

**Planning Regulatory Committee  
Minutes of the Meeting Held on Friday 20 February 2015  
at 10am in the Edwards Room, County Hall**

**Present:**

Mr D Collis (Chairman)

Mr S Agnew  
Mr B Bremner  
Mr C Foulger  
Mr A Grey (Vice-Chairman)  
Mr B Long  
Ms E Morgan  
Mr W Northam

Mr W Richmond  
Mr M Sands  
Mr E Seward  
Mr M Storey  
Mr J Ward  
Mr B Watkins  
Mr A White

**In attendance:**

Mr R Cox	Principal Planner
Mr S Bell	NPLaw
Mr N Campbell	Principal Planner
Mr J Hanner	Highways Authority
Mr A Harriss	Senior Planner
Mr N Johnson	Planning Services Manager
Ms A Lambert	Principal Planner
Mrs J Mortimer	Committee Officer

**1 Apologies and Substitutions**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr M Baker; Mr S Askew (Mr W Richmond substituted) and Mr J Law.

**2 Minutes from the meeting held on 9 January 2015**

- 2.1 The minutes from the Planning (Regulatory) Committee meeting held on 9 January 2015 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.

## 5 **South Norfolk District: C/7/2012/7017: Norton Subcourse Quarry, Loddon Road, Norton Subcourse, Extension to existing quarry involving the extraction of sand and gravel from three parcels of land with restoration to agriculture and heathland integrating with existing restored areas, retention of existing aggregate processing plant, silt lagoons, stocking area and access/haul road: Cemex UK Operations Ltd.**

- 5.1 The Committee received a report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services seeking planning permission for the extension of mineral extraction onto three areas of land adjoining the existing quarry, over a period of between 11 and 21 years, with progressive restoration to agriculture and heathland. The proposal includes retention of the existing aggregate processing plant complex and access/haul road.

The application was before the Planning (Regulatory) Committee because it was subject to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations and because more than four representations had been received.

- 5.2 During the presentation of the report, the Committee noted that no additional comments had been received since the report had been published.

- 5.3 In response to general questions from the Committee, the following points were noted:

- The extraction of sand and gravel at the site was dependant on market trends and demand and was expected to last between 11 and 21 years.
- Members expressed concern about the removal of mature oak trees on the land and were reassured that the County Council's Ecologist and Arboriculturist had raised no objections provided a condition was imposed for a replacement tree planting scheme to mitigate the loss of the mature oak trees. The replacement trees would be a mixture of broad leaf species which would provide adequate screening and any trees that failed would be replaced.
- The proposed use for wood arising from felling of trees in existing advanced planting belts was not known.
- In their assessment of the application, the Council's Ecologist and Natural Environment Team would have taken into account all aspects involved in removing mature trees, including the corridor of movement the trees offered for birds and mammals, etc.
- The Planning Services Manager confirmed that the site had been included in the

Norfolk Minerals and Waste Development Framework Mineral Site Specific Allocations Development Plan document.

- No comments had been received from the Local Members.
- The site would be worked in six phases. Each phase would be worked in turn, with no more than two phases of the site being worked at any one time.
- The applicant had not yet applied to UK Power Networks about the removal of the two pylons which ran across the site. The cables provided the power supply to Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft so re-routing them underground would be a time consuming and costly exercise. The decision on whether to progress the removal of the pylons rested with the applicant.
- Planning Services Officers had not been made aware of any complaints about dust and the Environmental Health Officer had made no reference to dust complaints in his assessment, although he had recommended the use of dust netting. The existing planning permission included conditions to mitigate dust at the site.
- The nearest properties were to the west along Ferry Road.

5.4 Ms Kirsten Hannaford-Hill, from Cemex attended to answer questions from the Committee, during which the following points were noted:

- Although Cemex had not yet applied to UK Power Networks to move the electricity pylons, it was anticipated that this work could be carried out before work commenced on phase 11 of the site.
- The existing site would be completed and landscaped before any work commenced on the application site.
- Cemex had not received any complaints about dust from local residents, the Environmental Health Officer or the County Council. It was confirmed that dust mitigation measures were in place, including water bowsers to douse the site during dry weather conditions. Ms Hannaford-Hill undertook to ensure that mitigation measures would be implemented as required, if planning permission was granted.
- Ms Hannaford-Hill confirmed that Cemex was committed to meeting any conditions imposed if the application was approved. Members suggested that Cemex meet regularly with the Parish Council to ensure that residents were kept up to date with developments at the site.

5.6 The Planning Services Manager advised that inspection of minerals and waste sites took place a minimum of four times per year by a dedicated team employed by the County Council. If the County Council received a complaint, or if evidence of poor performance

was found during an inspection, additional inspections would be conducted.

- 5.5 On being put to the vote, with 13 votes in favour, 1 vote against and 0 abstentions, the Committee **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 12 of the report.
- ii) Discharge conditions (after discussion with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman 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 Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee) to deal with any non-material amendments to the application that may be submitted.

**6 King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council: C/2/2014/2016: Erection of a building to house a replacement waste baler and generator with associated improvements to bunding and landscaping arrangements. Glazewing House, Station Road, West Dereham, King's Lynn, Norfolk, PE33 9RR: Glazewing Ltd.**

- 6.1 The Committee received a report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services seeking planning permission to erect a building to house a replacement waste baler and generator with associated improvements to bunding and landscaping arrangements.

- 6.2 The following points were noted during the presentation of the report:

- The nearest property was approximately 350 metres from the proposed building and not as stated in the report. The Committee was advised that this did not alter the Noise Impact Assessment that had been carried out.
- If the Committee granted its approval, the following condition would be imposed:

Details of the external finish to the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order for the Local Planning Authority to be satisfied that the materials to be used will be visually appropriate for the approved development and its surroundings, in accordance with Policy CS 08 of the adopted Core Strategy of the Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk.

- In response to concerns raised by the Highways Authority and residents, conditions 3 and 4 in the report which related to the amount of waste processed at the entire site (including the area marked with red and blue lines on page xx of the agenda papers), had been included to control the outputs to those at the current levels. Members noted that there would be no increase in the actual tonnage of material processed at the plant.
- The new baler would be of a similar size to the one which was already in use at the plant and would replace the old baler that had reached the end of its operational life.
- A new hedge would be planted at the foot of the bund to provide an additional screen.

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

- As part of the permit granted by the Environment Agency, monitoring of the swale (a ditch to allow drainage) would be carried out to ensure the conditions of the permit were met.
- The application had been assessed by the landscape officer and a condition had been proposed suggesting the external finish and colour of the building to ensure it blended with the surrounding area. No objections had been raised to this proposal. The new building would be visible from the public footpath, although it was noted that there were several other very large buildings in the area including the Wissington sugar beet factory.
- Condition 4 required the applicant to keep records and weighbridge receipts showing the amount of material processed at the plant. These records would be checked by the monitoring and control team when they carried out their inspections, to monitor the amount of material which was being processed at the site.
- The Highways Authority had considered the objections raised by local residents and confirmed that, as future output of material from the site would be no higher than that already experienced, the application had been deemed acceptable.

6.4 Mr B Long, County Councillor for Fincham Division which covered the application site, addressed the Committee as Local Member. Mr Long said he had received a lot of comments from the Parish Council and local residents about the conditions attached to the existing planning approval not being adhered to. He had also received regular complaints about the road and verges being damaged by the number of trucks getting to and from the site and the amount of litter which collected at the side of the roads after being blown from uncovered trucks. He had also received some photographs from residents showing the amount of litter which had collected at the side of the roads leading to the plant.

6.5 In response to a question from the Committee, Mr Long said that providing a direct access

from the site to the B1160 would stop the lorries travelling through the village to access the site and would also prevent the spread of litter throughout the village.

6.6 Mr Stephen Daw, Agent acting for Glazewing Ltd and Mr Paul Norris, Environmental Manager of Glazewing Ltd, attended the meeting to answer questions from the Committee, during which the following points were noted:

- The application made it clear that there would be no increase in the number of vehicle movements as the waste to be processed by the new baler was already at the site. Baling the additional material would enable it to be recycled or incinerated to produce electricity rather than being sent to landfill.
- The new building would be no higher than the existing building at the site and improved bunding would be provided to screen the building from the public footpath.

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

- The cap of 125,500k tonnes per annum on the amount of waste processed was well below the level issued by the Environment Agency permit of 225k tonnes per annum.
- All the trucks owned by Glazewing or their contractors were netted to prevent litter from being blown off the trucks. The Committee noted that material was accepted from other sources and it would not be possible to control whether or not those vehicles were netted.
- The site was open between the hours of 8am and 5pm. During those times anyone was able to drop off waste or scrap metal.
- The Committee noted that any conditions imposed as part of planning permission could only relate to land under the control of the applicants and could not be imposed outside of the site.
- Following a suggestion that in order to maintain good relationships with residents and the local Parish Council, notices could be displayed to customers that only covered vehicles would be accepted onto the site. Mr Norris agreed to discuss a suggestion made by the Committee that no waste from uncovered vehicles would be accepted at the plant, with the Board of Directors to see if a workable solution could be implemented.
- Alternative routes to the site had been considered, but it was not possible to progress this further at the present time.
- The amount of material currently processed at the site was between 95k and 115k

tonnes per annum.

- 6.8 The Committee **agreed** that the following condition should be included:

Details of the external finish to the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order for the Local Planning Authority to be satisfied that the materials to be used will be visually appropriate for the approved development and its surroundings, in accordance with Policy CS 08 of the adopted Core Strategy of the Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk.

- 6.9 On being put to the vote, with 8 votes in favour, 4 votes against (Mr B Long and Mr A White) and 2 abstentions, the Committee **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 12 of the report including the additional condition as set out in paragraph 6.8 above.
  - ii) Discharge conditions (after discussion with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman 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 Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee) to deal with any non-material amendments to the application that may be submitted.
- 7 North Norfolk District Council: Y/1/2014/1007. RAF Coltishall Airfield. Erection of live fire training facility, enlargement of existing hard-standing area and retention of four fire training containers; plus change of use of building 440 to provide briefing, mess and rest room facilities and building 109a for ancillary storage: Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services.**
- 7.1 The Committee received a report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services seeking planning permission for the erection of a live fire training facility, enlargement of existing hard-standing area and retention of four fire training containers; plus change of use of building 400 to provide briefing, mess and rest room facilities and building 109a for ancillary storage.
- 7.2 In response to a question from the Committee, the Planning Services Manager advised that there was no information available that may have an impact on any possible future users of the site and that the application had been considered acceptable.

7.3 Upon being put to the vote, with 13 votes in favour, 0 votes against and 0 abstentions, the Committee **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 12 of the report.
- ii) Discharge conditions (after discussion with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman 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 Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee) to deal with any non-material amendments to the application that may be submitted.

**8 Great Yarmouth Borough Council: Y/6/2014/6009. Change of use of former caretaker's accommodation (C3) to office accommodation (B1a) at the Time and Tide Museum, 16 Blackfriars Road, Great Yarmouth. Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services.**

8.1 The Committee received a report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services seeking planning permission to change the use of the former caretaker's accommodation to office accommodation at the Time and Tide Museum. No internal or external alterations were proposed.

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

- English Heritage had raised no objection. The proposed change of use would not cause harm to the significance of the building as there were no internal or external alterations proposed to the building.
- Great Yarmouth Borough Council had raised no objection.
- The consultation period had now expired. No additional comments had been received and no consultee had asked for an extension of time in which to respond.

8.3 Upon being put to the vote, with 14 votes in favour, 0 votes against and 0 abstentions, the Committee **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 12 of the report.



- ii) Discharge conditions (after discussion with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman 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 Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee) to deal with any non-material amendments to the application that may be submitted.

The meeting ended at 12.05pm

#### **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.