

## 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, 16 October 2019 at 10.00 am.

**Committee Members Present:** **Councillors:** V Thomson (Chairman), D Bills, V Clifford-Jackson, J Easter (items 2 – 6 only), F Ellis (items 1 – 6 only), G Minshull (items 2 – 8 only), L Neal (items 1 – 3 and 5 – 8 only) and T Laidlaw

**Apologies:** **Councillors:** R Elliott

**Officers in Attendance:** The Assistant Director Planning (H Mellors), the Development Management Team Leaders (T Lincoln and C Raine), the Senior Planning Officers (G Beaumont, C Curtis and C Watts) and the Planning Officers (T Barker and B Skipper)

25 members of the public were also in attendance

### 462. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

Application	Parish	Councillor	Declaration
2018/2699/F (Item 1)	DISS	G Minshull	Other Interest As Local Member, Cllr Minshull stepped down from the Committee and took no part in the consideration of this item
		J Easter	Other Interest As the Architect is known to Cllr Easter, he stepped down from the Committee and took no part in the consideration of this item
2019/1013/F (Item 3)	GILLINGHAM	All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by the Applicant
2019/1653/D (Item 4)	COLNEY	L Neal	Other Interest As a Cabinet Member, Cllr Neal left the room and took no part in the consideration of this item
			Other Interest Cllr Bills is a member of the Research Committee at the Norwich Research Park

<b>2019/1354/F (Item 5)</b>	<b>COLNEY</b>	All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by the Agent for the Applicant
<b>2019/1542/F (Item 6)</b>	<b>BUNWELL</b>	All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objectors
<b>2019/1552/F (Item 7)</b>	<b>WICKLEWOOD</b>	All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by the Applicant
<b>2019/1599/F (Item 8)</b>	<b>BRANDON PARVA, COSTON, RUNHALL, WELBORNE</b>	All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by the Applicant

#### 463. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 18 September 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

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

The Committee considered the report (circulated) of the Director of Place, 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.

<b>APPLICATION</b>	<b>PARISH</b>	<b>SPEAKER</b>
<b>2018/2699/F (Item 1)</b>	<b>DISS</b>	E Taylor – Parish Council R Bryant – Objector K Warnes – Applicant Cllr K Kiddie – Local Member Cllr G Minshull – Local Member
<b>2019/0428/F (Item 2)</b>	<b>WYMONDHAM</b>	A Nicholls – Applicant T Doyle – Agent for the Applicant Cllr S Nuri – Local Member
<b>2019/1013/F (Item 3)</b>	<b>GILLINGHAM</b>	C Smith – Agent for the Applicant Cllr J Knight – Local Member
<b>2019/1653/D (Item 4)</b>	<b>COLNEY</b>	J Alflatt – Agent for the Applicant
<b>2019/1354/F (Item 5)</b>	<b>COLNEY</b>	J Stone – Agent for the Applicant Cllr W Kemp – Local Member
<b>2019/1542/F (Item 6)</b>	<b>BUNWELL</b>	N Garner – Objector C Papadopoulos - Applicant
<b>2019/1552/F (Item 7)</b>	<b>WICKLEWOOD</b>	J Seville - Applicant
<b>2019/1599/F (Item 8)</b>	<b>BRANDON PARVA, COSTON, RUNHALL, WELBORNE</b>	J Stone – Agent for the Applicant

The Committee made the decisions indicated in Appendix B of the 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 Place.

**465. QUARTERLY ENFORCEMENT REPORT**

Members noted the quarterly enforcement report.

**466. PLANNING APPEALS**

The Committee noted the planning appeals.

(The meeting closed at 3.20pm)

---

Chairman

**Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE  
–16 October 2019**

Item	Updates	Page No
Item 1 2018/2699	<p>SNC Env Quality Team No objection to the approach for either infiltration or attenuated drainage we would expect further details. Appropriate planning conditions are required to secure these.</p> <p>Cllr Minshull Original objection (third parties) still stands, this will need to go back to committee.</p> <p>Historic Environment Service Previous comments in respect of archaeology remain valid.</p> <p>Diss Town Council The recent amendments to this application do not alter the previously expressed view. In addition, to the original reasons we would add objections to the recent amendments as follows:</p> <p>1. The Construction Management Plan does not contain any highway assessment for construction and contractor traffic entering and leaving the shopping courtyard onto Market Hill and St Nicholas Street. In addition, there is no provision for keeping this shopping courtyard or Market Hill / St Nicholas street clean after construction traffic movements. <b>Officer comments:</b> The Highway Authority have not objected to the proposal, nor did they request a construction management plan on highway grounds. The most recent construction management plan highlights at section 7 that vehicles will be cleaned before leaving the site to reduce debris on footpath and the highway</p> <p>2. Site Spoil - using the applicant's own cubic figures 600 tonnes of clay and subsoil will be overlaid on the garden area to a depth of 1.1m in places. It is completely unacceptable to put substandard clay/soil over what is a protected "<b>Important open space</b>". <b>Officer comments:</b> There is no evidence to suggest that the soil will be unsuitable for re-using across the site.</p> <p>3. Site Spoil Removal - a further 800 tonnes of spoil will have to be removed from site. The figures could be even higher as they qualify them by saying that they are subject to sub-structure and foundation design. This will involve a minimum of 200 lorry movements through the shopping courtyard for spoil removal alone.</p> <p>4. When you add in the construction traffic making deliveries to site (the number of movements shown in 3 will at least double), deliveries of concrete, contractors vehicle movements and a courtyard, which is not</p>	16

	<p>cleaned regularly, it makes the Town Council very concerned about the health and safety implications for both traders and the general public.</p> <p><b>Officer comments:</b> It is inevitable that a development in a town centre location will have an impact upon residents and users of the town centre and the construction management plan is seeking to understand and control how this is done but it would not be reasonable for the Council to refuse this application on the grounds of impacts resulting from the construction process. Officers would wish to point out that it is not uncommon to see large developments undertaken in town and city centres.</p> <p>As a Town Council, we would reiterate our concerns about the amendments to the application. We believe the scale of this development is far too large and that the proposal will be detrimental to the ecology of this “<b>Important Open Space</b>”. Furthermore, the proposals will impact on the traders’ ability to go about their normal business and drive footfall away from this private courtyard, which will seriously threaten the viability of traders in the immediate area.</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> It is the view of the officers that the scheme complies with all of the relevant planning policies for the reason identified in the various committee reports and update sheets.</p> <p>5 local/neighbour objections received to most recent re-consultation</p> <p>Following issues raised:</p> <p>Not against development that fits in with its surroundings, but scheme is overdevelopment and conflicts with its and surroundings and cannot be reconciled with Local Plan policies.</p> <p>Site is designated as area of important local open space and dumping tonnes of soil on the site is contrary to SNLP and NPPF.</p> <p><b>Officer comments:</b> It is not considered that this fundamentally changes the nature of the site or has an adverse impact on the backdrop of the Mere.</p> <p>Proposal will only have negative results, failed to demonstrate positive improvements.</p> <p><b>Officer comments:</b> In heritage terms, it is accepted that there is a requirement for public benefits where harm is identified, however, in this case the officers are saying it isn’t harmful.</p> <p>Still too large and in the wrong place, should not be built on important local open space, revised design is worse for neighbours contrary to DM3.4 of the SNLP. Position of the dwellings in relation to neighbours and</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>the large windows will impact on neighbours, especially 20 St Nicholas Street.</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> SNLP policy does not provide a blanket ban on development in an area of important local open space. The scheme does not cause significant overlooking or loss of light or outlook so as to justify refusal on amenity grounds as highlighted in the original committee report.</p> <p>Commercial neighbours will be impacted upon by increase in traffic.</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> The Highway Authority has confirmed that it has no objection on traffic grounds.</p> <p>Construction traffic is a further significant issue which has not been addressed by the construction management plan. This document focuses too much emphasis on other sites that haven't got one. Construction traffic will affect local businesses ability to trade.</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> See response to point 4 of the Diss Town Council comments.</p> <p>The northern banks of the mere are an historic asset and anything that causes less than substantial harm requires there to be a public benefit that outweighs this in line with the requirements of the NPPF and contrary to Policy DM4.4.</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> It is accepted that there is a requirement for public benefits where harm is identified in relation to heritage assets, however, in this case the officers are saying it isn't considered harmful.</p> <p>Would set an unfortunate precedent.</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> Any subsequent applications on neighbouring sites would need to be determined on their own merits.</p> <p>Set a poor standard of design for the conservation area. The application threatens the qualities that led to the award obtained by the wildlife garden in the RIBA excellence in planning for heritage and culture awards.</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> It is considered the scheme is an acceptable design.</p> <p>Policy 4.10 requires development affecting Heritage Assets and Environment to enhance or better reveal their significance. This development does neither.</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> Committee report sets out why officers, including Council's Senior Conservation and Design Officer, consider the scheme complies with this policy The design of the houses in their form of a Victorian pastiche will alter and harm the vista across the Mere, particularly in winter.</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b></p>	
--	--	--

	<p>It is considered the scheme is an acceptable design.</p> <p>Resulting garden to Dragon House is too small.  <b>Officer comment:</b>  The garden provided is sufficient in terms of size and shape to accompany 22a.</p> <p>Sole entrance is through the kitchen, these are potential fire traps with no direct fire fighting access and too far from the street when having regard to building regulations (Fail Fire safety regulations B1 and B5).  <b>Officer comment:</b>  Building Regs matter.</p> <p>The new dwellings have no outside space provided or easily accessible.  <b>Officer comment:</b>  They have both a private space and communal garden.</p> <p>No provision made for getting garden machinery to the lower garden area apart from taking it down ramps and steps.  <b>Officer comment:</b>  The garden is to be laid to lawn and it would not seem unmanageable.</p> <p>The access space will be cluttered with cars and waste bins which will be unsightly and has insufficient area for service, emergency or delivery vehicles. Entry and exit to the site will remain a hazard.  <b>Officer comments:</b>  The area will not be unsightly and the access and parking and turning space within the site is not highly visible from public vantage points. There is no highway objection.</p> <p>Inability for construction traffic to enter and leave the site in a forward gear contravenes G1.7 of "safe sustainable development the aims and guidance notes for local authority requirements in Highway department".  <b>Officer comment:</b>  G1.7 deals with damage caused to the highway or utility apparatus and as such and the ability of the Highway Authority to enter into an agreement under the Highways Act to make good any damage via legal agreement. This is not something that the Highway Authority has indicated that it wants to proceed with here.</p> <p>Reference made to most recent SNC Env Quality Team comments.  <b>Officer comment:</b>  They do not object, condition can be used (see their comments above).</p> <p>Objection from The Diss Heritage Triangle Trust (HTT):</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Previous concerns not addressed, indeed some of the amendments have made matters worse.</p> <p>It is significantly oversized for the site, the building design is not sympathetic to the surroundings. It would block views from the wildlife garden. Using spoil on the lower area of garden is environmentally unsound and the case officer is incorrect stating that 'the works would not compromise the immediate locality'</p> <p><b>Officer comment</b> These have all been covered no the committee reports, update sheet and above.</p> <p>The planting plan proposed is frankly pathetic for such a public and sensitive location.</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> It is a simple approach to what is a private domestic garden which is entirely appropriate to its context.</p> <p>The application is speculative, does not provide Diss with a quality building, nor addresses the issues that the site raises when considered with the significant amount of public money and effort that has been committed by DTC, SNDC and the Heritage Lottery Fund on improving the historic shopping and leisure areas around the Mere.</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> The scheme is acceptable in planning terms.</p> <p>Invalid application by way of incorrect certificate B of the application form.</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> Firstly, the application is accompanied by a certificate B and this available to view on the Council's website. Secondly, it should be noted that the purpose of Certificate B is to make those people who would have a interest in a scheme aware of the proposal, I am not aware that any such relevant parties are not aware of the proposal. There is also reference to that this may cause the Council to be open to financial penalty, but does not specify what.</p> <p>Incorrect site plan</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> Officers are satisfied that the scheme can be built in the form indicated.</p> <p>No justification for development impacting on historic assets as weighed against public benefits as required by the NPPF</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> It is accepted that there is a requirement for public benefits where harm is identified, however, in this case the officers are saying it isn't harmful.</p> <p>There is no list of these public benefits</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> Please see above, point insofar as the scheme isn't considered harmful.</p>	
--	---	--



	<p>Recommendation conflicts with SNLP policies 1.4, 3.13, 3.4, 3.5, 3.8, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.9</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> Officers consider the scheme complies with all relevant SNLP policies as set out in the original committee report.</p> <p>No provision for 2 extra parking spaces for 22 St Nicholas St as required by a change on the land in title of Dragon Yard House</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> Firstly, the extent of the red line on the layout plan and the that on the title plan do not appear different. Secondly, the proposed scheme does not in any event propose any change to the northern part of the site in question.</p> <p>Report omits enlarged balconies with privacy screens</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> The balconies do not project any further than previous plans show, and are consistent in width with those previously shown. The private screened areas in question are no greater than 5m and would cause no significant adverse visual impact.</p> <p>No specialist independent advice on impacts of changing levels of site through root compaction</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> The section provided shows that the greatest degree of soil will deposited down the centre of the site with the infill tapering down to both side boundary so as to specifically avoid any significant fill on the root system of the tree.</p> <p>No police direction has been sought on safety issues of turning right into the yard from St Nicholas Street</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> A view has bene sought and a response awaited, the Highway Authority has looked into the matter further and it is believed that a right hand turn could be made. However, it is important to stress that such a manoeuvre is not fundamental to whether the scheme is acceptable or not as the Highway Authority has confirmed that the alternative route not using the right hand turn is acceptable in any event.</p> <p>Committee report omits the overwhelming public response to see it refused and why a development on important open space that will cause considerable heritage harm which conflicts with important recent comparative appeals is recommended for approval.</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> It is considered that the Committee reports and update sheets to date have made clear the objections the Council has received. Whilst there is reference by the objector to important recent comparative appeals it does not specifically refer to any.</p> <p>Object, the yard is unique due to right angled corner which will cause issues with manoeuvring of vehicles.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p><b>Officer comment:</b> As highlighted in the committee report and above there is no objection from the Highway Authority.</p> <p>The Dragon House Metal gate and associated fence are owned by the neighbouring property no. 22.</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> The submitted plan makes it clear the metal gate is to stay in place and it is not necessary to remove the fence, nor does a planning approval authorise approval, this is a civil ownership matter.</p> <p>Suggest will request review by appropriate regulatory body.</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> Does not specify who they consider this to be, officers are satisfied that it has followed the requisite process, and no-one has been prejudiced by how the process has been conducted. Furthermore, the various committee reports and update sheets set out that the relevant policies have been given due regard to and the recommendation is a sound one.</p>	
Item 2 2019/0428	<p>There is an error in para 5.24 of the report which states that renewable energy will be provided through a biomass boiler. This is not correct; there is no proposal for a biomass boiler. The paragraph should read to state that the requirement for 10% of the scheme's energy to be renewable will be secured through condition (e.g. from solar panels or air source heat pumps).</p>	<b>36</b>
Item 3 2019/1013	<p>Additional letter of objection raising the same concerns as set out in the report re Traffic; highway safety concerns; capacity of Local services etc.</p> <p>Lobbying letter from the applicant sent to all members</p> <p><b>Officer Comment:</b> Para 5.47 should read NCC Planning Obligations Team has requested rather Highways Authority require.</p>	<b>46</b>
Item 4 2019/1653	<p>NCC Highways –</p> <p>No objection subject to condition requiring Construction Traffic Management Plan to include construction workers parking.</p>	<b>59</b>
Item 5 2019/1354	<p>An email has been received from the agent confirming that his client is willing to enter into a legal agreement to secure this application as a self-build proposal.</p> <p>The agent does not consider that the self-build plots that the Council has on its register have anything attached to them to secure them as self build.</p> <p>He also attached two appeal decisions, one in South Cambridgeshire District Council's area and the other in North West Leicestershire District Council's area, where self-build proposals were allowed and it is understood that these have been circulated to members.</p>	<b>68</b>

	<p><b>Officer comment:</b> The report has given appropriate consideration to the fact that the application is for a self-build dwelling and notes in the conclusion that this weighs in its favour. However, the conclusion also notes that it is not considered that there are material considerations of sufficient weight to warrant granting planning permission in this case.</p>	
Item 6 2019/1542	<p>Lobbying letter received from no. 141 Bunwell Street emailed to all members.</p> <p>Additional letter of objection received from Parish Council, summarised as follows:</p> <p>Concerns that the Anglian Water sewerage and drainage system will not be able to cope with another nine properties, despite their assurances. There have been many occasions in recent months when Anglian Water have had to bring bowsers into the village to empty the system.</p> <p>The properties will not have sufficient off-road parking for their residents and/or visitors without parking on Bunwell Street. This is unacceptable as the road is not wide enough for a parked vehicle and larger vehicles to pass, particularly as visibility is restricted by a bend.</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> The report has given appropriate consideration of the above matters. Anglian Water has confirmed that the upgraded system has available capacity for the proposed flows.</p>	<b>75</b>
Item 7 2019/1552		<b>87</b>
Item 8 2019/1599	<p>1) The agent has sent a lobbying email to members raising a number of issues. To a large extent, the officer response on self-build is the same as for item 4 above.</p> <p>In addition, officers can confirm that in September 2014, the Council was one of 11 areas across the country that was selected to benefit from the government backed Right to Build Scheme. opportunity to help custom or self-builders (Right to Build Vanguard Council). In any event, the Council is required to keep a register of individuals and associations of individuals who are seeking to acquire serviced plots of land in the Council's area in order to build houses for those individuals to occupy as homes. The Council is satisfied that it is accurately counting those plots that are capable of being serviced plots.</p> <p>2) The agent has also referred the sections of the Planning Practice Guidance on housing or older and disabled people. The Planning Practice Guidance is a material consideration and as</p>	<b>97</b>

	<p>members will have seen from the lobbying material sent by the agent, there are a range of needs to be catered for. Officers have taken account of the circumstances of the applicants' children and considered their needs and also noted that Policy DM3.1 of the Development Management Policies Document sets out that all housing proposals should help contribute to a range of dwelling types. However, in the round, it is not considered that the applicants' personal circumstances justify setting aside the provisions of the development plan.</p>	
--	---	--

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

**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 Place's final determination.

**Applications referred back to Committee**

1. **Appl. No** : **2018/2699/F**  
**Parish** : **Diss**

Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs A Warnes  
 Site Address : 22A St Nicholas Street Diss IP22 4LB  
 Proposal : Demolition of existing garage/stores. Erection of 3 dwellings, single garage and associated hard-standing parking/turning area.

Decision : Members voted 5-1 for **Approval**

Approved with conditions

- 1 Full planning permission time limit
- 2 In accordance with amendments
- 3 Reporting of unexpected contamination
- 4 Archaeological work to be agreed
- 5 New water efficiency
- 6 Foul drainage to main sewer
- 7 Surface water
- 8 Slab level to be agreed
- 9 Landscaping scheme to be submitted
- 10 Retention trees and hedges
- 11 External materials to be agreed
- 12 No PD for classes ABCDE & G
- 13 No PD for fences, walls etc
- 14 Construction management plan
- 15 Provision of parking
- 16 Ecology
- 17 Sectional drawings for proposed re-profiling to be agreed

**Major Applications**

2. **Appl. No** : **2019/0428/F**  
**Parish** : **Wymondham**

Applicants Name : Mr Ragan  
Site Address : Land at Industrial Site west of Stanleys Lane Wymondham Norfolk  
Proposal : Full planning permission for demolition of commercial building and replacement with 4 blocks of flats (total 21 dwelling units), demolition of Unit 13 and part Unit 12 and construction of an industrial unit (B2/B8). Outline planning permission for demolition of existing commercial units and erection of four industrial units (B2/B8) and 1 office unit (B1).

Decision : Members voted unanimously to authorise the Director of Place to **Approve.**

Approved with conditions

Full planning permission for residential element of scheme

- 1 Full Planning permission time limit
- 2 Flats in accord with submitted drawings
- 3 Provision of parking area
- 4 Highway Improvements - Offsite
- 5 Traffic Regulation Orders
- 6 Surface water drainage scheme
- 7 Construction Management Scheme
- 8 Noise attenuation (residential units)
- 9 Air source heat pumps
- 10 Full details of external lighting
- 11 Contaminated land - submit scheme
- 12 Implement of approved remediation
- 13 Reporting of unexpected contamination
- 14 Details of demolition
- 15 Implementation of landscaping
- 16 Renewable energy
- 17 Water efficiency
- 18 Fire hydrants
- 19 Ecological mitigation

Outline planning permission for commercial element of scheme

- 20 Outline Permission Time Limit
- 21 Reserved matters to be submitted
- 22 Limited Hours of Use
- 23 Noise attenuation (commercial units)

Subject to S106 agreement to secure affordable housing and open space contribution (open space contribution subject to viability).

3. **Appl. No** : **2019/1013/F**  
**Parish** : **Gillingham**
- Applicants Name : Mr Chris Smith  
Site Address : Land south of The Street Gillingham Norfolk  
Proposal : Residential development of 22 dwellings, together with associated public open space, access roads, garaging and car parking.
- Decision : Members voted unanimously to authorise the Director of Place to **Approve.**

Approved with conditions.

- 1 Full Planning permission time limit
- 2 In accordance with amendments
- 3 No first-floor windows plots 2 and 3
- 4 No PD for Classes ABCD and E
- 5 Air Source Heat Pumps
- 6 Landscaping scheme to submitted
- 7 Tree protection
- 8 Retention trees and hedges
- 9 Boundary treatment to be agreed
- 10 Drainage strategy
- 11 Foul drainage to main sewer
- 12 Renewable Energy
- 13 New Water Efficiency
- 14 Fire Hydrants
- 15 Gas Protection Measures and Verification
- 16 Construction management plan
- 17 Reporting of unexpected contamination
- 18 Mitigation as per submitted PEA report
- 19 Habitat Management Plan to be submitted
- 20 Visibility splay, approved plan
- 21 Provision of parking, turning
- 22 Construction Traffic Management
- 23 Highway Improvements - Offsite
- 24 Highway Improvements completed
- 25 Materials to be agreed

Subject to a S106 agreement for affordable housing and open space.

4. **Appl. No** : **2019/1653/D**  
**Parish** : **Colney**
- Applicants Name : Big Sky Developments & Bullen Developments Ltd  
Site Address : Land adj to Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital (off James Watson Road) Colney Lane Colney Norfolk NR4 7UY
- Proposal : Reserved Matters application for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following outline permission 2012/1880 (in respect of this phase only) - Proposed Research and Development Centre, associated car parking, internal access road, site infrastructure and landscaping.
- Decision : Members voted unanimously for **Approval**.
- Approved with conditions
- 1 In accordance with plans
  - 2 Provision of car and cycle parking
  - 3 Construction traffic management plan
  - 4 Landscaping - implementation

#### Other Applications

5. **Appl. No** : **2019/1354/F**  
**Parish** : **Colney**
- Applicants Name : Mr Nigel Willgrass  
Site Address : Land west of The Old Hall, Watton Road, Colney  
Proposal : Erection of self-build two-storey dwelling and associated garages
- Decision : Members voted 5-4 for **Refusal** (the Chairman used his casting vote after the vote was tied 4-4)
- Refused
- 1 Harm to significance of heritage asset
  - 2 No overriding benefits



6. **Appl. No** : **2019/1542/F**  
**Parish** : **Bunwell**

Applicants Name : Mr Costa Papadopoulos  
Site Address : Land adj to 141 Bunwell Street Bunwell Norfolk  
Proposal : Proposed residential development of 9 dwellings

Decision : Members voted 7-1 for **Approval**

Approved with conditions

1. Time limit full permission
2. In accordance with plans
3. Access in accordance with highways specification
4. Details of highway works for pedestrian refuge
5. Visibility splays to be provided
6. On-site car parking and turning to be provided
7. Construction traffic management plan and worker parking
8. Materials to be agreed
9. Surface water drainage scheme
- 10 .Foul water drainage scheme
- 11 .Finished floor levels to be agreed
12. Fire hydrants to be provided
13. Landscaping and management plan to be submitted
14. Tree protection measures
15. Ecology enhancement to be agreed
16. Contaminated land scheme
17. Full details of external lighting

7. **Appl. No** : **2019/1552/F**  
**Parish** : **Wicklewood**

Applicants Name : Mr John Seville  
Site Address : Land adjacent to 69 High Street, Wicklewood, Norfolk  
Proposal : Erection of 2 bed bungalow

Decision : Members voted unanimously for **Refusal**

Refused  
Cramped form of development

8. **Appl. No** : **2019/1599/F**  
**Parish** : **Brandon Parva, Coston, Runhall, Welborne**
- Applicants Name : Mr Carl and Mrs Angie Hannant  
Site Address : Land to the rear of Linden Cottage, Welborne Common, Welborne  
Proposal : Self-build detached bungalow
- Decision : Members voted unanimously for **Approval** (contrary to officer recommendation, which was lost 2-4)

Approved with conditions

1. Time limit
2. In accordance with submitted drawings
3. External materials and boundary treatments
4. Surface water drainage
5. Foul water drainage
6. Visibility splays
7. Provision of parking and turning area
8. Water efficiency

Reason for overturning officer recommendation

Members of the Development Management Committee considered that the specific personal circumstances of the applicants, which included:

- their long standing local connection;
- the specific care needs of their children;
- the full, but ultimately unsuccessful, exploration of all other potential avenues to meet their needs.

justifies the provision of specialist, bespoke accommodation on land that they have owned for a considerable period of time, and collectively are of sufficient weight as material considerations to justify approving a development that is contrary to Policies DM1.3 and DM3.10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document.