

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Held on Monday, 14 December 2015 at 9.30 am in
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

PRESENT

Mr R F W Brame
Mr H E J Clarke
Mr P.D. Claussen
Mr P.J. Duigan
Mr K. Martin
Mr A.P. Joel

Mr J Newton
Mr F.J. Sharpe (Vice-Chairman)
Mr W.H.C. Smith
Mr N.C. Wilkin (Chairman)
Mr P R W Darby (Substitute Member)

Also Present

Mr S.G. Bambridge
Mr K.S. Gilbert
Mr P.J. Hewett

Mr A.C. Stasiak
Mr M. A. Wassell

In Attendance

Mike Brennan
Neil Campbell
Gary Hancox
Helen McAleer
Nick Moys
Cathey Rix
Nicola Swan
James Tipping

Operations & Contract Manager (Capita) (shared)
Planning Policy Manager *
Principal Planning Officer*
Senior Democratic Services Officer
Principal Planning Officer *
Planning Assistant*
Locum Solicitor
Principal Planning Officer

* Capita for Breckland Council

140/15 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)

The Minutes of the meeting held on 16 November 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

141/15 APOLOGIES & SUBSTITUTES (AGENDA ITEM 2)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bowes and M Chapman-Allen. Councillor Darby was present as Substitute for Councillor Bowes.

**142/15 DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED
(AGENDA ITEM 3)**

Agenda Item 9, Schedule Item 9 (Cranworth) – all Members had received direct representation. Councillor Wilkin declared that he had been involved in the early application process and was close to pre-determination. He therefore left the room whilst the item was discussed.

143/15 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (AGENDA ITEM 4)

Following the Planning Committee meeting on 11 January 2016 there would be a training session for Members on Highways and Flood and Drainage issues. At the request of Councillor Clarke, it was agreed that Anglian Water would also be invited to attend.

Action By

Following the Council meeting on 21 January 2016 there would be a briefing session by the District Valuer.

144/15 REQUESTS TO DEFER APPLICATIONS INCLUDED IN THIS AGENDA (AGENDA ITEM 5)

Agenda Item 9, Schedule Item 2 (Mattishall)

Late correspondence had been received from the Lead Local Flood Authority regarding this application. It had therefore been deferred from the Agenda to allow time for further clarification. It was confirmed that the correspondence would be available to view on the public website.

Agenda Item 9, Schedule Items 7 and 8 (Snetterton)

Following discussions with the Chairman and in view of the fact that the context of the site was a very important issue for consideration, these items had been deferred for a Site Visit which would be held on Friday 7 January 2016. The applications would then be considered at the meeting on 11 January 2016.

145/15 URGENT BUSINESS (AGENDA ITEM 6)

None.

146/15 LOCAL PLAN UPDATE (AGENDA ITEM 7)

The Planning Policy Manager presented the update.

A publication strategy had been drafted for the Local Plan documents. The strategy would be considered by the Overview & Scrutiny Commission at their meeting on 17 December 2015. The public consultation would commence on 11 January 2016.

Evidence based studies in support of the Local Plan were ongoing including the additional addendum to the Dereham Transport Study. The Rocklands Neighbourhood Plan had been approved.

Councillor Smith asked if the affordable housing trigger figure had changed from 5 to eleven. He also wondered how the Government's Right to Buy impacted on such provision.

He was advised that the Council was still looking for an affordable housing contribution from sites of 5 or more dwellings. Advice would be sought from the Housing Officers on the impact of Right to Buy and that information would be forwarded to Councillor Smith.

Mike
Brennan

147/15 DEFERRED APPLICATIONS (AGENDA ITEM 8)

An amended Schedule of Deferred Items had been issued on the Supplement to the Agenda as the Caston application had been determined.

148/15 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS (AGENDA ITEM 9)

RESOLVED that the planning applications be determined as follows:

- a) Item 1: WATTON: Land south of Mallard Road: Outline planning application for residential development of up to 177 dwellings: Applicant: Mr Mark Dakeyne: Reference: 3PL/2015/0254/O

The Principal Planning Officer advised Members that due to the receipt of late advice he was recommending deferral of this application. Comments from the RSPB had been received on Friday and further advice had been sought from the Council's ecologist. As a result, it had been decided that an Appropriate Assessment was now required, contrary to Natural England's advice.

This was a significant application for the Town and Habitat implications affected the way that Planning Policy was applied. It was therefore the Officers' advice that the application be deferred.

Deferred, for further information.

The Chairman apologised to the Members of the public that had travelled to the meeting for this application, but he said that Members needed all the information to make a proper decision.

- b) Item 2: MATTISHALL: Land south of Dereham Road: Erection of up to 65 residential dwellings with associated infrastructure: Applicant: Gladman Developments Ltd: Reference: 3PL/2015/0498/O

This application had been deferred from the agenda. See Minute No 144/15 above.

- c) Item 3: SHIPDHAM: Land at Parklands Avenue: Construction of 24 dwellings, associated open space, parking & access road: Applicant: Wellington: Reference: 3PL/2015/0562/F

This full application proposed a slightly denser development than that already approved on the site. Existing trees would be retained and the two bridleways that crossed the site would be diverted through the required legal process.

Ms Jacinta Webb spoke on behalf of Saffron Housing, the Registered Provider that would manage the dwellings. There would be a separate drainage connection to the pumping station. The site was not high density and about a third of the site was Open Space.

Mrs Baker (Objector) said the original permission had been reduced to 14 houses which had been acceptable. The site was too small for the number of buildings proposed. The increased number of vehicles would add to existing problems on Parklands Avenue which was heavily used by large farm traffic. The village did not have the infrastructure for a new estate.

Councillor Hewett (Ward Representative) thought the application was bad for Shipdham in terms of location, infrastructure and Planning Policy. The site was on the fringe of the village, remote from services. The cramped development would have adverse impact on residents. Local roads were already blocked and the junction with the A1075 was dangerous. The area had serious sewage problems. The Planning Inspector had recommended 15 homes on the site; the current proposal was over development of the site. There were other more suitable sites in Shipdham.

Councillor Duigan asked what the site's status was in the LDF and was advised that it had been one of three preferred sites but had not received any allocation.

The following issues were clarified:

- the reference to Flagship in the report was an error. Saffron Housing would be the Registered Provider.
- the land owned by Breckland Council was a small strip on the site frontage which did not affect the application
- the Open Space would be managed by Saffron Housing
- drainage details would be dealt with by condition; there were no known technical issues in that respect.

Approved, as recommended.

- d) Item 4: CASTON: Former Coach Depot, Dukes Lane: Residential development of 3 new dwellings (inc the removal of a temporary structure used as a site office & store)

This former coach depot was known to Members as it had been subject to enforcement action to remove the storage building on site. The proposal would remove that building and create three dwellings.

Councillor Smith drew attention to the comments from Breckland Astronomical Society and asked for their recommendations to be included in any permission.

Councillor Claussen asked for the time limit to be reduced to two years as with other applications outside the Settlement Boundary and the Operations & Contract Manager agreed with that.

Approved, as recommended with an additional new two year condition on removal of existing building.

- e) Item 5: HOLME HALE: Bilmar, Station Road: Erection of bungalow: Applicant: Mrs M Johnson: Reference: 3PL/2015/0864/O

This outline application should have included access details, but they had not been submitted. The development was not considered appropriate for the village which had no Settlement Boundary.

Councillor Darby had been the Ward Representative for this area previously and was aware that residents had concerns about the lack of a footway and traffic speed so access was a major problem.

Refused, as recommended for the reason set out in the recommendation.

Councillor Sharpe asked for it to be noted that Members might have been minded to support the application if the access and visibility splay details had been provided.

- f) Item 6: GREAT ELLINGHAM: White House Farm, 97 Long Street: Erection of two dwellings: Applicant: Mr & Mrs Justin & Nesha Wilkins: Reference: 3PL/2015/0959/F

This application for two four bedroom properties with individual accesses was recommended for approval.

Mr Betts (Parish Council Chairman) supported the proposal .

Councillor Smith (Ward Representative) also supported it. The village was trying to get a mix of development, including aspirational housing to attract business people. He asked for two conditions; external lighting should be directed downwards, and no lighting on gateposts – to protect an area of land nearby which was to be adopted as a wildlife reserve and the village's 'dark sky' status.

It was pointed out that a lighting condition had already been included.

Approved, as recommended.

- g) Item 7: SNETTERTON: Land to North-West of A11 London Road: Erection of factory, warehouse and office building for the manufacture and distribution of pet food: Applicant: Nature's Menu: Reference: 3PL/2015/0967/F

This application was deferred without discussion, for a Site Visit. See Minute No 144/15 above.

- h) Item 8: SNETTERTON: Grange Farm, Chalk Lane: Extension to access road & creation of drainage lagoon: Applicant: Twells Partnership: Reference: 3PL/2015/0982/F

This application was deferred without discussion, for a Site Visit. See Minute No 144/15 above.

- i) Item 9: CRANWORTH: Fredericks Loke, Southburgh: Residential development (three dwellings): Applicant: Mr Simon Cole: Reference: 3PL/2015/1012/F

All Members had received direct representation on this item. Councillor Wilkin declared an interest as he had been involved in the early application process. He therefore left the room.

Councillor Sharpe in the Chair (for this item only).

Additional information had been provided in the Agenda Supplement The Applicant had offered one of the units as affordable housing. A very similar, previous application for three dwellings had been refused and dismissed on appeal due to its detrimental effect on the rural landscape.

Mr Cole (Applicant) said the two stumbling blocks were affordability and sustainability. He wanted to promote affordable housing, hence his offer of one unit. There was no precise definition of sustainability. His proposal would be 100% energy efficient. More dwellings would make the village more sustainable.

Mr Brown (Parish Council Chairman) had received many objections and considered the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the small hamlet. There was no need for development. There were some empty houses in the village and no services.

Councillor Hewett (Ward Representative) said the application had been called in by Councillor Turner (the other Ward Representative) to clarify the

Action By

reasons for refusal and prevent repeat applications. The site was outside the Settlement Boundary and the previous application had been rejected by the Planning Inspector.

Councillor Smith liked the look of the proposal but Officers, the Parish Council and NCC all recommended refusal. He was not persuaded by the offer of affordable housing, particularly as it would not be in perpetuity due to the Government's Right to Buy policy.

Refused, as recommended on the grounds that the application does not represent sustainable development.

Councillor Wilkin returned to the room and re-took the Chair.

- j) Item 10: ATTLEBOROUGH: Building Plot, Leys Lane: Erection of dwelling: Applicant: Mr Stephen Westrop: Reference: 3PL/2015/1058/F

This application was recommended for approval in view of the Council's housing land supply shortage. The Planning Officer stated that the proposed development was outside the Settlement Boundary but was in keeping with what was already there.

Councillor Stasiak (Ward Representative) supported the proposal which would provide perfect infill within walking distance of the Town Centre.

Councillor Martin (also a Ward Representative) classed the area as a small hamlet and said there were ten businesses opposite.

Approved, as recommended.

- k) Item 11: LYNG: Lakeside Country Club, Quarry Lane: Change of Use of buildings and land currently in C3 use ('Dwellinghouses' – restricted occupancy) and D2

Further representations had been received concerning the loss of leisure facilities; impact on local businesses; noise; light impact, etc.

No additional buildings were to be built although some of the proposed activities might require additional equipment. Fencing adjacent the River Wensum would be conditioned. Air rifle use would be restricted to within the buildings. Quarry Lane would be resurfaced from Elsing Road to the end. The submitted ecology management plan and the Flood Risk assessment were considered acceptable.

Ms Susan Jarvis (Objector) owned the adjacent, adult-only camp site for touring caravans. She thought the application would destroy her business which was aimed at the over 50s, many of whom had disabilities and came to the site for its tranquillity. Her business supported the other facilities in the village which would suffer if she closed.

Mr Paling (Objector) was concerned about the detrimental effect that 200 children would have on the peace and quiet of residents. There were lots of inaccuracies in the plans and the application would not benefit the existing businesses in Lyng.

Mr Goddard (for Applicant) would be the on-site manager. The Company had 25 years of experience running five centres for outdoor education. The

Action By

facilities would be subject to inspection by the Adventure Licensing Authority and would be monitored by other bodies. Up to 40 staff would be employed; 20 would live on-site throughout the year. The facility would bring trade to the village. The local garage would be used to service Company vehicles. It would be a 'dry' site so staff would use the local Public House. Noise concerns would be managed. The majority of activities would take place on the northern parts of the site with only archery taking place close to dwellings. He asked Members to review the proposed condition restricting hours as that would cause problems.

Councillor Bambridge (Ward Representative) said the site had a long history of applications and the village needed assurance that any conditions imposed would be carried out; eg the improvements to Quarry Lane. He asked Members to consider the special status of the site as the River Wensum was a Special Area of Conservation. The effects on wildlife, the rural community and local facilities needed to be considered.

Councillor Martin asked about restrictions on people living on site and was advised that the conditions applied to holidaymakers, not staff. It was also clarified that there would be no children on site between November and February.

Councillor Joel thought that such facilities were good for children and an important part of life experience. However, the problem was the amount of noise it would generate, especially in relation to the adjacent camp site.

The layout of the site was explained. The accommodation for students was further from the caravan site than the staff accommodation and it was proposed to have a hedge and fence at the boundary.

Members suggested that acoustic fencing should be required.

Councillor Claussen asked about the fence to protect the River Wensum. The route was shown on the map. However, the route might be affected by ecology such as water voles, requiring it to be 5m from the river and only one metre in height. Councillor Claussen did not consider that to be high enough. He was also concerned that if the time restrictions were not applied it would lead to endless complaints. He asked how wildlife would be safeguarded and it was pointed out that the management plan stipulated timings of certain activities to reduce the impact on wildlife.

It was noted that the Council's ecologist had looked at the management plan and had no concerns.

Councillor Smith's particular concern was the impact on the viability of local businesses. He asked what competition the proposal would create and he was advised that the site would have no bar or shop so all trade would go to local businesses.

Councillor Bambridge pointed out that the pub and shop currently got business from fishermen using the lakes and they would no longer be permitted to access the site when residential groups were there.

Mr Goddard clarified that the activities on site would cease at 8.30pm. The restriction to weekend hours was his concern as work with Youth Groups took place mainly at weekends. He reiterated that there would be no children on site between November and February but staff would remain

and would carry out refurbishments and training during that period.

The Solicitor advised the Committee that they could attribute more weight to the noise and amenity concerns than they could to their concerns relating to business competition.

Councillor Smith thought that a high enough acoustic fence would suffice but Ms Jarvis doubted that it would give sufficient peace and quiet. She also feared that wildlife would be lost and that was what brought some of her customers to the site.

Approved, as recommended together with a condition for acoustic fencing.

-) Item 12: ATTLEBOROUGH: Coombe-Martin, Hargham Road: Erection of two bungalows. Applicant: Mr Richard Adcock: Reference: 3PL/2015/1186/O

This Outline application proposed development to the rear of and accessed between two existing properties. Officers felt that the proposal would give a more built up appearance at odds with other frontage development causing harm to the character of the area.

Councillor Stasiak (Ward Representative) supported the application which had received no objections from neighbours. The site was near a bus stop, post office and shop. He pointed out that 2000 dwellings would be built in the area, including a new primary school and the Attleborough Link Road. He did not think that the development would make any difference to the character of the area at all.

Councillor Martin (also a Ward Representative) said that each application should be considered on its own merits. The surrounding area was to be developed and a nearby site had been granted permission recently.

Councillor Smith thought that the proposal would provide a more inclusive community appearance preferable to ribbon development.

The Solicitor referred to page 122 of the Agenda which said that further ecological assessments would be required before the application could be approved.

Members decided the application should be:

Deferred, for an ecological appraisal.

149/15 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF PLACE (AGENDA ITEM 10)

Noted.

150/15 APPEAL DECISIONS (AGENDA ITEM 11)

Noted.

The meeting closed at 12.55 pm