

Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 14 October 2022

Contents

1.	Apologies and welcome	2
	Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014	2
2.	Declarations of interest and introductions	2
3.	Minutes of last meeting	2
4.	Matters of urgent business	2
5.	Chair's announcements and introduction to public speaking	3
6.	Requests to defer applications and/or vary agenda order	3
7.	Applications for planning permission	3
	(1) BA/2022/0258/FUL and BA/2022/0259/LBC. No's 1, 2 & 3 Barn Mead Cottages, Coltishall	3
	(2) BA/2022/0239/HOUSEH - Freshfields, Priory Road, St Olaves	6
8.	Enforcement update	7
9.	Oulton Neighbourhood Plan – proceeding to referendum	8
10.	Updated National Flood Risk Guidance and our Flood Risk Supplementary Planning Document	8
11.	Consultation responses	8
12.	Appeals to the Secretary of State	9
13.	Decisions made by officers under delegated powers	9
14.	Date of next meeting	9
	Appendix 1 – Declaration of interests Planning Committee, 14 October 2022	10

Present

Harry Blathwayt – in the Chair, Stephen Bolt, Nigel Brennan, Bill Dickson, Andrée Gee, Tony Grayling, Gail Harris, Tim Jickells, James Knight, Vic Thomson, Melanie Vigo di Gallidoro and Fran Whymark

In attendance

Natalie Beal – Planning Policy Officer, Jason Brewster – Governance Officer, Cheryl Peel – Senior Planning Officer, Callum Sculfor – Planning Assistant, Cally Smith – Head of Planning and Sara Utting – Senior Governance Officer

Stuart French, Local Highway Authority (Norfolk County Council), attended for item 7(1).

Members of the public in attendance who spoke

Eliza Heaffey representing the Norfolk Mead Hotel and Alistair Paterson (objector) both for item 7(1) – application BA/2022/0258/FUL No's 1, 2 & 3 Barn Mead Cottages, Coltishall.

1. Apologies and welcome

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

An apology was received from Leslie Mogford.

Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014

The Chair explained that the meeting was being audio-recorded. All recordings remained the copyright of the Broads Authority and anyone wishing to receive a copy of the recording should contact the Governance Team. The minutes remained the record of the meeting. He added that the law permitted any person to film, record, photograph or use social media in order to report on the proceedings of public meetings of the Authority. This did not extend to live verbal commentary. The Chair needed to be informed if anyone intended to photograph, record or film so that any person under the age of 18 or members of the public not wishing to be filmed or photographed could be accommodated.

2. Declarations of interest and introductions

Members provided their declarations of interest as set out in Appendix 1 to these minutes and in addition to those already registered. All members declared that they had been lobbied by the objectors with regard to the planning application BA/2022/0258/FUL.

3. Minutes of last meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2022 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4. Matters of urgent business

There were no items of urgent business

5. Chair's announcements and introduction to public speaking

Public Speaking: The Chair stated that public speaking was in operation in accordance with the Authority's Code of Practice for members of the Planning Committee and officers.

6. Requests to defer applications and/or vary agenda order

No requests to defer or vary the order of the agenda had been received.

7. Applications for planning permission

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

The following minutes relate to additional matters of information or detailed matters of policy not already covered in the officer's report, which were given additional attention.

(1) BA/2022/0258/FUL and BA/2022/0259/LBC. No's 1, 2 & 3 Barn Mead Cottages, Coltishall

Alterations & extensions to 1, 2 & 3 Barn Mead Cottages to create a new Spa Treatment Centre.

Applicant: Mr James Holiday

The Senior Planning Officer (SPO) provided a detailed presentation of the application for the change of use of terrace of cottages known as 1, 2 & 3 Barn Mead and their extension to expand the existing spa facilities at the hotel. The SPO provided various maps showing the location of the site within Coltishall, within the surrounding area and within the boundary of the Norfolk Mead Hotel. The SPO provided photographs detailing the access from Church Street onto Church Loke, the various car parks associated with the Hotel, and the buildings and garden associated with the application. The SPO's presentation also provided floorplans of the terrace of cottages and garden showing their current configuration and proposed layout, and elevation drawings of the proposed development. The presentation also included an image of the access to Church Loke from Church Street showing the proposed widening of the eastern side of the access as part of the recommended conditions of the Local Highway Authority (LHA).

In assessing the application, the SPO addressed the key issues of: the principle of development, the design of the new buildings and the impacts on the Conservation Area, neighbour amenity and highways.

The SPO explained that this was an existing tourism and recreation destination that had existing spa facilities within the main house but proposed to move them to a dedicated facility immediately adjacent to the main building. The design of the proposals was considered to be acceptable and it was not considered that the proposal would result in an adverse impact on highway safety or neighbour amenity given the current levels of usage. Therefore, it was

recommended that planning permission and Listed Building Consent be approved subject to conditions.

In response to a member's question the SPO confirmed that the existing garden would be replaced by single storey structures to accommodate the spa room and conservatory restaurant and sauna/jacuzzi leaving an abbreviated outdoor patio area.

Mr Paterson, an objector representing himself and Richard Howlett, both residents of Church Loke, provided a statement, questioning whether due diligence had adequately been performed on the highway, parking and waste management aspects of the application. Mr Paterson believed the traffic data supplied by the applicant was not correct and this had implications for the safety of pedestrians and drivers at the junction of Church Loke and Church Street. Mr Paterson questioned the viability of the predicted 70% utilisation of the new facility by hotel residents; wouldn't the applicant be forced to increase day visitor numbers to ensure a return on their investment thereby exceeding agreed/permitted visitor traffic. Mr Paterson urged members of the Planning Committee, if they agreed that traffic would increase, to refuse this application. If they could not refuse this application then, Mr Paterson requested, could members defer their decision and ask officers of the Local Planning Authority to request a full traffic impact assessment, to include a survey of current visitor numbers and an assessment of likely visitor numbers to provide the LHA with accurate data with which to assess the safety of the Church Street/Church Loke junction. Mr Paterson then questioned whether the parking available to the applicant was sufficient for this new usage, he believed, based on Norfolk County Council guidelines, that this new usage would require an additional 25 parking spaces. The nature of this new usage would, according to Mr Paterson, generate an increase in chemical waste associated with the beer spa, mud baths, swimming pool and jacuzzi, not to mention the additional waste from the new toilet and restaurant facilities. Mr Paterson highlighted that the applicant would create a new connection to the main sewer, via Church Loke, however unlike the waste water from the Hotel this waste would not be conditioned, what steps would be taken to ensure that this new waste did not add to the pollution of the River Bure?

Eliza Heaffey, Spa Manager at the Norfolk Mead Hotel, on behalf of the applicant, provided a statement in support of the application, detailing the recent history of this business and highlighting its role in the local community as an employer, a supporter of local businesses and as a popular, award winning destination. Ms Heaffey stressed the importance of this development in terms of its benefit to local building businesses and trades people, the extra local employment provided by these new facilities and the increased business for local suppliers. The environment was important to the business and Ms Heaffey demonstrated this by highlighting the use of local suppliers, recycling, minimising food waste, the adoption of new technology to reduce paper usage, the use of chemical free products in the hotel, maintenance of the grounds to allow wildlife to prosper and the provision of electric car charging points. Ms Heaffey explained that a new water and drainage system would be installed and this would employ the most environmentally friendly method of waste disposal. The spa would be a place of tranquillity and Ms Heaffey added that it would not be in the interest of the business to sacrifice this.

Members were keen to better understand the impact of this development on traffic to/from the venue. Ms Heaffey confirmed that there would be two extra treatment rooms bringing the total to four and that the expected increase in traffic would only relate to these additional rooms. Ms Heaffey explained that the majority of usage would be by residents of the hotel and the remainder would be to pre-booked day visitors attending on a half or full day basis and hence the minimal uplift in traffic. Ms Heaffey confirmed that the spa would operate from 8am to 8pm and as such would not impinge on the arrival of extra guests for an evening wedding event.

A member wanted to better understand the water treatment for this new development. Ms Heaffey explained that this development would not be utilising the existing onsite water treatment facility and waste water would be pumped into the main sewer on Church Street and there would be no discharge into the River Bure.

Members were supportive of this application and commended the business for their high standards, the opportunities provided for local employment and success as a visitor attraction and welcomed their investment given the economic uncertainty. Members sympathised with the possible amenity effects to neighbours but felt that it was not in the interest of the applicant to sacrifice the peace and quiet.

Members acknowledged the narrow access track to the venue and the difficulty of entering/leaving Church Street. A member was concerned that cars would need to reverse onto the main road to enable traffic to exit the venue. Stuart French, representing the LHA, confirmed that the condition to widen the splay to 4.3m (and keep a drop kerb) would ensure that two vehicles could be accommodated side by side at the head of Church Loke thus eliminating the need for a vehicle to reverse onto Church Street. Mr French also stressed the tidal nature of the traffic associated with the venue would minimise the likelihood of this occurrence/situation. Members acknowledged that the extra traffic associated was small in comparison to that associated with a wedding and some visitors and/or staff would walk or cycle to the venue. Members welcomed the LHA's condition and the resulting improvement to road safety.

A member questioned whether the existing parking provision would be adequate although accepted that it was not in the interest of the applicant to not accommodate visitors' cars.

Bill Dickson proposed, seconded by James Knight and

It was resolved unanimously to approve the application subject to the following conditions:

- Time Limit.
- In accordance with submitted plans and documents.
- Highways conditions regarding off site improvement works.
- Material details required prior to their installation including flint work, mortar mix, brick bond and brick type, cladding details, coping details, truss modification details and window colour.

- Prior to their installation details of the sauna and jacuzzi structure shall be submitted and agreed.
- Landscaping plan to show new planting.
- Hours of opening for the spa only.
- No external lighting.
- Spa use in association with the hotel only and not as an independent business.
- Removal of Permitted Development rights for the spa facility

Tim Jickells proposed, seconded by Stephen Bolt and

It was resolved unanimously to approve the Listed Building Consent subject to the following conditions:

- Time Limit
- In accordance with submitted plans and documents.
- Material details required prior to their installation including flint work, mortar mix, brick bond and brick type, cladding details, coping details, truss modification details and window colour

The Chair thanked those attending for their contributions.

The Committee adjourned at 11:03am and reconvened at 11:06am.

(2) BA/2022/0239/HOUSEH - Freshfields, Priory Road, St Olaves

Conversion of garage into additional living space, alterations to rear sun room including upgrading of roof, new windows and doors, new windows arrangement to rear elevation and new double garage to front driveway.

Applicant: Mr Greg Munford

The Planning Assistant (PA) explained that this application was before the Planning Committee as the applicant was a member of the Broads Authority. The PA provided a detailed presentation of the application for the conversion of an integrated garage into additional living space, to modernise the rear elevation by changing the existing glass roof with a built tiled roof and a new detached double garage to front driveway. The PA provided various maps showing the location of the site within St Olaves, within the immediate residential area and the site boundary. The PA included images of the property showing the front driveway, the front and rear elevations of the property and highlighting the height of the trees that were integral to the hedge to the front of the property along its northern boundary. The PA provided detailed drawings of the front and rear elevations of the property and ground and first floorplans showing the changes associated with this application.

In assessing the application, the PA addressed the key issues of: the principle of development, the design of the proposed development and the impacts on neighbouring amenity.

The PA explained that the modernisation and updating of the rear of the property and the erection of a garage were acceptable changes. The PA confirmed that in terms of design (Local Plan Policy DM43) the replacement of the sun room would use matching materials to the existing dwelling which were sympathetic to the area. The PA confirmed that the reorganised first floor windows would have a minimal impact and would not be detrimental to the overall design of the building and the same was true for the new windows to the front of the property that would replace the existing garage doors. The PA explained that the development would not increase overlooking or additional overshadowing and would not be detrimental to neighbouring amenity (Policy DM21).

The Chair thanked the PA for a clear and concise presentation.

Gail Harris proposed, seconded by Melanie Vigo di Gallidoro and

It was resolved unanimously to approve the application subject to the following conditions:

- Three-year timeframe for commencement
- In accordance with the approved plans and material details

8. Enforcement update

Members received an update report from the Head of Planning (HoP) on enforcement matters previously referred to the Committee. Further updates were provided at the meeting for:

Land at the Beauchamp Arms (Unauthorised static caravans): prosecution was still in preparation; latest, and most likely final, drafts of witness statements had been sent to the solicitor.

Blackgate Farm, High Mill Road, Cobholm: The HoP confirmed that reference to 3 October 2023 in this report item was incorrect, the correct year was 2022.

The HoP, whose last communication with the Landowner (LO) at a recent site visit had indicated that they were not intending to comply with the Enforcement Notice, had now received a letter from the LO's solicitor offering to remove the caravans and requesting more time to do so. The HoP stated that the offer was to remove three of the caravans by the end of October 2022 and the remainder by April 2023. Given that the matter had been ongoing for some years and the short initial deadline, the HoP recommended that the Local Planning Authority (LPA) for the Broads accept the offer, with the caveat that if the initial deadline is not met then the LPA would withdraw acceptance and pursue resolution in a manner deemed most expedient. If the LPA was to proceed towards prosecution the HoP believed that this matter would not reach court until March 2023 at the earliest, and if the later deadline was not met the HoP indicated that at least half the caravans would have been removed.

Members were keen to avoid any further delay on this matter and keep the pressure on the Landowner to comply and it was proposed to specify the beginning of April 2023 as the final deadline.

Tim Jickells proposed, seconded by Stephen Bolt and

It was resolved unanimously that the LPA for the Broads accept the offer by the Landowner to remove 3 caravans by the end of October 2022 and the remaining caravans by 1 April 2023, subject to the strict caveat that unless the initial removal is completed as offered by the end of October, the LPA will withdraw acceptance and take the most expedient approach to resolution.

Land to east of North End, Thorpe next Haddiscoe: Following legal advice the HoP would produce a full report for a future Planning Committee.

9. Oulton Neighbourhood Plan – proceeding to referendum

The Planning Policy Officer introduced the report, which sought approval for the Oulton Neighbourhood Plan proceeding to referendum. The Plan had been subject to an independent examination and endorsed, with some changes, for referendum.

Tony Grayling proposed, seconded by Fran Whymark and

It was resolved unanimously to support the Examiner’s report and support the Oulton Neighbourhood Plan proceeding to referendum.

10. Updated National Flood Risk Guidance and our Flood Risk Supplementary Planning Document

The Planning Policy Officer introduced the report that had been produced in response to an update to the Flood Risk section of the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG). The introduction of an addendum was a pragmatic response to these changes and highlighted whether content in the Flood Risk Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) had been superseded (or not) by the updated NPPG content.

Andrée Gee proposed, seconded by Vic Thomson and

It was resolved unanimously to endorse the addendum to the Flood Risk SPD.

11. Consultation responses

The Planning Policy Officer (PPO) introduced the report, which documented the responses to the Hemsby Neighbourhood Plan. The PPO indicated that the majority of responses sought clarification.

Tim Jickells proposed, seconded by Stephen Bolt and

It was resolved unanimously to endorse the nature of the proposed response.

12. Appeals to the Secretary of State

The Committee received a schedule of appeals to the Secretary of State since the last meeting.

13. Decisions made by officers under delegated powers

The Committee received a schedule of decisions made by officers under delegated powers from 5 September to 4 October 2022 and any Tree Preservation Orders confirmed within this period.

14. Date of next meeting

The next meeting of the Planning Committee would be on Friday 11 November 2022 10.00am at Yare House, 62-64 Thorpe Road, Norwich.

The meeting ended at 11:40am.

Signed by

Chair

Appendix 1 – Declaration of interests Planning Committee, 14 October 2022

Member	Agenda/minute	Nature of interest
Harry Blathwayt on behalf of all members	7.1	Lobbied: Receipt of letters and emails from objectors
Harry Blathwayt on behalf of all members	7.2	Applicant is a member of the Broads Authority
Andrée Gee	9	East Suffolk Councillor - other registerable interest