

**Planning Regulatory Committee  
Minutes of the Meeting Held on Friday 11 July 2014  
at 10am in the Edwards Room, County Hall**

**Present:**

Mr S Askew	Mr B Long
Mr M Baker	Mr W Northam
Mr B Bremner	Mr M Sands
Mr D Collis (Chairman)	Mr E Seward
Mr A Dearnley	Mr M Storey
Mr N Dixon	Mr J Ward
Mr A Grey (Vice-Chairman)	Mr B Watkins
Mr J Law	Mr A White

**In attendance:**

Mr N Johnson	Planning Services Manager
Mr R Cox	Principal Planner
Ms A Lambert	Principal Planner
Mr J Shaw	Senior Engineer - Highways Development Management
Mr J Hanner	Engineer - Highways Development Management
Mrs F Croxen	Senior Solicitor, NPLaw
Mrs J Mortimer	Committee Officer

**1 Apologies and Substitutions**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr C Foulger (Mr N Dixon substituted); Mr S Agnew and Mr B Watkins.

**1 Minutes from the meeting held on 6 June 2014**

The minutes from the Planning (Regulatory) Committee meeting held on 6 June 2014 were agreed as a correct record by the Committee and signed by the Chairman.

**3 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**4 Urgent Business**

The Chairman asked the Planning Services Manager to update the Committee about the outcome of the Public Inquiry into the Haddiscoe application which had been refused by the Committee in January 2013 against officer advice. The Planning Services Manager

advised that the Public Inquiry had found in favour of the County Council with the appeal being dismissed. The claim for costs by the appellant had been dismissed. Norfolk County Council was responsible for its own costs.

**5 Applications Referred to Committee for determination: North Norfolk District: C/1/2013/1012: East Beckham: Holt Road, East Beckham, Sheringham: Excavation, processing, bagging and sale of sand and gravel: Gresham Gravel Ltd.**

- 5.1 The Committee received a report by the Interim Director of Environment, Transport and Development setting out the planning application following the resolution at the Planning (Regulatory) Committee meeting on 25 April 2014 to defer the application to allow further consideration of the highway issues.
- 5.2 During the presentation of the report, the following key points were noted:
- An email had been received from Matlaske and Barningham Parish Council reiterating their objection to the application on the grounds of road safety and water usage.
  - The Stage 1 Safety Audit had approved the visibility splays included within the scheme as they exceeded the requirements for the 50mph speed limit in force along the A148. Therefore, it was the professional view of highways officers and the safety audit team that the scheme would not impede visibility of traffic turning onto the A148.
  - The Committee was informed that it would not be reasonable to request the applicant to submit a new scheme to provide a site access via Gibbett Lane as the entrance proposed in the application had been deemed safe by the Highways Authority and the Safety Audit Team. The Committee was also advised that the width of Gibbett Lane was insufficient to accommodate HGV vehicles and that a significant number of trees would need to be removed to provide safe access.
  - The Planning Services Manager advised that Norfolk County Council could incur significant costs if the application was refused on the grounds of road safety and access if any subsequent appeal against the decision was successful.
- 5.3 In response to a question from the Committee, it was noted that there was insufficient land within the ownership of the applicant to allow for an acceptable visibility splay to be provided into the site to the south of the reservoir.
- 5.4 Mr Brian Hannah, Member for Sheringham Division addressed the Committee in objection to the application on the grounds of road safety and showed a short video to the Committee. Mr Hannah stressed that he had no objection to the site being used for the excavation of sand and gravel but felt that the access and egress at the site should be reconsidered.

The Highways Officer confirmed that the site access had been designed to a standard over and above the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) guidance. The

proposed right hand turn included visibility splays in excess of 215m and both the Highways Authority and the Safety Audit Team had deemed this to be a safe distance. A traffic count which had been conducted to the east of the proposed site had shown that there were approximately 5100 vehicle movements per day and it was confirmed that the assessment carried out by the Safety Audit Team had taken into account seasonal fluctuations in traffic movements.

- 5.5 Mr Mark Thompson (Smallfish), Mr Mark Allen (Create Consulting Engineers), and Mr Robert Batt (Gresham Estate) attended the meeting and gave a presentation, outlining that the minerals operation would not take place at weekends, apart from limited amounts of maintenance works.

The Committee noted that the applicant had given serious consideration to providing a site access onto Gibbett Lane, but it had not been possible to agree a mutually acceptable scheme.

- 5.6 The following points were noted in response to questions from the Committee:

- As part of the application process, the applicant would need to demonstrate that the access was suitable for the purpose, which had been done.
- The provision of a roundabout was considered feasible in principle, although it was not possible to justify a roundabout in the context of this application.
- The application had been designed with a 4.5m visibility setback and met with the DMRB guidance to allow slow moving vehicles to turn right out of the site. The Highways Officer confirmed that he was not aware of any scheme to introduce speed reduction measures on the A148 and again reiterated that the scheme in the application had been designed in accordance with the DMRB manual for trunk roads.

- 5.7 Cllr Michael Baker, Member for Holt Division which included the parish of East Beckham, addressed the Committee as the Local Member. Mr Baker said that he had met officers at the site and listened carefully to the highway officer advice and the presentation from the applicants before making up his mind. He again reiterated that his objection centred around the road safety aspect of the site entrance and that he had no objection to the extraction of sand and gravel at the site.

- 5.8 The following points were confirmed in response to questions from the Committee:

- The visibility splays would not be affected by the undulation along the A148.
- The Committee suggested that appropriate road signs could be installed to warn traffic about slow moving traffic pulling out onto the highway. Mr Thompson, on behalf of the applicant, confirmed that the applicant was prepared to fund appropriate signs and discussions would take place with the Highways Authority to agree the appropriate signage designs after the meeting. It was agreed that a scheme for highways signs

could be incorporated into a wider scheme for off site highways works.

- The Committee received a brief explanation about the Safety Audit process.

The meeting adjourned at 11.30am and reconvened at 11.40am.

- The Committee was advised that it could not ask for a condition to be included about reducing the speed limit on the A148. The Highways Officer confirmed that the speed limit could only be reduced if there was a proven need; however he agreed to discuss the issue with the Traffic Analysis team.
- The site would be open on Saturdays for maintenance purposes, but not for excavation works.
- Mr Long asked for it to be noted that he had concerns about the safety at the junction due to his first hand knowledge, although he had every confidence in officer assurance that the scheme was suitable. .

5.10 With 13 votes in favour, 1 vote against and 0 abstentions, the Committee:

5.11 **RESOLVED** that the Director of Environment, Transport and Development be authorised to:

- i) Grant planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in section 12 of the original committee report.
- ii) Discharge conditions where those detailed in the report required the submission and implementation of a scheme, or further details, either before development commenced, or within a specified date of planning permission being granted.
- iii) Delegate powers to officers (in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman) to deal with any non-material amendments.

**6 Development by the County Council. Great Yarmouth Borough Council: Application Y/6/2013/6008: Caister-on-Sea: Erection of modular building for office/welfare purposes: Director of Environment, Transport and Development.**

- 6.1 The Committee received a report by the Interim Director of Environment, Transport and Development setting out the planning application which related to the provision of a single storey modular administration building at a County Council Highways Depot at Pump Lane, Caister-on-Sea.
- 6.2 During the presentation of the report, it was noted that no objections to the application had been received and that all pedestrian movements would be managed through the site management plan.

- 6.3 Following a question from the Committee, it was confirmed that the building would be a modular building, built elsewhere and constructed at the site. The applicant had identified that no disabled access was required at present, although the Planning Services Manager said that this may be a requirement under Building Regulations. He urged the Committee to consider the application as it has been submitted.

The Committee requested that the Planning Services Manager bring the lack of disabled access to the attention of the applicant, although it would be up to the applicant if they decided to proceed without disabled access.

- 6.4 The range of opening hours between 7am to 6pm, including Sundays and Bank Holidays, were the standard opening hours for highways depots.
- 6.5 The Committee **RESOLVED** unanimously that the Director of Environment, Transport and Development be authorised to:
- i) Grant planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in section 11 of the committee report.
  - ii) Discharge conditions where those detailed in the report required the submission and implementation of a scheme, or further details, either before development commenced, or within a specified date of planning permission being granted.
  - iii) Delegate powers to officers (in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman) to deal with any non-material amendments to the application that may be submitted.

The meeting ended at 12.05 pm

#### CHAIRMAN



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or Textphone 0344 8008011 and we will do our best to help.