

**Planning Regulatory Committee
Minutes of the Meeting Held on Friday 21 March 2014
at 10am in the Edwards Room, County Hall**

Present:

Mr B Bremner, Chairman

Mr S Askew
Mr A Dearnley
Mr N Dixon
Mr C Foulger
Mr A Grey
Mr A Gunson

Mr B Hannah
Mr B Iles
Mr B Long
Mr I Monson
Mr R Parkinson-Hare
Mr M Storey

1 Apologies and Substitution

Apologies for absence were received from Mr S Agnew, Mr M Baker (Mr R Parkinson-Hare substituted), Mrs J Brociek-Coulton, Mr J Joyce and Mrs M Somerville (Mr I Monson substituted).

2 Minutes from the meeting held on 17 January 2014.

The minutes from the Planning (Regulatory) Committee meeting held on 17 January 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

There were no items of urgent business.

Applications referred to the Committee for Determination

Reports by the Director of Environment, Transport and Development

5 North Norfolk District: C/1/2010/1005: Edgefield: Erection of plant to accommodate an anaerobic digestion facility, provision of ancillary office and weighbridge, retention of existing landfill gas engines and provision of landscaping: Buyinfo Ltd.

- 5.1 The Senior Solicitor, nplaw advised that only the Committee Members who had attended the Planning (Regulatory) Committee meeting on 17 January and had listened to the full

debate would be able to reconsider the application. Those Members who had not attended the meeting were asked to abstain from voting for reasons which would become clear during the statement by the Planning Services Manager, Norfolk County Council.

- 5.2 Mr N Johnson, Planning Services Manager, Norfolk County Council, advised that the application had been approved at the January meeting of the Planning (Regulatory) Committee against the officer recommendation for refusal.

Following the Planning (Regulatory) Committee meeting on 17 January, the Local Member for Melton Constable, Mr D Ramsbotham, had raised a number of concerns based on comments made at the committee meeting. Namely that at the time the committee made its recommendation, Members may not have had a proper understanding of the views of North Norfolk District Council as the Local Planning Authority and Statutory Consultee, and of the local River Glaven Conservation body.

The minutes stated that North Norfolk District Council fully supported the application. Since that committee meeting, North Norfolk District Council had submitted a written response, setting out their position (attached at Appendix B of the report) that “As the Local Planning Authority, they had no objection to the application subject to the conditions detailed in the report. The Cabinet Member for Economic Development, North Norfolk District Council, fully supported the proposal”.

In light of the clarification, the Planning Services Manager asked the Members who had attended the January meeting to consider what their understanding was of North Norfolk District Council’s position at the time they made their decision. He added that if it was any different to that contained in Appendix B of the report, would it have made any difference to their decision. If the Committee did not think it would have made any difference to their decision, no further consideration of the application would be required on this point.

- 5.3 The Planning Services Manager also advised that it had been reported at the 17 January meeting that the River Glaven Conservation Group, who were not a statutory consultee for the application, supported the application. It had since been clarified that the River Glaven Conservation Group had raised no objection to the application.

The Planning Services Manager asked Members to consider what they had heard and debated at the January meeting and their understanding at that time and what bearing, if any, it would have made on the decision they had reached.

If Members considered that their decision may have differed in light of this clarification, the application would need to be reconsidered. If Members were content that their decision would remain the same, then the decision reached on 17 January 2014 would stand.

- 5.4 The Chairman confirmed the following Members had attended the meeting on 17 January and taken part in the discussion and the decision made:

Mr S Askew, Mr A Dearnley, Mr N Nixon, Mr C Foulger, Mr A Grey, Mr A Gunson, Mr B Hannah, Mr B Iles, Mr M Storey and Mr B Bremner.

- 5.5 Some members expressed disappointment that they appeared to have been misled by the information given by the Cabinet Member at North Norfolk District Council, although they agreed it would not have altered their opinion and the decision reached.
- 5.6 It was unanimously **RESOLVED** that the Committee were content with the decision made at its meeting on 17 January 2014 in respect of the application and that no further deliberations were required.
- 6 Borough of King's Lynn & West Norfolk. C/2/2013/2006: Coxford: Continued extraction of sand and gravel from existing quarry (part retrospective) and restoration to agriculture and mixed woodland; extraction of sand and gravel from land east, west and south of existing quarry and restoration to agriculture and mixed woodland; use of ready-mixed concrete batching plant; Siltmaster plant; storage sheds; aggregate storage bays; importation, storage and recycling of inert waste; importation, storage and resale of aggregates; erection of plant and construction of hardstanding for the manufacture and storage of concrete blocks: Coxford Abbey Quarry, Docking Road, Syderstone, Fakenham, Norfolk: Longwater Gravel Co. Ltd.**
- 6.1 During the presentation of the report, it was noted that since the publication of the report, one late objection had been received relating to land at the west extension. This objection related to the proposed footpath alongside the site which would be above an underground irrigation main. Further consultation had been carried out in conjunction with the Rights of Way Officer and it had been deemed that this objection was not sufficient grounds to refuse the application.
- 6.2 The following points were noted during the discussion:
- The land where the proposed footpath was to be sited was within the ownership of Longwater Gravel, although the specific detail of who owned the underground irrigation main was not known.
 - If any maintenance work was required to the footpath a Public Rights of Way permit would need to be applied for and granted before work could commence. This was to ensure that the work was carried out to health and safety requirements, and that barriers would be erected, etc.
 - The application sought to consolidate the extant inert recycling permission granted in 1996 with the current proposals.
 - Approximately 20,000 tonnes of inert material would be processed at the site per annum.

- The Monitoring and Enforcement team had received one complaint about the quarry which was in 1999 and related to the amount of dust. On investigation it had been ascertained that the dust had come from the industrial estate and not from the quarry site.
- The Tumulus ancient heritage ruins to the south of the site were outside the application site. English Heritage, as a statutory consultee, had not objected to the application as long as conditions were included that the tree belt remained in situ.

6.3 Cllr Michael Chenery of Horsburgh, Member for Docking Division which included the parish of Syderstone, addressed the Committee as the Local Member, in support of the application, during which the following points were noted:

- Mr Chenery advised that he fully supported the application and the employment opportunities which would result from the award of planning permission.
- Mr Chenery confirmed he had not received any complaints from his constituents about the quarry site, either in his capacity as the Borough Councillor or as a District Councillor.
- Once the extraction of sand and gravel had been completed, the site return to agricultural use.
- The Parish Council had raised no objection to the application.

The Chairman thanked Mr Chenery for attending.

6.4 Following a vote on the recommendation within the report, with 12 votes for, 0 votes against and 1 abstention, it was **RESOLVED** that the Director of Environment, Transport and Development be authorised to :

- i) Grant planning permission subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement in respect of borehole monitoring, highway arrangements and tree protection, and the conditions outlined in section 12 of the 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 to deal with any non-material amendments to the application that may be submitted.

7 Broadland District Council: Y/5/2013/5012: Removal of existing modular classroom and erection of a permanent pavilion: Salhouse CE VC Primary School, Cheyney Avenue, Salhouse, Norwich NR13 6RJ. Director of Children's Services.

7.1 During the presentation of the report, the following points were noted:

- The nearest residential property was situated approximately 36m from the proposed pavilion.
- Following the consultation, no objection had been received from the Environmental Health Officer on amenity grounds.
- The proposal had been amended to include top opening windows in the northwest elevation, which would be glazed with obscure glass.
- Provision for outdoor lighting had been included. This lighting would be activated by a passive infrared sensor.
- As well as being used by the primary school, the pavilion would provide Ofsted Registered childcare provision and accommodation for a local gardening club and a brownie pack.
- Strong concerns had been raised by the village hall committee about the viability of the village hall if the pavilion was to be used for community purposes, however potential competition was not a reason for refusing planning permission.

7.3 Following a question from the Committee, the Senior Planning Officer clarified that the proposed hours of opening for the pavilion would be the same as for the existing school, which included occasional use during evenings and weekends.

7.4 The Chairman welcomed Mrs K Dukes, Executive Headteacher, Salhouse CV Primary School who attended the meeting in support of the application. A copy of her statement was circulated to the Committee and is attached at Appendix A to these minutes.

7.5 The following points were noted in response to questions to Mrs Dukes:

- The proposed building would be used for educational purposes when required. The current mobile classroom was being used as a nursery and pre-school for 2 year old pupils. The school also now offered a breakfast club, which meant the existing facilities were no longer fit for purpose.
- The playing field and playground facilities would not be reduced.
- There was no intention to hire out the school facilities in direct competition with those offered at the village hall and any organisations wishing to hire the school facilities would need to be able to demonstrate that the village hall was not suitable for their requirements before agreement was reached.

7.6 Cllr Tom Garrod, Member for Wroxham Division which included the parish of Salhouse, submitted a statement in objection to the application. A copy of Mr Garrod's statement can be found at Appendix B to these minutes.

7.7 In response to a question, the Headteacher advised that a sprinkler system should not be necessary in the new building, as the building was to be constructed from recycled materials which were almost fireproof.

7.8 Following a vote by the Committee, it was unanimously **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 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 to deal with any non-material amendments to the application that may be submitted.

The meeting ended at 10.40 am.

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.

**Mrs Karen Dukes
Executive Headteacher
Salhouse VC Primary School**

I am writing in support of the planning application – Y/5/2013/5012 – for Salhouse VC Primary School to replace an old mobile class base with a permanent building which will answer legal requirements for childcare and educational purposes.

I intend to attend the planning meeting on Friday so that I might answer any questions that might arise. I would, furthermore, appreciate the opportunity to express these key points to the members of the committee:

- The new building will be the replacement of an existing facility which is at the end of its serviceable life – it cannot be economically repaired, refurbished or extended.
- It was only ever meant to be a temporary location as a result of building works 5 years ago.
- The new building will incorporate facilities that currently have to be accessed in the main school (eg. toilets) and therefore it will be self-contained.
- A recent “Good” Ofsted inspection praised this provision. We do fully expect the school to increase in numbers beyond the predicted demographic growth.
- This is a valuable facility for the community of Salhouse that is integral with what the school has to offer.
- A chosen location that is on balance going to make least, if any, impact on neighbours.
- The existing location of the mobile classroom is actually nearer to several more properties on the opposite boundary, which are built much closer to the fence.
- The houses that are located on the properties whose boundaries will abut the proposed new building are a long way from it. In fact the houses on the opposite side of the school are almost as close to it!
- The planning officer clearly states that most of the local resident comments are not material planning considerations. However, I would like to add that I am disappointed at how exaggerated many of them seem – some are simply not credible.
- The location is chosen to minimise loss of playing field and open up the vista with the removal of the current mobile. It is also a safer site as it is directly in line with the main school entrance and car park (People approaching the site will be clearly visible).
- It is NOT in competition with the Jubilee Hall. The pre-school was already on the verge of closing when it was rescued by the school. The current childcare facilities already fully utilise the current building from 7.30am to 6pm. Any clubs which currently use the main school hall, will continue to use the main school hall. We do not envisage that changing.
- The main school building does not have the facilities to accommodate the pre-school. We educate 7 year groups in four main classrooms and all the space is timetabled for use every school day.

I look forward to attending on Friday.

Regards.

Mrs Karen Dukes

County Councillor Mr T Garrod comments regarding Application: Y/5/2013/5012

OBJECTION

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this application.

Throughout the report the impression is given that this proposal is intended to replace existing education provision that is already taking place in temporary mobile classrooms. However, the report also states in 1.3 that the pavilion will cater for childcare and "be made available as a local community resource"; therefore it is unclear whether the proposal is to permanently house existing activity that is already on the school site, or if it is to increase community activity on the school site. If the former, I would like to draw members attention to 6.10 where with respect to the school roll the Director for Children's Services states that "there has been a decline over recent years", and pose the question to committee members: Is it worth reducing the amount of playing field area for classrooms that may not have the demand to fill them in the medium to long term?

If the intention is to make the school more available as a community resource, I would draw members attention to 5.10 of the report where the Salhouse Village Hall Committee highlight that this will be in direct competition with the village hall. This poses the question: does this help or hinder the message we are giving to local communities that they should be more self-reliant at this time of scarce resource in the Public Sector?

It is because of the reasons I have outlined that I hereby register my objections to this application. This, together with the concerns made by Salhouse Parish Council and local residents, gives ample reason, in my opinion, for the committee to reject this application

Tom Garrod
County Councillor
Wroxham Ward