

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 8th January, 2018 at 9.30 am in the Assembly Room, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs V Spikings (Chairman)
Councillors R Blunt (sub), A Bubb, Mrs S Buck, Mrs S Fraser, G Hipperson,
A Morrison, T Parish, M Peake, Miss S Sandell, M Storey, D Tyler, G Wareham,
Mrs E Watson, A White and Mrs A Wright

An apology for absence was received from Councillor C J Crofts and
Mrs S Young

PC73: MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 5 December 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings.

PC74: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Storey declared that in relation to item 8/2(d), he was a member of Feltwell Parish Council but had not taken part in any discussions relating to the application.

PC75: URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7

There was no urgent business under Standing Order 7.

PC76: MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34

The following Councillor attended under Standing Order 34:

A Beales *8/2(e)* *Grimston*

PC77: CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE

The Chairman reported that any correspondence received had been read and passed to the relevant officers.

PC78: RECEIPT OF LATE CORRESPONDENCE ON APPLICATIONS

A copy of the summary of late correspondence received since the publication of the agenda, which had been previously circulated, was

tabled. A copy of the summary would be held for public inspection with a list of background papers.

PC79: **INDEX OF APPLICATIONS**

The Committee noted the Index of Applications.

(a) **Decisions on Applications**

The Committee considered schedules of applications for planning permission submitted by the Executive Director for Planning & Environment (copies of the schedules are published with the agenda). Any changes to the schedules are recorded in the minutes.

RESOLVED: That, the applications be determined as set out at (i) – (x) below, where appropriate to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chairman.

(i) **17/01050/RM**

Downham Market: Land at Nightingale Lane: Outline planning application for up to 250 dwellings and associated infrastructure and access: The Grosvenor Partnership 3LP

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was located to the south east of Downham Market, bounded by the A1122 on the south boundary, Ravensway and Denver Hill to the north east boundaries, Nightingale Lane and Crow Hall Cottages to the north and open farmland to the east boundary. Nightingale Lane was a Restricted Byway (PROW RB23) and ran from the north boundary south through the site to the footbridge crossing over the A1122 and south towards Denver.

The site was an allocation for Downham Market under Policy F1.4 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016, with the policy requiring at least 140 dwellings. Planning permission was granted for up to 170 dwellings (following the completion of the S106 agreement) in October 2016.

The current application was in outline form with all matters reserved apart from access. Originally the application was submitted for up to 300 dwellings including land to the north and outside the allocated site. The application had been revised to reduce the number of dwellings to up to 250 dwellings following concerns regarding density and parking.

The Principal Planner explained that a 4-arm roundabout had been proposed to serve the site, and also outlined the pedestrian and highway improvements works proposed by the applicant.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was contrary to the views of the Town Council.

The Principal Planner then outlined the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Highways issues;
- Residential amenity;
- Flood risk and sustainable drainage;
- Archaeology;
- Ecology;
- Section 106 matters;
- Any other matters requiring consideration prior to the determination of the application;
- Crime and disorder.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Town Councillor Frank Daymond (objecting on behalf of the Town Council) and Mr Richard Brown (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In relation to density, the Senior Planner, Planning Policy explained that studies had been carried out with other developments within Downham Market and the average density was 27 dwellings per hectare. This scheme provided 18 dwellings per hectare which was lower than the other sites in the area.

Councillor Tyler expressed concern in relation to the capacity of the sewerage works, which was already over-subscribed. He asked whether there was anything planned to enhance this. The Principal Planner explained that a Section 104 agreement would be in place for Anglian Water to adopt the sewers. The Principal Planner also explained that Anglian Water had raised no objection to the application for 300 dwellings although they had not responded to this current application.

Councillor Tyler informed the Committee that he had requested a deferment of the item following receipt of a report on behalf of the Internal Drainage Board (IDB). He considered that the report from the Internal Drainage Board and the comments from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) contradicted each other.

The Principal Planner explained that the LLFA were the statutory consultee and they would take IDB's comments into account.

She further explained that the proposal was for 250 dwellings but it could be for less. The developer had demonstrated that a workable solution could be achieved at outline stage, and the main details would

be submitted as part of the Reserved Matters application. In relation to the additional condition 32 (outlined in late correspondence) which related to a full surface water drainage strategy, it was explained that there were 11 parts to that condition, all of which would need to be submitted with the reserved matters application.

Councillor Wareham expressed concern in relation to the location of the proposed roundabout to serve the site, as there were localised highway issues at the junction of London Road and Downham Road junctions with the A1122 and he considered therefore that the roundabout should be moved nearer to the junction to provide benefits to the locality.

The Principal Planner advised that with regards to highway safety matters, the Local Highway Authority had provided accident data for the staggered junction, which indicated that the junction was not an accident cluster site. With regards to the location of the roundabout itself, the applicant did not own the adjacent land to the London Road and Downham Market junctions and neither should they be forced to resolve an issue which was not supported with technical accident data. In addition, there was no technical or highway safety objection to the current location of the roundabout on highway grounds.

In response to a comment from Councillor Mrs Wright regarding the lack of response from Anglian Water, the Executive Director explained that Downham Market was a major growth area and had a number of allocations within the Local Plan. All infrastructure providers had been consulted during the Local Plan process and they had a statutory duty to consider the allocations and to respond. He added that Anglian Water would be expecting this site to come forward for development.

The Principal Planner further added that Anglian Water looked at foul water and capacity at the treatment plant, the IDB dealt with surface water and the LLFA were the statutory consultee.

Councillor Storey added that the main issue related to the position of the roundabout. He added that several HGV operators used the staggered junction. He considered that the land ownership issue for the relocation of the roundabout could be overcome.

The Executive Director advised the Committee that the parcel of land was in private ownership. Norfolk County Council had made it clear that they would not be prepared to fund or deliver the relocation of the roundabout.

He strongly advised the Committee that given the fact that there was no technical or highway safety objection to the current location of the roundabout, it would be very difficult to defend this reason for refusal on highway grounds at appeal, and there could be an award of costs against the Council if it were unable to support its reasons for refusal.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings asked if there had been any discussion with third parties in relation to purchasing the land. The Executive Director explained to the best of his knowledge no discussions had taken place. He explained that the County Council had not identified a need for a roundabout at the Denver junction and the funding was not available.

Councillor White referred to the fact that Norfolk County Council had indicated that the roundabout could be moved slightly to the west. He indicated that there were two building plots which could be bought to create the access.

Councillor Bubb referred to the layout of the roundabout and asked whether anyone had consulted with HGV drivers on how they could get around the roundabout. He referred to the new roundabout at Heacham, which he considered that HGV drivers struggled to manoeuvre around. The Assistant Director advised that the roundabout would have been designed to national technical standards, and would have been designed to cater for the full range of vehicles using the roundabout.

Councillor Parish explained that this was an allocated site. The developer already had permission for 170 dwellings on the site. In addition, the Council currently had a 5 year supply of housing sites. He added that if the developer required more dwellings on the site, then this should be included in the next round of site allocations.

Councillor Storey proposed that the application be refused on the grounds of highway safety, as the proposal would exacerbate the existing problems encountered with the staggered junction. This was seconded by Councillor White. The County Council was criticised by several Councillors for not requiring the relocation of the roundabout to the Denver junction.

The Executive Director advised that as far as the County Council was concerned, they were satisfied that a fully acceptable access had been provided for this allocation, and this did not imply that they were behaving improperly. The County Council had considered the scheme, which was acceptable in highway terms. In relation to the relocation of the roundabout, the County Council would not deliver or fund a scheme and they did not own the land. The County Council would not defend the reason for refusal on highway grounds at appeal, therefore it would be down to Members of the Committee to do this.

Councillor Parish suggested another reason for refusal, which was that 250 dwellings were too many. This was seconded by Councillor Mrs Fraser.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to refuse the application on the grounds of highway safety and sustainability, which was carried.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused for the following reasons:

1. *The Council maintains in excess of a 5 year supply of deliverable homes. The proposed development, by reason of the increase in the number of houses to 250, is in excess of the housing numbers required by the SADMP Policy F1.4 (at least 140 homes) and without appropriate infrastructure for Downham Market and justification, is not considered sustainable development and is therefore contrary to the NPPF, NPPG, Policies CS01, CS04, CS08 of the Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM1 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016.*

2. *Given existing localised highway issues in the locality (London Road and Denver junctions) combined with the increase in traffic from the site, it is considered that the proposed four-arm roundabout is inappropriately located and should be located at the staggered junction of London Road, Downham Market and Downham Road, Denver. The proposal is therefore contrary to the NPPF and Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy 2011.*

The Committee adjourned at 10.35 am and reconvened at 10.45 am.

(ii) 17/01336/OM

Dersingham: Allotment site north of 6 to 10, west of 53 Doddshill Road: Outline major application: Residential development of 30 houses: The Sandringham Estate

The Senior Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was an allocated site in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies document – Policy G29.1 Dersingham – land north of Doddshill Road and was allocated for residential development of at least 20 dwellings.

The site formed part of the setting, but was not contained within the Dersingham Conservation Area.

The site was also 1km to the east of The Roydon Common and Dersingham Bog SAC, Dersingham Bog SSSI and Ramsar sites.

The site was contained behind hedging on the northern side of Doddshill Road and was elevated above road level and increased in height heading in a northerly direction. The site had post and rail fencing that divided the site in two heading in a north-south direction. There were a few asbestos sheds on the eastern side of the site.

The application proposal was for 30 houses, and was in outline form with layout, scale and access being determined at this stage.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Bubb.

The Senior Planner highlighted that a key issue was the required removal of a building within the conservation area to facilitate the necessary highway improvements at Doddshill Road/Manor Road junction. The Committee also noted the following key issues:

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon visual amenity;
- Impact upon designated heritage assets;
- Trees and landscape;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity;
- Highway impacts;
- Ecology – upon European Designated Sites;
- Ecology – impact upon protected species;
- Infrastructure provision;
- Affordable housing;
- Open space;
- Flood risk and drainage;
- Contamination;
- Archaeology;
- Mineral safeguarding; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr C Watson (objecting) and Mr C Morris (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to comments made by the objector, the Senior Planner explained the distances between the rear of the row of terraced properties and the objector's property. He also explained that the driveway and access of the site was not directly in front of the objector's property.

Councillor Bubb addressed the Committee and explained why he had called-in the application. He referred to the old school building and that it was not an attractive building. He added that just because it was old it didn't mean that it had to be kept. He considered that the replacement would be better for the village. He did have sympathy with the objector in relation to car headlights shining into his property.

Councillor Morrison asked for clarification in relation to where the affordable housing was sited. The Senior Planner highlighted the location of the affordable housing. Councillor Morrison expressed concern that the affordable housing was not pepper-potted adequately across the scheme.

The Assistant Director informed the Committee that the developers had followed the Council's policy in relation to affordable housing.

Councillor Mrs Wright referred to the comments from the Historic Environment Service (HES), in that the evaluation report would have to

be re-written and re-submitted. She added that she was concerned that things were not being scrutinised as they should be.

Councillor Mrs Wright expressed concern in relation to the proposal and endorsed the comments from the Conservation Officer and Historic England asking why the community centre building had to be demolished. She proposed that the application be refused on the grounds of the principle of development, impact on a designated heritage asset and loss of a building in the conservation area. This was seconded by Councillor Morrison.

Councillor Mrs Watson asked if it would be possible to rebuild the gable end into the new development. The Assistant Director explained that the road had to be realigned.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to refuse the application, which was lost.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the late correspondence and the need to correct the recommendation, and that the conditions and reasons had been labelled the wrong way round, and a further correction was needed to condition 22, which was agreed.

RESOLVED: (A) That, the application be approved subject to conditions and completion of a Section 106 agreement that secures affordable housing provision, SUDS Maintenance and Management, and public open space within 4 months of the date of this decision.

(B) In the event that the Section 106 agreement is not completed within 4 months of the date of the Committee meeting, the application shall be refused due to the failure to secure affordable housing, public open space, SUDS maintenance and management.

(C) That the conditions and reasons be corrected, as detailed in late correspondence, and condition 22 be corrected to refer to condition 21.

(iii) 17/01337/F

**Dersingham: Former Community Centre, 74 Manor Road:
Residential development of 9 houses: The Sandringham
Estate**

The Senior Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was on the junction of Manor Road and Doddshill Road, Dersingham and was contained in the Conservation Area of Dersingham, which was classified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

The site comprised a former Community Centre building and hard surfacing playground. The site was above road level and increased sharply heading in an easterly direction.

The proposal sought consent for 9 dwellings, following the demolition of the former Community Centre building. Highway improvements were also proposed to improve the Doddshill and Manor Road junctions.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was contrary to the comments from Historic England.

The Senior Planner highlighted that a key issue was the proposed demolition of the existing vacant derelict Community Centre, which was in a prominent position on the site in the Conservation Area, to facilitate the junction improvements.

Other key issues for the Committee to consider included:

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon the Conservation Area;
- Other form and character issues;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity;
- Arboricultural matters;
- Protected species;
- Impact upon European Designated Sites;
- Highway safety;
- Affordable housing;
- Drainage;
- Archaeology; and
- Other matters.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr C Morris (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In relation to density per hectare, the Assistant Director explained that the application had been looked at in its own right and cottage style dwellings were elsewhere in the village. There was a tighter framework of dwellings in that part of the village but overall it was felt that the scheme would fit in well with the conservation area.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings asked who would maintain the open space included within the scheme. The Senior Planner advised that a condition could be imposed to cover this issue if required.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings felt that there would be no gain for the village. The Assistant Director advised that CIL monies would be payable to the Parish Council.

The Assistant Director explained that this application and the previous application was interlinked and was reliant on removing the community centre for the road improvement works to be carried out.

Councillor Morrison considered that the dwellings were sparsely populated and that more houses could be accommodated on the site, which would then trigger the need for affordable housing to be provided.

Councillor Mrs Watson expressed concern in relation to the car parking provided for the scheme - that it was overly dominant and visually intrusive.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings considered that a better layout and design could be achieved to provide affordable housing within the scheme and a better car parking layout.

The Assistant Director reminded the Committee that as Dersingham was not a designated rural area, the scheme would have to incorporate 11 dwellings before affordable housing needed to be provided.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings then proposed that the application be refused, on the grounds of poor design and layout, particularly through the inefficient use of land, and the intrusive and poorly laid out car parking, which did not preserve or enhance the conservation area, which was seconded by Councillor White and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused, contrary to recommendation for the following reasons:

The scheme is considered to represent a poor design and layout, particularly through the inefficient use of land, and the car parking which is considered to be overly intrusive and poorly laid out, which does not preserve or enhance the conservation area, contrary to the provisions of the NPPF, policies CS08 and CS12 of the Core Strategy, and policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan.

(iv) 17/01932/F

Brancaster: Skippers Piece, Main Road: The proposed demolition of existing dwelling and construction of 5 residential dwellings: GCC Developments Ltd

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was located on the northern side of the main A149 running through the village of Brancaster.

The site currently consisted of a single, detached, two-storey dwellinghouse, detached garage and associated garden land. There were many garden trees across the site with established hedge boundaries along a high proportion of the east and west boundaries.

The site was surrounded by other residential properties; a mix of single and two storey properties on the Branodunum residential estate to the

east, two storey properties to Hempland Close to the west, two storey properties on Cross Lane to the north and two storey properties on the southern side of the A149 at Saxon Close. Hempland Close and Saxon Close were small groups of dwellings set within cul-de-sacs whilst those on Cross Lane follow a linear layout. Dwellings on Branodunum have a more relaxed layout with cul-de-sacs leading off the main through road.

A public right of way, known as Brancaster Footpath 8 ran along the western boundary of the site.

The site and the whole of the village of Brancaster was within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The application was for full planning permission for the demolition of the existing dwelling known as Skippers Piece and the construction of five residential properties; two detached and three terraced dwellings.

During the course of the application, amended plans had been received in response to third party comments received.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the views of Brancaster Parish Council were contrary to the officer recommendation.

The Principal Planner outlined the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon AONB and visual amenity;
- Form and character;
- Highway impacts;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity;
- Trees and landscape;
- Affordable housing; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Gould (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to issues raised by the public speaker, the Principal Planner advised that Norfolk County Highways had raised no objection to the application.

Councillor Mrs Watson explained that particular part of Brancaster got very congested, particularly in the summer months. She referred to the impact of the Saxon Fields development in relation to parking on the road and that two bus stops were also in the vicinity. She added that she had looked at the site and it had retained a lot of water. She

referred to the design of the terraced houses and asked whether they all had rear accesses.

The Assistant Director explained that the site was quite large with lots of on-site car parking to serve the dwelling. The Council would not be able to sustain a highway objection.

Councillor Mrs Wright asked whether County Highways Officers had been to look at the site.

The Executive Director explained that Norfolk County Council knew the village and the problems experienced in the summer months. Officers also had the benefit of plans showing visibility splays.

Councillor Morrison added that the Chairman of the Parish Council spoke strongly about the highways issues, which were a problem in the summer months. He proposed that the application should be refused on highway grounds.

The Executive Director reminded the Committee that any reason for refusal had to be substantiated if it went to appeal, and as County Highways raised no objection to the application, it would be for Members to defend that reason at appeal.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings added that the terrace building did not represent good design because there was no separate rear access to the mid-terrace property.

Councillor Hipperson considered that the application did not comply with the Neighbourhood Plan for Brancaster, where it stated that if bungalows or houses were demolished they should be replaced like for like. The Assistant Director explained that the Policies of the Neighbourhood Plan were set out at page 39 of the agenda.

The Principal Planner explained that Policy 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan with regard to the encouragement of smaller dwellings, the units proposed were shown to be more modest in size than those in the adjoining Hempland Close. Whilst smaller units of up to 3 bedrooms were encouraged, four bedroom dwellings were not prohibited through this policy.

The Assistant Director added that Policy 5 (Replacement dwellings) stated that replacement dwellings should occupy no more than 50% of the plot. This proposal was under 50%.

Councillor Bubb commented that if cars were parked along the road, then the visibility splay would be lost.

Councillor Morrison withdrew his proposal to refuse the application on highway grounds, after hearing the advice given by officers.

Councillor White proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that the design of the terraced housing was not acceptable by virtue of there being no rear access for the middle property, which was seconded by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings and, after having been put to the vote, was carried.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused, contrary to recommendation for the following reasons:

That the lack of a separate rear access to the middle terrace in the row of three is a poor standard of design, which is considered to be contrary to the provisions of the NPPF, and policy CS08 of the Core Strategy, and policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan.

(v) **17/02002/F**

Grimston: Tithe Farm, Broad Drove: Conversion and change of use of an agricultural barn to a dwelling: Geoffrey Mason Ltd

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located within an area of countryside according to Local Plan Proposals Maps for Grimston.

The site contained a fletton brick and flint barn and concrete apron to the front that was accessed from Broad Drove.

The application sought consent for a change of use of the barn to a residential property, following a refusal of a prior notification for a change of barn to dwelling 16/00524/PACU3.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was contrary to the views of Grimston Parish Council and it had been called-in by Councillor Alistair Beales.

The Principal Planner then outlined the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development and planning history;
- Impact upon visual amenity;
- Residential amenity;
- Protected species;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Martin Skeritt (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Alistair Beales addressed the Committee in support of the application. He explained

that he had called-in the application in consultation with Councillor Mrs Fraser. He considered that the proposals would enhance the barn with the extension to the rear being removed. He also considered that there would be no amenity issues for the occupiers of the barn, as the applicant had gone to great lengths to work with the Council's CSNN team, and the measures put in place would address the concerns raised by the Parish Council. He explained that this was a largely redundant building which was part of an existing and established farm complex, including an existing farm house. He considered that this was strong application which would result in an attractive house.

Councillor Mrs Fraser concurred with the comments from Councillor Beales and added that this would be a beautiful house.

RESOLVED: That, the application be approved, as recommended.

(vi) **17/01700/O**

Burnham Market: West Mead, Docking Road: Outline Application: development of three dwellings: Mr Shaun Salter

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located within an area designated in the development boundary of Burnham Market.

Burnham Market was a Key Rural Service Centre in accordance with Policy CS02 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011.

The site contained a detached chalet bungalow and detached garage which was to be demolished to provide 3 dwellings.

The application was in outline form with all matters reserved.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Sam Sandell.

The Principal Planner outlined the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon the AONB;
- Form and character issues;
- Highway safety
- Impact upon neighbour amenity;
- Arboricultural information; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Greg Garland (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Assistant Director advised that he had had the benefit of seeing the site, and his view was that given the size of it, 3 dwellings could be accommodated on the site. He added that the layout proposed was indicative but any development would need a different layout.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings added that the existing dwelling to be removed was of a nice design and spacious and enhanced the character of area. She further added that although it was a large plot it currently fitted in with the street-scene. She agreed with the recommendation of refusal.

Councillor Miss Sandell (Ward Member) stated that the site appeared to have two vehicular accesses onto a busy road with a sharp left hand bend. She also supported the recommendation of refusal.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as recommended.

The Committee adjourned at 12.35 pm and reconvened at 1.10 pm.

Councillor Blunt left the meeting at 12.35 pm

(vii) 17/01691/F

Feltwell: 24 Addison Close: New build 2 bedroom bungalow in part of existing garden: Mr T George

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that full permission was sought for the erection of 1 no. single storey dwelling in the curtilage of 24 Addison Close, Feltwell.

The site falls within the development boundary for Feltwell, which was classified as a Joint Key Rural Service Centre (with Hockwold) in the Settlement Hierarchy of the Core Strategy (Policy CS02).

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was contrary to the views of the Parish Council.

The Principal Planner then outlined the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr T George (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the late correspondence and the need to add an additional condition requiring the windows on the

north west-elevation serving the ensuite and bathroom to be obscured glazing, which was agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended, subject to the imposition of an additional condition requiring the windows on the north west-elevation serving the ensuite and bathroom to be obscured glazing.

(viii) 17/01981/F

**Holme next the Sea: Hope Cottage, Busseys Lane:
Erection of single storey side extension: Ocean Breaks**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located within the Conservation Area of Holme-next-the-Sea. Holme-next-the-Sea was classified as a Smaller Village or Hamlet according to Policy CS02 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011.

The application site contained one dwelling. The existing property comprised a two-storey building with a single storey linked building to the site. The property was constructed of traditional clunch (chalk) together with timber boarding and was roofed with traditional Norfolk clay pantiles. The proposal sought consent for a single storey side extension.

The property had been the subject to a recently refused application to extend the building to the west (16/00196/F) and was subsequently dismissed at appeal (APP/V2635/D/3148824).

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the site was subject of a previously dismissed appeal for an extension.

The Principal Planner then outlined the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and other design considerations.
- Impact on the AONB.
- Nature conservation.
- Highway safety;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr W Draper (objecting) and Mr A Brand (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to concerns raised by the objector in relation to the position of the balcony and overlooking into his property, the Principal

Planner explained that this had not been raised on the previous application. However there was a separation distance of 20m and a screen could be added to the balcony as condition 5 required details of the balcony design to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Councillor Storey suggested that the balcony could be moved, as suggested by the objector.

Councillor White proposed that the application be deferred for one cycle to see if the balcony could be moved to overcome the concerns raised by the objector. This was seconded by Councillor Storey and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: That, the application be deferred for one cycle.

(ix) 17/02027/F

**Holme next the Sea: Sandy Ridge, Broadwater Lane:
Variation of Condition 10 of planning permission
16/00323/F: replacement dwelling: Mr David Gray**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site comprised a triangular plot of land on the north western side of Broadwater Road, Holme-next-the-Sea. Until recently the site contained a detached dwelling of single storey height, a series of domestic outbuildings and associated garden land, but this has now been demolished in connection with the valid planning permission for a replacement dwelling following the demolition of the existing chalet bungalow and ancillary structures on the site in 2016.

The site was bounded to the south west by a detached dwelling. To the south, on the south side of Broadwater Road, was a caravan whilst to the north and north-east were the coastal marshes and open land leading out towards the sea.

In policy terms the site was in countryside and within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). It was in or close to nature conservation sites of national and international importance including a SSSI, National Nature Reserve, Special Protection Area, Ramsar site and Special Area of Conservation.

The area was also in a high risk flood zone (Flood Zone 3 and Tidal Hazard Area).

Earlier in the year the applicant submitted an application for the variation of condition 10 of planning permission 16/00323/F to amend the previously approved drawings (ref: 17/00735/F). This was considered by the Planning Committee in July but was refused. This was now the subject of a planning appeal.

The current application sought to vary condition 10 of planning permission 16/00323/F to amend the previously approved drawings to substitute amended plans for those previously approved.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the previous application for amendments had been refused by the Planning Committee and was now subject to an appeal.

The Principal Planner then outlined the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Form and character and impact on AONB;
- Nature conservation issues;
- Flood risk;
- Residential amenity; and
- Other matters.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

(x) 17/01951/RM
Stoke Ferry: Land between 11 and 12 Buckenham Drive:
Reserved matters application: Construction of two
dwelling: BCKLWN

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application was for the construction of the Reserved Matters (access, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping) associated with outline permission granted under application 14/01454/O).

The submitted Reserved Matters application reflected the indicative plan that was submitted under the outline application and showed a pair of semi-detached properties with shared access and parking to the rear. An existing footpath was relocated around the southern and eastern edges of the site and access for the garage of No.11 (the existing neighbouring property to the east) was retained via the shared access.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as it was a Borough Council application which had attracted objections.

The Principal Planner then outlined the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material considerations.

In relation to the relocation of the footpath, Councillor White asked for assurances that the footpath would be wide enough for people with prams, wheelchairs, etc as this was a primary route to the school.

The Principal Planner explained that the footpath measured between 1.25 and 1.3 m, and suggested that details of the footpath could be conditioned

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed that the application be deferred for a cycle to check the footpath measurements. This was seconded by Councillor White and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: That, the application be deferred for one cycle to allow the footpath measurements to be re-checked to ensure that it would be wide enough.

PC80: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

RESOLVED: That, the report be noted.

The meeting closed at 1.45 pm