

BROADLAND PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Broadland Planning Committee of Broadland District Council, held on Wednesday, 22 May 2024 at 9.30 am.

Committee Members Present: Councillors: C Karimi-Ghovanlou (Chair), E Laming (Vice-Chair), P Auber, N Brennan, B Johnson, K Leggett, A Miah and K Vincent

Apologies for Absence: Councillors: B Baby, L Hemsall and A Tipple

Substitute: Councillors: F Whymark (In place of L Hemsall)

Officers in Attendance: B Burgess (Assistant Director for Planning), H Bowman (Principal Planning Officer), C Watts (the Area Planning Manager), T Meachen (Senior Planner) and L Arthurton (Democratic Services Officer)

Also in Attendance: One member of the public

62. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

63. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Baby, Tipple and Hemsall (with Cllr F Whymark appointed substitute).

64. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 April 2024 were confirmed as a correct record with the minor amended to read *J Shaw from Norfolk County Highways* in the *also in attendance* section.

65. APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE COMMITTEE IN THE ORDER SHOWN ON THE BELOW SCHEDULE

The Committee considered the reports circulated with the agenda, which were presented by the officers.

The Committee had received updates to the report which had been added to the published agenda.

The following speakers addressed the meeting on the application listed below.

Application	Parish	Speakers
20222010	Great Plumstead	R McVicar- agent

The Committee made the decisions indicated in the attached appendix, conditions of approval or reasons for refusal of planning permission as determined by the Committee being in summary form only and subject to the final determination of the Director of Place.

66. PLANNING APPEALS (FOR INFORMATION)

The Committee noted the appeals lodged and decisions received.

(The meeting concluded at 10.50 am)

Chairman

NOTE: Conditions of approval or reasons for refusal of planning permission as determined by the Committee are in summary form only and subject to the Director of Place’s final determination

- 1** **Appl. No** : **20222010/F**
 Parish : **GT & LT PLUMSTEAD (THORPE END)**
 Applicant’s Name : John Ingram
 Site Address : Land east of Hare Road Hare Road Great Plumstead
 Proposal : Erection of seven single storey dwellings
- Decision : Members voted 6-3 for delegate authority to the Assistant Director of Planning to approve subject to conditions, sufficient mitigation to mitigate the Habitats regulations impacts on Protected Sites (Nutrient Neutrality) and an acceptable Habitats Regulations Assessment to satisfy the competent Authority of the mitigation; a S106 securing open space, GIRAMS and anything as may be necessary for Nutrient Neutrality.
1. Time Limit - Full Permission
 2. In accordance with submitted drawings
 3. Materials
 4. Provision of parking and turning
 5. Vehicular crossing
 6. Visibility Splays
 7. Gates etc
 8. Access gradient
 9. Construction parking (PC)
 10. Highway Boundary
 11. Off-site highway works details
 12. Off-site highway works
 13. New Water Efficiency
 14. Air Source Heat Pumps
 15. Unknown Contamination
 16. Surface Water Drainage Strategy
 17. Tree Protection
 18. Ecology
 19. Landscape Scheme
 20. Boundary treatments
 21. Foul water to mains sewer
 22. No occupation until nutrient mitigation in place
 23. Archaeology
 24. Levels
 25. Replanting hedge within boundary of The Firs

2 **Appl. No** : **2023/3782/F**
 Parish : **HEVINGHAM**
 Applicant's Name : Mr David Knights
 Site Address : Sun View 6 The Turn Hevingham Norfolk NR10 5QP
 Proposal : Change of use of land from agriculture to land used for
 training in plant operators.

Decision : Members voted unanimously for refusal.

Reasons for refusal

1. It is considered that the development would result in noise and disturbance due to the movement of plant machinery which would have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of the occupants of the residential properties close to the site. This would be to such a degree that it would outweigh the benefits of the training facilities generated by the development. Therefore, the development does not comply with policy GC2 and GC4 (iv) of the Local Plan and paragraph 135 of the NPPF.
2. The unclassified road (57005) serving the site is considered to be inadequate to serve the development proposed, by reason of its restricted width, lack of passing provision and substandard construction. The proposal, if permitted, would be likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to highway safety, contrary to Development Plan Policy TS3 of the Local Plan. Furthermore, the development would not accord with paragraph 111 of the NPPF as there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
3. The access is unsatisfactory to serve the proposed development by reason of its inadequate width and the proposal would therefore lead to the parking of delivery vehicles on the highway to the detriment of highway safety. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Development Plan Policies TS3 and TS4 of the Local Plan. Furthermore, the development would not accord with paragraph 111 of the NPPF as there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
4. The proposal does not incorporate adequate on-site vehicular parking and maneuvering facilities for delivery vehicles to the standard required by the Local Planning Authority. The proposal, if permitted, would therefore be likely to lead to an undesirable

increase in on-street parking to the detriment of highway safety. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Development Plan Policy TS3 and TS4 of the Local Plan. Furthermore, the development would not accord with paragraph 111 of the NPPF as there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

5. The proposal does not incorporate adequate facilities for the servicing of the premises and would therefore result in the maneuvering of vehicles on the adjoining highway to the detriment of highway safety. Contrary to Development Plan Policy TS3 and TS4 of the Local Plan. Furthermore, the development would not accord with paragraph 111 of the NPPF as there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
6. The site is located outside of any defined settlement limit and is classified as being within the 'countryside'. The application does not accord with any other specific development management policy within the Local Plan which allows for development in the countryside nor do the limited benefits of the scheme in terms of the economic, social and environment dimensions of the NPPF outweigh the identified harm in relation to highway safety and residential amenity. As such the proposal fails to comply with either Policy GC2 or GC1 of the DM DPD, Policy 6 of the GNLP and Paragraph 85 of the NPPF