DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Development Management Committee of South Norfolk District Council held at South Norfolk House, Long Stratton, on Wednesday 28 March 2018 at 10.00 am.

Committee Members Present: Councillors: V Thomson (Chairman), V Bell, D Bills (for applications 1–6), B Duffin (for applications 1–9), F Ellis, M Gray, C Kemp, G Minshull, L Neal (for applications 1–7) and A Thomas

Apologies: Councillor: Y Bendle

Substitute Members: Councillor: N Legg for Y Bendle

Officers in Attendance: The Development Manager (H Mellors), the Development Management Team Leader (R Collins), the Senior Planning Officers (C Raine and C Watts) and the Planning Officers (T Barker and B Skipper)

The Press and 34 members of the public were also in attendance.

380. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following members declared interests in the matters listed below. Unless indicated otherwise, they remained in the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/2450/H</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by local member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>V Bell</td>
<td>Member considered she was pre-determined and stepped down from the Committee for this item and reverted to her role as local member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application ID</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/1828/RVC</td>
<td>ALDEBY</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Applicant, Objector and local member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2515/F</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2701/O</td>
<td>EAST CARLETON</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Member considered he was pre-determined and stepped down from the Committee for this item and reverted to his role as local member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2920/F</td>
<td>WRAMLINGHAM</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by the Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/0004/F</td>
<td>ALDEBY</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by local member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/0082/RVC</td>
<td>WHEATACRE</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by the Applicant and local member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/0199/F</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>V Bell</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by the Applicant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 381. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 31 January 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### 382. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

The Committee considered the report (circulated) of the Director of Growth and Business Development, which was presented by the officers. The Committee received updates to the report, which are appended to these minutes at Appendix A.

The following speakers addressed the meeting with regard to the applications listed below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICATION</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>SPEAKER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/2450/H</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Cllr V Bell – on behalf of objectors and as local member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/1828/RVC</td>
<td>ALDEBY</td>
<td>B Wyllie - objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2515/F</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>D Sarson – Diss Town Council M Bootman – objector P Hyde - objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr T Palmer – local member Cllr K Kiddie – local member Cllr G Minshull – local member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2490/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>E Whettingsteel – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2701/O</td>
<td>EAST CARLETON</td>
<td>G Davies – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2845/F</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>N Cooper – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/0272/F</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>R Brown – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2743/F</td>
<td>GREAT MOULTON</td>
<td>J Grimmer – Applicant J Parker – Agent for Applicant Cllr M Wilby – local member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2920/F</td>
<td>WRAMLINGHAM</td>
<td>L Norton – in support of the Applicant Cllr M Dewsbury – local member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2795/F</td>
<td>NEWTON FLOTMAN</td>
<td>P Sneddon – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2796/LB</td>
<td>NEWTON FLOTMAN</td>
<td>P Sneddon – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/0004/F</td>
<td>ALDEBY</td>
<td>K Powley – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/0017/F</td>
<td>REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON</td>
<td>R Twigg – in support of the Applicant P Oakes - Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/0082/RVC</td>
<td>WHEATACRE</td>
<td>D Ladd – Objector Mrs Beaumont – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/0199/F</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>D Le-May – Applicant J Thompson – in support of Applicant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Committee made the decisions indicated in Appendix B of these minutes, conditions of approval or reasons for refusal of planning permission as determined by the Committee being in summary form only and subject to the final determination of the Director of Growth and Business Development.

383. PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the planning appeals.

(The meeting closed at 4.38pm)

_____________________
Chairman
## Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

– 28 March 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Updates</th>
<th>Page No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1 - 2017/2450</td>
<td>Representation from Cllr Lewis forwarded to the Development Management Committee and noted by officers.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Item 2 – 2017/2247 | 1. Further comments received from Council’s Landscape Architect in response to amended Landscape Scheme and Management Plan. All amendments satisfactory and to be listed as agreed plans/documents for implementation.  

**Officer response:**  
It is recommended that Condition 3 is updated to remove the requirement for a landscape management scheme to be submitted, as these details have now been agreed and list new agreed documents/plans.  
2. Updated comments received from the Highways Authority with regards to the detailed internal road layout.  

**Officer response:**  
Further minor amendments are awaited from applicant, however all other aspects of the road layout, access arrangements and parking are acceptable and the overall layout will not change as a result of these amendments. Application is recommended for approval subject to confirmation from the Highway Authority that the amendments comply with the highway authority’s technical standards. | 24 |
| Item 3 – 2017/1828 | No update | 45 |
| Item 4 – 2017/2515 | A further letter of objection has been received from the Diss Heritage Triangle Trust, their comments are summarised as follows:  
The proposal is one of many submitted for development in various Morrison’s carparks and has little or no relation to the layout, character or needs of Diss.  
This is a proposal essential to the development of the Neighbourhood Plan and in the deferred consideration of the application on 28th March the Trust again asks for the application to be refused.  
The design quality is low and for that reason alone fails to meet the requirements of the current National Planning Policy Framework. The new, out for consultation, Framework (Section 7 ... Ensuring the vitality of town centres, Section 12 Achieving well-designed places, and especially Section 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment, para 183) further extends and emphasises design and heritage reasons for refusal. | 57 |
In the Diss Express of March 23rd it is announced by the Council Leader that SNC will work with local communities as part of a new 'proactive and innovative approach'. Diss Town Council, the Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, Local dependent Traders Group and this Trust, all forming part of the Diss community urge the refusal of this application. It is hoped the 'better planning' involved in 'engaging communities' will mean the objections to this application are given considerable weight and the application refused.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 5 – 2018/0126</th>
<th>No update</th>
<th>69</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 6 – 2017/2490</td>
<td><strong>Officer update</strong>: The proposed building straddles the strategic gap and the proposed garden is within the strategic gap.</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Parish Council**  | • Outside development boundary and inside Wymondham / Hethersett strategic gap  
• Contrary to streetscene and out of keeping with neighbouring dwellings. | |
| **An addition letter of objection** | • Concerned that the proposed development would exacerbate surface water flooding problems at their property on the opposite side of the road. | |
| Item 7 – 2017/2701 | A proposed Street scene photomontage has been submitted by the applicant and sent to members. It will form part of the officer presentation. Water Management Officer: Support conditionally subject to condition for details of surface water disposal. | 81 |
| Item 8 – 2017/2845 | No update | 91 |
| Item 9 – 2018/0272 | **NCC Highways**: Support subject to provision of on-site car parking.  
1 letter of objection:  
• Proposed house would dominate gardens of Nos 5 and 5a,  
• Height of roof would be out of character with the area.  
• The rear garden of the proposed house would be very small for the size of the house.  
• The  
• proposal represents overdevelopment of the site.  
• The proposed house is shown as being hard against the southern boundary of the applicant's land, along which a fence is to be erected on completion of No. 5. There is thus no room for scaffolding to be erected during the construction works, neither would any maintenance on that side of the house be possible without accessing from the neighbour's land (No. 5). | 99 |
- If the proposal were to go ahead there is very limited space for delivery vehicles, a rubbish skip, workers’ vehicles and all the paraphernalia that goes with a building site. The applicant has right of access over the portion of the access track referred to above but we foresee our access (to No. 7 and No. 5A) being frequently blocked. No. 5 will suffer similarly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 10 – 2017/2743</th>
<th>There is a proof-reading error in section 5.3 of the report (second reason for refusal) which should read - “…within a location where a 5-year housing land supply can be demonstrated…”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Item 11 – 2017/2920  | 1. There is a proof-reading error in section 5.3 of the report (second reason for refusal) which should read - “…within a location where a 5-year housing land supply can be demonstrated…”  
2. Expansion of comments from Cllr Dewsbury in calling in this application; Proposal would support small country business and contribute to community life of small village. Site is not isolated, close to village boundaries of Wramplingham, Barford & Gt Melton. Short car journeys are acceptable in this context.  
3. Two further letters of representation have been received and are summarised with an officer response below: Planning policies generally unchanged since enforcement action some years ago. Unauthorised use of land as forestry contractors yard. Approval would legitimise unauthorised use and should be deferred until forestry business is considered. Forestry business better sited in less sensitive or commercial area. Issues of wildlife and flooding not addressed. Site is spatially isolated from other built development. Site will be visually intrusive. If permitted, would urbanise this rural spot. Approval would legitimise unauthorised use and should be deferred until forestry business is considered. Objections are raised to development of river valley in recent GNLP consultation. This would set poor precedent.  
Officer response: These matters have largely been addressed within the relevant sections of the committee report. |

104

111
In 1992, the Council served an enforcement notice requiring removal of an unauthorised building on this site, notice upheld on appeal. Subsequent planning application to retain this building was refused on landscape harm and lack of functional need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 14 – 2018/0004</td>
<td>Further to Cllr William Kemp's comments in the committee report, please note his further comments, summarised below, with regards to this application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed annexe is not &quot;significantly distanced from the main dwelling&quot;. It is a 10 second walk from door to door.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The house and proposed annexe would have a shared parking area so it is incorrect to state that the proposed annexe would have its own parking area. The 'garden' for the annexe already exists within the curtilage of the main house so this application does not 'on the ground' create a new garden. Indeed creating 'rooms' within a larger garden or having dedicated spaces within a larger garden separated by hedges/walls is a well respected technique within landscaping (i.e. a kitchen garden).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It has been suggested that the Applicants could convert the building to the left of the main house but again from a cursory inspection on site this is not viable. This building has no foundations, is tall and thin and unsuited to being an annexe for elderly relatives. The building could not provide adequate accommodation on the ground floor and is not suited for the installation of chair lifts for that purpose. Any extensions to this building to make it more user friendly would have detrimental impact on the appearance of the main farm house which whilst not listed should be preserved/enhanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I also note that the Highways Officer has also provided support for the application on the basis that the accommodation is used as an annexe - not as a separate home or holiday accommodation. This refutes the officers point that you would struggle to resist removing any conditions re. re-sale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officer response: There is no set definition of close relationship. How we would usually interpret this is that the main dwelling and the annexe would either share accommodation, garden or other outside space, without separation. Given the annexe is separate and has its own garden and parking I would suggest it has no relationship with the main dwelling and its position adjacent to the highway further exacerbates this and its likelihood that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
it would be a separate dwelling in the future, contrary to policy.

 Officers have suggested an extension to the building adjacent to create ground floor accommodation and we consider this is possible without altering the character and appearance of the existing.

 I have reviewed the highways authority comments which are in response to this proposal only. Therefore, I would not assume that an application for a dwelling would be unacceptable in this location in terms of impact on the highway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 15 – 2018/0017</th>
<th>Highway Authority comments:</th>
<th>131</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The section of Swan Lane from where the car park is served has double yellow lines from the junction with Weavers Croft to The Thoroughfare both sides. Therefore there can be no possibility of parking on the highway should any problems arise within the car park itself. The road is also subject to a 20 mph speed limit for that section. The road is one way only for the section at the side of the PH building up to the junction with The Thoroughfare. The development does however, appear to be using a good proportion of the car parking area. Although the space used will depend on the customer attraction of the facility. If the facility does prove very popular then whilst there is the possibility of vehicles backing up onto the highway, then this is likely to be sporadic. The NPPF only permits a highway reason for refusal in terms of vehicle congestion, when the situation is severe. Which is not the case in this instance. Having considered the proposal as submitted no highway objections are therefore raised. The applicant has not however provided any justification for the loss of parking for PH use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Item 16 – 2018/0082 | The three vehicles referred to in the offices report could be vehicles of up to 35 seats. Members to note letter from applicant previously circulated. | 138 |

| Item 17 – 2018/0199 | District Councillor Must be determined by Committee The applicant has already possess a Certificate of Lawfulness and I agree with Costessey Town Council’s position that this will only improve the area | 144 |
NOTE:
Conditions of approval or reasons for refusal of planning permission as determined by the Committee are in summary form only and subject to the Director of Growth and Business Development's final determination.

Applications referred back to Committee following Site Panel Visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Applicants Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/2450/H</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs S Swatman</td>
<td>23 Margaret Road Costessey NR5 0AU</td>
<td>Rear and side extensions</td>
<td>Members voted 5-4 with 1 abstention for Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved with conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Full Planning permission time limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. In accordance with amendments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Applicants Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/2247/D</td>
<td>SWARDESTON</td>
<td>Bennet PLC</td>
<td>Land Off Bobbins Way Swardeston Norfolk NR14 8DT</td>
<td>Reserved matters application for demolition of existing buildings, residential development of 38 dwellings and ancillary works following outline permission 2014/1642 for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.</td>
<td>Members voted unanimously for Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authorise Director of Growth and Business Development to Approve with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Conditions of outline must be met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. In accordance with amended plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Implementation of landscape scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subject to no objection from Norfolk County Council Highway Authority and no new material considerations being raised by other consultees and third parties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Application referred back to Committee

3  Appl. No  :  2017/1828/RVC
Parish   :  ALDEBY

Applicants Name : Mr Akerman
Site Address : Aldeby Business Park, Common Road, Aldeby, NR34 0BL
Proposal : Variation of Condition 4 (Hours of Use) of 2000/0917 - Change of Use from B2 (General Industrial) use to mixed B2 (General industrial) and B8 (Storage/Distribution) use - to allow permanent change to hours of use (following temporary change to hours of use under Permission 2015/1994)

Decision : Members voted 9-2 for Approval

Approved with conditions
1  Specific Use – B2/B8
2  Restricted hours of use
3  No extraction / fan system
4  No outside manufacturing
5  No retail sales
6  No vehicle repairs or maintenance
7  retention of fencing
8  Highways signs to be agreed
9  Management plan

Other applications

4  Appl. No  :  2017/2515/F
Parish   :  DISS

Applicants Name : Morrisons
Site Address : Morrisons, Victoria Road, Diss, IP22 4XF
Proposal : Erection of 4 mixed use retail units, car wash area, tyre service area and small retail pod, within the existing car park.

Decision : Members voted 8-0 with 2 abstentions for Refusal (contrary to officer recommendation, which was lost 0-8 with 2 abstentions)

Refused

Reasons for overturning officer recommendation
1. Poor form and layout of the two units and poor design.
2. Location of car wash and tyre bay and loss of parking, causing congestion and obscuring access to public footpath.
5 Appl. No : 2018/0126/H
Parish : COSTESSEY

Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs Simon & Sarah Hawken
Site Address : 192 West End Costessey Norfolk NR8 5AW
Proposal : Demolition of existing utility and garage, erection of two-storey front and side extension, incorporating new integrated garage.

Decision : Members voted unanimously for Approval

Approved with conditions
1 Full Planning permission time limit
2 In accord with submitted drawings
3 Windows to be obscure glazed

6 Appl. No : 2017/2490/F
Parish : WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs A Carman
Site Address : Land Adj to 4 Norwich Common Wymondham Norfolk
Proposal : Construction of detached dwelling together with detached garage

Decision : Members voted unanimously for Approval

Approved with conditions
1 Reduced time limit (5 yr land supply)
2 In accordance with amendments
3 Slab level to be agreed
4 External materials to be agreed
5 Window details
6 Specific details to be agreed
7 No PD for Classes ABCDE & G
8 Domestic Microgeneration Equipment
9 Provision of parking, service
10 Foul drainage to main sewer
11 Surface Water
12 Water efficiency
13 Tree protection
14 Retention trees and hedges
15 Reporting of unexpected contamination
16 Hard and soft landscaping for frontage
App. No : 2017/2701/O
Parish : EAST CARLETON

Applicants Name : Mr Alan Jones
Site Address : Former Nursery Site To The West Of Low Common Swardeston
               NR14 8LG
Proposal : Outline Permission for three dwellings and associated landscaping
& external works.

Decision : Members voted 6-4 for Refusal

Refused
1 Impact on rural landscape and character
2 Poor connectivity
3 Unsustainable development

App. No : 2017/2845/F
Parish : HETHERSETT

Applicants Name : Mr Hundal
Site Address : Land North Of Twin Barn Farm Ketteringham Lane Hethersett NR9 3DF
Proposal : New dwelling to include self-contained residential annex and ancillary facilities

Decision : Members voted 9-0 for Approval

Approved with conditions
1 Reduced time limit (5 yr land supply)
2 In accord with submitted drawings
3 External materials to be agreed
4 Surface Water
5 Foul drainage to sealed system
6 Provision of parking, service
7 Occupation of annexe
8 No PD for Classes ABCDE & G
9 No PD for fences, walls etc
10 Boundary treatment to be agreed
11 Landscaping scheme to be submitted
12 New Water Efficiency
13 Renewable Energy - Decentralised source
14 Reporting of unexpected contamination
9  Appl. No : 2018/0272/F  
Parish : HETHERSETT

Applicants Name : Mr Ray Brown  
Site Address : Land To The Rear Of 3 Great Melton Road Hethersett Norfolk  
Proposal : Erection of new detached dwelling

Decision : Members voted 8-0 with 1 abstention for Refusal

Refused
1. Out of character with the established built form of the immediate area
2. Poor quality amenity space for the future occupiers of the new dwelling.
3. The physical bulk of the dwelling results in an overbearing impact on the neighbouring properties

10  Appl. No : 2017/2743/F  
Parish : GREAT MOULTON

Applicants Name : Ms Joanne Grimmer  
Site Address : Land North Of Frosts Lane Great Moulton Norfolk  
Proposal : Erection of new self build dwelling and garage

Decision : Members voted 7-0 with 1 abstention for Approval (contrary to officer recommendation, which was lost 0-7 with 1 abstention)

Approved with conditions
Conditions to be finalised by officers but to include additional landscaping condition

Reasons for overturning officer recommendation
1. Members considered that the development would not erode the rural character
2. Given the housing shortfall in the rural policy area, it was considered that this development would form sustainable development

11  Appl. No : 2017/2920/F  
Parish : WRAMPLINGHAM

Applicants Name : Mr Roger Norton  
Site Address : Land West of The Street Wramplingham Norfolk  
Proposal : Proposed new dwelling

Decision : Members voted 5-3 for Refusal

Refused
1. Harm to landscape character
2. Unsustainable development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12</th>
<th>Appl. No: 2017/2795/F</th>
<th>Parish: NEWTON FLOTMAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants Name: Mr Richard Kenyon</td>
<td>Site Address: Relish Restaurant And Bar Old Street Newton Flotman NR15 1PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal: Change of use from existing restaurant with 3 bedroom first floor living area to 4 bedroom residential property and new 3 bedroom dwelling within current car parking area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision: Members voted 8-0 for Approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approved with conditions: 1 Full Planning permission time limit, 2 In accord with submitted drawings, 3 External materials to be agreed, 4 Window details to be agreed, 5 New Water Efficiency, 6 Protection of existing hedgerow, 7 Use of existing building, 8 Surface water, 9 Car parking/turning, 10 Surface water, 11 Contaminated land, 12 Boundary treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13</th>
<th>Appl. No: 2017/2796/LB</th>
<th>Parish: NEWTON FLOTMAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants Name: Mr Richard Kenyon</td>
<td>Site Address: Relish Restaurant And Bar Old Street Newton Flotman NR15 1PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal: Change of from existing restaurant with 3 bedroom first floor living area to 4 bedroom residential property.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision: Members voted 8-0 for Approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approved with conditions: 1 Listed Building Time Limit, 2 In accord with submitted drawings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14</th>
<th>Appl. No: 2018/0004/F</th>
<th>Parish: ALDEBY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants Name: Mr Jon-Henri Sherwood</td>
<td>Site Address: Church Farm Waterheath Road Aldeby Norfolk NR34 0DQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal: Proposed conversion and extension to garage to form granny annexe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision: Members voted 7-0 with 1 abstention for Refusal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused: 1 Contrary to SNLP policy 3.7 relating to residential annexes, tantamount to new dwelling in unsustainable location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15  **Appl. No**: 2018/0017/F  
**Parish**: REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON

**Applicants Name**: Mr Patrick Oakes  
**Site Address**: Swan Hotel 19 The Thoroughfare Harleston IP20 9AS  
**Proposal**: Change of use for part of the Swan Hotel car park to be used as a hand car wash and valeting service.

**Decision**: Members voted 8-0 for **Refusal**

Refused
1 Detrimental to setting of Listed Building and Conservation Area  
2 Detrimental to neighbour amenity

16  **Appl. No**: 2018/0082/RVC  
**Parish**: WHEATACRE

**Applicants Name**: Mr Roger Beaumont  
**Site Address**: Old Mill House Beccles Road Wheatacre Norfolk NR34 0BS  
**Proposal**: Variation of condition 2 of permission 2014/1221 (Variation of Conditions 2 and 3 of planning permission 2013/1602/RVC - permitted hours increased to 6.00am to 23.59pm Monday to Saturday inclusive and increase setting capacity of 2 buses from 33 to 41 seats.) - To allow for increased hours of operation on Friday and Saturday's from 23:59 to 00:59 for three vehicles only.

**Decision**: Members voted 5-3 for **Refusal**

Refused
1 Detrimental to residential amenity, contrary to Policy DM3.13 of the SNLP and paragraph 123 of the NPPF

17  **Appl. No**: 2018/0199/F  
**Parish**: COSTESSEY

**Applicants Name**: Mr Damian Le-may  
**Site Address**: Land To The Rear Of 45-49 Stafford Avenue Costessey Norfolk NR5 0QF  
**Proposal**: Erection of single storey dwelling

**Decision**: Members voted 4-3 with 2 abstentions for **Refusal** (the Chairman used his casting vote)

Refused
1 Detrimental to form and character