

**Planning (Regulatory) Committee
Minutes of the Meeting Held on 23 April 2021
at 11am on Microsoft Teams (virtual meeting)**

Present:

Cllr Colin Foulger (Chair)
Cllr Brian Long (Vice Chair)

Cllr Mick Castle
Cllr David Collis
Cllr Danny Douglas

Cllr William Richmond
Cllr Martin Storey
Cllr Tony White

Also Present

Hollie Adams
Charles Colling
Oliver Field
Jon Hanner
Isabel Horner
Nick Johnson
Angelina Lambert
Lee Napper
Peter Peloe
Andy Scales
Craig Shranz
Andrew Sierakowski
Richard Smith
Teresa Smith
Francesca Sutton
Adrian Truss

Committee Officer
Senior Planning Officer
Public Speaker
Principal Engineer (Developer Services)
Public Speaker
Head of Planning
Principal Planner
Public Speaker
Public Speaker
Public Speaker
Public Speaker
Senior Planner
Public Speaker
Public Speaker
Public Speaker
Locum Senior Lawyer (Planning and Environment)

1. Apologies and Substitutions

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Mike Sands. Cllr Brian Iles was also absent.

2. Minutes

- 2.1 The minutes from the Planning (Regulatory) Committee meeting held on 5 March 2021 were agreed as an accurate record.

3. Declarations of Interest

- 3.1 No declarations of interest were made.

4. Urgent Business

- 4.1 There was no urgent business.

Applications referred to the Committee for determination.

5. FUL/2020/0100 - Ormiston Victory Academy, Middleton Crescent, Costessey, Norwich, NR5 0PX

- 5.1 The Committee received the report setting out an application for the expansion of the existing 1200 pupil secondary school to a 1500 pupil school by construction of a new stand-alone three storey building, and refurbishment works to the existing school, improved secure fencing to the front of the school, an increase of 42 car parking spaces and 60 cycle storage spaces and relocation of the existing on-site temporary modular accommodation at the Ormiston Victory Academy, Middleton Crescent, Costessey.
- 5.2.1 The Senior Planner gave a presentation to the Committee; see [appendix A](#):
- Issues raised about the expansion related to the potential impact on the surrounding residential area
 - The extension would not impinge on the existing playing fields; dialogue had been held with Sport England to ensure this.
 - The west side of the proposed extension would be quite close to the boundary but there was a substantial tree belt here, slightly taller than the proposed extension, providing screening.
 - The biggest shadow cast over properties to the west would be in December in the morning. The shadow-cast forecasting did not take into account the shadow that would be cast by the existing tree boundary. The shadow in December would be cast over the corner of the closest property's garden where there was a shed.
 - 13 objections were received from neighbouring occupiers, with the main issue being related to the impact of traffic at drop off and pick up times.
 - An extension to the double yellow lines on Richmond road via a Traffic Regulation Order and an additional crossing point were recommended.
- 5.2.2 Members asked questions about the presentation:
- The Vice-Chair noted that some local residents had asked for speed bumps in their representations whereas others did not want them; he queried whether this issue should be taken up by the local Councillor and the Parish Council.
 - Cllr Danny Douglas asked why the school travel plan taking into account the extension was not presented with the planning application; the Principal Engineer (Developer Services) responded that policy was for this to be reviewed at 6 months to allow for footfall to be in place, travel patterns to form and the development to bed-in. When looking at school applications, officers would look at how sustainable transport would be encouraged such as facilities to promote walking and cycling.
 - Cllr Danny Douglas felt that when content of planning applications was next reviewed, school travel plans should be considered for inclusion in the initial

proposals. The Head of Planning noted Cllr Douglas' comment and would take this into consideration in the next review.

5.3 The Committee heard from registered speakers.

5.3.1 Teresa Smith, Director of Finance and Operations of Ormiston Academy spoke to the Committee on behalf of the applicant:

- Regarding the concerns on traffic flow Ms Smith explained that the academy had a safe drop off area for parents to drive into the site and drop off or pick up their children rather than parking on routes into the school. The entrance to the site was manned at pick up and drop off time, providing a safe area for this.
- The school encouraged a cycle to school scheme.
- The school had been oversubscribed for many years; 50 appeals had been held this year, showing the need for the additional space.

5.3.2 Isabel Horner of Children's Services spoke to the Committee on behalf of the applicant:

- There was pressure for school places in this area; Easton Village, which was in the catchment for this school, recently had 900 new homes approved.
- Sport England were a considerable consultee as the rest of the site was used for sports pitches. The area proposed for the extension was slightly sloping and not appropriate for pitches.
- The proposed building would be 27 metres from the boundary; it had been moved here, further from the boundary, as part of the design development. It could not be moved further because of a service yard.

5.3.3 A Member asked for information on links for students from Easton and plans to improve public transport links to the school. Isabel Horner asked Teresa Smith to answer this question. Teresa explained that a school bus travelled from Easton to the school and a public bus from Queen's Hill accessed the school site. Most of the students from Easton accessed the school by bus.

5.3.4 Craig Shranz, lead architect from NPS, spoke to the Committee on behalf of the applicant. Mr Shranz did not have any further information to add.

5.3.5 Oliver Field, project manager from NPS, spoke to the Committee on behalf of the applicant. Mr Field did not have any further information to add.

5.3.6 Richard Smith, Senior Planning Consultant from NPS, spoke to the Committee on behalf of the applicant. Mr Smith did not have any further information to add.

5.4 The Committee unanimously **RESOLVED** to **APPROVE** that the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services be authorised to:

- I. Grant planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in section 11.
- II. Discharge conditions where those detailed above require the submission and implementation of a scheme, or further details, either before development commences, or within a specified date of planning permission being granted.
- III. Delegate powers to officers to deal with any non-material amendments to the application that may be submitted.

6 FUL/2020/0088, Bridge End, Foulsham Road, Hindolveston, Norfolk, NR20 5BZ

- 6.1 The Committee received the report seeking Planning permission for the change of use of a residential property (C3 dwellinghouse use) known as Bridge End, situated on Foulsham Road, Hindolveston, to a residential children's home (C2 use). The property would offer a home for up to two children aged between 12-16, although it was anticipated only a single child would be accommodated at the property for the majority of the time. No external changes were proposed and a gravelled area within the site would provide parking spaces for staff/visitors. No members of staff would live permanently on site, instead staff would operate on a shift system providing 24/7 presence and care at the site.
- 6.2.1 The Senior Planning Officer gave a presentation to the Committee; see [appendix B](#):
- Since writing the report, two representations had been received from North Norfolk District Council and a neighbouring resident as shown on slide 3 of [appendix B](#)
 - Neighbouring properties shared a common boundary with the site
 - Objections from neighbouring properties had been received and were addressed in the report.
- 6.2.2 Members asked questions about the presentation:
- The Vice-Chair asked about the previous agricultural occupancy condition on the property which had been lifted by North Norfolk District Council. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that this condition was lifted in 2018 to give unrestricted occupancy to a regular dwellinghouse.
- 6.3 The Committee heard from registered speakers.
- 6.3.1 Peter Peloe spoke to the Committee in objection of the application:
- Some residents' addresses were not in the mapping system and there was not engagement with some residents during the application process. Councillor Aquarone had involved them and apologised for the poor way notification was distributed but maintained his situation on the proposal without visiting the rural homes. Mr Peloe reported that the only resident who supported the application was the person who sold the home to the council and had since moved out.
 - Residents had received mixed messages; the service manager had said children at the proposed home may have been involved in county lines.. However, the application stated it was not intended for teenagers involved in criminal behaviour; Mr Peloe requested clarity on this and whether the children at the home may be subject to ASBOs.
 - Mr Peloe spoke about traffic and noise disturbance; no restriction of usage on vehicle movements was in place, and the application stated that movements were likely to be comparable to that of a 4-bed property. However, Mr Peloe pointed out that the staff who may visit the home each day were likely to be a greater amount of people visiting than a typical family based on information in the application.
 - Mr Peloe was concerned that there may be additional noise above and beyond a typical family home if the facility was used for teenagers with emotional and behavioural difficulties.

- Mr Peloe asked officers to provide reassurance to residents who had requested feedback from residents living near to similar facilities but not received this so far.
- 6.3.2 Francesca Sutton of Children's Services spoke to the Committee on behalf of the applicant. She had nothing further to add.
- 6.3.3 Andy Scales, Head of Planning Consultancy from NPS, spoke to the Committee on behalf of the applicant:
- North Norfolk District Council's policy permitting adaption of housing in the countryside did not conflict with this application. Mr Scales noted that there were other examples of c2 usage approved by North Norfolk District Council in areas like this and in areas with closer residential properties.
- 6.3.4 Lee Napper from Children's Services spoke to the Committee on behalf of the applicant:
- The model of these properties was to allow children in crisis to be away from towns and cities, to reduce temptation to get in trouble, while working with them to move back home. There was no proposal to make any changes to the property's appearance. Officers had attempted to engage with neighbours and would continue to do so on a regular basis.
- 6.3.5 The Committee asked questions of Lee Napper:
- A Member asked how much residential provision there was in Norfolk. Mr Napper confirmed there were 4 rural residential provisions and 4 urban residential provisions including a short break and long-term residential provision. .
- 6.4 The Committee moved to debate on the application:
- Members noted the positive impact this provision could have for young people by distancing them from County Lines activity and that there would be no changes to the building.
 - The Vice-Chair noted the objector's concern, however, felt that management of the facility would be key to avoiding potential problems. It was therefore inherent of Children's Services to make the provision as good as possible for neighbours as well as the children in it.
 - The Chair shared that he lived close to a similar facility which had not negatively impacted on the value of his or neighbouring properties, and he believed it would provide a good opportunity to help children.
- 6.5 The Committee unanimously **RESOLVED** to **APPROVE** that the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services be authorised to:
- I. Grant planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in section 11.
 - II. Discharge conditions where those detailed above require the submission and implementation of a scheme, or further details, either before development commences, or within a specified date of planning permission being granted.
 - III. Delegate powers to officers to deal with any non-material amendments to the application that may be submitted.

- 7.1 The Committee received the report seeking planning permission for the provision of a replacement 2 class base modular building for a temporary period of 5 years. Associated works include external lighting and provision of 6no car parking spaces. The applicant is Norfolk County Council, Children's Services.
- 7.2.1 The Principal Planner gave a presentation to the Committee; see [appendix C](#):
- Norwich City Council had removed their objection due to additional information being provided to them on ecological enhancements, cycle provision and planting.
 - There were no objections from statutory consultees or third parties.
 - The number of parking spaces proposed was within the maximum Norfolk County Council parking standards.
 - As this was complex needs school, teachers and parents were more likely to need to drive to school.
- 7.2.2 Members asked questions about the presentation:
- A Member asked whether it would be more appropriate for permanent planning permission for a mobile structure on the site; the Principal Planner said that in order for permanent permission, planners would need to look into the design and long term sustainability of the mobile classroom.
- 7.3 The Committee heard from registered speakers.
- 7.3.1 Isabel Horner of Children's Services spoke to the Committee on behalf of the applicant:
- Since Norwich City Council had withdrawn their objection, Ms Horner no longer had anything to add in addition to the information in the application.
- 7.4 The Committee unanimously **RESOLVED** to **APPROVE** that the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services be authorised to:
- I. Grant planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in section 11.
 - II. Discharge conditions where those detailed above require the submission and implementation of a scheme, or further details, either before development commences, or within a specified date of planning permission being granted.
 - III. Delegate powers to officers to deal with any non-material amendments to the application that may be submitted.

The meeting ended at 12:02

Chair