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 20 June 2018 at 10.00 am.

Committee Members Present: Councillors: V Thomson (Chairman), B Duffin, F Ellis, C Gould, M Gray, C Kemp, G Minshull and L Neal

Apologies: Councillor: D Bills

Substitute Members: Councillor: J Hornby for D Bills

Officers in Attendance: The Development Manager (H Mellors), the Development Management Team Leader (R Collins), the Major Projects Team Leader (T Lincoln), the Senior Planning Officer (G Beaumont)

21 members of the public were also in attendance

393. 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>2017/1197/D</td>
<td>COLNEY</td>
<td>B Duffin and C Gould</td>
<td>Other Interest Members have relatives who work at the Norfolk &amp; Norwich Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/0804/F</td>
<td>ROYDON</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by the Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>F Ellis</td>
<td>Other Interest Member’s granddaughter had attended the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/0912/F</td>
<td>EAST CARLETON</td>
<td>V Thomson</td>
<td>Other Interest Applicant is known to Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
394. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 23 May 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, with the following amendment to minute 389:

- C Kemp’s declaration for item 3 to read ‘Other Interest – Applicant was a client of Cllr Kemp’s 20 years ago’.

395. 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>2017/1197/D</td>
<td>COLNEY</td>
<td>S Hackwell - Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M Carpenter – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/0804/F</td>
<td>ROYDON</td>
<td>A Lamb – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr D Goldson – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/0877/O</td>
<td>THARSTON AND HAPTON</td>
<td>M Thompson – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>S Whymark – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/0878/H</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>T Bishop – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>H Franklin – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/0912/F</td>
<td>EAST CARLETON</td>
<td>G Davies – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr N Legg – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/1047/F</td>
<td>STOKE HOLY CROSS</td>
<td>J Venning – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></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.
396. **PLANNING APPEALS**

The Committee noted the report and were pleased to see a reduction in the number of appeals

(The meeting closed at 1.40pm)

_____________________

Chairman
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Updates</th>
<th>Page No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Item 1 2017/1197 | A flight trial was undertaken by Bristows on 17 June 2018 to test the proposed SAR helicopter corridor. Bristows, on behalf of NNUH, have commented that the routing of heavy helicopters in initial stages of departure or final stages of approach over areas of parked cars, property or that cannot be cleared of people are hazardous due to downwash effects. Proposed new corridor not viable in its present format. Will not be used by SAR without significant modification of ground features. Will require clear and controlled areas out to approx. 100m from landing site. If measures cannot be put in place, SAR helicopters cannot use helipad and alternative means will be required.  
**Officer response:**  
Officers will continue to work with the applicants, NNUH and Bristows to look at satisfactory mitigation measures to facilitate safe SAR helicopter operations.                                                                                     | 23     |
| Item 2 & 3 2018/0324 & 2018/0804 | No update.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 44     |
| Item 4 2018/0804 | The red line plan and application description have been amended to fully reflect the proposals.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 49     |
| Item 5 2018/0855 | No update.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 59     |
| Item 6 2018/0877 | **Arboricultural officer’s comments:**  
The suggested landscaping improvements comprising of new hedging and trees are welcomed. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment would assist with the assessment of the existing trees on site with regard to the root protection areas of the trees, especially those to the south and calculation of present and future shade patterns regarding plot 4.  
I will also await Highways comments with regard to the visibility splay and subsequent quantity of hedgerow that would require removal.  
**Officer response:**  
An arboricultural impact assessment could be required with the reserved matters application to be taken into consideration in its determination.  
The highways comments are contained within the officer response, including the need to provide a sufficient access which would regrettably lead to the loss of vegetation on this frontage. However, as set out in the officer report, further landscaping would be sought by this proposal and the improved access would be a benefit in terms of highway safety.                                                                 | 67     |
| Item 7 2018/0878 | No update.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 74     |
| Item 8 2018/0912 | Further information has been received from the applicant and copied to members, addressing the                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 79     |
comments made by the landscape officer. In summary, they state:

- The undeveloped land as shown on the site plan will be allocated to the new properties to manage.
- We confirm that no construction related activities will be carried out or located in the blue land to the South East of the site so it was not considered necessary to submit arboricultural information.
- The proposed boundary treatment to the PROW will be designed to ensure it does not become a corridor like space.
- No access from the PROW to the open space is proposed.
- We are happy for details of the road access, including the use of materials in character with the locality, and minimal kerb treatment at the existing road junction, to be conditioned.
- We are happy for planting and landscaping to be conditioned.

The Landscape Officer has commented on these additional points as follows:

- A management plan should be conditioned for non-garden areas.
- The fact that the poplar trees are on another party’s land makes it all the more important to ensure they are not affected. The extent of the canopy/drip line is not the guideline for root protection. Without an arboricultural assessment, we cannot be sure that the existing trees will not be compromised. This cannot be left to condition to verify.
- If planning permission is subsequently granted, we will need to have a tree protection condition.
- It is not just the boundary treatments, but the width available. In my opinion, ideally the width allowed for the path should be greater than the current allowance between ‘Woodlands’ and ‘Boundary House’.

NCC Ecology response:  
No change to comments made on earlier application, as follows:  
There is considerable scope for increasing the biodiversity value onsite. I recommend that the section on ‘mitigation’ in the aforementioned letter is followed in respect of planting. Any new hedgerow planted should be of mixed native species. I would also like to add that no construction materials are stored near the boundaries and that everything is kept off the ground, on pallets if possible. Lastly any further clearance should take place outside of bird nesting season, 1st March – 31st August inclusive.

Officer response:
If approved, conditions would be required, which could include that set out above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 9 2018/1047</th>
<th>Amended plan received showing revised car parking layout. Reduced opening hours proposed Thursday – Sunday and bank holiday Mondays 09:30-16:00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Highway Officer:** | • Revised plan shows 10 car parking spaces  
                                • This covers the requirement for the proposed coffee shop and the residence and is likely to be adequate in most day to day circumstances.  
                                • Formal highway objection is withdrawn  
                                • There is still some concern that the parking provision will not cover for any additional seating that may be provided externally within the garden area for any events that may take place. |
| Four additional letters of support raising no new issues. | Four additional letters of objection raising no new issues other than concern over the increased load a café would put on the private sewer. |
| **Officer response:** | Remove highway reason for refusal in paragraph 5.4. Reduced opening hours do not overcome concerns previously raised.  
                                The capacity of the private sewer is a civil matter between the parties. |
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 Growth and Business Development’s final determination.

Major Applications

1. **Appl. No**: 2017/1197/D  
   **Parish**: COLNEY  
   **Applicants Name**: Bullen Developments Ltd  
   **Site Address**: Land Adj Norfolk And Norwich University Hospital Colney Lane Colney Norfolk NR4 7UY  
   **Proposal**: Reserved Matters for multi-storey car park, internal access roads, landscaping and associated infrastructure on Hethersett Lane for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, together with the discharge of conditions 4, 5, 19 and 21 relating to outline consent from 2012/1880  
   **Decision**: During the discussion, officers amended their recommendation to give delegated authority for the Director of Growth and Business Development to approve, subject to further consideration of mitigation in respect of downwash or other reasonable alternatives, as set out in the report and prior to the completion of a Section 106 agreement to ensure that only one multi-storey carpark is erected. 
   
   Members then voted 7-2 for Deferral  
   
   **Reasons for Deferral**: To allow officers to look at mitigation measures to facilitate safe SAR operations before referring the item back to Committee for further consideration

Other Applications

2. **Appl. No**: 2018/0324/H  
   **Parish**: STARSTON  
   **Applicants Name**: Mr Robert Taylor  
   **Site Address**: The Lodge, Low Road, Starston, IP20 9NT  
   **Proposal**: Single storey rear extension  
   **Decision**: Members voted unanimously for Approval  
   
   Approved with conditions  
   1. Full planning permission time limit  
   2. In accordance with submitted drawings  
   3. Matching materials
3. **Appl. No**: 2018/0325/LB  
**Parish**: STARSTON

- **Applicants Name**: Mr Robert Taylor  
- **Site Address**: The Lodge, Low Road, Starston, IP20 9NT  
- **Proposal**: Single storey rear extension

**Decision**: Members voted unanimously for **Approval**

Approved with conditions:

1. Listed building time limit  
2. In accordance with submitted drawings  
3. Matching materials

4. **Appl. No**: 2018/0804/F  
**Parish**: ROYDON

- **Applicants Name**: Mr & Mrs P Murton  
- **Site Address**: Land Adj To Pumping Station Brewers Green Roydon Norfolk  
- **Proposal**: Erection of residential dwelling and new vehicular access and parking area to Forest School Centre and change of use of land to north to Forest School

**Decision**: Members voted unanimously for **Approval**

Approved with conditions:

1. Full Planning Permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Boundary treatment to be agreed  
4. Reporting of unexpected contamination  
5. External materials to be agreed (dwelling and garage)  
6. New Access Construction over verge  
7. Visibility splay dimension in condition  
8. Provision of parking, service  
9. Foul drainage to main sewer  
10. Surface Water  
11. Access and Parking (forest school) before occupation of dwelling  
12. Travel Plan
5. **Appl. No**: 2018/0855/O  
**Parish**: BARFORD

Applicants Name: Mr & Mrs Rodney Brown  
Site Address: Haulage Yard, 46 Chapel Street, Barford, NR9 4AB  
Proposal: Change of use from haulage yard to residential development

**Decision**: Members voted unanimously for **Approval**

Approved with conditions

1. Outline – 5 year supply  
2. Standard outline requiring reserved matters  
3. Relevant drawing  
4. Phasing plan  
5. Updated tree protection details  
6. Surface water drainage  
7. Ground and finished floor levels  
8. Contaminated land - submit scheme  
9. Implement approved remediation  
10. Reporting of unexpected contamination  
11. Water efficiency

6. **Appl. No**: 2018/0877/O  
**Parish**: THARSTON AND HAPTON

Applicants Name: Darren & Samantha Whymark  
Site Address: Land at Chequers Road Tharston Norfolk NR15 2YA  
Proposal: Outline permission (with all matters reserved) for four detached dwellings with gardens and garages.

**Decision**: Members voted unanimously for **Approval**

Approved with conditions

1. Outline - 5 Year Land Supply  
2. Standard outline requiring RM  
3. In accord with submitted drawings  
4. Standard Outline Condition  
5. Visibility splay dimension in condition  
6. Highway Improvements - Offsite  
7. Surface Water
7. **Appl. No**: 2018/0878/H  
**Parish**: PORINGLAND  
Applicants Name: Mr & Mrs Franklin  
Site Address: 14 Boundary Way, Poringland, NR14 7JD  
Proposal: Ground floor kitchen extension, first floor bedroom extension with balcony and internal alterations.  
Decision: Members voted 8-1 for **Approval**  
Approved with conditions  
1. Full planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with submitted drawings  
3. Privacy screen to be provided and retained

8. **Appl. No**: 2018/0912/F  
**Parish**: EAST CARLETON  
Applicants Name: Mr Alan Jones  
Site Address: Former Nursery Site To The West of Low Common Swardeston NR14 8LG  
Proposal: Erection of 3 single storey bungalow dwellings and associated landscaping and external works  
Decision: Members voted 7-2 for **Refusal**  
Refused  
1. Impact on rural character  
2. Poor connectivity  
3. Unsustainable development

9. **Appl. No**: 2018/1047/F  
**Parish**: STOKE HOLY CROSS  
Applicants Name: Mrs Tina Riches  
Site Address: Tantallon 14 Chandler Road Stoke Holy Cross Norfolk NR14 8RG  
Proposal: Change of use of former garage/store to form coffee shop including extension and alterations  
Decision: Members voted 6-2 for **Refusal**  
Refused  
1. Residential amenity noise and disturbance  
2. Residential amenity odour