

**Planning Regulatory Committee  
Minutes of the Meeting Held on Friday 6 January 2017  
at 10am in the Edwards Room, County Hall**

**Present:**

Mr M Sands (Chair)

Mr S Agnew  
Mr S Askew  
Mr M Baker  
Mr C Foulger (Vice-Chair)  
Mr A Grey  
Mr D Harrison  
Mr B Long

Ms E Morgan  
Mr W Northam  
Mr E Seward  
Mr M Storey  
Mr J Ward  
Mr A White

**1 Apologies and Substitutions**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr B Bremner, Mr T Jermy and Mr J Law.

**2 Minutes from the meeting held on 21 October 2016**

- 2.1 The minutes from the Planning (Regulatory) Committee meeting held on Friday 21 October 2016 were agreed as a correct record by the Committee and signed by the Chair.

**3 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**4 Urgent Business**

There was no urgent business.

**Applications referred to the Committee for Determination:**

**5 Y/7/2016/7008: St Augustines Primary School, West End, Costessey, Norwich, NR8 5AG.**

- 5.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services seeking retrospective planning permission for provision of a

new classroom block on part of the school playing field, within the settlement boundary. Conditional permission for the development under consideration was originally approved in 2014. Development had been undertaken without discharge of the pre-commencement conditions and the actual design of the classroom block was not fully in accordance with the approved drawings.

- 5.2 During the presentation of the report, the Committee was informed that, since the report had been published, comments had been received from Mr T East, Local Member for Costessey Division, which covered the application site. Mr East had confirmed that in his view the application should be approved. He also requested that Norfolk County Council write to the Diocese and say that they should engage in pre-commencement negotiations and ensure that the building conformed to the plans as agreed. He considered that the Roman Catholic Diocese was a large organisation, employing experienced planning consultants, who should be fully aware that development should not be commenced until pre-commencement conditions had been discharged and the building conformed to the agreed plans”.
- 5.3 Mrs Helen Bates, Assistant Director (Schools’ Service), Roman Catholic Diocese of East Anglia spoke on behalf of the applicant in support of the application. Mrs Bates apologised for the errors which had resulted in the application being presented to Committee and said it had not been an attempt to circumvent the planning processes, but had been a result of miscommunication caused by time pressures and changes in staffing. Mrs Bates added that the changes to the buildings were minimal and did not affect the scope of the scheme. One classroom was currently being used with two others being utilised in 2017 and 2020.
- 5.4 Upon being put to a vote, the Committee unanimously **RESOLVED** to
- i) Grant planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in section 13 of the report.
  - ii) Discharge conditions (in discussion with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee) where those detailed in the report require 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 discussion with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee) to deal with any non-material amendments to the application that may be submitted.

## **6 C/7/2016/7015: Land at Hempnall Road, Morningthorpe, NR15 2RE.**

- 6.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services seeking planning permission for the upgrade of surface water drainage on the site, with the installation of a HydroFilterra tree unit, pipework and all associated works.
- 6.2 Since the report had been published, the Committee was asked to note the following additional information:

- 6.2.1 Mrs A Thomas, Local Member for Long Stratton Division, which covered the application site had confirmed she fully supported the proposals which would address long standing drainage issues.
- 6.2.2 Morningthorpe Parish Council had raised no objections to the proposal.
- 6.3 The following points were noted in response to questions from the Committee:
- 6.3.1 Once the filter system, which would include a mature native tree, had been installed responsibility for the ongoing maintenance would be carried out by the site owner – in this case the County Council' Waste Disposal Authority which was also under the control of the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services. In the event the tree did not survive, it would be replaced by a native, mature tree of the same size and species.
- 6.3.2 One filter system would be sufficient for a site the size of the one detailed in the application. The mulch around the tree would clean the water, before it was discharged via underground pipework into a soakaway on an adjoining site.
- 6.3.3 In order to install the soakaway, it may be necessary to fell one existing mature tree. This would depend on the root system of the tree and would not be known until work to dig the soakaway started. If it was necessary to remove a tree, a replacement would be planted as detailed in the scheme required by condition 3b in section 13 of the report.
- 6.3.4 Although the land to house the soakaway did not fall within the ownership of the applicant, it was included in the area covered by the red line application site, therefore conditions could be imposed on the development.
- 6.3.5 As hazardous waste was not generally dealt with at the site, a very low level of contamination was likely to be produced. The Environment Agency would need to issue an environmental permit before the soakaway could be used and the Environment Agency would be responsible for monitoring discharges to groundwater.
- 6.3.6 Members requested an update be brought to a future meeting about how well the filter system was working and whether the tree had survived. The Planning Services Manager suggested the Committee hold a training session to cover this topic, which was agreed by the Committee.
- 6.4 Upon being put to the vote, the Committee unanimously **RESOLVED** that the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services should be authorised to:
- i) Grant planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in section 13 of the report.
  - ii) Discharge conditions (after discussion with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee) 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 (after discussion with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee) to deal with any non-material amendments to the application that may be submitted.

7 In response to questions about the number of retrospective planning applications heard by the Committee and how many appeals had been successfully made, the Planning Services Manager advised that he was not aware of any increase in the number of retrospective planning applications at county level but reassured the Committee Norfolk County Council had a proactive enforcement policy in place. The Committee was also advised that approximately 33% of appeals were successful and this had been a steady percentage for some years.

The meeting ended at 10.30am

**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.