

Minutes of a Meeting held in the Conference Room, Riverside, Lowestoft
on **Tuesday, 15 September 2015 at 6.00pm**

2

Members Present:

J Groom (Chairman), S Allen, P Ashdown, A Cackett, G Catchpole, J Ceresa, M Cherry, G Elliott, J Ford, I Graham, L Harris-Logan, M Pitchers and S Woods.

Officers Present:

R Amor (Principal Planner for Development Management), I Robertson (Area Planning and Enforcement Officer), M Van de Pieterman (Area Planning and Enforcement Officer) and N Wotton (Senior Democratic Services Officer).

The Chairman took the opportunity to advise the Planning Committee that 2 applications had been withdrawn. They were Item 8 – DC/15/2343/FUL – Land adjacent to 20 Bourne Road, Lowestoft and Item 13 – DC/15/2823/FUL – Beccles Heliport, Benacre Road, Ellough.

1 APOLOGIES / SUBSTITUTES

An apology for absence was received from Councillor N Brooks.

Councillor S Woods attended the meeting as a Substitute for Councillor Brooks.

2 MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 11 August 2015 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Elliott declared a Local Non Pecuniary Interest in Item 14 – DC/15/1713/FUL – Land at South Cove House, Southwold Road, South Cove, Beccles, as he was a friend of the applicant.

Councillor Graham declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in Item 9 – DC/15/2965/ROC – Ocean View Holiday Homes, Coastguard Lane, Kessingland, as he was the owner of a chalet at another holiday park in Kessingland and the decision of the Planning Committee could potentially have an impact upon other holiday parks in Kessingland. He stated that he would leave the meeting during the consideration of this item and would take no part in the discussions or voting thereon.

Councillor Groom declared a Local Non Pecuniary Interest in Item 10 – DC/15/2770/FUL – 2 Market Place, Bungay and in Item 11 – DC/15/2771/LBC – 2 Market Place, Bungay. Councillor Groom reported that the application had been considered by Bungay Town Council at their recent meeting and in order to avoid the public perception of pre-determination, he would leave the meeting during the consideration of these items and would take no part in the discussions or voting thereon. The Vice Chairman, Councillor Ashdown, would preside over the meeting during the consideration of these items.

Councillor Woods declared a Local Non Pecuniary Interest in Item 10 – DC/15/2770/FUL – 2 Market Place, Bungay and in Item 11 – DC/15/2771/LBC – 2 Market Place, Bungay. He reported that he had voted in favour of the applications when they had been considered by Bungay Town Council at their recent meeting. However he had come to the meeting this evening with an open mind and would make his decision based upon the facts presented at this meeting.

4 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING

All Councillors had received a printed copy of an email from Bungay Chamber of Trade at the meeting in respect of Item 10 – DC/15/2770/FUL – 2 Market Place, Bungay and Item 11 – DC/15/2771/LBC – 2 Market Place, Bungay.

Councillor Elliott declared that he had received communications in relation to Item 10 – DC/15/2770/FUL – 2 Market Place, Bungay and in Item 11 – DC/15/2771/LBC – 2 Market Place, Bungay.

Although they had been lobbied, Members felt that they could bring an open mind to the consideration of the application before the Committee.

With the agreement of the Chairman, Items 5, 6 and 7 on the Agenda were considered together, although Members were given the opportunity to ask questions and comment upon each report separately.

5 APPEAL DECISIONS REPORTS

The reports of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management advised the Committee that no appeal decisions were made in July 2015. Two appeals had been determined in August 2015, both of which had been withdrawn.

RESOLVED

That the reports concerning Appeal Decisions during July and August 2015 be noted.

6 DELEGATED CHIEF OFFICER DECISIONS

The reports of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management informed Members of all the Chief Officer delegated planning decisions made during July and August 2015.

RESOLVED

That the reports concerning the Chief Officer Delegated Planning Decisions made during July and August 2015 be noted.

7 ENFORCEMENT ACTION – CASE UPDATE

The report of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management provided Members with a summary of all outstanding enforcement cases sanctioned under delegated powers or through the Committee up until 1 September 2015. There were currently 11 cases.

73 High Street, Lowestoft – Unauthorised replacement of shop front. It was reported that the application was still outstanding and should be received shortly.

318 London Road South, Lowestoft – Alleged unauthorised conversion from single dwelling to 3 self contained flats. No response had been received from the owner and the case had been passed to the Council's legal department for prosecution.

6 Thoroughfare, Halesworth – Non compliance with condition on Listed Building Control granted in January 2015. Further information regarding the ventilation was required by 24 September 2015.

Holton Sawmills – Containers still on site beyond the deadline for clearance. The containers had not been removed and the deadline had expired, The case had been passed to the Council's legal department for prosecution.

RESOLVED

That the report detailing the outstanding Enforcement Matters up to 1 September 2015 be received.

N.B. Councillor J Ceresa arrived at this point in the proceedings.

8 DC/15/2343/FUL – LAND ADJACENT 20 BOURNE ROAD, LOWESTOFT

This application had been withdrawn from the agenda.

N.B. Councillor I Graham, having previously declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest, left the meeting at this point in the proceedings and took no part in the discussions or voting thereon.

9 DC/15/2965/ROC – OCEAN VIEW HOLIDAY HOMES, COASTGUARD LANE, KESSINGLAND

The Principal Planning Officer presented the application which proposed the removal of Condition No 4 of N2650/8 relating to the holiday occupancy conditions from a long-standing development of 14 holiday chalets in Kessingland to enable them to be occupied as permanent dwellings.

The Committee was advised that the "Ocean View" holiday development had been granted outline planning permission by the former East Suffolk County Council in March 1973 and the relevant Condition No. 4 stated that "the chalets shall be used solely for holiday purposes and may be occupied only during the period from 1 April or Easter whichever is the earlier to 31 October in any one year". Reserved matters had been approved by Waveney in 1975 and the chalets had been constructed between 1977 and 1980. The site became fully operational in 1981.

The development consisted of 14 chalets of brick and tile construction set out in three terraces, arranged around three sides of a central grassed area, with a separate area at the western end of the site for parking. The site itself was outside but adjacent to the physical limits of Kessingland and was accessed from Coastguard Lane, via Green Lane, both of which were unadopted roads. The boundary of the Coastal Change Management Area was immediately adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site.

Members were shown photographs, an aerial view and location plans of the site and its surroundings. It was noted that Coastguard Lane was a narrow, unadopted road, which narrowed considerably in places and there was insufficient space for vehicles to pass each other.

It was reported that two additional representations had been received since the papers for the meeting had been published. Both raised similar concerns about increased traffic on Coastguard Lane, that the removal of the condition would set a precedent and that the site would be a viable holiday business if there had been sufficient investment and maintenance of the site over time.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that the application had been accompanied by an assessment from a Tourism Consultant and, based on the information submitted, it was unlikely that the site had a future as a holiday park, full details of which were contained in paragraph 6 of the report. Members were advised that it was recommended that Condition 4 be removed to allow year round residential use of the site.

Councillor L Martin – Kessingland Parish Council

Councillor Martin reported that Coastguard Lane was not an unmade road but a footpath and the Highways Agency had objected to the application on the grounds that it was not suitable for increased vehicular traffic. The site had no facilities and there was no room in order to develop them. Other holiday sites worked well in Kessingland and the lack of investment and maintenance was the main reason for this business not succeeding.

Kessingland Parish Council objected to the possible removal of the condition. The Kessingland Neighbourhood Plan was in the process of being developed and would highlight sites for the potential development of permanent housing in the village. Tourism was vital to the local economy and community and the Parish Council recommended this site should be retained for tourist accommodation.

Ward Councillor A Green

Councillor Green reported that the removal of the condition would result in significantly increased levels of traffic in Coastguard Lane. There was also very little on site parking and permanent residential use would lead to increased parking in nearby roads which were already congested. The removal of the condition would also set a precedent, which could lead to the loss of additional holiday accommodation and would therefore change the character of Kessingland forever.

Mr Haslam – Agent on behalf of the Applicant

Mr Haslam stated that the report was a fair account of the situation. The occupancy level of the holiday business had dropped this year to 16% and the business was about to fold. He reported that it was better to find an alternative use for the site, rather than to allow it to decline further. The situation was very sad, as the applicants had tried to make a success of the business for many years but the report from the Tourism Consultant clearly stated that the business was not viable or sustainable.

Questions

A Member queried what would happen if the business were to fail. Would the owners sell the site to another company who would continue to use it for holiday lets? It was reported that the evidence provided by the Tourism Consultant proved that the business was not viable. No-one would buy the site and provide the investment required. There was no future for the site as a holiday business and it was confirmed that there was no information on occupancy rates for similar sized holiday accommodation in Kessingland, for comparative purposes. It was also noted that many holiday sites were operated in a different way – they were often second homes, rather than purely holiday lets, which made comparisons difficult. The applicant had advertised the business for sale on several occasions and there had been no interest.

In response to a query from a Member, it was reported that the owners currently spent approximately £4,500 per year on advertising their business online.

Confirmation was provided that the holiday lets were fit for human habitation. They did require modernisation but they met all of the building regulations that were required when they were built around 1974. The buildings were made of brick, with a tile roof.

Clarification was provided that if the condition was removed, there would not need to be an additional Change of Use Application. The premises would simply change from holiday use to permanent use.

With regard to Council Tax, it was confirmed that the dwellings would be liable for Council Tax if they were used for permanent residential accommodation, however that was not a planning consideration.

A Member queried the location of the holiday lets in relation to the beach. It was confirmed that they were not close to the cliff edge and that part of Kessingland beach was experiencing deposition not erosion.

In response to a query about the current condition limiting the occupation, it was confirmed that it was a standard condition which had been applied at the time the application was approved. It was clarified that the applicant had not requested permission for year round opening for the business, with a restriction on individual usage.

The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that there had been no comments received from the Economic Regeneration Team in respect of this application.

A Member commented that it was very different living somewhere on a temporary basis whilst on holiday and living somewhere on a permanent basis. They queried whether there was sufficient space for drying areas, storage and private outdoor space. It was also queried whether the refuse collection vehicles would be able to access the site due to the narrow width of Coastguard Lane. It was confirmed that modernisation of the dwelling was required to meet modern standards and expectations. It was also reported that the owners of nearby properties would take their wheelie bins out to be collected and it was not expected that the refuse collection vehicles would access Coastguard Lane.

Debate

Members were still concerned that the removal of the condition would set a precedent and may lead to the loss of other holiday accommodation in Kessingland over time. There were also strong objections raised by the Highways Agency and the Public Rights of Way and Access Team. It was therefore unanimously

RESOLVED

That the application be refused for the following reasons:

1. The Waveney Core Strategy policy CS13 seeks to protect existing tourism uses. Tourism plays a very important role in the economy of the District and the loss of existing tourism uses should therefore be resisted unless it can be justified that the use cannot be made viable. It is not considered that all avenues have been explored to improve the viability of the site in holiday use.
2. Residential use of the chalets will incur an increase in traffic as there will be more deliveries/visitors to the site and potentially the residents themselves could have more than one vehicle per property. It is considered that the proposal to allow all year round use of the site for residential purposes would be a degree of intensification of use at this site and this would be detrimental to the safety and condition of the existing unmade surface access route from the site to Green Lane. This would be exacerbated by use during the months with the worst weather, which is not the case with the existing restricted summer season use. The route is not wide enough for two way traffic and residential use is likely to increase the number of vehicle trips, including servicing vehicles, deliveries and visitors, again this is likely to be an intensification of use compared to the existing restricted arrangements. This intensification is likely to have a potentially severe impact on highway safety, which would be contrary to the Waveney Core Strategy policy CS02 and Development Management policy DM02.

N.B. Councillor I Graham returned to the meeting at this point in the proceedings.

N.B. Councillor J Groom, having declared a Local Non Pecuniary Interest and in order to avoid the public perception of pre-determination, left the meeting at this point.

N.B. Councillor P Ashdown, Vice Chairman, presided over the meeting for Items 10 and 11.

The Vice Chairman announced that Items 10 and 11 would be taken together.

10 DC/15/2770/FUL – 2 MARKET PLACE, BUNGAY

The Area Planning and Enforcement Officer presented the application and explained that Members were considering this in conjunction with the Listed Building Consent which was Item 11 on the Agenda. Members were updated on a number of responses which had been received since the papers for the meeting were published.

The application proposed the redevelopment of an existing hotel to an 'apart hotel' with ground floor retail/office use; function rooms and buildings to the rear to be converted to provide three residential units, and the conversion of a cart shed to provide parking and bin storage area.

The Area Planning and Enforcement Officer explained that 'The Kings Head' was a Grade II listed, well known, prominent landmark facing towards Market Place and with the castle mound to the rear. The town centre itself was a thriving market town with a wide variety of shops, cafés and pubs, some of which were undergoing renovation works prior to reopening. The main elements of the application were:

1. Conversion of existing hotel to six apartments, comprising four two-person, one four-person and one six-person, each of which would include a sitting area, bathroom and small kitchen; and having a reception area on the ground floor at the rear of the property.
2. The front ground floor to be converted to office/retail space.
3. Conversion of Brick House at the rear into a single two-bedroomed two-storey residential dwelling.
4. Oddfellows Hall to be subdivided into two mews style dwellings comprising one three-bedroomed five-person property and one three-bedroomed three-person property.
5. Renovation of the cart lodge for parking and bin storage.

Members were shown photographs and location plans of the site and its surrounds as presented at the meeting, including the different elevations. It was noted that the frontage of the building would be retained, whilst the wooden structures and fire escape to the rear would be removed.

The proposed development was considered to be appropriate and a positive regeneration project that would help sustain and widen tourist facilities in the town. It would make use of empty buildings and ensure the future of the listed building in a Conservation Area. The application was recommended for approval, subject to additional conditions from the Highways Authority, Conservation Officer and an amendment to Condition 3 within the report, to reduce the number of days the apartments could be let on a long term basis from 56 to 21 days in any one calendar year.

Mrs S Knights – Bungay Town Council

Mrs Knights reported that the application site was in a prime location in the centre of Bungay, the building predated the great fire of 1688 and contained architecture dating back to Tudor times. The building had been used as a public house and hotel and the Oddfellows

Hall to the rear of the building contained a large function room suitable for dancing and there were no other similar facilities in the local area. The business had not been viable and as a result the building had fallen into disrepair. The Town Council wanted the building to be restored and for it to provide visitor accommodation and hospitality again.

There were concerns about how the conditions attached to the application would be enforced and how soon the development would be completed. It was felt that the proposed development was not appropriate for Bungay, as it would have unwanted repercussions and another investor may have more sympathetic ideas for the site.

Mr R Gilles – Agent on behalf of the Applicant

Mr Gilles reported that although the permission to develop the site would last for 3 years, it was anticipated that the renovation work would commence much sooner. The previous business had not been commercially viable however it was proposed that the new development would be more sustainable. The development of an 'Apart Hotel' would provide increased flexibility and would be suitable for families.

The redevelopment of Oddfellows Hall would help to fund the overall development and the nearby 3 Tonnes public house would be able to provide the facilities which were previously provided by Oddfellows Hall. Any archaeological finds would not be disturbed and there would be no changes to the rights of way over the site. The development would lead to a reduction in the number of vehicles accessing the site and the car parking provided would be adequate. The development would have a considerable impact upon Bungay and would help to preserve an important part of its heritage for the future. The Agent stated that the Applicant was happy to accept all of the proposed conditions in relation this application.

Questions

A Member expressed their concern about the large dance floor which would be lost during the redevelopment of Oddfellows Hall. It was confirmed that ballrooms were not well used at the moment and did not generate sufficient income to be retained.

Clarification was provided in respect of the retail/office space which would be provided. The site was in a prominent and central location and would be full of character. As such it would be suitable for offices, a restaurant, retail or a bar. It was anticipated that it would be very easy to let the premises in the future, as it would be a useful size. There would also be a lobby and reception on the ground floor for the Apart Hotel.

It was confirmed that the premises had been closed for over 2 years, during which time there had been a significant deterioration in the appearance of the building. It was confirmed that the Applicant was very keen to proceed with the development. Once approval had been granted, more detailed plans would be created and advice sought from various experts and professionals on the best way to proceed. It was anticipated that building work would commence in Autumn 2016 and the street scene would remain unchanged. The interior renovations would take 1 – 2 years, whilst the external work would take 1 year. It was anticipated that the building work would be undertaken in 2 stages, and work on Oddfellows Hall would commence first, followed by the work on the former public house.

Clarification was provided that the site had been originally built in the 17th Century and there had been many additions and modification over time. A detailed historical survey would be undertaken and the building would be restored to its former glory, using traditional materials which were more expensive and time consuming to use.

In response to a query, it was confirmed that the original Edwardian Bar was still in place. It was very small and simple and the applicant would try and encourage it to be used by the future tenants. However there were already 6 other large pubs within walking distance of the site, so it was unlikely that a small pub would be a viable business.

A Member queried the proposed removal of the external fire escape. It was reported that an external fire escape would not be required due to the improved internal arrangements. The Apart Hotel would provide shorter escape distances to the main fire escape and there would be fire doors within the development. The application would meet all of the current safety standards and regulations.

Debate

Members were concerned by the loss of the dance facilities which were previously offered by Oddfellows Hall. It was noted that there were other premises which offered similar facilities but not to the same size. However, Oddfellows Hall had been closed for 2 years and a dance hall was not a viable business.

It was noted that the development of an Apart Hotel was very contemporary and would appeal to families and groups of people.

RESOLVED

That permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within a period of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the application form, plans numbered 1855 DE 10-01 A, 1855 DE 10-02 A, 1855 DE 20-01 A, 1855 DE 20-02 A, 1855 DE 20-03 A, 1855 DE 30-1 A and 1855 DE 30-02 A, the Design and Access Statement and Heritage Assessment submitted on 9th July 2015 and the plan numbered 1855-DE-10-02B (proposed site) unless otherwise submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
3. The 'apart hotel' hereby permitted shall be used purely for tourist/hotel purposes as defined under Class C1 of the Use Classes Order and for no other purposes. At no time shall the apartments be let on a long terms basis exceeding a period of **21** days in any one calendar year.
4. Prior to the occupation of the residential properties or use of the office and hotel the developer shall carry out a suitable improvement scheme that aims to protect pedestrians entering and leaving through the access from motor vehicles, the scheme will also need to consider providing additional signs and road markings to formalise the access / exit movements, to facilitate safe traffic management on and off the site. The details of the proposed scheme will need to have been approved by the highway authority in writing, prior to commencement on site.
5. Prior to the change of use hereby permitted being first occupied, the vehicular access onto the highway shall be properly surfaced with a bound material for a minimum distance of 13 metres from the edge of the metalled carriageway, in accordance with details previously submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
6. The use shall not commence until the areas within the site shown on 1855 DE 10-02 Revision A for the purposes of [LOADING, UNLOADING,] manoeuvring and parking of vehicles has been provided and thereafter that areas shall be retained and used for no other purposes.
7. The areas to be provided for storage of Refuse/Recycling bins as shown on drawing number 1855 DE 10-02 Revision A shall be provided in its entirety before the

development is brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for no other purpose.

8. Any variation or extension of the works shown on the approved plan which may be necessary to satisfy the requirements of the Building Regulations shall not take place until also approved by the Local Planning Authority.
9. Before work on site is commenced a site meeting shall be held between the Local Planning Authority and the persons responsible for undertaking the works, to ensure that the Conditions attached to the Listed Building Consent are understood and can be complied with in full. Notification of the date and time of a meeting shall be made in writing to the Local Planning Authority.
10. No works authorised by this consent shall take place until the applicant has implemented a programme of building recording and analysis by a person or body approved by the Local Planning Authority. This programme shall be in accordance with a written scheme which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
11. Details in respect of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council as Local Planning Authority before the work is begun. The work shall be carried out in accordance with such approved details: Full materials specification and all construction details
12. In the event that any hidden historic features are revealed during the course of the works, work shall be suspended in the relevant area of the building and the Council shall be notified immediately. Provision shall then be made for their retention and/or proper recording as required by the Council.
13. All new external rainwater goods and soil pipes on the visible elevations shall be of metal, painted black.

11 DC/15/2771/LBC – 2 MARKET PLACE, BUNGAY

The Area Planning and Enforcement Officer advised that Listed Building Consent was required as the planning application DC/15/2770/FUL was for the redevelopment of a listed building to an 'apart hotel' with ground floor retail/office use; function rooms and buildings to the rear to be converted to provide three residential units, and the conversion of a cart shed to provide parking and bin storage area.

The proposed development was considered to constitute an appropriate form of development that would ensure the future of the listing building and would help sustain and widen the tourism in the town. Having considered and approved the application under Item 10 on the Agenda, it was

RESOLVED

That Listed Building Consent be granted.

N.B. Councillor J Groom returned to the meeting at this point in proceedings and presided over the rest of the meeting.

12 DC/15/2481/FUL – ABBEY FARM MEADOW, THE STREET, SOUTH ELMHAM ST JAMES

The Area Planning and Enforcement Officer presented the application which sought approval for the erection of a two storey 4/5-bedroomed detached dwelling with a five bay garage block. It was proposed to make the dwelling energy efficient by including features such as air source heat pumps, solar panels and rainwater harvesting. The dwelling would

also be fully DDA compliant and the ground floor bedroom/study would be intended for use by medical staff should the need arise.

The Area Planning and Enforcement Officer explained that South Elmham St James was a small, very rural village and the site of the proposal was located within a ribbon of development along The Street, the main road through the village. He advised that it was the principle, design and scale of the dwelling and its potential impact on the setting of the adjacent listed building that required assessment. The proposal should be considered in the context of the site, its surroundings and current local and national planning policy. The application was before Committee because the Cabinet Member for Planning and Coastal Management lived immediately adjacent to the site. Members viewed photographs and plans of the site and its surrounds, as presented at the meeting.

The Area Planning and Enforcement Officer drew attention to the relevant planning policies and explained that the application was finely balanced. In this instance, the proposed development was considered to be unacceptable because of the design, scale, overall bulk, impact on the street scene and adjacent listed building, and lack of visibility from the proposed access.

Questions

In response to a query from a Member, it was reported that solar panels would be installed onto the single storey garage roof.

Clarification was provided that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee for consideration because the Cabinet Member for Planning & Coastal Management lived immediately adjacent to the site. It was felt that it would be useful for the Planning Committee to see the application for themselves, rather than the decision being taken at officer level.

Debate

Members discussed the application and were concerned by the scale and design of the proposed development, which was not in keeping with its surroundings.

RESOLVED

That permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development is considered unacceptable by virtue of the overall scale, bulk, design and siting of the dwelling and the resultant negative visual impact this would have on the street scene as a whole and, in particular, the setting of the adjacent listed building. As such the development is contrary to Core Strategy policies CS02 and CS17 and Development Management policies DM02 and DM30.
2. The visibility of the access on to the development is well below the standards set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). For a classified C-class road, with a 30mph speed limit, minimum visibility splays would be in the X axis 2.4m and in the Y axis, 90m in both directions. The access in its proposed form as shown in Drawing Title: Site Plan/Street Scene, has a current Y visibility of 6m to the right and 3m to the left. Allowing this visibility splay on the proposed access would be detrimental to highway safety, for both users manoeuvring from the access and for those on the public highway.

13 DC/15/2823/FUL – BECCLES HELIPORT, BENACRE ROAD, ELLOUGH

This application had been withdrawn from the agenda.

14 DC/15/2481/FUL – LAND AT SOUTH COVE HOUSE, SOUTHWOLD ROAD, SOUTH COVE, BECCLES

The Area Planning and Enforcement Officer presented the application which proposed a new building to provide a single holiday unit. The site was adjacent to the Grade I listed Church of St Lawrence and also within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The site, currently an open site, had previously had an agricultural building on its southern boundary which has also been used as a car repair workshop.

Members were reminded that a similar application had been presented to Committee in March 2012 but that planning permission had contained a number of pre-commencement conditions, none of which had been discharged prior to the approval having expired. Although the demolition of the barn on site had occurred, the permission granted in 2012 was not considered to have been legally implemented.

The site was in an open area within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and outside the development limits of Wrentham. The application proposed the construction of a single storey, long narrow building with clay pantile and lime render appearance, with photovoltaic panels on the southern roof slope and amended plans had reduced the number and height of roof lights on the northern roof space. Within the current proposal, Historic England had highlighted concerns over the impact on the setting of a heritage asset and the proposed building's prominence would cause harm to the significance of the listed building

Members viewed photographs and plans of the site and its surrounds, as presented at the meeting. The Area Planning and Enforcement Officer explained that the National Planning Policy Framework stated that where a proposal had a harmful impact on the significance of a designated heritage asset, the Local Planning Authority should weigh the public benefit against the harm. In terms of economic benefit to the area from visiting tourists, this would be limited. Therefore, the overriding consideration was the safeguarding of the setting of the adjacent Grade I listed building for the enjoyment of future generations.

Councillor M Parsons – Ward Councillor

Councillor Parsons reported that he had called-in the application for consideration by the Planning Committee. The site was brownfield and had a varied landscape history. South Cove was a small village and there was already a dwelling close by to the church. Over one third of the local residents and the Parish Council had reported that they were in favour of the application, which would transform an area which had been an eyesore. A letter had also been received from the Parochial Church Council, expressing their support for the application.

Dr A Eastaugh – Applicant

Dr Eastaugh reported that the original design of the building had proved to be too costly. The new design was slightly smaller, with a simplified roof. It would be made of straw bales and the storage buildings would provide space to store the yurts when they were not in use over the winter.

The new design of the building meant that the dwelling would be further away from the church, which would lessen its impact and improve the relationship between the buildings. Once the building had been completed, landscaping would take place which would enhance the appearance of the site.

Dr Eastaugh reported that the pre-building conditions had been completed but formal submission and notification had not taken place, as the original design of the building had required some adjustments and a further application needed to be submitted. He stated that

he had taken part in detailed negotiations and was keen to address any concerns about the design.

Questions

Clarification was provided that a pantile roof for the dwelling was the preferred option for the applicant, although a green roof could be provided if necessary and the location of the proposed roof lights had been amended.

With regards to the hedging around the site, it was confirmed the one of the conditions for the original application had been that the hedging should be supplemented in order to provide improved screening. The Applicant confirmed that planting had taken place already and the hedging was improving slowly over time.

Debate

Members discussed the application as presented and noted that the site had been an eyesore in previous years and the removal of the chicken shed and clearance of the site had been a significant improvement. The amended application would lead to the dwelling being slightly further away from the church, therefore there was no valid reason for refusing the application.

Members discussed the use of a green roof and resolved to grant officers delegated authority to discuss the roof materials further with the applicant to provide a suitable solution. On being put to a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED

That the application be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within a period of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until it has been completed in all respects strictly in accordance with amended plans for which permission is hereby granted or which are subsequently submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and in compliance with any conditions imposed by the Local Planning Authority.
3. The approved holiday unit shall be occupied solely as holiday accommodation and for no other purpose whatsoever including residential use. No unit shall be occupied for more than 28 consecutive days in any calendar year by the same person or persons. The owner shall maintain, and keep available for inspection at all reasonable times, an up-to-date register of lettings
4. Details in respect of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council as Local Planning Authority before the work is begun. The work shall be carried out in accordance with such approved details:

Full materials specification and all construction details.

5. The north boundary shall be planted as a native species hedge within 6 months of the commencement of the development or such other period as shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and any plants which die during the first 3 years shall be replaced in the next planting season.

6. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced, the existing fence on the frontage of the site shall be removed. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order) (with or without modification), no walls or fences of any kind, other than those approved within this application, shall be erected without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.
7. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the programme agreed with the Local Planning Authority; and any trees or plants which, within a period of five years from completion of the development, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation; all works shall be carried out in accordance with the relevant provisions of appropriate British Standards or other recognised Codes of Good Practice.
8. No development shall take place within the area indicated [the whole site] until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work has been secured, in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme of investigation shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:
 - a) The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
 - b) The programme for post investigation assessment
 - c) Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording
 - d) Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
 - e) Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
 - f) Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.
 - g) The site investigation shall be completed prior to development, or in such other phased arrangement, as agreed and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
9. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

15 EXEMPT/CONFIDENTIAL ITEM

RESOLVED

That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

16 MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the Exempt Minutes of the meeting held on 11 August 2015 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The meeting concluded at 7.55 p.m.

Chairman