential Home, The Green: Extensions and internal alteration of care home. Create 9 new bedrooms, increase number with en-suite. Provide additional space: Applicant: Samved Holdings Ltd: Reference: 3PL/2014/0490/F

Members were shown a shaded layout plan to explain which areas were to be extended and where the internal alterations would take place. The applicants had submitted a proposal to extend the staff car park to provide 3-4 additional parking spaces.

Councillor Duffield (Ward Representative) said the Parish Council was concerned that the Care Home did not contribute to the expense of the road. Local residents were concerned about staff parking on the village green damaging it. More parking spaces should be provided.

Action By

Councillor Chapman-Allen felt that as long as emergency services could access the Home it was not a problem.

Approved, as recommended.

Notes to the Schedule

Item No	Speaker
Agenda Item 9a (Deferred Item)	Cllr Borrett – Ward Representative Mr Davies – Billingford Parish Council Mr Wood – Hoe Parish Council Mr Atterwill – Swanton Morley Parish Council Mr Labouchere – Objector Mr Howell – Objector Mr Moulton – Agent Mr Todd – Applicant Mr Kirk – for Applicant
1	Cllr Richmond – Ward Representative Mr Atterwill – Swanton Morley Parish Council Mr Carrick – Objector Mr Smith - Agent
2	Ms Crossley – North Lopham Parish Council Mr Barnet-Lamb – Blo’Norton Parish Council Mrs Martin – South Lopham Parish Council Mr Bedford – Objector Ms Melanie Van de Pieterman - Agent
3	Mr Green – Agent
4	Mrs Grace – Objector Mr Codd – Applicant
5	Cllr Rose – Ward Representative Mr Reeson – Objector
6	Cllr Kybird – Ward Representative Mr King – Croxton Parish Council Ms Fulford – Applicant
7	Cllr Duffield – Ward Representative

Written Representations taken into account

Reference No	No of Representations
3PL/2014/0429/O	10
3PL/2014/0310/F	44
3PL/2014/0490/F	3
3PL/2014/0143/F	147
3PL/2014/0056/F	63
3PL/2014/0458/F	16
3PL/2014/0350/F	13

71/14 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE DIRECTOR OF COMMISSIONING (AGENDA ITEM 11)

Noted.

72/14 APPEAL DECISIONS (AGENDA ITEM 12)

Noted.

73/14 EXCLUSION OF PRESS & PUBLIC (AGENDA ITEM 13)

Action By

RESOLVED that under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act.

74/14 ENFORCEMENT UPDATE (AGENDA ITEM 14)

The Enforcement Team Leader provided the update.

There was a new member of the Enforcement Team. Laura Steward was providing administrative assistance three days a week.

The Ocella software system was to be updated with a S106 monitoring system, jointly funded by the Council and Capita.

Members were advised of the current case load being dealt with by the Team and the number of S106 and Unilateral Undertakings that were being monitored.

Councillor Carter asked for an update on a planning condition that the Committee had imposed with a time limit. That time limit was due to expire that day and the Enforcement Team Leader had been assured that it would be met.

In response to a further question about an individual application he requested prior notice in future to ensure that he would have the relevant information.

Councillor Armes asked about advertising signage on lampposts and was advised that they were on Highways land and therefore the responsibility of NCC.

The meeting closed at 3.55 pm

CHAIRMAN