

## **DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the meeting of the Development Committee held on Thursday, 31 March 2022 in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 9.30 am**

<b>Committee</b>	Mrs P Grove-Jones (Chairman)	Mr P Heinrich (Vice-Chairman)
<b>Members Present:</b>	Mr A Brown Dr V Holliday Mr N Lloyd Mr N Pearce Mr A Varley	Mr P Fisher Mr R Kershaw Mr G Mancini-Boyle Mr M Taylor Ms L Withington

**Substitute  
Members Present :**

**Other Members in  
Attendance:** Mrs S Bütikofer

**Officers in  
Attendance:** Assistant Director of Planning (ADP)  
Major Projects Manager (MPM)  
Planning Officer (PO)  
Principle Lawyer (PL)  
Democratic Services Manager  
Democratic Services Officer - Regulatory

### **106 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Cllr A Fitch-Tillett.

### **107 SUBSTITUTES**

Cllr J Toye was present as a substitute for Cllr A Fitch-Tillett.

### **108 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

The Chairman invited the MPM to provide speak on the matter of Nutrient Neutrality. The MPM advised that Agenda Items 7,8, 11 and 12 (Planning Application references PF/21/1990, PF/21/2644, PF/21/1478 and PF/21/1479) had been deferred due to new Habitat Regulations matters raised by Natural England concerning Nutrient Neutrality published on 16<sup>th</sup> March. He noted that this was an extremely complex matter and that the regulations affected all Local Planning Authorities in Norfolk and several others across the country, with a total of 74 Local Planning Authorities now impacted.

### **109 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr V Holliday declared an interest in both Planning Applications RV/21/2583 and PF/21/0882 for Cley, she is both the Local Member and Chairman of Cley Parish Council and considered herself to be pre-determined. She advised she would speak on each application as the Local Member, but would not participate in the debate or vote and would excuse herself from the meeting during member's debate.

**110 CLEY-NEXT-THE-SEA - RV/21/2583 - VARIATION OF THE WORDING OF CONDITION 2 (APPROVED PLANS) AMENDED SITE LOCATION PLAN SCALED AT 1:2500, AND DRAWINGS 2260-01, 2317-02Z1, 2317-03E, 2317-05F AND 2317-11B. APPROVED ON APPEAL REF: APP/Y2620/A/13/2205045 RELATING TO PLANNING APPLICATION REF: PF/12/1219 FOR REPLACEMENT HOUSE AND STUDIO - DATE OF DECISION: 05/02/2014 AT ARCADY; HOLT ROAD, CLEY-NEXT-THE-SEA.**

The ADP introduced the Officer's report and recommendation for refusal. He noted that a revised plan had been received during the week, and corrected the description as it appeared in the agenda. He referred to page 105 of the Agenda Pack and affirmed although the first paragraph was unchanged the second paragraph should be amended from 'replace plan 2317-11b with 1660-00-08' to 'replace plan 2317-11B with 16600-00-008c'. These changes had been reflected in the Officer's presentation.

He affirmed that the application was for the substitution of a revised sectional plan contained within the bundle of drawings from the 2014 planning appeal decision, and not an application to retain the existing building as built. He noted that as this was a Section 73 application for permission, it was in effect an application for the issuing of a new planning permission. He advised members in their decision making to assess the merits of the contemporary building as described and consider its relationship with nearby buildings including Holly House, St Margaret's Church, Newgate Green, and within the local context.

The ADP noted that plans for Arcady provided to the Planning Inspectorate in 2014 had shown the building at a significantly lower position than neighbouring Holly House and advised this formed a point of reference of the Planning Inspector when they closely looked at the impact of Arcady on neighbouring dwellings and on the street scene. The proposed plans now appeared to place Holly House at a lower position than Arcady. He highlighted that the original bungalow located on the site was of a simple and tradition design with an apex roof, and the current structure as proposed, and as constructed was with a flat roof. He commented that this arguably made the original bungalow and current contemporary property of a similar height, however this had been disputed by members of the local community. The change of the roof form had a significance of the scale and mass of the development. The ADP reminded Members that this was not an application to approve the building as built, rather to approve a series of plans which should have been considered by the Planning Inspector.

Whilst going through the officer's presentation the ADP asked that members not consider the floor plan contained within the officers report supplied from the original sales brochure.

The ADP noted with regret that the revised plans had not had opportunity to be publically consulted. However considered that the amended drawing did not materially change the contents of the officer's report or recommendation for refusal.

The ADP relayed the officers conclusion located on page 116 of the Agenda pack, in that it would have been inconceivable that the Planning Inspector would have formed the same conclusions as those reached on the basis of the approved drawing 2317-11b. As a consequence of the new proposals as presented, the delicate balance had been tipped and policy's EN3, EN4, EN8 and HO8 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy were no longer complied with. There were considered to be no overriding public benefit identified to offset the harm to the

heritage assets of the Norfolk Coast AONB, as such significant weight must be afforded to the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 which dictates that the proposal should be refused in accordance with Development Plan provisions.

Public Speakers:

Richard Allen – Cley Parish Council

Jane Carter – Objecting

- i. Local Member- Cllr V Holliday stated her support of the Officer's recommendation. She established that Arcady is situated in an area of Cley which was of historic significance overlooking Newgate green; the site of an original medieval harbour, and St Margaret's Church; a grade one listed building. She expressed her frustrations that revised plans, supplied by the applicant, had only been received 3 days prior to the meeting and that they had been unable to be publically consulted, however considered that there was no material differences between the latest plans and those which had been publically consulted. She reflected on her position as Local Member to represent the balance of opinion within the community, and noted the views of members of the public on the planning portal, all of which had been objections. She highlighted specific representations made by members of the public verbatim, which focused on the harm caused by the development to the nearby heritage assets, in particular St Margaret's Church, and considered Arcady to be disproportionate in its scale, massing and design, having a detrimental effect on the Cley Conservation Area and the wider AONB. In addition, that the development as built was considered to be entirely different from that which had been granted planning permission, and was clearly in breach of permission granted at appeal. She noted comments that the contention that the revised proposal would not be much larger than the original bungalow it replaces was untrue.

*Cllr V Holliday left the meeting at 10.03am*

- ii. Cllr J Toye asked for clarity in the changes in the plans, if it were in the scale, position, or both. The ADP noted the lack of survey drawings of the original bungalow, which had hindered the assessment. He reflected on representations made by local residents, who were familiar with the site, and who considered the bungalow inaccurately represented even in its most recent designs. He advised that the Council's Surveyors had been unable to consider the most recent plans, as these had been received only 3 days prior. The ADP advised that the inspector's decision letter made clear the expectation of the developments relationship with Holly House, in being lower than Holly House, and that position of Arcady was now considered to be significantly higher than that permitted by the Planning Inspector. He referred to the Officer's Report and findings that the height, scale and mass of the building were considered to have a negative impact which were not offset by any wider public benefits. He advised the importance of the sectional drawings in Members decision making.
- iii. On receipt of clarification from the ADP, Cllr J Toye proposed acceptance of the officer's report and recommendation for refusal.
- iv. Cllr A Brown seconded the proposal and considered the importance of the protection of Cley Conservation Area, and that proposal would neither protect nor enhance the historic setting, as noted in the Conservation Area

Appraisal. He reflected on a recent decision, referred to within the Officers Report, of an appeal case of Choice Place Properties which made clear the situation when there was significant doubt caused by a plan that would have considerably affected the decision made by the Planning Inspector. He concluded that the application should therefore be considered with a fresh set of eyes. Cllr A Brown expressed his disappointment that a revised plan had been received at late notice, but accepted that the revised plans did not materially change determination of the proposal.

- v. In response to questions from Cllr N Pearce regarding the length of time issues surrounding the development had been ongoing, the ADP advised that whilst not material the decision making of Members, the first plans were received in 2012, and that this had been a long standing issue, in which the Council had served enforcement notices on and would looking towards an enforcement appeal. He noted that the current applicant was not the original appellant, and that they had purchased the site subsequently and had inherited the drawings.
- vi. Cllr N Pearce stated his support for the Officers recommendation and reflected that the approved plans had not been followed. He noted that the application was contrary to policies HO8, EN1, EN2 and EN8 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy as well as the NPPF.
- vii. Cllr P Heinrich stated that he had no issue with modern architectural design provided that the building was sympathetic with its local environment through its use of materials which would pay homage to the local vernacular. He noted that the current building differs significantly from the approved plans, and the comprehensive information and findings supplied in the Officers Report which detailed the detrimental intrusive visual effect of the mass and bulk of Arcady on the historic setting. He stated that the built relationship of Arcady with Holly House, as compared to approved designs, would have almost certainly impacted on the Inspectors decision. Cllr P Heinrich referred to Pages 114 and 115 of the Officers report and commented on the divergence of the proposal from planning policy.
- viii. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle expressed his support of the Officers Recommendation and stated that this application failed to comply with policy HO8 of the NNDC Core Strategy and was grossly out of proportion with the area.

**RESOLVED** by 12 Votes for, and 1 abstention.

**That planning application RV/21/2583 be REFUSED in accordance with the Officers recommendation.**

**111 CLEY-NEXT-THE-SEA - PF/21/0882 - ERECTION OF DWELLING AND ASSOCIATED EXTERNAL WORKS AND LANDSCAPING AT ARCADY; HOLT ROAD, CLEY-NEXT-THE-SEA.**

The ADP introduced the Officers report and recommendation for refusal. He advised that moving forward in cognizance of the decision reached on the last application, which would effectively strike out any potential fall-back position in terms of substitution of the drawings and the issues relating to the Choice Place case law.

He stated that Officers were genuinely committed to exploring whether this case could be resolved without being subject to enforcement appeal, and noted the applicant's attempts to deliver remediation which would enable the Council to step away from the enforcement process. He advised that Officers were not opposed to residential development on the site, and the principles of the appeal decision were noted which contended that a contemporary design or other sensitively designed development should not take place on this site. He affirmed that the Inspectors decision was clear in what may be acceptable on the site and within the context of Local Plan policies.

He asked that Members not consider the former bungalow floor plan as contained within the presentation, as this was misleading.

The ADP commented on the articulation of the development with its group block concept, and with its rise and fall of roofline that provided some articulated variance with respect of impact and in breaking up the scale and massing of the building. He noted changes between the plans as approved and those as remediated, and that within the approved plans Holly House was shown in a higher position than Arcady in excess of nine meters.

The ADP considered the northern elevation of the remediated plans, and the critical role of Block Two, located to the left hand side of the vestibule which runs concurrently through Blocks Three and Four, which caused issues with the articulation. With reference to the southern elevation, the ADP identified changes to the balcony which would notably run the majority of the building and the impact that this would have on the building as set against the approved plans granted by the Planning Inspector. He noted that whilst attempts had been made to add articulation through staining Block Two in a darker colour, but that it was considered that the proposal was significantly different in terms of height and articulation of blocks as set against the expectation of the Planning Inspectors decision. He noted that there would be improvements brought through the proposal when compared to the building as built, but that overall the proposal sat far apart from the expectation of delivering those carefully articulated interconnected contemporary development designs as granted by the Planning Inspector. The ADP highlighted to Members the 15 proposed elements in design remediation.

He advised Members consider the local context, the relationship of the building with the Cley Conservation Area, Holly House, St Margaret's Church, Newgate Green, and the AONB.

The ADP concluded that the property as built had 48 breaches in design alone and was very different from that permitted, and although some changes were small, the cumulative effect was substantial. He considered that making the building acceptable was not a matter of cosmetic changes and the proposal would need to go considerably further. He stated that Officers did not doubt the appellant's good faith in suggesting the proposed changes, however Officers felt these were limited and did not go far enough to address concerns in particular with respect of issues of height and articulation. The combination of the removal of much of the articulation of both elevations and the roofline of the permitted building and its increase in overall height produced a dominant bulky effect. He stated that the remediated scheme failed to appropriately mitigate the detrimental effects of the development on its local context, and that the proposals were consequently recommended for refusal.

Public Speakers:

Richard Allen – Cley Parish Council

Jane Carter – Objecting  
Adam Spiegel – Supporting

- i. Local Member – Cllr V Holliday stated her support for the officer's recommendation and reflected on the volume of objections from members of the public on the planning portal. She recited verbatim extracts from public representations which focused the dominating effect the building would have on Newgate Green, the ancient church of St Margaret's, and the excessive height and massing of the building which was higher than the original bungalow. The cosmetic alternations were not considered to alter the height and impact of the building and its bulky appearance, and both the proposal and building as built were contrary to a large number of planning policies.

*Cllr V Holliday left the meeting at 10.55am*

- ii. Cllr J Toye affirmed that he had attended the site, and whilst he was not against modern design, he considered it was an unsuitable location for such a development due to its scale and mass, and that it would have a detrimental impact on the grade one listed property of St Margaret's Church and on Newgate Green. He expressed sympathy with the family living in the property but contented that this also impacted the whole community and the whole of North Norfolk. He considered that even with the adjustments made, the application was unacceptable and so proposed acceptance of the Officer's recommendation for refusal.
- iii. Cllr N Lloyd seconded the proposal. He welcomed the applicant's attempts to mediate and minimise the harm of the development on the Cley Conservation Area but concluded that the scale and mass of the building remained a problem. He noted the large number of public objections as well as those objections raised by Planning Officers and Consultees. He stated that one of the Council's primary duties was to protect the integrity of the landscape.
- iv. Cllr N Pearce affirmed that the Council had a responsibility to protect its heritage, and that the gentile view of Newgate Green, which he considered typical for Norfolk, had been lost through this development as a consequence of its size. He concurred with the Officer's assessment, and whilst he felt for the family, the deviation from approved planning permission was incomprehensible.
- v. Cllr P Heinrich stated his support for the Officers recommendation and acknowledged that the building as built was nothing alike to the approved scheme. He stated it was not an appropriate building within its location, and that even with the the proposed improvements, the dwelling would still have an unacceptable impact. He affirmed that the proposal was contrary to policies EN1, EN2, EN4 & EN8 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy, paragraphs 135, 174, 176, 199, 200 & 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, and Section 66(1) of the of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. He expressed his great sympathy with the applicant, however commented that changes in design did not get away from the original problem.
- vi. Cllr R Kershaw expressed his support for the Officer's recommendation, and noted that had the property been built in accordance with approved plans at appeal, members would not be debating the application today. He

considered the building to be harmful to its environment, and that its scale was unreflective of the original plan.

- vii. Cllr L Withington stated her support for the Officers recommendation, but acknowledged the positive attempts made by the applicant through design to reduce the visual impact of the mass and scale of the building. She concluded that such changes did not go far enough, and that the impact of the properties height remained. She expressed regret for the horrendous situation incurred by both the family and community.
- viii. Cllr A Varley noted that a clear attempt had been made by the applicant to work with the Planning Team to address concerns, but considered that this had been limited with minimal effects to the plans. He asked what would happen next should Members vote to refuse the application.
- ix. The ADP advised that the decision made by Members must be on the matter before them, and that should the application be refused it could be appealed. He stated that an enforcement notice appeal had been scheduled for June, but that this was separate to Members material considerations. He noted that if that appeal was dismissed it would be subject to the enforcement process and would require removal of the building. He stated that Members must make a decision on the materiality of the decision brought forward from the contents of the Officers Report.
- x. Cllr A Brown commented that the building as built was in breach of planning policies and that it would inflict significant harm to the environment with nothing to counter in way of public benefit. He considered Members responsibilities in upholding planning policies.

**RESOLVED** by 12 Votes for, and 1 abstention.

**That planning application RV/21/2583 be REFUSED in accordance with the Officers recommendation.**

At the discretion of the Chairman the meeting took a short break at 11.15am and resumed at 11.30am.

**112 WEST RUNTON - ADV/21/1260 - INSTALLATION OF FREE STANDING EXTERNAL NON-ILLUMINATED SIGN FOR AT DORMY HOUSE HOTEL, CROMER ROAD, WEST RUNTON FOR MR S BRUNDLE.**

The PO introduced the Officers report and recommendation for approval. He noted the historic applications for a replacement sign which had been refused by officers, and identified that the sign currently in situ was unlawful, and was subject to an enforcement case.

He stated that the site was located close to an AONB, but not within the AONB, and that the proposed sign was a reduction of 1.4m of the current sign, and compared to the original sign was only half a metre taller and roughly half a metre wider including posts.

He informed Members that the relevant policies for consideration were Chapter 8 of the North Norfolk Design Guide which observes the proportionality of the size of the sign to its associated business, and policy EN4 of the adopted North Norfolk Core

Strategy. Officers had determined that the current proposals satisfied both the relevant National and the Council's own adopted policies.

Public Speakers:

John Simpson – Runton Parish Council

- i. Local Member – Cllr S Bütikofer – considered the impact of the sign on the surrounding area to be significant, particularly with respect of the signs close proximity to the AONB. She stated that the standalone nature of the sign and situation near the road made it more impactful and that it would dominate the landscape. The Local Member asked that policy EN3 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy, be considered, and stressed the importance of protecting the undeveloped coast. She determined that the sign should be considered non-essential as the Dormy House Hotel could be clearly and easily be identified from the road, and the lack of a freestanding sign would not have a detrimental impact on the business. Cllr S Bütikofer expressed surprise that the Highways Authority had not commented on the application, and felt that there were many highway safety issues with the associated area which would be further exacerbated by the proposed sign. She considered it preferable that a smaller sign, comparable to that of the original, be introduced, if a sign was seen as necessary.
- ii. Cllr N Pearce considered the placement of the proposed sign to be dangerous in that it would obscure driver's view of the A149, and that the application should be refused on highways safety grounds. He stood with the Local Member in the need to protect the undeveloped coast.
- iii. Cllr A Brown noted that no comments had been submitted by the Highways Authority and reflected had there been concerns about the impact of the sign on road safety, by that Authority, that this would have been reported. He affirmed that the proposal was compliant with policy EN4 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy, and questioned the application of policy EN3 which he understood to be designed for new developments as opposed to replacement signage. Cllr A Brown proposed acceptance of the officers recommendation for approval.
- iv. Cllr P Heinrich stated his support for the Officer's recommendation, and agreed with Cllr A Brown that the lack of representation from the Highways Authority indicated that they had no concerns about the proposed sign. He considered that whilst the sign was large it was not excessively so.
- v. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle affirmed his belief that the size of the sign was unacceptable and agreed with the Local Member that a replacement sign comparable with the size of the original should be introduced.
- vi. In response to questions from Cllr R Kershaw on the associated road accident statistics, The MPM advised that if Members were concerned about the impact of the sign on highways safety, and considered this to be a defining issue in coming to their determination, that this Item could be deferred to await a response from the Highways Authority.
- vii. Cllr J Toyne noted Crashmap UK data for the area, and the history of accidents on the road. He stated that the sign was 30% larger in volume than the original and considered this sign to be unacceptably large. He affirmed that whilst he wanted to support the local business, he considered the sign to



be too large.

- viii. In response to questions from Cllr A Varley about the proposed signs proximity to the AONB, and the impact this should have on decision making, the PO affirmed that the site was not within the AONB and that this could not be considered therefore material in decision making. He stated that the application of policy EN3 should be given lesser weighting than policy EN4, as the application was for advertising consent.
- ix. On reflection of member's debate and concerns about Highways Safety, Cllr A Brown withdrew his proposition.
- x. The MPM advised Members that in making their assessment, the Highways authority considered a variety of factors not just accident history. He reiterated that if Members would find a submission from the Highways Authority useful in coming to their determination, that this Item could be deferred, till such representation was received.
- xi. Cllr P Grove-Jones advised Members that the Officers recommendation must first be voted upon, before an alternate proposition be put forward and so proposed acceptance of the Officer's recommendation. Cllr Heinrich seconded.

**THE VOTE WAS LOST** by 3 votes for, 7 against and 2 abstentions.

- xii. Cllr R Kershaw proposed deferment of the item to await clarification from the Highways Authority on the visual impact of the sign on road safety. Cllr Pearce seconded.

**RESOLVED** by 9 votes for and 3 against.

**That planning application ADV/21/1260 be DEFFERED to await clarification from the Highways Authority**

**113 WALSINGHAM - PF/21/3302 ERECTION OF DETACHED TWO STOREY DWELLING: ST JAMES COTTAGE, 18 BRIDEWELL STREET, WALSINGHAM, NR22 6BJ**

The MPM introduced the Officer's report and recommendation for refusal. He advised that the application had been brought to the Committee in accordance with the Constitution as the application had been submitted by Cllr's T Fitzpatrick and V Fitzpatrick. The MPM noted that the proposed application was a resubmission application from a scheme which had been previously refused by the Development Committee in 2020.

He noted that the description on page 151, paragraph two, was incorrect and that the proposed materials would consist of brick with a natural slate roof and aluminium metal windows.

He advised the most significant matter for consideration was the impact of the proposed dwelling on the character and appearance of the Walsingham Conservation Area. The proposal would be contained within the rear garden of a grade two listed building, 18 Bridewell Street, and would result in the loss of a historic wall to gain vehicle access. In accordance with Section 66 and 72 of the Listed Buildings Act, the Council had a statutory duty to give weight to the

preservation of heritage assets. He noted that Officers considered there to be limited capacity within the site to provide proportionate mitigation planting to replace the five trees which would need to be removed and to ensure no net loss of biodiversity.

The MPM concluded that whilst the proposed plan was an improvement on those previously submitted, there were relatively modest public benefit when weighed against the harm to the heritage asset.

### Public Speakers

Vincent Fitzpatrick – Supporting

- i. The Chairman advised that the Local Member, Cllr T Fitzpatrick, was not present due to a conflict of interest.
- ii. Cllr N Pearce expressed his support of the application. He considered the proposed use of materials to be sympathetic with the local area and stated that there would be preservation of the historic setting through the retention of a large portion of the existing wall, and noted that the trees lost through the development were already in poor condition. He affirmed that there would be minimal material change to the area, with the site set away from public view.
- iii. Cllr A Brown noted that the materials used were vernacular with the area and that this was an overall improvement on the previous application, but expressed concern with relation to policy EN8 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy, and highlighted the Conservation and Designs Officers assessment on page 80 of the Agenda Pack. He affirmed that the proposed development would be surrounded by 4 listed buildings, in the centre of Little Walsingham which had significant historic and cultural heritage.
- iv. In response to questions from Cllr A Brown, the MPM advised that the trees which would be removed by consequence of the development would be replaced, but that the replaced trees would extensively contribute to a lack of natural light. Whilst off-site mitigation was possible, the MPM questioned where this would be and how it would be provided, and noted that there was no clear precedent for such process other than securing a planning obligation but that this would require an alternate site to be known and agreed upon.
- v. Cllr R Kershaw proposed acceptance of the Officers recommendation and noted that the proposed development would fail to comply with policy's EN4, EN7 and EN9 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy, and that he was concerned about the loss of trees through the development.
- vi. Cllr P Heinrich considered the design to be sympathetic with the surrounding buildings, and noted that other properties in the area were of modern design. He commented that the apple trees located on the site to be of a poor condition, and therefore could be considered of reduced value. He reflected of the potential matter of Highway Safety in that the turning area for vehicles in the chapel yard would be very tight, but noted that lack of objection from the Highways Authority.
- vii. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle affirmed that the development would be very visually appealing, and acknowledged that there were other properties located in close proximity which were far more modern and larger in scale than that of the proposed development.

- viii. Cllr L Withington enquired whether a condition could be applied that a brick and flint wall be erected between the proposed and existing property which would reflect the view from the existing dwelling, and which would aid to retain the integrity of the site. The MPM advised that if Members were so minded, and considered this the suggestion may assist to mediate the heritage impact, that this could be added as a condition.
- ix. Cllr J Toye noted the loss of biodiversity and intensification of a small plot. He sympathised with the applicant but considered that there may be a variation in the long term future use of the property, and only the property itself could be considered not the applicants own circumstances.
- x. The Chairman stated that it was a small site area located within the Walsingham Conservation Area and that the land had formed part of an ancient orchard, and whilst the apple trees on the site could be retained they may be compromised by the development.
- xi. Cllr A Varley seconded the proposal and affirmed that the integrity of the Walsingham Conservation Area must be protected, and that the proposal was contrary to policy EN4 and neither preserved nor enhanced the protected area.
- xii. The MPM reminded members that in determining the application, Members were not granting personal planning permission, and that the property would exist in perpetuity with a potentially different future use. He advised Members to consider and weigh the harm to the associated heritage assets by consequence of the development against public benefit.

**RESOLVED** by 8 votes for, and 4 against.

**That planning application PF/21/3302 be REFUSED in line with the officer's recommendation with final wording or reasons to be delegated to the Assistant Director of Planning.**

#### **114 APPEALS SECTION**

- i. New Appeals
- ii. No questions.
- iii. Inquiries and Hearings – Progress
- iv. The ADP noted a decision regarding the Kelling Estate, planning application PF/20/1056 was anticipated by the end of April.
- v. Written Representations Appeals – In Hand
- vi. No questions.
- vii. Appeal Decisions
- viii. No questions.

#### **115 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

None

The meeting ended at 12.41 pm.

---

Chairman