

Broads Authority

Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 28 February 2014

Present:

Dr J M Gray – in the Chair

Mr M Barnard	Mr M Jeal
Miss S Blane	Dr J S Johnson
Mrs J Brociek-Coulton	Mr P Ollier
Mr N Dixon	Mr J Timewell
Mr C Gould	Mr P Warner

In Attendance:

Mrs S A Beckett – Administrative Officer (Governance)
Mr S Bell – for the Solicitor
Mr F Bootman – Planning Officer
Ms M Hammond – Planning Assistant
Mr B Hogg – Historic Environment Manager
Ms A Long – Director of Planning and Resources
Mr A Scales – Planning Officer (NPS)
Ms C Smith – Head of Development Management

Members of the Public in attendance who spoke:

BA/2013/0392/FUL BAM Nuttall Site Office, Old Road, Acle

Mrs Pat Watson	Acle Parish Council
Mr Jeremy Halls (BESL)	On behalf of Applicant

BA/2014/0013/FUL Land to rear of Bridge Stores, Potter Heigham

Mr David Sanford	The Applicant
------------------	---------------

BA/2013/0405/CU Waveney Inn and River Centre, Staithe Road, Burgh St Peter

Mr James Knight	The Applicant
-----------------	---------------

BA/2013/0388/FUL Hill Cottage, Mill Hill, Bramerton, Norwich

Yvonne Wilson	Neighbour Objector
Robin Watts	Agent for the Applicant

BA/2013/0208/FUL Icehouse Dyke, The Shoal, Irstead

Stuart Bizley and Kevin Cole	Consultant and Agent for the Applicant
---------------------------------	--

BA/2014/0012/CU Whitlingham Broad Campsite, Whitlingham Lane, Trowse

Ms L Robey

The Applicant

9/1 Apologies for Absence and Welcome

Apologies were received from Prof J Burgess, Mrs L Hemsall and Mr R Stevens.

9/2 Declarations of Interest

Members introduced themselves and provided declarations of interest as set out in Appendix 1 of these minutes.

9/3 Minutes: 31 January 2014

The minutes of the meeting held on 31 January 2014 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

9/4 Points of Information Arising from the Minutes

Minute 8/4 Appeals

The Chairman reported that the Authority had now received a full response to the Authority's letter of 17 December 2013 from the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) which had been circulated to all members. The letter apologised for the delays and explained that some of these were due to the shortage of Inspectors with the necessary knowledge particularly to deal with specialist enforcement casework but that this was now being rectified. Members noted that lately there had been an improvement in the time taken to provide decisions on appeals.

9/5 To note whether any items have been proposed as matters of urgent business

No items had been proposed as matters of urgent business.

9/6 Chairman's Announcements and Introduction to Public Speaking

(1) Planning Advisory Service - Review of Committee

The Authority had invited the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) to review its Planning Committee with the aim of improving the quality of decision making. As well as reviewing the papers and processes, this would include a member and an officer from an external body or bodies attending one or two committee meetings and carrying out interviews with a sample of committee members including the Chairman and Vice-Chairman and attending officers. Expenses would be covered by the PAS.

(2) **Public Speaking**

The Chairman reminded everyone that the scheme for public speaking was in operation for consideration of planning applications, details of which were contained in the revised Code of Conduct for members and officers, and that the time period was five minutes for all categories of speaker. Those who wished to speak were requested to come up to the public speaking desk at the beginning of the presentation of the relevant application.

9/7 Requests to Defer Applications and /or Vary the Order of the Agenda

The Chairman proposed that Application **BA/2013/0410/FUL Ivy House Farm Hotel, Ivy Lane, Lowestoft** be deferred for a site visit. A number of objections had been received within the last week and although it was not usual to recommend holding a site visit simply due to there being a large number of objections, in this case the issues were slightly unusual in that the concern was about noise travelling over water. It was therefore considered to be useful for members to gain an understanding of this concern. This was agreed (Minute 9/8/(2)).

The Chairman reported that he intended to vary the order of the applications so as to deal with those applications where members of the public were present in order to enable them not to extend their time at the meeting unnecessarily.

9/8 Applications for Planning Permission

The Committee considered applications submitted under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as well as matters of enforcement (also having regard to Human Rights), and reached decisions as set out below. Acting under its delegated powers the Committee authorised the immediate implementation of the decisions.

The following minutes relate to further matters of information, or detailed matters of policy not already covered in the officers' reports, and which were given additional attention.

- (1) **BA/2013/0392/FUL BAM Nuttall Site Office, Old Road, Acle**
Use of the site for offices and site compound with replacement of existing offices with new energy efficient cabins
Applicant: Environment Agency

The Head of Development Management provided a detailed presentation on the proposal for the retention of the BESL site compound and for the erection of new energy efficient cabins to replace the existing buildings until 2021. Permission had originally been granted for site offices in 2007 on the basis that it would be used while the flood defence works were being carried out in this area. The application included a reconfiguration of the site with an area being re-grassed and restored to grazing marsh which would remove some of

the impact on the adjacent residents. Since the writing of the report the existing flag poles had been removed.

The Head of Development Management updated members on the consultations received since the writing of the report. One of these came from the Local District Member, copies of which had been circulated to members. The comments followed on from the concerns already expressed but now raised a formal objection to the application on grounds that the application was contrary to Core Strategy Policies particularly CS1, Landscape Protection and Enhancement and CS18 Rural Sustainability, NPPF guidance relating to building in the open countryside, and on the basis that there was no justification for an “extension“ of temporary consent.

The Head of Development Management explained that the application related to a Broads specific development and concluded that whilst the proposed development was seeking consent to retain an employment/commercial use on a rural site for a further period of seven years, which was not provided for by the relevant Development Plan Policies, it was considered that there were material considerations that justified a departure from Development Plan Policy: the site met the operational needs of the applicant to ensure the satisfactory completion of the Broads Flood Alleviation Project; other sites were constrained and unsuitable and the alternative sites in Acle would have a greater impact on the amenity of residents since lorries and traffic would be going through Acle itself; there were no highway objections; the proposal was for a temporary period only and BESL would be required to restore it completely to grazing marsh by the end of the project in 2021. It was considered that there were sufficient mitigating measures to reduce the impact on the residents. It was not considered that an unacceptable precedent would be set by approving the application because of its specificity to the Broads. It was noted that there was nothing to prevent the landowner applying for permanent planning permission for an industrial/commercial use after 2021, however, it was considered that this would be very unlikely to be justified and the grounds for exception in this instance were very clear. The current application was recommended for approval as a departure application subject to the conditions outlined in the report including a signage scheme.

Mrs Watson, for Acle Parish Council and resident of Hermitage Close opposite the site, expressed the concerns of the Parish Council as stated within the report explaining that the Parish Council was opposed to a temporary permission for a further seven years, given that the original temporary consent had already been extended beyond the four years originally expected. There were considerable concerns that the use would become permanent and the site was not appropriate for such a use. Acle was considered to be a Gateway to the Broads and therefore the current and proposed use was not considered to provide an appropriate first impression for holiday makers especially when this

was advertised by the large untidy and unsightly signs at the entrance to the site. There were also concerns over the hours of operation for office workers stated as 7am to 6pm Monday to Friday and 7am to 3pm on Saturdays as well as lorry movements from the site.

Mr Halls on behalf of BAM Nutall/BESL explained that an operational site was still required for the Broads Flood Alleviation Project. There was a programme for crest raising as well as piling removal within the Acle area itself together with elsewhere in the Bure.. The site provided good access for this work. Activity on the site would not be as intensive as previously and therefore the proposal involved the reduction in the scale of the site by a third. There was no longer justification for an office site within Norwich and the fewer office staff now required could be accommodated at the Acle site. Alternative locations for a base had been explored but were rejected as unsuitable due to the greater impacts these would have. The concerns of neighbour amenity were acknowledged and the proposal would reduce those impacts further. BAM Nutall had removed the flags and would be prepared to remove and modify some of the signs at the entrance of the site, although some of the signs, particularly within the site were mandatory for safety reasons. Mr Halls emphasised that the proposal was associated with the fixed contract for the flood alleviation project due to end on 1 June 2021 after which BESL would no longer exist and the site would be covered by the planning permission conditions involving the restoration to grazing marsh. With regard to the hours of use, BESL would be happy to accept a reduction in the number of hours of use especially those relating to Saturday.

Members gave careful consideration to the proposal, recognising the concerns of the local residents and the policy constraints and particularly having regard to the use of "temporary" consent. Members recognised the excellent work that had been undertaken by BESL over the last 13 years in delivering the Broads Flood Alleviation Project and were mindful that it was a fixed term project. However, there was concern that a continuation of the use granted on a temporary basis could send an inappropriate message that this was an acceptable use for a gateway site as it diminished the landscape setting. Reference was made to the extant Government Circular 11/95 paragraph 112, which stated that a second temporary permission should not normally be granted and that following a set trial period there should be sufficient evidence as to whether permanent permission or a refusal was the correct solution. There was also concern that the units proposed had a much greater life expectancy than the 7 year term proposed. It was also considered that there were plenty of alternative appropriate employment sites in the region which would be more appropriate and accessible.

The Head of Development Management clarified that temporary permission had not been granted because there was a need for a trial but that the use was not required on a permanent basis. Paragraph

112 of Circular 11/95 was under the heading of "Trial runs". It was not a site where permanent industrial use would be accepted and therefore permission had been specifically for the particular project and there was a restoration scheme provided for by the application. The current proposal was for a defined time period for the fixed term of the project. A condition could be imposed limiting permission to use in connection with the Flood Alleviation Project.

Some members expressed concern that by granting a further temporary permission, there was a degree of permission creep and a period of fourteen years had a level of permanency which was not desirable. Other members commented that the Authority was and had been well aware of the nature of the flood alleviation project from the outset. A further seven years with the certain knowledge of the termination of the project and that the site was to be cleared was acceptable. Those members prepared to accept the officer's recommendation accepted the argument that the site would be the most convenient in terms of access and limitation of impact in relation to traffic for the amenity of residents of Acle as a whole.

Mr Warner proposed, seconded by Mr Jeal that the application be refused.

It was RESOLVED by 8 votes to 3

that the application be refused on the grounds that the site was not allocated as an employment site, that there were other sites specifically allocated for the purposes proposed, concerns over the impact on the landscape, especially when seen from the road, and impact upon residential amenity. Therefore the application was considered to be contrary to policies in the adopted Core Strategy 2007 and Broads Development Management DPD 2011 specifically CS1, CS10 and DP28.

(2) **BA/2013/0410/FUL Ivy House Farm Hotel, Ivy Lane, Oulton Broad Lowestoft**

Erection of a marquee and toilet accommodation within existing building

Applicant: Ivy Country House Hotel Ltd. Dr Adrian Parton

RESOLVED:

that the application be deferred for a site visit (Scheduled date 14 March 2014) for members to gain an understanding of the concerns expressed by residents from the other side of Oulton Broad relating to noise travelling across the water.

- (3) **BA/2014/0013/FUL Land to rear of Bridge Stores, Potter Heigham**
Retrospective application for extension and resurfacing of existing car park
Applicant: Bridge Car Park Company Limited

The Planning Officer provided a detailed presentation of the application seeking retrospective consent for a small extension of a private car park between the Broadshaven Tavern public house and the private dwelling Riverside House to the rear of Lathams stores by an area measuring approximately 23m x 8m and for the resurfacing of the entire car park, the land use for which had been granted permission in 2010. The area had been used for informal car parking over a number of decades until this had been regularised. The application covered both the existing approved area and the proposed new car park area. The car park extension, which had formerly been occupied by a large concrete garage, and resurfacing had been completed and was SUDs compliant. The applicant had offered to provide a new fence of 1.8 metres at its highest point to screen the car park from the neighbouring Riverside House from where objections had been received.

Since the writing of the report a further representation had been received on behalf of the neighbour Riverside House, copies of which had been circulated as well as tabled for members' information. The Environment Agency had no objections.

In assessing the application the Planning Officer gave particular attention to the amenity of the local residents, the landscape impact and the matter of flood risk. He concluded that the site had intrinsic value as a car park and in serving those occupying the Thurne Bungalows, did reduce the impact of car parking on more visible sites of Broads value in the vicinity. The information supplied had been considered by the technical advisers of the Environment Agency and considered to be proportionate and acceptable. The overall level of the car park had not changed significantly. The use of the car park was restricted and there would not be an increase in its use as a result of the works. He concluded that the works did not have unacceptable impacts on the Broads landscape or the amenity of the neighbouring occupier, addressed the issue of flood risk and was in accordance with policy and therefore recommended for approval.

Members gave careful consideration to the proposals and particularly to the objections received. They were satisfied that these had been satisfactorily addressed, that the area had been tidied up and concurred with the officer's assessment.

RESOLVED unanimously

that the application be approved subject to conditions as outlined within the report including an Informative as requested by the IDB relating to surface water management. The application is considered to accord

with Policies DP2 and DP28 and satisfies the requirements set out in the NPPF and Policy DP29 of the Broads DM DPD 2011.

(4) **BA/2013/0405/CU Waveney Inn and River Centre, Staithe Road, Burgh St Peter**

Conversion of existing shop to luxury apartment with re-location of shop to unused part of pub

Applicant: Waveney River Centre (2003) Ltd. (Mr James Knight)

The Planning Officer provided a detailed presentation of the proposal relating to the alteration of the operations for the Waveney River Centre which involved the conversion of the existing shop to create a new 5 bedroom self-catering holiday apartment and the change of use of part of the on-site public house, the Waveney Inn, to accommodate the relocated site reception and shop facilities.

The Planning Officer explained that since the writing of the report the Parish Council had indicated that they had no objections but noted that there had been a number of recent applications for other works and therefore requested that the applicant submit a five year comprehensive business plan to accommodate any further development.

The Environment Agency had originally objected to the application on the basis of inadequate information, since when they had received additional information and were satisfied with the proposals.

The Planning Officer concluded that the proposal, on balance was to be welcomed as it would be beneficial in securing a viable future for the public house at this site and would preserve and enhance the existing amenities on offer. The proposal would have no unacceptable impacts in terms of design, highways, amenity or flood risk, there have been no objections received and therefore it was recommended for approval.

In response to the Parish Council's comments regarding a five year plan, Mr Knight, the applicant explained that the purpose of the proposal was to consolidate the use of the on-site pub and make use of the area used for the shop and reception which had been abandoned for the last two to three years. All of the proposals recently provided which had received planning permission were to enhance the facilities and the overall development of the site which was now largely well developed with no further land available.

Members concurred with the officer's assessment

RESOLVED unanimously

that the application be approved subject to conditions as outlined within the report including additional conditions relating to .The proposal is considered to be acceptable in accordance with Policies DP4, DP11,

DP14, DP15, DP27 and DP29 of the adopted Development Management Policies DPD (2011) and emerging Policy XNS9 of the Broads Site Specifics DPD.

(5) **BA/2013/0388/FUL Hill Cottage, Mill Hill, Bramerton, Norwich**

Two storey side extension and single storey rear/side extension

Applicant: Mr Ashley Banester

The Planning Assistant provided a detailed presentation of the application for a two storey and one storey extension to a dwelling forming half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings. The objection came from the neighbour occupying the two-storey dwelling 20 metres from the application site and situated on much lower ground. The footprint of the existing dwelling would be increased by 140% but this scale of the proposed extensions was a reduction to the original proposal that had been amended following discussions with officers. One of the main issues to consider was the presence of a substantial mature oak tree protected by a TPO in the grounds of the neighbouring property but adjacent to the boundary of the application site. Since the writing of the report a further representation had been received from this neighbour, and a response provided, copies of which had been circulated to all members and tabled for the meeting.

The Planning Assistant concluded that although the proposal significantly increased the scale of a modest semi-detached dwelling, the design and materials to be used were acceptable and would not result in an unacceptable overbearing impact on adjoining occupiers. Subject to conditions and appropriate mitigation and protection measures in association with the oak tree being included in the conditions, the application was recommended for approval.

Yvonne Wilson, the neighbour, spoke to her subsequent letter of concern particularly in relation to the oak tree and boundary laurel hedge explaining that her house was an “upside Down” design with living areas looking directly across to the neighbour. She expressed concern about the threat from foundation diggings and requested clarification on the site investigation and its timing, the foundation construction and regulations to insure these were carried out satisfactorily.

Mr Watts, on behalf of the applicant expressed concern about the potential condition requiring a site investigation and foundation design to be undertaken and agreed by the Local Planning Authority before planning permission was granted. He disagreed with the Authority’s arboricultural officer’s assessment. He confirmed that he was confident that a site investigation and necessary mitigating measures would be undertaken to protect the tree and hedge and that it would be his responsibility as a structural engineer on behalf of his client and should not be dependent on or the responsibility of the LPA.

The Planning Assistant confirmed that a pre-commencement condition was standard practice and it was not a case of withholding permission. The proposed condition would be contained on the Decision Notice for planning permission (should members be minded to approve), and would of course be the responsibility of the applicant and agent. The LPA would need to be satisfied that the necessary investigations and mitigation measures were adequate to protect the tree, the subject of the TPO, and the amenity of the neighbour. The foundation design would ultimately be the subject of building regulations.

Members considered that the proposal was an acceptable extension on a modest property and would improve the design and living accommodation of the existing. They considered that the additional components of the proposed pre-commencement condition relating to site investigation and foundation design in association with the oak tree and boundary treatment to be agreed by the LPA were appropriate and would not jeopardise the development.

RESOLVED unanimously

that the application be approved subject to conditions as outlined within the report together with additional conditions relating to the foundation design and treatment of the tree and boundary hedge. The proposal was considered to be acceptable in accordance with Policies DP1, DP2, DP4 and DP28 of the adopted Development Management Policies DPD (2011) and Policy CS1 of the adopted Core Strategy (2007) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

- (6) **BA/2013/0208/FUL Icehouse Dyke, The Shoal, Irstead**
Erection of holiday dwelling within curtilage of Icehouse Dyke to enable refurbishment of main dwelling
Applicant: Mr and Mrs Andrew Lodge

The Planning Officer reminded members that the application had been considered at the Planning Committee meeting on 8 November 2013 but determination had been deferred for further information and specific details of the proposed Section 106 Agreement to secure the restoration of the existing dwelling on the site. The requested additional information on the financial implications of the proposed restoration and enabling development had now been received as well as a draft heads of terms for the Section 106 Agreement prepared setting out the detailed works, phasing of works to the Ice House and the proposed new holiday dwelling as well as the timetabling for completion of each. Following a detailed assessment particularly focussing on those issues previously raised at Committee and taking into account the guidance from English Heritage and the NPPF, the Planning Officer recommended approval. It was considered that the benefits of securing the future of the non-designated heritage asset were substantial and outweighed the disbenefits associated with departure from policy which

were considered limited. It was also considered that the Draft Heads of Terms of the Section 106 Agreement represented robust safeguards.

Since the writing of the report the local District Councillor had responded with no objection stating that she fully supported the officer recommendation.

The Historic Environment Manager reported that English Heritage had been contacted to inquire whether the Ice House could be statutorily listed and they had indicated that it was borderline and would require further information before doing so. The Authority was attempting to include the Ice House on the Local List.

Mr Cole and Mr Bizley on behalf of the applicant commented that they were confident that all the problems involved with the building had been discovered and there should be no further surprises not accounted for. They were confident that the schedule of works would their clients were local and keen to complete the scheme which would benefit the landscape of the Broads and generate income which would eventually benefit the economy of the Broads generally.

Members gave careful consideration to the application. They considered that the Ice House was a very valuable non-heritage asset for the Broads and exceedingly worthy of preservation. They considered that it was disappointing that English Heritage had not yet considered it should be listed. Following detailed discussion and clarification on the phasing detailed in the Draft S106, and queries relating to ownership of the properties, they were satisfied that the provisions of the Heads of Terms were fair and reasonable and linked to the financial value were a basis on which the Authority could proceed with some level of confidence. As a detail it was considered that the provisions of Phase 3 could be included as the Final Obligations part of Phase 2. They considered that the heads of terms for the Section 106 were suitably robust and the terms and conditions would meet the test and criteria of the EH guidance, the NPPF and regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, as amended.

RESOLVED unanimously

that the application be approved subject to prior completion of a Section 106 legal agreement as set out in Appendix 3 and subject to conditions as outlined within the report. The application will enable development which is considered necessary in order to address the conservation deficit and render the restoration of a financially viable proposition, thereby securing the long term future of the Ice House. The application is considered to be in full accordance with the guidance of the NPPF and Policies DP4, DP5 and DP 28 of the adopted DM DPD 2011.

- (7) **BA/2013/0406/FUL Wildwood, Brimbelow Road, Hoveton**
Proposed extension to living room of dwelling
Applicant: Mr and Mrs Royall

The Planning Officer provided a detailed presentation of the application to construct a single storey, single room extension on the end elevation of an existing dwelling which would be constructed and finished in materials to match those on the existing dwelling with a slate roof, timber clad walls and upvc windows.

Since the writing of the report comments from Hoveton Parish Council had been received stating that it had no objections. A further representation had been received from the neighbouring property Leisure Hour expressing concerns and if the application was to be approved requesting obscure glazing to the windows.

The Planning Officer concluded that the application was modest in scale and the design acceptable. The distance between the extension and the nearest neighbouring property together with intervening screening and oblique nature of the site was not considered to result in any unacceptable impacts. It was therefore recommended for approval.

Having given careful consideration to the neighbour's objections, Members concurred with the officer's assessment and did not consider that glazing of the windows would be necessary.

RESOLVED unanimously:

that the application be approved subject to conditions as outlined within the report. Due to the modest scale of the proposal, the distance between the extension and the nearest neighbouring property and having regard to the intervening screening, it was considered that the proposal satisfies the requirements of Policies DP4 (design) and DP28 (amenity).

- (8) **BA/2014/0012/CU Whitlingham Broad Campsite, Whitlingham Lane, Trowse**

Change of use of private amenity land to provide one 'yurt' camping pitch and two relocated bell tent pitches; relocation of existing bell tent pitches; erection of storage shed; provision of pedestrian bridge over existing culvert; construction of open sided lean-to as cover to outside wash-up area; retrospective consent for construction of lean-to store in service yard and timber walkway and deck to access manager's accommodation. All of the above for a temporary period until 25 March 2016 to accord with existing consent BA/2012/0338/CU
Applicant: Whitlingham Broad Campsite

The application was before members as the applicant was associated with a member of the Authority's staff. The Planning Officer provided a detailed presentation on the proposal for changes to the layout and

further development of the Whitlingham Broad campsite. Since the writing of the report, comments had been received from the Broads Society and the Environment Agency, neither of which had any objections.

The Planning Officer concluded that the proposal was considered to be of an appropriate scale and form to complement the existing facilities provided. It was not considered that there would be any unacceptable impacts on amenity, trees or highways and therefore the application was recommended for approval. The temporary nature of the permission was in order to establish whether the use would be viable and sustainable, to evaluate whether the nature of the structures were appropriate and whether further investment would be feasible.

Members were satisfied and concurred with the Officer's assessment.

RESOLVED unanimously

that the application be granted temporary consent until March 2016 subject to the conditions outlined within the report. It was considered that the application proposals in view of their modest scale and temporary nature would not unacceptably impact on the landscape setting or the visual amenities of the area or country park. The proposal was considered to be acceptable and consist with the thrust of development plan policy, particularly Policies CS, CS9, CS11, CS12, CS19 of the adopted Core Strategy and Policies DP4, Dp14 and DP15 of the DM DPD 2011 and NPPF provisions.

- (9) **BA/2014/ 0032/FUL Staithecote, Beech Road, Wroxham**
Proposed replacement quay heading comprising of approx, 30 metres of Alder Pole piling, 20 metres of timber quay heading and demolition of 3no timber sheds
Applicant: Jonathon Edye

The application was before members as the applicant was connected to a Broads Authority member of staff.

The Planning Officer provided a detailed presentation of the proposal for the replacement of quayheading in a dilapidated stated of repair and the demolition of three timber sheds on the site of Staithecote, Beech Road, Wroxham which fell within the Wroxham Conservation Area. The Scheme had been designed in accordance with the Authority's own design guidance on riverbank protection work.

Since writing the report, the Authority's Ecologist had commented indicating that there would be no impact on the ecology of the area.

The Planning Officer concluded that the proposal was minor in nature and would provide new improved quayheading, designed in accordance with Authority guidance, and the removal of three wooden sheds. It was considered that the scheme was acceptable in design and would have no unacceptable adverse impact in relation to flood risk, ecological, or landscape considerations. The Planning Officer therefore recommended approval subject to conditions.

Members concurred with the officer's assessment and considered that the application was acceptable and would provide a considerable improvement to the riverbank and the Conservation Area.

RESOLVED unanimously

that the application be approved subject to conditions as outlined within the report. The scheme was considered to be acceptable in design and will have no unacceptable adverse impact in relation to flood risk, ecological, or landscape considerations. It was therefore considered that the application is in accordance with Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy (2007) and Policies DP1, DP2, DP4, DP5 and DP21 of the DM DPD 2011 and NPPF provisions.

9/9 Enforcement Item for consideration: Site adjacent to Land at North End Thurlton, Unauthorised storage of non-agricultural items

The Committee received a report on the state of the land at North End Thurlton following the appeal decision to uphold the Authority's Enforcement Notice with the aim of removing the unauthorised storage of non-agricultural items. The landowner was required to comply with the Enforcement Notice by 18 February 2014 to clear the site and have the site restored to agricultural use by 15 April 2014. It was reported that since writing the report a site visit had been carried out which showed the fence still in place, although the landowner advised that he was in the process of clearing the site. The landowner had given assurances that the site would be completely cleared.

Members noted the options available to the Authority should compliance not be achieved. They noted that further site visits were to be carried out and therefore considered that it would not be appropriate to consider further options in detail at this juncture. The Enforcement Notice was still in place.

RESOLVED

that consideration of any further action be deferred until the next Planning Committee meeting following further site inspection by the officers.

9/10 Consultation Documents Update and Proposed Responses: Acle Neighbourhood Plan

The Committee received a report on the proposed response to the First Draft Consultation on the Acle Neighbourhood Plan. Members noted that the

process of producing the plan involved extensive consultation with residents and other stakeholder organisations as well as the drafting of the plan, objectives and policies. Members noted the comments in the report and those detailed on the more significant issues set out in the Appendix to the report.

RESOLVED

that the proposed comments on the first Draft Consultation of the Acle Neighbourhood Plan be endorsed and forwarded to Acle Parish Council.

9/11 Conservation Area Appraisals – Update on progress: Langley Abbey

The Committee received a report on the recent consultation process that had taken place on the Reappraisal of the Langley Abbey Conservation Area together with a summary of the responses received. It was noted that the extension to the Conservation Area was small to include two estate cottages. Members noted the amendments to the Scheduled Ancient Monument and that part of this was outside the Conservation Area, but since the SAM had greater weight, this would not be problematic. Although the attendance at the public open day and the response to the consultation had been disappointing, the occupier of one of the cottages most affected had attended and despite initial reservations had not objected.

RESOLVED

- (i) that the consultation response be noted;
- (ii) that officers be delegated to make appropriate amendments to the reappraisal Conservation Area resulting from the consultation process;
- (iii) that the extension to the existing boundary of the Langley Conservation Area be endorsed; and
- (iv) that the Langley Abbey Conservation Area appraisal and management proposals be adopted including the proposed extension to the existing boundary.

9/12 Enforcement Update

The Committee received an updated report on enforcement matters already referred to Committee.

Thorpe Island

It was noted that the Planning Inspector had undertaken a site visit on 28 January 2014 and subsequently decided to hold a Hearing as part of the appeal process. Therefore there would be a delay in determination of the appeal.

RESOLVED

that the report be noted.

9/13 Appeals to the Secretary of State: Update

The Committee received a schedule showing the position regarding appeals against the Authority since January 2013 as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

RESOLVED

that the report be noted.

9/14 Decisions Made by Officers under Delegated Powers

The Committee received a schedule of decisions made by officers under delegated powers from 21 January 2013 to 14 February 2014.

RESOLVED

that the report be noted.

9/15 Circular 28/83: Publication by Local Authorities of Information about the Handling of Planning Applications for Quarter ending 31 December 2013

The Committee received a report setting out the planning statistics for the Authority for the quarter ending 31 December 2013.

RESOLVED

that the report be noted and welcomed.

9/16 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Planning Committee would be held on Friday 28 March 2014 at 10.00am at Yare House, 62- 64 Thorpe Road, Norwich.

The meeting concluded at 14.33

CHAIRMAN

Code of Conduct for Members

Declaration of Interests

Committee: Planning Committee – 28 February 2014

Name <i>Please Print</i>	Agenda/ Minute No(s)	Nature of Interest (Please describe the nature of the interest)
Sholeh Blane	Items 9/8(8)	Application BA/2014/0012/CU Whitlingham Broad Campsite, Whitlingham Lane, Trowse Trustee of Whitlingham Charitable Trust
Julie Brociek-Coulton	Item 9/8 (8)	Application BA/2014/0012/CU Whitlingham Broad Campsite, Whitlingham Lane, Trowse Trustee of Whitlingham Charitable Trust