

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

**Held on Monday, 22 June 2009 at 9.30 am in
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

PRESENT

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

Also Present

Mr S. J. P. Rogers

In Attendance

Heather Burlingham	- Assistant Development Control Officer
John Chinnery	- Solicitor & Standards Consultant
Phil Daines	- Development Services Manager
Helen McAleer	- Member Services Officer
Nick Moys	- Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects)
Mike Brennan	- Principal Development Control Officer
Darryl Smith	- Principal Housing Officer (Strategy and Enabling)

94/09 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)

The minutes of the meeting held on 1 June 2009 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

95/09 APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 2)

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs M Chapman-Allen.

**96/09 DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED
(AGENDA ITEM 3)**

The following declarations of interest were received.

Mr M Kiddle-Morris, Mr B Borrett and Mr J Labouchere declared a personal interest in Schedule Item 6 (Scarning) by virtue of knowing the applicant.

Mr N Wilkin declared a personal interest in Schedule Item 8 (Necton) by virtue of owning two properties in the vicinity of the site and having called the application in as Ward Member.

Action By

97/09 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (AGENDA ITEM 4)

1. Jon Durbin, Operations Manager from Capita Symonds, was introduced to the Committee. Mr Durbin told Members that he would be overseeing the maintenance of the high standard of service. He said that he aimed to be accessible if they had any issues they wished to raise with him.
2. The Principal Planning Officer (major projects) told Members that the planning and listed building applications for the Abbey Barns development had been called in by the Secretary of State. (This decision had come as a surprise as twelve months previously similar proposals had not been called in.)

This meant that the Council could no longer make the decision and the next steps would be similar to the appeal process. A Public Inquiry would be arranged, probably in September or October, but no date had yet been set.

A Member asked if there was any indication why the applications had been called in and was told that the letter said that the decisions might conflict with national policies on important matters.

98/09 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (AGENDA ITEM 7)

The Development Services Manager told Members that the Examination in Public would commence the following week. The Inspector was only able to sit for two days that week (on the Tuesday and Wednesday) and therefore the programme had been extended slightly and should now conclude on 17 July.

99/09 ATTLEBOROUGH: PROPOSED ANAEROBIC DIGESTION UNIT ON LAND AT ATTLEBOROUGH POULTRY FARMS, OFF B1077: REFERENCE: 3PL/2009/0247/F: APPLICANT: S S AGRISERVICES (AGENDA ITEM 9)

The Principal Planning Officer (major projects) advised Members that there had been a number of outstanding issues relating to odour control, impact on local residents and traffic.

Comments from the Environment Agency had been received late on Friday 19 June, objecting to the odour management proposals. The applicants had been informed that officers would be recommending refusal in the light of those comments and the application had been withdrawn.

100/09 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS (AGENDA ITEM 10)

RESOLVED that the applications be determined as follows:

- (a) Item 1: 3PL/2008/1627/F: Brettenham: Shadwell Breck Cottage, Snarehill: New cottage and garage: Mr Phillip Hodson

This item had been deferred for further investigation following the late withdrawal of objections by the RSPB.

Action By

- (b) Item 2: 3PL/2009/0242/F: Swanton Morley: Adjacent Swanton Morley Doctors' Surgery & Lincoln House Care Home: 30 bed care unit: Dr Sanjay Kaushal

Outline approval had previously been granted for a two storey care home on this site. This new application proposed a single storey care home to fit in with the development of single storey, assisted care bungalows currently being constructed on part of the site. The simple design followed the form of the bungalows.

Members had concerns particularly with regard to the size of the roof and detailing.

Deferred, to allow negotiations on design.

- (c) Item 3: 3PL/2009/0247/F: Attleborough: Crows Hall Farm, Land west of Stony Lane & South of B1077: On-farm anaerobic digestion unit, construction of silage clamp store, one lagoon and a balancing pond: SS Agriservices

This item had been withdrawn. See Minute No 102/09 above.

- (d) Item 4: 3PL/2009/0263/CU: Kilverstone: Kilverstone Park: Change of use of land to use for football pitches and training: Thetford Independent Football FC

This application proposed the creation of four football pitches and car parking areas and the change of use of a former café to changing, toilet and refreshment facilities.

The site fell within the Stone Curlew buffer zone and this issue had been addressed.

No objections had been received and the proposal was supported by Sport England. A short-fall in pitches in Thetford had been identified following the Open Space Assessment and this proposal would provide facilities for junior players.

Approved, as recommended.

- (e) Item 5: 3PL/2009/0274/D: Carbrooke & Grison: Former RAF Watton Technical Site, Norwich Road: Development of 100 affordable dwellings: Broadland Housing Association

This application formed part of the redevelopment of the RAF Watton Technical Site. Members were shown a plan of the whole site and the different phases of development were pointed out.

The scheme under consideration was a reserved matters application for affordable housing on three separate parcels of land, referred to as Sites A, B and C.

Sites A and B provided blocks and small terraces of housing, situated between the road and the green spine area. Site C was different, providing three blocks of apartments. All areas maintained key views through the development.

Action By

A number of existing trees would be retained and additional tree planting was proposed.

No full set of elevational drawings was available as a number of amendments to the layout and design had been required. Members were shown the original drawings and then sketches of the agreed changes which included additional brick detailing, chimneys and improvements to the appearance of corner properties.

The apartments had butterfly style mono-pitched roofs and incorporated brick, timber boarding and render. They provided an interesting contrast to the rest of the development.

Mr Mumford-Smith, representing Broadland Housing Association, said they were keen to raise the standards and build to Code Level 4 including solar and photo-voltaic panels and rainwater collection. The development would help to meet a district-wide need for affordable housing. They had been successful in getting funding and were in a position to deliver the first houses by next Easter.

A Member was unhappy with the provision of parking courts as they were not user friendly. However, he applauded the team on having negotiated amendments which he felt upgraded the level of design.

The following points were clarified:

- the parking provision requirements had been set by the Appeal Inspector at 150% and could not be increased;
- the 100 affordable houses represented 30% of the houses in this phase of development;
- some of the houses would be rented, some shared ownership and others rented with a right to buy.

A Member asked if some of the new trees to be planted could be fruit trees and if allotments could be provided. Although it might be possible for fruit trees to be included, as the level of open space had been approved at the outline stage, allotments could not be provided.

Approved, as recommended, subject to receipt of a full set of amended drawings

- (f) Item 6: 3PL/2009/0310/F: Scarning: Riverside Garden Centre, Swaffham Road: Provision of 399m² retail/commercial space with 14 flats above (over two floors) and 16 parking spaces to rear: Mr S Cross

Mr Borrett, Mr Kiddle-Morris and Mr Labouchere all declared a personal interest in this item.

This application was a revision to a previously approved scheme. It proposed the reduction of the ground floor retail area from 615m² to 399m² and a change to the design of the building incorporating a new gable above each shop unit and Juliet balconies. The massing was also significantly reduced.

All the issues raised had been discussed previously.

Action By

Members considered that this was a much better scheme but further consideration should be given to the inclusion of window arches.

Approved, as recommended.

- (g) Item 7: 3PL/2009/0366/F: Land at Rose Farm, Dereham Road:
Erection of two holiday cottages: Mr G Loxton

Members were shown a plan of the Rose Farm complex which included a farmhouse and a number of outbuildings which had already been converted to residential use. There was also an existing holiday cottage and one agricultural building.

Under the terms of a proposed S106 agreement, this agricultural building (to the front of the application site) would be removed and a previous permission for that building and a workshop (not yet constructed) would be revoked.

The proposed holiday cottages would provide two-bedroom accommodation, with parking and bin storage provision.

Mr Loxton, applicant, explained that the site was not a busy working farm and although there had been problems with the industrial use of adjacent agricultural buildings previously, these had been resolved and there were no noise problems now. He said that holiday homes were more in keeping with the area and would benefit the neighbours as they would create less traffic movements and noise than the existing building to be removed and the proposed workshop which could still be built.

Members discussed the proximity of the proposed holiday cottages to the agricultural buildings on the adjacent site. They asked for clarification of the low-key industrial use and it was explained that previous inappropriate and unauthorised use had led to enforcement action. The activities had reduced. An Enforcement Notice remained in force.

Other concerns raised were in relation to the busy road and the unattractive design of the holiday cottages. It was pointed out that the holiday accommodation would reduce the number of traffic movements and that the cottages had been designed to appear as agricultural outbuildings to fit in with existing.

Finally a Member requested additional screening once the agricultural building was removed.

Deferred and the Development Services Manager be authorised to grant approval, as recommended, with a condition requiring additional landscaping, on completion of the section 106 agreement described.

Mr Kiddle-Morris abstained from voting as he had arrived during the discussions and had not heard all the arguments.

Mr Labouchere also abstained from voting.

Action By

(h) Item 8: 3PL/2009/0368/F: Necton: Garden Plot adjacent 21 Tuns Road: Proposed dwelling and garage: Mr C & Mrs W England

Mr Wilkin declared a personal interest and did not take part in the discussions or vote on this item.

This application was for a bungalow and garage in the rear garden of the applicant's dwelling. A similar proposal had previously been refused on grounds of overdevelopment.

The current proposal had been reduced in size by the removal of the conservatory; the garage had been detached and also reduced in size; and the overall width of the dwelling had been reduced. Rear facing windows had been removed to avoid undue impact on amenity and avoid overlooking. These changes had improved the relationship with the existing and neighbouring properties.

Mr Wagstaff, objector, said that the development did not enhance the village. It would be intrusive and visually dominating. The new dwelling would only be 18" lower than a two storey house and two windows would overlook six neighbouring properties. He was also concerned about highway safety due to the number of traffic movements at the adjacent Inglenook House.

Mr Moulton, Agent, said that although the previous application had been unsuccessful, the site could accommodate a dwelling and garage as the original house occupied a double plot. The dwelling would integrate well with existing. The reduction in the size of the footprint would provide better parking and turning facilities.

A Member queried the description of the dwelling as a bungalow when it was clearly two storeys. He felt the site was suitable for a bungalow but not a house.

Another Member was concerned that the reduction in size was mainly due to the omission of a conservatory, but noted that there was no proposed condition to restrict permitted development rights. It was confirmed that this would be added if the application was approved.

In response to being asked why the application was recommended for approval when it was clearly 'backland' development, the Development Services Manager explained that this did not make it automatically unacceptable. There was already development in depth in the vicinity and officers had to consider its impact on the character and appearance of the area.

Refused, contrary to recommendation, on grounds of over-development of the site and failure to enhance.

Notes to the Schedule

Item No	Speaker
5	Mr Mumford-Smith – for Applicant
7	Mr Loxton - Applicant
8	Mr Wagstaff – Objector Mr Moulton - Agent

Action By

Written Representations taken into account

<u>Reference No</u>	<u>No of Representations</u>
3PL/2009/0310/F	2
3PL/2009/0366/F	2
3PL/2009/0368/F	2

**101/09 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
MANAGER (AGENDA ITEM 11)**

This item was noted.

102/09 ENFORCEMENT ITEMS (AGENDA ITEM 12)

This item was noted.

103/09 APPEAL DECISIONS (AGENDA ITEM 13)

This item was noted.

104/09 THETFORD REGENERATION (AGENDA ITEM 14)

At a previous meeting of the Committee Members had requested further information on the plans for regeneration of the Barnham Cross Estate.

The Council's Principal Housing Officer (Strategy and Enabling) introduced Liz Robinson from Oxburys (Project Managers), Laura Handford from Flagship Housing, and Nicole LeRonde and David Thompson from Ingleton Wood (Architects). They gave an informal presentation.

David explained that the original brief had been to assess the Estate which comprised about 800 dwellings, some small shops, a community centre and two schools. Regeneration proposals included the improvement of parking and open space facilities and the replacement of out-dated buildings.

There were long-term goals, but quick wins were needed to build the confidence of residents in the ability of the project to succeed. Crime reduction was also key.

A number of partners were involved including an active group of residents known as the Barnham Action Group and the Norfolk Constabulary.

One main issue identified was that the estate had not been designed to cope with the present day level of car ownership. Some garage courts were not used, leading to vandalism and security problems. Residents wanted to park close to their homes and this led to damage to green areas.

An Open meeting was held to which everyone was invited. A Steering Group was formed and a Masterplan developed.

The estate was divided into zones and each area was surveyed and a record made of the current state. Strategies were created.

- Where possible, green spaces and trees would be protected and preserved, but where this was not possible they would be removed and replaced with formal parking areas.

Action By

- 44 poor grade houses would be re-developed providing 80-100 new dwellings built to Code Level 4.
- The old shops (all vacant) and community centre would be replaced with new to provide a focal point for the estate.

Nicole told Members that lessons had been learned during this process. The most valuable being the need to keep people involved at all stages by partnership working and inclusive consultation.

Flexibility and funding were also key issues. It would be necessary to identify development partners and to source funding. It was hoped that Moving Thetford Forward would contribute to funding for the Beech Close parking improvements. The HCA (Home and Communities Agency) was another potential funding source.

Laura said that the residents were starting to believe that positive results could be achieved. It was a very big job and help would be needed to co-ordinate all the landowners involved. The fact that so many different landowners were involved would complicate the process.

This was not just a one-off scheme and would be rolled out to the Abbey and Redcastle estates which had different designs and would require different solutions.

The following questions were asked during the presentation:

- Q.** How can whole areas be re-developed when some houses are in private ownership?
- R.** 95% of owner/occupiers were in favour of what was proposed. Owners would be worked with on an individual basis to reach agreement. Some dwellings would be bought, other owners might be offered new homes if required. Compulsory Purchase would only be considered as a last resort.
- Q.** Has consideration been given to providing young people with a place to go – they need a building of their own? If they have nowhere to go problems with anti-social behaviour are likely to recur.
- R.** This project did not include a youth facility as there were no resources to run one. However, this aspect was being looked at by the Moving Thetford Forward Board and had not been forgotten.
- Q.** It was no good building new shops if they would remain empty. What was being done to encourage the right sort of businesses to the estate – such as a Post Office and a grocers shop?
- R.** The Economic Development Team was involved in this work.

Finally it was noted that Swain Close was being planned as a single development with work phased over a number of years. The planning application for this would come to the Committee at the end of the year.

Action By

A Member noted that the cost would be immense and asked if some of the houses would be sold on the open market. Laura advised that they were working out the costs and details were not known at the moment.

The Chairman thanked them for a very useful and enlightening presentation.

The meeting closed at 1.03 pm

CHAIRMAN