

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Held on Monday, 25 July 2016 at 9.30 am in
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

PRESENT

Mr R F W Brame	Mr A.P. Joel
Councillor M. Chapman-Allen	Mr K. Martin
Mr H E J Clarke	Mr F.J. Sharpe (Vice-Chairman)
Mr P.D. Claussen	Mr N.C. Wilkin (Chairman)
Mr P.J. Duigan	Mr P S Wilkinson

Also Present

Mr S Bell	Mr R.W. Duffield
Mr S Askew	Mrs L.H. Monument
Mr S.G. Bambridge	Mr R. R. Richmond
Mr J.P. Cowen	Mr W.H.C. Smith
Mr P M M Dimoglou	

In Attendance

Viv Bebbington	Senior Development Planner*
Steven Bell	Legal Advisor
Jemima Dean	Senior Development Planner*
Chris Hobson	Principal Planning Officer*
Helen McAleer	Senior Democratic Services Officer
Nick Moys	Principal Planning Officer *
Cathey Rix	Planning Assistant*
Sarah Robertson	Senior Planning Policy Officer*
James Tipping	Principal Planning Officer*

* Capita for Breckland Council

91/16 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)

Councillor Gilbert had requested an amendment to Minute No 84/16 to clarify that comments made about access, drainage and pressure on local services had been made by him on behalf of Councillor Wassell and that his comments about Trenchard Crescent had been omitted. He had said that Trenchard Crescent was a unique area which needed protection and to surround it with modern housing would destroy the setting of the existing houses. He was not against some small scale high quality development on part of the site and suggested that the area around Trenchard Crescent could be incorporated into the open space.

Subject to that amendment, the Minutes of the meeting held on 27 June 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

92/16 APOLOGIES & SUBSTITUTES (AGENDA ITEM 2)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Bowes. Councillor Darby was present as her Substitute.

Action By

**93/16 DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED
(AGENDA ITEM 3)**

Agenda Item 8a – Deferred Report: Old Buckenham. All Members had received direct representation.

Agenda Item 9 – Schedule Item 14: Old Buckenham. Councillor Joel was a personal friend of the applicant. He left the room whilst the item was discussed.

94/16 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (AGENDA ITEM 4)

In view of the number of applications to be considered the Chairman announced the order in which items would be discussed and confirmed which items would not be heard until the afternoon for the benefit of members of the public.

**95/16 REQUESTS TO DEFER APPLICATIONS INCLUDED IN THIS AGENDA
(AGENDA ITEM 5)**

None.

96/16 URGENT BUSINESS (AGENDA ITEM 6)

None.

97/16 LOCAL PLAN UPDATE (AGENDA ITEM 7)

The Planning Policy Officer provided the update and told Members that there had been a significant amount of work done on the Local Plan, including five sessions held in the Market Towns which had been well attended. There would be one further session, the date had yet to be arranged.

Public consultation on site allocations, the settlement boundary review and the revised housing distribution would commence in September and last for six weeks.

The evidence base studies would be reported soon.

A number of Neighbourhood Plans were being prepared with Attleborough and Mattishall both at the pre-submission consultation stage.

Councillor Clarke asked again when the Dereham Transport Study would be published as the site specifics were dependant on that. He was advised that no date had been set yet, but that Officers were aware of the issues and were hoping to confirm the date within the next couple of weeks. He was also advised that Members would get the chance to see the Study when it was presented to the Local Plan Working Group, before it was included within the evidence base for the Local Plan.

98/16 DEFERRED APPLICATIONS (AGENDA ITEM 8)

**98 .1 Old Buckenham: Builders Yard, Hargham Road: Single dwelling with access:
Applicant: Mr B Barnard: Reference: 3PL/2015/0869/O**

All Members had received direct representation on this item.

The application had been considered by the Planning Committee in February and had been approved, subject to a legal agreement tying the dwelling to the

Action By

business. However, due to financial constraints the applicant had not been able to sign the legal agreement.

Members were given a recap of the application and asked to decide if they considered it to be sustainable development.

Mr Barnard (Applicant) had sent Members a letter setting out the key reasons he believed the development was sustainable. He had been unable to obtain finance for the build whilst the dwelling was subject to a legal agreement. He had a large amount of valuable cars on site and needed security. By living on site he would no longer need to commute to his place of employment. The business employed eight local people and supported local services. It was a brownfield site and would replace one dwelling with another. He would be happy to accept a condition limiting permission to one dwelling only.

Councillor Joel (Ward Representative) said the existing house had been derelict for over 30 years and it was an eyesore. The applicant's business had been operating from the site for 12 years. He asked Members to remove the requirement for a legal agreement

Councillor Martin asked for guidance as he had thought that brownfield sites could be developed. It was explained that that did not apply to sites in the countryside if they were not sustainable under NPPF criteria.

It was confirmed that the applicant currently lived on-site in a static caravan and that Old Buckenham Parish Council supported the proposal.

The recommendation of refusal was not supported. Members felt that the application was sustainable.

RESOLVED that the application be deferred and the officers authorised to grant approval, subject to conditions, on completion of the section 106 agreement restricting the site to one dwelling only.

Members did not want to see any more dwellings on the site of the business of the area covered by this application.

98 .2 Banham: Rosary Farm, Kenninghall Road: Erection of four dwellings:
Applicant: Mr Graham Hancy: Reference: 3PL/2016/0232/O

This application had been deferred from the previous meeting for consultation with the Environmental Health Officer (EHO) regarding the potential amenity problems caused by the working farm yard to the rear of the site.

The EHO had raised no objection subject to an additional condition requiring a scheme of measures to protect amenity. The application was therefore recommended for approval with a two year time limit.

Councillor Joel supported the application which was in his Ward.

The Chairman was not happy with the layout, which was indicative only. He suggested that it could be reconfigured but agreed with the principle of development.

RESOLVED to approve Outline Planning Permission, subject to conditions.

RESOLVED that the applications be determined as follows:

- a) Item 1: DEREHAM: Mill Vue Farm, Badley Moor: Remove covenants 5.1, 5.3 and 5.4 on 3PL/2006/1067/O (re occupancy restriction): Applicant: Mr & Mrs Worledge: Reference: 3OB/2016/0006/OB

This application had been approved in 2006 subject to an occupancy restriction tying the dwelling to the engineering business. The foundations had been laid but the Applicants had been unable to get funding for the build due to the occupancy restriction. In the particular circumstances Officers felt it was reasonable that the restriction should be lifted.

Mr Futter (Agent) explained that the Applicants had been trying to get a mortgage since 2008. Their presence on the site was necessary and they were currently living on site in a caravan on temporary consents, with no certainty of future renewals.

Councillor Monument (Ward Representative) said that the applicants had persevered with the business which was viable and which she believed they intended to continue. The caravan was deteriorating and she asked Members to support the proposal.

Approved, as recommended.

- b) Item 2: STOW BEDON/BRECKLES: Watering Farm (Building 1) Woodcock Road: Demolition of existing duck rearing buildings & erection of pig rearing building - Building 1 (retrospective): Applicant: Mr C W Garrod: Reference: 3PL/2012/0707/F

Items 2 to 6 were discussed together. They were five retrospective planning applications. The background to the site was explained. The key issues were all set out in the report and included: impact on Peddars Way, residential amenity and pollution.

It was noted that the applicant could continue to rear 2,500 pigs in the original indoor buildings and up to 20,000 outdoor pigs without requiring planning permission. That was described as the 'fall back' position and was a material planning consideration.

After considerable discussions the applicant had agreed to remove the outdoor pigs, in perpetuity, in exchange for permission for the buildings.

Mr Pickering (Agricultural Planning Specialist on behalf of the Applicant) pointed out that the planning balance was in favour of approval. The Applicant had lawful use for 20,000 outdoor pigs and was prepared to agree to stop that use and limit the number of indoor pigs to 7,000. That was the best case for the environment.

Mr Gooding (for Applicant) explained that eight buildings had been demolished and replaced by four on the same footprint. The farm had originally had pigs before ducks and was now used for pigs again.

Mr Cowen (Ward Representative) represented all the Parishes concerned and they and the residents were astonished by the recommendation of approval. Peddars Way was an historic route which had been destroyed by the traffic movements. It became impassable in wet weather. The immediate neighbour lived in misery due to the noise, smell, etc. He urged Members to refuse the

application due to the pollution and harm to the environment.

Councillor M Chapman-Allen wondered why NCC had not taken any enforcement action. The Solicitor pointed out that the Committee had to determine the applications before them. They could condition a traffic movement scheme.

The Senior Planner explained that it was NCCs responsibility to maintain Peddars Way to a standard commensurate with its use. Retrospective use of the buildings would not increase traffic movements.

Members raised concerns about the damage to Peddars Way, dislike for retrospective applications and environmental pollution.

Councillor Claussen expressed the view that Members were caught between a rock and a hard place because the environment would be worse off if the application was refused.

Deferred and the officers authorised to grant approval, subject to conditions, on completion of the section 106 agreement.

- c) Item 3: STOW BEDON/BRECKLES: Watering Farm (Building 2) Woodcock Road: Demolition of existing duck rearing buildings & erection of pig rearing building - Building 2 (retrospective): Applicant: Mr C W Garrod: Reference: 3PL/2012/0708/F

This item was discussed under Minute No 99/16b) above.

Deferred and the officers authorised to grant approval, subject to conditions, on completion of the section 106 agreement.

- d) Item 4: STOW BEDON/BRECKLES: Watering Farm (Building 3) Woodcock Road: Demolition of existing duck rearing buildings & erection of pig rearing building - Building 3 (retrospective): Applicant: Mr C W Garrod: Reference: 3PL/2012/0709/F

This item was discussed under Minute No 99/16b) above.

Deferred and the officers authorised to grant approval, subject to conditions, on completion of the section 106 agreement.

- e) Item 5: STOW BEDON/BRECKLES: Watering Farm (Building 4) Woodcock Road: Demolition of existing duck rearing buildings & erection of pig rearing building - Building 4 (retrospective): Applicant: Mr C W Garrod: Reference: 3PL/2012/0710/F

This item was discussed under Minute No 99/16b) above.

Deferred and the officers authorised to grant approval, subject to conditions, on completion of the section 106 agreement.

- f) Item 6: STOW BEDON/BRECKLES: Watering Farm (Barn 2) Woodcock Road: Demolish building and extension Barn 2 convert building to pig rearing, remove portacabin and erect new office/toilet (retrospective): Applicant: Mr C W Garrod: Reference: 3PL/2012/0715/F

This item was discussed under Minute No 99/16b) above.

Deferred and the officers authorised to grant approval, subject to conditions, on completion of the section 106 agreement.

- g) Item 7: BEETLEY: land at rear of The Paddocks: Erection of 4 dwellings with detached garages: Applicant: John Hilditch Builders: Reference: 3PL/2015/0826/O

This was an outline application with only access and layout for consideration. The original proposal for seven dwellings had been reduced to four to address issues. Ecological concerns could be addressed by condition.

Mr Mayhew (Beetley Parish Council) was not against development but it should be on road frontage sites. The site was outside the Settlement Boundary and approval could set a precedent for other back-land development. The village had no housing allocation in the Local Plan the Parish Council did not support the proposal.

Mr Howe (Agent) said the site was sustainable and deliverable and ecology, tree and layout concerns could be overcome.

Mr Phelps (Objector) had lived in The Paddocks since 1998. There were very few facilities in the village. There was a lack of affordable housing which the proposal would not address. Three properties already used the brick-weave access which would not cope with further traffic.

Councillor R Richmond (Ward Representative) was also a member of the Parish Council. The Paddocks was a nice peaceful area and the site was outside the settlement boundary in open countryside and if approved would set a precedent for back-land development. A previous appeal on the site had been dismissed by the Inspector and nothing had changed. There was an alternative site put forward in the village for housing allocation.

The Chairman advised Members that it was not for them to discuss other sites and the appeal decision had been for the proposal for seven dwellings.

Councillor Sharpe asked if the surface of the access road would be changed and asked who was responsible for its upkeep. The Agent said that the Applicant owned the access and he would be happy to accept a condition to upgrade the surface if required.

Approved, as recommended.

- h) Item 8: NORTH ELMHAM: Brookside Farm: Holt Road: Demolish Brookside Farm and erect residential development, new access, community car park and public footpath: Applicant: Mr & Mrs Granville Mark: Reference: 3PL/2015/0919/O

This was an outline application with all matters reserved except access. All other information provided was indicative only. Widening of the access would provide adequate visibility splays in the 20mph zone. The legal agreement was not ready yet but would provide for community parking, footpaths and a footbridge to the school. The Parish Council would be a party to the agreement.

Mr Evans (Agent) explained that an initial application had been withdrawn and the layout had been changed and numbers reduced after negotiations with the Parish Council. There had been considerable liaison with Officers.

Action By

Mr Labouchere (on behalf of North Elmham Parish Council) said there had been good consultation between the Parish Council, Applicant, Agent and Officers and an amenable agreement had been arrived at. The legal agreement would secure the community benefits even if the land was sold on. The road would be improved by the car park, especially at school times.

Councillor Bambridge (Ward Representative) had been asked by the Parish Council to support the proposal and to ensure that the community benefits were covered by the legal agreement. He asked the developer if the car park could be provided first as that would be very helpful and the Agent confirmed that they would.

The Chairman asked about the surface of the car park and Mr Labouchere advised that there would be a porous surface and that the area adjacent Elmham Stream had an increased slab height to avoid drainage problems.

Deferred and the officers authorised to grant approval, subject to conditions, on completion of the section 106.

- i) Item 9: WHINBURGH/WESTFIELD: Westwood Stud, Dereham Road: Erection of 4 No dwellings: Applicant: Mr Dave Greenwood: Reference: 3PL/2015/1264/F

This application had received no statutory objections, subject to conditions and ecological mitigation measures.

Councillor Dimoglou (Ward Representative) supported the proposals which would provide good quality housing.

Mr Greenwood (Applicant) had been a resident since 1990. The dwellings were within easy reach of services. Two formal passing places would be provided on the access track. The scheme had a lot of local support.

Approved, as recommended.

- j) Item 10: BAWDESWELL: Land off Hall Road: Residential development of 36 dwellings: Applicant: Sovereign Group Limited: Reference: 3PL/2015/1424/F

This site was outside but adjacent to the settlement boundary. The access had been amended at the request of the Highways Authority. Additional objections had been received raising the same concerns as listed in the report. A financial contribution was proposed to increase the capacity of the school and the mobile library service. Drainage/sewage problems had been caused by a blockage to the system which had been resolved. Anglian Water had confirmed there was sufficient capacity for the development.

Mr Shannon (Objector) was representing other local residents. The site was not sustainable as current facilities could not support the increase. 36 dwellings would increase the size of the village by 15%. Sewage problems had existed for many years. There would be an increase in noise and light pollution and traffic and safety problems at the access and the A1067 junction.

Mr Mason (Vice-Chairman Bawdeswell Parish Council) said the village was not identified for growth. A previous application had been rejected. Anglian Water should demonstrate that the sewage network was adequate. Hall Road was inadequate for more traffic. There were no medical facilities in the village and no

Action By

public transport to those in North Elmham, Reepham and Swanton Morley. The school was likely to become an academy; any contribution should therefore be direct to the school not to NCC. The amenity area should be transferred to the Parish Council with an appropriate management sum.

Mr Pettifer (Agent) said all Statutory Consultee responses had been positive. They would be happy to secure appropriate ownership and funding of the open space.

Mr Bingham (Drainage Engineer on behalf of the Applicant) had checked the capacity of the foul water and sewer networks with Anglian Water. Their records showed that the only flooding problems on the register were due to a blockage.

Councillor Bambridge (Ward Representative) said there was no public transport to Dereham from the village. The Parish wanted the application refused and was objecting to its Local Service Centre status. The sewage system had always had problems and it would need to be upgraded to accommodate the 36 houses. Road access was not good and additional traffic would affect the 'walk to school' route.

Councillor Brame said local people said there was a problem and Anglian Water said there was not – it was difficult to make a decision. The plan showed a green space and he suggested a condition to require a high kerb or bunding to protect it from becoming a car park.

The Solicitor advised that with open space it was usual to require a management plan in the legal agreement and that could include restrictions to prevent parking etc, and a sum for future maintenance.

The distance to existing houses was clarified.

Councillor Claussen was concerned about the impact of 36 houses but it was pointed out that they would take several years to construct and be occupied. There had been other similar sized developments in the village built over the last 20-30 years. The school would receive a contribution and other positive benefits would be more life to support existing facilities.

The Chairman pointed out that the proposal would provide 40% affordable housing whereas several smaller developments would not bring any.

Councillor Sharpe observed that the site was identified as the preferred site for development in the Local Plan. A 15% increase in dwellings represented the village's housing allocation for the next 30 years.

Approved, as recommended.

- k) Item 11: NORTH ELMHAM: Development site adjacent to 10/12 Larch Grove: Erection of 4 No one and a half storey dwelling houses: Applicant: Mr Jon Pennells: Reference: 3PL/2015/1459/F

This application proposed four chalet bungalow style dwellings to be accessed off Larch Grove. Additional information had been provided by the applicants re flooding. The Environment Agency had no objections.

Mr Hodson (Objector) informed Members that an existing development of two chalet bungalows had been in progress for three years. He requested a time limit on this application. He was concerned about damage and safety issues caused

Action By

by large construction vehicles accessing the site through narrow roads. He also pointed out that there was no drainage provision to the site.

Councillor Bambridge (Ward Representative) had been asked to say that the Parish Council had no objection to the proposal. He requested a 9m Internal Drainage Board access strip to the site. It was confirmed that there was 9m to the nearest point of Plot 4.

Foul water drainage would be to a package treatment plant and a condition would secure other drainage details prior to development.

Approved, as recommended.

- l) Item 12: GRISTON: Development Plot Caston Road: Construction of 2 new houses with associated garages, access drive and external works: Applicant: RSLC Ltd: Reference: 3PL/2016/0050/F

This application had been amended to reduce the scale of the dwelling immediately adjacent the Grade I church. Boundary landscaping would also be provided.

The Chairman pointed out that the boundary line shown on the site layout plan was not the whole site. He was concerned about the potential for future development. Other Members agreed with those concerns.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that it could not be foreseen what applications might be made in the future but each application had to be considered on its own merits.

Approved, as recommended.

- m) Item 13: ICKBURGH: The Old Forge, Swaffham Road: One detached bungalow: Applicant: Mr Simon Ball: Reference: 3PL/2016/0108/F

This had originally been an application for two dwellings which had been amended to one. The proposal met the sustainability criteria and was recommended for approval with a two year time limit.

Mrs Ball (Applicant) had lived at the existing property for 17 years. It had substantial grounds and the application site had previously only been used for parking. The access would be improved and the new property would have a spacious plot with ample parking.

Approved, as recommended.

- n) Item 14: OLD BUCKENHAM: Asparagus Field, Cake Street: Erection of new dwelling and garage: Applicant: Mr P Potter: Reference: 3PL/2016/0194/O

Councillor Joel declared that he was a friend of the Applicant. He left the room whilst the item was discussed.

This was an outline application with only access to be considered. Highways had objected to the intensification of the use of the access. The dwelling would be sited to avoid the area of the site in flood zone 2.

Mr Doyle (on behalf of the Applicant) was a Highway Specialist. He confirmed

Action By

that the access could be safe. It was a village setting, the access had no accident history and one dwelling would not compromise safety.

Dr Wilford (Objector) handed a document to all Members. He was concerned about the unsafe junction of Harlingwood Lane and Cake Street which was very dangerous for pedestrians. He said it was unwise to use it as a pedestrian crossing place.

Approved, as recommended.

- o) Item 15: BESTHORPE: Norwich Road: Erection of 3 detached dwellings and associated garages, access and parking: Applicant: Mr & Mrs Simon Rogers: Reference: 3PL/2016/0271/O

A previous application for two dwellings had been refused as encroachment into the open countryside. If approved, Highways required a footway link. Officers felt the land had value as an area of natural separation.

Mr Cowen (Agent) explained that the previous refusal had been before the NPPF was adopted. The site was natural infill and would contribute to the Council's five year housing land supply. The indicative design followed the existing street pattern, as recommended by Officers in informal discussion.

Councillor Askew (Ward Representative) was surprised the application was recommended for refusal. Two similar applications in the parish had been approved recently. The application represented small scale, infill development in a sustainable location. He asked Members to approve it.

Councillor Martin agreed with the Agent and Ward Representative. He felt that Besthorpe deserved infill development. There was a continuous footpath opposite and local employment opportunities. He supported the proposal.

The recommendation for refusal was not supported.

Approved, as Members considered it represented sustainable development.

- p) Item 16: GRISTON: Low Meadow Park, Thompson Road: Replacement of permanent static caravans with a mix of seven dwellings: Applicant: Mr D Ulrych: Reference: 3PL/2016/0297/O

This application had been amended and now proposed the replacement of five static caravans with five dwellings, not seven as originally applied for. Due to that reduction, a footpath was no longer required.

Approved, as recommended.

- q) Item 17: STOW BEDON/BRECKLES: Moat Farm Caravan and Camp Site, Low Road: Erection of dwelling: Applicant: Mr & Mrs Peter Mills: Reference: 3PL/2016/0371/F

Further information had been provided in the Supplement to the Agenda. Additional supporting representations had been received. The site was outside the settlement boundary. There were no local services and no public transport. Ecology impacts could be conditioned as could an archaeological condition.

Mr Cowen (Agent) had had preliminary discussions with Officers. Low Road was at the heart of Breckles which was part of a large rural parish. The proposal

Action By

would cause no harm or intrusion to the rural setting. The house had been designed as a house for life and would blend into the landscape.

Mr White (Supporter) had lived in Breckles for 16 years. The Parish Council strongly supported the application. The whole of the village of Breckles and lower Stow Bedon were outside the settlement boundary. The house was consistent with others and would fit in well. It looked like a barn and was completely in keeping, eco-friendly and energy efficient. It would contribute to local housing need.

Councillor Smith (Ward Representative) agreed that the application would make a positive contribution to housing in the area. There were services in Rocklands which was close-by. The house adhered to the landscape character assessment and would cause only moderate harm.

Councillor Clarke asked about the reference to heritage assets on the site. Mr Cowen provided an earlier map extract which showed the position of a large moat which was not part of the site. When the pond on-site had been dug 12 years ago no archaeological evidence had been found. However, the Applicant was willing to dig trial trenches across the site if required.

The recommendation of refusal was not supported.

Approved, subject to conditions including the requirement for archaeological investigation before the commencement of work. Members felt the modest dwelling on an infill plot would enhance the countryside

- r) Item 18: SWANTON MORLEY: New House, Gooseberry Hill: Residential development – 9 dwellings: Applicant: Ms Sara Large: Reference: 3PL/2016/0454/O

This was the re-submission of an Outline application previously refused due to concerns about density, appearance and impact on the character of the area. The new proposal included some single storey development and a more spacious layout.

Mr Atterwill (Chairman Swanton Morley Parish Council) supported the application. The only problem was some confusion about open space. The Parish Council requested a condition requiring landscaping and open space details to be provided at the reserved matters stage.

Mr Evans (Agent) had worked with the Parish Council to reach agreement on the design. He was happy to agree to the landscaping and open space condition. Regarding objections to the application on road safety grounds, he had checked with Norfolk Constabulary and there had been no accidents within 250m of the site in the last nine years.

Mr Willis (Objector) lived in the Listed Building close to the development. He had concerns about density and traffic. He still felt that the development would cause unacceptable harm to the character of the area. Traffic volume and speed was already a problem and the additional movements from a single access would cause additional problems.

Councillor Duffy (Ward Representative) noted that although there were a lot of objections on the website they were not from local people. He was happy to support the proposal.

Action By

The Chairman pointed out that some of the objections might have been from relatives of local people, writing on their behalf and said that all comments were taken into consideration. He asked whether a legal agreement was required for the open space and the Solicitor confirmed that it could be dealt with by condition.

Councillor Claussen accepted that there had been a lot of work with the Parish Council but he was worried that that might count for nothing at Reserved Matters stage. He asked for the application to come back to Committee if the proposals deviated from the indicative layout.

The Principal Planning Officer said that a condition could be framed to require the proposals to broadly accord with the indicative layout provided.

Approved, as recommended.

- s) Item 19: NECTON: 20 Hale Road: Conversion of existing bungalow (C3) into Church Hall: Applicant: Dudley Business Services: Reference: 3PL/2016/0491/F

This application proposed change of use of a bungalow surrounded by residential development, opposite a Doctor's surgery, to a Church Hall for a Christian fellowship known as the Brethren. The garage would be demolished and the access widened to provide additional parking. Up to 40 people would use the Hall for about four hours a week, for worship only. An informal agreement with the Doctor's surgery would allow staff from the medical practice to park at the Hall during working hours.

Mr Porter (Objector) lived next door and was concerned about overlooking and noise in the early mornings. The open yard could also lead to security issues.

Mr Fisher (Objector) noted that the 'minor alterations' would be all the internal walls being removed to create a Hall.

Mr Barnes (Applicant) had attended the Necton Parish Council meeting in May and was aware of local concerns about car parking and traffic. He had heard that the surgery opposite had problems with people parking in the street and he had spoken to the Practice Manager. As their hours of use did not conflict he had offered the car park if needed and had also offered to erect a sign asking people not to park on the street. With regard to noise, they would only use the Hall for four hours a week. It would not be hired out to anyone else. They sought to be considerate and neighbourly. Their facility in Ashill had met with the same objections but had been operating for eight years without problems.

Councillor Sharpe asked what time the worship would take place and he was advised that the Brethren universally had a 6am start on a Sunday morning, but they were very conscious of the need not to disturb their neighbours.

Approved, as recommended.

It was noted that if the use ceased the property could revert to a dwelling.

- t) Item 20: MATTISHALL: Land to rear of Vine Cottage, Welborne Common: Erection of one agricultural workers dwelling: Applicant: Mr Stacey Beesley: Reference: 3PL/2016/0651/F

Members were advised that the site was part in Breckland, part in South Norfolk.

Action By

An application for a cattle shed had been approved by South Norfolk the previous week. Currently the number of cattle on site was relatively small. The application did not sufficiently demonstrate the functional need required for an agricultural worker's dwelling.

Councillor Dimoglou (Ward Representative) explained that the applicant was trying to increase the size of the herd and improve the business. His daughter was taking over and deserved to be able to live independently of her father.

Mr Parker (Agent) said the Parish Council did not object as long as agricultural need could be demonstrated. The same information had been submitted to South Norfolk and they had accepted it when approving the cattle building.

Ms Beasley (Applicant's daughter) was passionate about keeping the farm going and increasing the size of the herd. She hoped to breed stock in the future and would be playing a more active role in the business.

In response to a question from Councillor Sharpe it was explained that the applicant wanted separate accommodation for his daughter to give him more room for his role as a foster carer.

It was confirmed that the dwelling would be subject to an agricultural tie.

Councillor Claussen pointed out that both Mattishall and Welborne Parish Councils had raised concerns and yet the Agent said they did not object.

The Principal Planning Officer advised that it was difficult to disentangle agricultural need and personal circumstances. Someone was needed on site but there were already a number of dwellings on the holding. Based on the information provided the income from the holding did not match the size of dwelling proposed. It was pointed out that the dwelling would be future proof.

The occupants and ownership of the other dwellings on site were explained.

The recommendation for refusal was not supported.

Deferred and the officers authorised to grant approval, subject to conditions, on completion of a section 106 agreement requiring agricultural occupancy. Members felt the need was justified to care for the increased number of cattle.

- u) Item 21: NARBOROUGH: Cabin, Swaffham Road: Removal of condition 3 on 3PL/2010/0979/F to a general residential dwelling C3 use: Applicant: Mr K Bell: Reference: 3PL/2016/0005/VAR

This was a finely balanced application seeking the removal of an occupancy condition. Planning permission had been granted to the applicant as a Gypsy/Traveller. There was still an unmet need for such sites in the District. However, local issues had arisen due to the close proximity of the site and shared access with other residential properties. The Applicant wanted to move away and relinquish the use of the site. However, it was pointed out that it could still be acquired and occupied by another member of the Travelling community.

Ms Davies (Supporter) and other neighbours to the site had concerns about the shared access and use of the site for Traveller use.

Mr Nicholls (Agent) agreed that the site was too close to other properties. It had

Action By

been marketed for the required time but the issues would continue if it was sold to another Traveller. The proposal to remove the condition had local support.

Councillor Wilkinson (Ward Representative) confirmed that the site was not suitable as a Traveller site. He urged Members to approve the application.

The recommendation for refusal was not supported.

Approved, as Members felt the removal of the condition was acceptable and Traveller accommodation should be in more appropriate locations.

100/16 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF PLACE (AGENDA ITEM 10)

Noted.

101/16 APPEAL DECISIONS (AGENDA ITEM 11)

Noted.

102/16 ENFORCEMENT UPDATE (AGENDA ITEM 12)

Noted.

103/16 2016 ANNUAL STATEMENT OF FIVE YEAR HOUSING LAND SUPPLY (AGENDA ITEM 13)

The Senior Planning Policy Officer presented the report and explained that there had been some changes to the five year housing land supply calculation based on a new evidence base.

Previously the Council had been expected to create 780 new dwellings per year, which was the target set within the Core Strategy and reflected the Regional Spatial Strategies' requirements. That target had been adjusted to 597 per year following new evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). Due to the previous under delivery against the housing requirement, it was necessary to provide a 20% buffer on land supply as per the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

In 2015/16, 619 dwellings had been delivered. This was the highest delivery rate of new homes since 2008/9.

The way in which the figures had been calculated was explained to Members. Legal advice had been taken on which method the Council should use. A range of scenarios was presented within the report.

It had become apparent that the majority of housing provision from the two Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUE) in Attleborough and Thetford, would provide housing over a longer period than the Local Plan would cover. The five year housing land supply could only include houses which would be delivered in the next five years. Following research with developers and giving consideration to the sites with existing planning permissions it was estimated that 3509 dwellings would be delivered in the next five years which would provide a 4.7 year housing land supply based on the SHMA figures and the Liverpool approach. The statement had been calculated as at 31 March 2016 and there had been some recent planning applications which were not included. Therefore, it had been decided to produce a mid-year statement in October to see if the five year

Action By

land supply could be achieved. In the absence of a five year land supply the NPPF stated that the policies in the Local Plan regarding housing supply were not considered to be up to date.

Councillor Duigan asked if there was a more recent SHMA than the one produced in 2015. It was explained that the SHMA had been finalised in mid-2015 and it was a joint report with four other Local Authorities. The other Local Authorities were using the SHMA figures to calculate their five year housing land supply.

Councillor Clarke noted that with the slower delivery of the two SUE developments would put greater on Dereham and surrounding areas to provide housing.

As the two SUEs had a development period beyond 2036 which was the end date for the Local Plan, discussions were being held with developers to try to clarify delivery rate figures as accurate information was needed to avoid an appeal challenge to the Plan.

Councillor Clarke asked for an explanation of the relationship between Neighbourhood Plans and the Local Plan. It was explained that when a Neighbourhood Plan was adopted it became part of the development plan for the District. It was subject to the same tests in the NPPF as the Local Plan and if the Council did not have a five year housing land supply its policies relating to the supply of housing would not be considered up to date. If an adopted Neighbourhood Plan included a housing allocation those figures could be included within the five year housing land supply.

Councillor Martin pointed out that Attleborough was different to Thetford. There were some sites with planning permission which were not included in the prediction and development was progressing so well he thought it likely that the predicted figures would be exceeded.

Councillor Claussen asked if the problem in Thetford was the lack of a developer.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer said that discussion with the applicants were on-going. She was confident that the evidence base was sound. All the sites had been visited and Officers had been realistic in their presumptions.

The meeting closed at 6.03 pm

CHAIRMAN