

Development Committee



Please contact: Lauren Gregory

Please email: lauren.gregory@north-norfolk.gov.uk Direct Dial: 01263 516108

TO REGISTER TO SPEAK PLEASE SEE BOX BELOW

Wednesday, 14 June 2023

A meeting of the **Development Committee** will be held in the **Council Chamber - Council Offices** on **Thursday, 22 June 2023 at 9.30 am.**

At the discretion of the Chairman, a short break will be taken after the meeting has been running for approximately one and a half hours

Please note that members of the public should not speak to Committee Members prior to or during the meeting.

Members of the public who wish to speak on applications must register **by 9 am on the Tuesday before the meeting** by telephoning **Customer Services on 01263 516150** or by emailing customer.service@north-norfolk.gov.uk. Please read the information on the procedure for public speaking at Development Committee on our website or request a copy of "Have Your Say" from Customer Services.

Anyone may take photographs, film or audio-record the proceedings and report on the meeting. You must inform the Chairman if you wish to do so and must not disrupt the meeting. If you are a member of the public and you wish to speak, please be aware that you may be filmed or photographed. Please note that this meeting is livestreamed: <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCsShJeAVZMS0kSWcz-WyEzg>

Presentations: If you wish to view the Officers' presentations for the applications being considered by the Committee please follow the following link:

<https://modgov.north-norfolk.gov.uk/ecCatDisplayClassic.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13644&path=0>

Emma Denny
Democratic Services Manager

To: Cllr P Heinrich, Cllr R Macdonald, Cllr M Batey, Cllr A Brown, Cllr P Fisher, Cllr A Fitch-Tillett, Cllr M Hankins, Cllr V Holliday, Cllr G Mancini-Boyle, Cllr P Neatherway, Cllr J Toye, Cllr K Toye, Cllr A Varley and Cllr L Vickers

Substitutes: Cllr T Adams, Cllr P Bailey, Cllr J Boyle, Cllr G Bull, Cllr S Bütikofer, Cllr E Coleman, Cllr N Dixon, Cllr T FitzPatrick, Cllr W Fredericks, Cllr N Housden, Cllr L Paterson, Cllr J Punchard, Cllr C Ringer, Cllr E Spagnola and Cllr E Vardy

All other Members of the Council for information.

Members of the Management Team, appropriate Officers, Press and Public



If you have any special requirements in order to attend this meeting, please let us know in advance

If you would like any document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact us

Chief Executive: Steve Blatch

Tel 01263 513811 **Fax** 01263 515042 **Minicom** 01263 516005

Email districtcouncil@north-norfolk.gov.uk **Web site** www.north-norfolk.gov.uk

A G E N D A

PLEASE NOTE: THE ORDER OF BUSINESS MAY BE CHANGED AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIRMAN

PUBLIC BUSINESS

1. CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTIONS

2. TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

3. SUBSTITUTES

4. MINUTES

(Pages 1 - 6)

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of a meeting of the Committee held on 25th May 2023.

5. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

(a) To determine any other items of business which the Chairman decides should be considered as a matter of urgency pursuant to Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972.

(b) To consider any objections received to applications which the Head of Planning was authorised to determine at a previous meeting.

6. ORDER OF BUSINESS

(a) To consider any requests to defer determination of an application included in this agenda, so as to save any unnecessary waiting by members of the public attending for such applications.

(b) To determine the order of business for the meeting.

7. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(Pages 7 - 12)

Members are asked at this stage to declare any interests that they may have in any of the following items on the agenda. The Code of Conduct for Members requires that declarations include the nature of the interest and whether it is a disclosable pecuniary interest. Members are requested to refer to the attached guidance and flowchart.

OFFICERS' REPORTS

8. CROMER PF 22 3010 DEMOLITION OF FORMER BANDSTAND AND STORAGE BUILDING; REDEVELOPMENT OF FORMER TENNIS COURTS CONSISTING OF ERECTION OF 2NO. PUBLIC TOILET BUILDINGS, COMMUNITY SHED BUILDING, POLYTUNNEL AND ASSOCIATED FENCING CONTAINING HORTICULTURAL HUB, 2NO. CURVED WALLS WITH CANOPY FOR ENTERTAINMENT SPACE, MULTI-USE SPACE FOR POP-UP MARKET STALLS/LEISURE ACTIVITIES AND ASSOCIATED ON-SITE CAR/CYCLE PARKING,

(Pages 13 - 26)

VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN ACCESS POINTS, AT NORTH LODGE PARK OVERSTRAND ROAD, CROMER.

9. **NORTHREPPS - PF/22/1708 - SITING OF 2 GLAMPING PODS FOR HOLIDAY USE AND CREATION OF PERMISSIVE FOOTPATH AT SHRUBLANDS FARM CAMPING SITE, CRAFT LANE, NORTHREPPS.** (Pages 27 - 38)
10. **CLEY-NEXT-THE-SEA - PF/22/1843: CHANGE OF USE OF OUTBUILDING FROM SHOP (USE CLASS E(A)) TO SELF-CONTAINED ANNEXE (USE CLASS C3) FOR USE IN CONJUNCTION WITH WEST COTTAGE WITH EXTENSION AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS AT WEST COTTAGE, NEW ROAD, CLEY-NEXT-THE-SEA** (Pages 39 - 46)
11. **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE** (Pages 47 - 50)
12. **APPEALS SECTION** (Pages 51 - 56)
 - (a) New Appeals
 - (b) Inquiries and Hearings – Progress
 - (c) Written Representations Appeals – In Hand
 - (d) Appeal Decisions
 - (e) Court Cases – Progress and Results
13. **EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

To pass the following resolution, if necessary:-

“That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A (as amended) to the Act.”

PRIVATE BUSINESS

14. **ANY URGENT EXEMPT BUSINESS**
15. **TO CONSIDER ANY EXEMPT MATTERS ARISING FROM CONSIDERATION OF THE PUBLIC BUSINESS OF THE AGENDA**

This page is intentionally left blank

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

**Minutes of the meeting of the Development Committee held on Thursday, 25 May 2023
in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 9.30 am**

Committee	Cllr P Heinrich (Chairman)	Cllr A Brown
Members Present:	Cllr P Fisher Cllr M Hankins Cllr G Mancini-Boyle Cllr J Toye	Cllr A Fitch-Tillett Cllr V Holliday Cllr P Neatherway Cllr K Toye Cllr L Vickers

Substitute	Cllr T Adams
Members Present:	Cllr L Withington

Officers in Attendance:	Development Manager (DM) Principle Lawyer (PL) Senior Planning Officer (SPO) Democratic Services Officer – Regulatory
--------------------------------	--

1 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr R Macdonald, Cllr M Batey and the Assistant Director for Planning.

2 SUBSTITUTES

Cllr T Adams was present as substitute for Cllr R Macdonald, with Cllr L Withington present as a substitute for Cllr M Batey.

3 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Development Committee held on 12th April were approved subject to typographical corrections.

4 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

5 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr P Fisher declared a non-pecuniary interest regarding planning application PF/22/1660, he is known socially to the director. Cllr V Holliday also declared a non-pecuniary interest and cited the same reason as Cllr P Fisher.

6 SHERINGHAM - PF/22/1660 - 37 SUITE APARTMENT HOTEL (CLASS C1) WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING, LAND TO EAST OF, THE REEF LEISURE CENTRE, WEYBOURNE ROAD, SHERINGHAM FOR MORSTON PALATINE LTD

The SPO introduced the Officers report and recommendation for approval subject to

conditions. He noted was deferred at the 23rd March Development Committee meeting pending Members request for greater clarity on renewable energy provision and surface water drainage.

The SPO affirmed the sites location, the proposals relationship within its wider setting and context within the AONB. He detailed the proposed site plans and elevations, noting efforts made by the developer to marry the proposal with the adjacent Reef Leisure Centre with respect of scale and material pallet. Officers determined that the design was acceptable and would work well in conjunction with the Reef to nicely frame the entrance to Sheringham.

With regards to those matters cited as reasons for deferral, the SPO highlighted the additional information submitted with respect of surface water drainage. The Lead Local Flood Authority had reviewed the revised strategy and subsequently raise no objection to the proposal 'subject to a build-to condition being attached to any consent' which would ensure compliance with the submitted specification and details.

An Energy Statement had also been submitted following the March deferment, with the developer committing to a series of measures outlined in the Officers report (p.32 of the Agenda), which Officers advised they were satisfied would ensure compliance with Policy EN6 of the Adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy.

The SPO reiterated the Officers recommendation subject to the outlined conditions, and any others considered necessary by the Assistant Director for Planning.

Public Speakers

None

Members Questions and Debate

- i. Cllr L Withington – Member for Sheringham North, speaking on behalf of the Local Members in the adjoining Sheringham South Ward, readdressed her concerns relayed at the March meeting. She affirmed that the local community remained concerned about the economic impact of the business model, and the loss of employment land which could offer greater employment opportunities. Cllr L Withington commented that Sheringham had a limited amount of designated employment land (6 hectares) which meant this land was especially precious.

In terms of design, Cllr L Withington stated the 'art-deco' design was not in keeping with the neighbouring Reef complex, which had been recognised nationally for its design merits, and would be out of character with the wider Edwardian seaside town, dominating the nearby golf course. Further, Cllr L Withington considered the important position the site forms as the physical and visual gateway to the Town and to the AONB.

Cllr L Withington expressed concerns over the practicalities of development and access to the site by HGVs across the porous Reef car park, and commented that this was not currently permissible due to concerns regarding potential damage to the surface. Further, any damage to the sub-system would be a considerable cost to the Council as land owner to put right. If developed access to the site would remain an issue, with concern that HGVs would therefore need to unload on the main road. Cllr L Withington reflected

on the development at nearby Westwood site and the lack of a traffic management plan which had resulted in disruption on the main road, especially as the site was located before the 30 mph zone.

- ii. The DM advised, with regards to the risk of traversing the existing Reef carpark by HGVs and potentially damaging the surface, that this was not a direct planning consideration, rather it was a civil matter between the Council (as owners of the car park) and the developer to agree how any remediation would be secured should the access way be damaged.
- iii. Cllr J Toye sought clarification about the 'building management system'. The SPO confirmed that the full details were available in the energy statement, aspects of which would include smart lighting i.e. automatic lighting not requiring human intervention.
- iv. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle spoke positively of improvements to the proposal's carbon footprint following deferment in March, however questioned the composition of disabled parking with two of the three spaces being also designated for electric vehicles. He asked if there was scope to increase the number to disabled parking spaces (not EV spaces), as he considered the proposed provision limited.
- v. The DM affirmed that the Council have adopted car parking standards, which the proposal accorded with. He confirmed that, at present, there was no policy on mandatory electric car charging, and those EV spaces offered by the applicant was on a voluntarily. The DM advised that neither Highways nor NNDC Officers had objected to the proposal with respect of parking matters.
- vi. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett proposed acceptance of the Officers recommendation, and stated she was content that the concerns raised at the March meeting had been addressed, particularly with respect of surface water drainage, but stressed the importance that conditions regarding surface water be tightly controlled. Additionally, whilst Cllr A Fitch-Tillett agreed that whilst the proposal was policy compliant, the provision of disabled parking and EV charging was limited.
- vii. Cllr V Holliday supported the representation made by Cllr L Withington with respect of the loss of employment land. She sought clarification over the status of the apartments and whether they would be classed as second homes, something which she contended would be a sad reflection on the district's housing stock. Further, Cllr V Holliday asked if consideration had been given to the use of 'smart' glazing, given the site was located next to the AONB. She concluded that the carbon footprint of the development did not align with NNDC's Carbon Neutrality pledge (with the potential to produce 17.76 tons of CO₂ per annum), and references to the development complying with these aspirations were disingenuous.
- viii. The DM advised that it would not be permitted for the apartments to be used as second homes, and that this expectation had been clearly communicated with applicant. The units would not have the individual amenity space expected for a dwelling, and would be designated use class C1 (for hotel use). With respect of the ownership model, the DM advised this would be complaint with policy in principle, and confirmed this model had been used elsewhere in the country. The use of proposed conditions would restrict the

number of letting days per person per annum to 31 days, which would ensure the properties were not used as primary or secondary residences. The DM set out the intention of the business model was for visitors to come to the area and by extension contribute to the local economy. He noted that any form of tourism coming into the district would have some form of carbon impact from travel, and therefore it would be highly unlikely to have a zero carbon position on tourism.

- ix. Cllr A Brown asked if there had been any further discussion over installing solar car ports.
- x. The SPO advised that the developer was largely content with their application, including solar array on the roof, and other measures outlined in the report. These measures ensured compliance with policy EN6 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy. The scope for a solar car port, whilst possible, did not form part of the proposal presented for consideration.
- xi. The DM noted that the solar car port being constructed at the adjacent Reef site, did not form part of the initial application and was a retrofit. He reiterated comments from the SPO, and affirmed that this was not included in the application.
- xii. Cllr A Brown stated that although he was minded to approve the application, it was disappointing that the site could not be developed for greater employment opportunities or for social housing. Further, he considered the design lacking, stating it did not make use of vernacular materials.
- xiii. Cllr T Adams asked if the occupancy restriction was a standard condition for this type of accommodation.
- xiv. The DM stated that whilst this type of accommodation was new to the district, perceived problems could be managed through appropriate conditions. He acknowledged Member's concerns that the model may encourage people to use the apartments as second homes, however Officers considered that the conditions would dissuade such action and would provide the Authority the tools ensure enforcement.
- xv. Cllr K Toye reflected on the site's immediate setting and considered the proposal would accord with the adjacent Reef Leisure complex, to construct a more traditional style building would not work in this setting. Cllr K Toye questioned the demand for this business model, noting the tourist accommodation offering in Sheringham was comprised largely of small hotels and B&B's.
- xvi. The Chairman affirmed that there was a growing demand for self-contained holiday accommodation, and that traditional B & B's were less popular with tourists.
- xvii. Cllr P Fisher asked how many jobs would be created through the proposal. He drew comparisons with Henries Garage in Sheringham which is of a similar footprint but which employs around half a dozen people. The DM advised 3 part-time positions were expected to be generated.
- xviii. Cllr L Withington was uncertain that the conditions would prevent individuals from using the apartments as second homes if they were able to stay in them.

for 96 days.

- xix. The DM advised it would be conditioned that no individual could stay in the apartment for more than 31 days per annum. This would dissuade individuals from booking the apartments for continued periods.
- xx. Cllr V Holliday asked how the lettings would be monitored. The DM advised this would be a matter for the planning enforcement team. It would be conditioned that a register of lettings be maintained and made available to the enforcement team as required.
- xxi. The PL noted that on page 28 of the Agenda that the recommendation was for 96 days occupancy. The SPO confirmed that Officers had since reflected on the application and considered a 31 day condition more appropriate. This was more reasonable to control, aligned with other tourist accommodation conditions in the district, and reflected the intention for regular turnover. The DM confirmed that the condition would be for a maximum of 31 days occupancy per annum for any one individual.
- xxii. Cllr L Vickers asked if the developer was confident that the business model was viable with the 31 day restriction.
- xxiii. The DM advised that the applicant had applied for a C1 class hotel, and it was therefore expected that individuals would not stay on the site for long periods of time. Officers had received nothing from the applicant which expressed that they considered the application (and conditions) unviable.
- xxiv. The Chairman asked, should there be a breach of the occupancy, if it would be the owner of the apart-hotel site, or the owner of the individual units who enforcement would pursue. The DM advised this would be anyone with an interest in the land, and likely the apartment owner.
- xxv. Cllr A Brown expressed concern that the 31 day restriction may be open to abuse from individuals staying with family members who then change name of primary occupier every month. He asked how conditions would be applied and enforced to mitigate such issues.
- xxvi. The DM affirmed that should individuals abuse the process, then the enforcement team would investigate and take action accordingly. If individuals were using the apartments as a second home, this would constitute a material change of use and would be something the Authority would frown upon.
- xxvii. Cllr J Toye asked if it could be conditioned that vehicle registration plates were recorded for all those staying on site, as this would aid in monitoring whether the same person or persons were attending the site, effectively breaching 31 day condition.
- xxviii. The DM advised he would seek to add this as a condition, and noted it was not unusual for hotels to take license plate details from guests on arrival.
- xxix. Cllr G Mancini- Boyle seconded the Officers recommendation.

IT WAS RESOLVED by 11 votes for, 1 against and 1 abstention.

That Planning Application PF/22/1660 be APPROVED in line with the Officers recommendation. Final wording of conditions to be delegated to the Assistant Director for Planning.

7 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE

- i. The DM introduced the Development Management performance update and spoke positively of the team's performance both in respect of Major and Non-Major Performance, and which was above national averages. He stated that the Council had a strong appeal record which is reflective of good decisions being reached by Officers and Members.
- ii. The Chairman and Cllr A Brown thanked Officers for their continued hard work during challenging times.
- iii. The PL updated members on outstanding S106 agreements and advised that she regularly was in contact, and putting pressure on Norfolk County Council to progress the traffic order required in the Crisp Maltings agreement.

8 APPEALS SECTION

- i. The DM introduced the Appeals report and advised that the Appeals for Arcady had concluded with the Planning Inspector deciding to dismiss the appeal in the main. He advised the Applicant had 6 weeks to challenge the decision (via the courts). The DM stated this had been a long and drawn out process, one which had garnered local and national interest.
- ii. The Chairman thanked Officers for their work and spoke in support of the Councils good record at appeals.
- iii. The DM reflected that the Appeals list was lengthy, and that this was a reflection of recruitment issues within the Planning Inspectorate. He acknowledged that this ongoing situation was challenging for appellants who were required to wait for hearings and decisions beyond intended timeframes.

9 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

None.

The meeting ended at 10.35 am.

Chairman

Registering interests

Within 28 days of becoming a member or your re-election or re-appointment to office you must register with the Monitoring Officer the interests which fall within the categories set out in **Table 1 (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests)** which are as described in "The Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012". You should also register details of your other personal interests which fall within the categories set out in **Table 2 (Other Registerable Interests)**.

"Disclosable Pecuniary Interest" means an interest of yourself, or of your partner if you are aware of your partner's interest, within the descriptions set out in Table 1 below.

"Partner" means a spouse or civil partner, or a person with whom you are living as husband or wife, or a person with whom you are living as if you are civil partners.

1. You must ensure that your register of interests is kept up-to-date and within 28 days of becoming aware of any new interest, or of any change to a registered interest, notify the Monitoring Officer.
2. A 'sensitive interest' is as an interest which, if disclosed, could lead to the councillor, or a person connected with the councillor, being subject to violence or intimidation.
3. Where you have a 'sensitive interest' you must notify the Monitoring Officer with the reasons why you believe it is a sensitive interest. If the Monitoring Officer agrees they will withhold the interest from the public register.

Non participation in case of disclosable pecuniary interest

4. Where a matter arises at a meeting which directly relates to one of your Disclosable Pecuniary Interests as set out in **Table 1**, you must disclose the interest, not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation. If it is a 'sensitive interest', you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest, just that you have an interest. Dispensation may be granted in limited circumstances, to enable you to participate and vote on a matter in which you have a disclosable pecuniary interest.
5. Where you have a disclosable pecuniary interest on a matter to be considered or is being considered by you as a Cabinet member in exercise of your executive function, you must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest and must not take any steps or further steps in the matter apart from arranging for someone else to deal with it

Disclosure of Other Registerable Interests

6. Where a matter arises at a meeting which **directly relates** to one of your Other Registerable Interests (as set out in **Table 2**), you must disclose the interest. You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting but otherwise must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation. If it is a 'sensitive interest', you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Disclosure of Non-Registerable Interests

7. Where a matter arises at a meeting which **directly relates** to your financial interest or well-being (and is not a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest set out in Table 1) or a financial interest or well-being of a relative or close associate, you must disclose the interest. You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting. Otherwise you must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation. If it is a 'sensitive interest', you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.
8. Where a matter arises at a meeting which **affects** –
 - a. your own financial interest or well-being;
 - b. a financial interest or well-being of a relative, close associate; or
 - c. a body included in those you need to disclose under Other Registrable Interests as set out in **Table 2**

you must disclose the interest. In order to determine whether you can remain in the meeting after disclosing your interest the following test should be applied

9. Where a matter **affects** your financial interest or well-being:
 - a. to a greater extent than it affects the financial interests of the majority of inhabitants of the ward affected by the decision and;
 - b. a reasonable member of the public knowing all the facts would believe that it would affect your view of the wider public interest

You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting. Otherwise you must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation.

If it is a 'sensitive interest', you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

10. Where you have a personal interest in any business of your authority and you have made an executive decision in relation to that business, you must make sure that any written statement of that decision records the existence and nature of your interest.

Table 1: Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

This table sets out the explanation of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests as set out in the [Relevant Authorities \(Disclosable Pecuniary Interests\) Regulations 2012](#).

Subject	Description
Employment, office, trade, profession or vocation	Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain. [Any unpaid directorship.]
Sponsorship	Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from the council) made to the councillor during the previous 12-month period for expenses incurred by him/her in carrying out his/her duties as a councillor, or towards his/her election expenses. This includes any payment or financial benefit from a trade union within the meaning of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992.
Contracts	Any contract made between the councillor or his/her spouse or civil partner or the person with whom the

	<p>councillor is living as if they were spouses/civil partners (or a firm in which such person is a partner, or an incorporated body of which such person is a director* or a body that such person has a beneficial interest in the securities of*) and the council —</p> <p>(a) under which goods or services are to be provided or works are to be executed; and</p> <p>(b) which has not been fully discharged.</p>
Land and Property	<p>Any beneficial interest in land which is within the area of the council.</p> <p>'Land' excludes an easement, servitude, interest or right in or over land which does not give the councillor or his/her spouse or civil partner or the person with whom the councillor is living as if they were spouses/civil partners (alone or jointly with another) a right to occupy or to receive income.</p>
Licenses	<p>Any licence (alone or jointly with others) to occupy land in the area of the council for a month or longer</p>
Corporate tenancies	<p>Any tenancy where (to the councillor's knowledge)—</p> <p>(a) the landlord is the council; and</p> <p>(b) the tenant is a body that the councillor, or his/her spouse or civil partner or the person with whom the councillor is living as if they were spouses/civil partners is a partner of or a director* of or has a beneficial interest in the securities* of.</p>
Securities	<p>Any beneficial interest in securities* of a body where—</p> <p>(a) that body (to the councillor's knowledge) has a place of business or land in the area of the council; and</p> <p>(b) either—</p> <p>(i) the total nominal value of the securities* exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body; or</p> <p>(ii) if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which the councillor, or his/her spouse or civil partner or the person with whom the councillor is living as if they were</p>

	spouses/civil partners has a beneficial interest exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.
--	---

* 'director' includes a member of the committee of management of an industrial and provident society.

* 'securities' means shares, debentures, debenture stock, loan stock, bonds, units of a collective investment scheme within the meaning of the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000 and other securities of any description, other than money deposited with a building society.

Table 2: Other Registrable Interests

You have a personal interest in any business of your authority where it relates to or is likely to affect:

- a) any body of which you are in general control or management and to which you are nominated or appointed by your authority
- b) any body
 - (i) exercising functions of a public nature
 - (ii) any body directed to charitable purposes or
 - (iii) one of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union)



CROMER – PF/22/3010 - Demolition of former bandstand and storage building; Redevelopment of former tennis courts consisting of erection of 2no. Public toilet buildings, community shed building, polytunnel and associated fencing containing horticultural hub, 2no. curved walls with canopy for entertainment space, multi-use space for pop-up market stalls/leisure activities and associated on-site car/cycle parking, vehicular and pedestrian access points, at North Lodge Park Overstrand Road, Cromer.

Other Minor Development

- Target Date: 2nd March 2023

- Extension of time 23rd June 2023

Case Officer: Miss A Walker

Full Planning Permission

RELEVANT SITE CONSTRAINTS:

Within Settlement Boundary of Cromer

Within Cromer Conservation Area

Open Land Area

Public Realm Area

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

PF/16/0552

Removal of existing shelter, re-location of shelter for use as band-stand and erection of storage shed to North Lodge Park, Cromer

Approved 05/07/2016

QF/85/1898

Retail craft shop deemed permission

Approved 10/01/1986

THE APPLICATION

The application seeks the demolition of the former bandstand and storage building and the redevelopment of former tennis courts. The proposal consists of the erection of two new public toilets, a community shed, a polytunnel and associated fencing to contain a horticultural hub, two curved walls with a canopy above for an entertainment space, a multi-use space for pop-up market stalls/leisure activities and associated on-site car/cycle parking, vehicular and pedestrian access points at North Lodge Park, Overstrand Road, Cromer.

REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE:

Under Section 6.2, Note 4a of the Councils constitution, as the application is made by the Town Council on land owned by the District Council and has received representations in objection, it shall be determined by Development Committee.

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL:

Cromer Town Council – No response received.

CONSULTATIONS:

NNDC Landscape Officer – **No objection**, subject to the following comments:

‘The proposed re-use and animation of this redundant area of North Lodge Park is to be welcomed in principle.

The Park is a valued green space within the town and is designated as Open Land Area within the Local Plan. Policy CT1 Open Space Designations states that ‘development will not be permitted on Open Land Area except where it enhances the open character or recreational use of the land’. The Landscape section considers that the flexible community use proposed and the enhancement of a neglected area of the park would comply with this policy requirement.

The two circular toilet pods are bulky structures that do not make efficient use of space and dominate the whole area, particularly overpowering the covered entertainment space. These could be re-designed to be more unobtrusive and occupy far less space, e.g. tucked in behind the existing hedge.

The community shed is a large structure, but with a sedum roof and timber cladding as proposed, will be relatively well assimilated into the south-east corner amongst mature vegetation. The proposed fencing around the horticultural enclosure is appropriate, as is the proposed timber cladding to the two food hub containers.

The enhanced landscape planting in the form of semi-mature trees with under-planting along the south site boundary with Overstrand Road is appropriate. If there is no revision forthcoming of the design of toilet pods, then there should be increased landscape planting around the structures to soften their impact in the wider park, especially on the north side of both pods.

Hard and soft landscape proposals and external lighting details should all be secured by condition.’

Norfolk County Council (Highways) – **No objection**, subject to the following comments:

Initial concerns that the proposed uses would engender an increased use of the narrow, historic, gated access to 'Carriage Drive' which has restricted width, a very tight turning radii and it would be shared with pedestrians who regularly and predominantly use this route.

Increased vehicle movements increases the likelihood of:

- kerb/footpath overrun,
- the risk of conflicts with pedestrians and/or other vehicles within the narrow access,
- vehicles stopping, waiting or reversing onto the C634 Overstrand Road which affects the free flow of traffic and highway safety

The revised proposal to only permit a maximum vehicle size on the site for the pop up markets, which are at a scale which could fall under permitted development (28 days) and would also be limited under the terms of the market permitting only relevant vehicles at specified times and managing this access would significantly reduce any potential impacts subject to

adequate management of the above, would find any objections difficult to substantiate.

NNDC Conservation and Design Officer – No objection, subject to the following comments:

‘With reference to the amended plans received, and in light of the comments previously offered, Conservation & Design can clearly welcome the reduction in the overall length of the entertainment area and the repositioning of the changing places facility so that it is tucked in behind the driveway hedge. With there also being modest gains to be had in terms of cladding the storage containers and in supplementing the planting across the site frontage, the scheme has undoubtedly moved forward in a positive way.

At the same time, however, with essentially the same comparatively high concentration of structures, and with outstanding concerns about the appropriateness of the community shed and polytunnel, it is apparent that some harm would still be caused to the appearance and character of the park, and thus to the setting of the Grade II listed North Lodge Building, and to the overall significance of the Cromer Conservation Area.

In terms of quantifying the level of this harm, clearly the magnitude has been reduced through the changes made. Therefore, whilst it must still be considered ‘less than substantial’ for NPPF purposes, it has unquestionably been reduced on this spectrum. As we know, however, great weight must still be given to the conservation of heritage assets irrespective of the level of harm. Therefore, due consideration still needs to be given to the balancing exercise required under para 202 of this document. However, with the scheme potentially offering a persuasive package of public benefits, it would be understandable if the residual heritage harm were to be set aside in this case.’

Environmental Protection – No objection subject to condition.

Note that no lighting is detailed on the application/proposed plan. Would ask for the following conditions be included, should any subsequent lighting be installed.

E32 Lighting

Prior to the installation of any external lighting, details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting shall thereafter be installed in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Further to my previous comments I just wish to add an advisory note regarding demolition, should it be relevant to the application.

N43 Demolition of Buildings

The applicant/agent is advised that no person should begin demolition of any building that has a cubic content of more than 49.55m³ (1750 cubic feet) unless the Local Authority has first been given notice in accordance with Section 80 of the Building Act 1984, and, either the Local Authority has given notice under Section 81 of the Building Act 1984 or the relevant period has expired. The details to be submitted with the notice shall include a scheme for the method of demolition and means of controlling noise and dust during demolition. Further advice regarding demolition can be sought from the District Council’s Environmental Protection Team.’

Economic Growth Team – Support Application, subject to the following comments:

Have reviewed the application and it is recognised that there are potential economic benefits that would be derived by such a proposal such as supporting local businesses and local supply chain etc. through pop-up markets.

Also recognised that it would provide an additional draw to the eastern end of Cromer, boosting footfall for businesses located on Church Street.'

Historic England - No advice provided, subject to the following comments:

'Historic England provides advice when our engagement can add most value. In this case we are not offering advice but make the following observations. This should not be interpreted as comment on the merits of the application.'

North Lodge Park is an important element of the Cromer Conservation Area. The site is also within the setting of the grade II listed building North Lodge, an early 19th century villa which benefits from the formal gardens around it. You should be satisfied that any development proposals within the park, in particular new buildings, are very carefully considered to ensure that they sustain, or realise opportunities to enhance, the significance of these designated heritage assets.

We suggest that you seek the detailed advice of your specialist conservation advisers in this case.'

REPRESENTATIONS:

Two in **objection** and summarised as follows:

Highways

- Increased vehicle movements within the park
- Vehicular egress from the site is hazardous
- Poor visibility for both drivers and pedestrians on Carriageway Drive
- The proposed market is the cause of a major traffic hazard
- The proposed highways access will not improve safety but make risk more severe
- The proposal does not seek to reduce vehicle movements in the park
- The hazardous location of pedestrian access points

Visual Impact/ Design

- The proposals would not enhance or improve the area
- No visual or design relevance to the existing buildings
- Many of the structures (e.g. timber shed, polytunnel, and canopy) appear to be of low quality and short life expectancy
- The proposals are not the uses the public wanted to see in North Lodge Park from the 2015/16 survey results
- Lots of unsightly structures, better to add one multi-function structure of real long-term value
- Inappropriate location and design of the new public toilets
- Contemporary toilet blocks have no design connection to or visual link with the character of their surroundings
- Risk of people jumping the gap between the flat roofs of the two toilet buildings
- Concerns about the longevity, endurance and suitability of each of these proposed structures
- No proposal to renew or refurbish the hard landscaping

Intended use

- The sale and consumption of alcohol in North Lodge Park should be prohibited
- Without a secure perimeter this site will inevitably be open to vandalism

HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

It is considered that the proposed development may raise issues relevant to

Article 8: The Right to respect for private and family life.

Article 1 of the First Protocol: The right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions.

Having considered the likely impact on an individual's Human Rights, and the general interest of the public, approval of this application as recommended is considered to be justified, proportionate and in accordance with planning law.

CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998 - SECTION 17

The application raises no significant crime and disorder issues.

LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS

Under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the council is required when determining planning applications to have regard to any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application. Local finance considerations are not considered to be material to this case.

RELEVANT POLICIES:

North Norfolk Local Development Framework Core Strategy (September 2008):

Policy SS 1 Spatial Strategy for North Norfolk

Policy SS 5 Economy

Policy SS 6 Access and infrastructure

Policy SS 7 Cromer

Policy EN 2 Protection and enhancement of landscape and settlement character

Policy EN 4 Design

Policy EN 5 Public realm

Policy EN 8 Protecting and enhancing the historic environment

Policy EN 9 Biodiversity and geology

Policy EN 13 Pollution and hazard prevention and minimisation

Policy CT 1 Open space designations

Policy CT 3 Provision and retention of local facilities and services

Policy CT 5 The transport impact of new development

Policy CT 6 Parking provision

Material Considerations:

Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance:

North Norfolk Design Guide (December 2008)

North Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment (January 2021)

North Norfolk Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (January 2021)

National Planning Policy Framework (2021):

Chapter 2 Achieving sustainable development

Chapter 4 Decision-making

Chapter 6 Building a strong, competitive economy

Chapter 8 Promoting healthy and safe communities

Chapter 9 Promoting sustainable transport

Chapter 12 Achieving well-designed places
Chapter 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
Chapter 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Other relevant documents/considerations

National Design Guide (September 2019)

OFFICER ASSESSMENT:

MAIN ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION:

- 1. Principle and Site History**
- 2. Design and Heritage Impacts**
- 3. Landscape and Visual Impacts**
- 4. Residential Amenity**
- 5. Highway Safety**

1. Principle and Site History

The application seeks to redevelop the disused former tennis courts and bandstand area in North Lodge Park, with two new public toilets, a community shed, a polytunnel and associated fencing containing a horticultural hub, an canopied entertainment space, a multi-use space and associated on-site car/cycle parking, vehicular and pedestrian access points.

The site lies within the settlement boundary of Cromer, which is designated as a 'Principal Settlement' by Policy SS 1 and SS 7 of the Adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy where development is supported in principle subject to compliance with all relevant core strategy policies.

North Lodge Park is located to the eastern end of Cromer town centre and is designated as Open Space and Public Realm. Core Strategy Policy CT 1 requires that development will not be permitted in Open Space designations except where it enhances the open character or recreational use of the land. Similarly, Policy CT 5 states that within areas designated as Public Realm proposals will be expected to enhance the overall appearance and usability of the area. Given the dilapidated appearance of the former tennis courts and bandstand building, which have stood unused for some years, the proposal to upgrade and bring the area back into active use would be considered to enhance the sites appearance and usability.

Policy CT 3 provides support for new or improved community facilities within Principle and Secondary Settlements. Cromer is a Principal Settlement with parks being an important local facility. The proposed redevelopment and improvements to the former tennis courts are therefore also supported by this policy in principle.

2. Design and Heritage Impacts

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 (LBCA) states that with respect to any buildings or other land within a conservation area, in the exercise of relevant functions under the Planning Acts, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. In this instance the whole site falls within the Cromer Conservation Area and as such the statutory duty imposed by Section 72 is engaged. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCA) places a duty on Local Planning Authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a Listed Building, or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses. This application site falls within the setting of a number of Listed Buildings.

A site layout plan has been provided in support of the application, along with elevations and visualisations which give an idea of some of the potential uses for the multi-use area. The proposal is made up of several different elements.

Public Toilets

Two new public toilets are proposed as part of the redevelopment to the North-West of the site with one unit being a Changing Places & Accessible toilet facility and the other a Male & Female toilet facility. Both toilets are single storey and circular in design, clad with vertical cedar cladding with an overhanging circular flat roof. The Male and Female toilet block features a glazed polycarbonate roof and the Changing Places block would use a sedum covering with roof lanterns providing natural light.

The structures, whilst contemporary in their aesthetic, are considered compatible to their surroundings in terms of scale and materials. Conservation and Design Officers consider the structures would also have a stylish simplicity which is what one would expect within a park. The materials palette in time, would also have a recessive quality and would be compatible and respectful of their historic setting. Following consultation from C&D Officers the toilet blocks were moved further into the site, enclosing them within the driveway hedge.

Entertainment Space

The concept of creating an entertainment space is considered entirely appropriate within this parkland setting. The former bandstand currently occupying the site is considered an accessory to the 'principal' Grade II listed North Lodge building and is not of special architectural or historic interest. The proposed entertainment space is again modern in design, with two curved walls clad with vertical cedar cladding set on a brick plinth and a canopy supported by four metal stays. Following a consultation response from Conservation and Design, the original plans for the entertainment space were reduced in height and length, an amendment which has been welcomed in order for the structure to complement the existing parkland buildings which are relatively modest and subservient in scale and do not challenge the primacy of the main listed building.

Multi-Use Area

The remaining central area of hardstanding is to remain and made good to allow it to play host to a number of flexible community uses. The applicant has provided visuals to demonstrate an example of such uses and includes outdoor exercise classes and sports, concerts and a pop-up market. Improving the appearance of the hardstanding which is currently run down would visually enhance the area and the accessibility of the site. The pop-up market is

intended for occasional use, with a maximum of two pop-up markets per month akin to the number allowed under permitted development. A small amount of parking has been provided on the site to allow vendors to set up stalls and bring goods to the site. The details of how this will be managed have been provided within a Traffic Management Plan for the site.

Horticultural hub

A horticultural hub is proposed along the eastern boundary of the site for the applicants to create a community-based plant growing operation, involving local groups using the growing and nurturing of plants to aid well-being and mindfulness. The Hub is formed by a 10m x 6m Polytunnel and enclosed with 1.8 high 'V' Mesh Security fencing. Officers have raised concerns about the appropriateness of a polytunnel within such a sensitive location. However, the temporary nature and low physical impact of the structure lends itself to flexibility and can be easily removed if the need were to no longer exist such that concerns about appropriateness could be set aside.. Additional planting has been added along the eastern boundary of the site to soften the visual impact of the polytunnel within the wider park setting. Whilst there is considered to be some heritage harm resulting from this element of the proposal and having regard to the NPPF, such harm is considered to be less than substantial and would need to be weighed against the public benefits accruing from the scheme.

Community Shed

As with the Polytunnel there are some concerns about the scale and appropriateness of the structure, which is a large timber shed measuring c.12.5 metres long with a gable width of c.8.5 metres, it would therefore be a comparatively large structure within its setting with a very functional appearance. However, the roof has been softened visually with a lightweight sedum blanket to help reduce its impact, Sedum roofs are often very heavy and would need appropriate structural support, however the agent has confirmed that this lightweight version could be supported by the shed structure. Officers consider the shed will therefore be relatively well assimilated into the south-east corner amongst mature vegetation. As with the Polytunnel the temporary nature and low physical impact of the building lend itself to flexibility. The shed has been screened to the south and east by additional planting and therefore whilst there would be some heritage harm resulting from this structure, it would be at the lower end of the scale and would need to be weighed against the public benefits accruing from the scheme.

Food Banks

Two standard shipping containers, to be clad horizontally to match that of the Community Shed, are proposed to the south-west of the site in order to provide food banks for local people to collect food from. Whilst shipping containers are very utilitarian in appearance, the timber cladding will soften over time to give them a more recessive appearance as it silvers.

Summary

Whilst the amendments made to the scheme have been positive and have reduced the impact of several elements within the park, there is still a comparatively high concentration of structures and it is apparent therefore that some level of harm would still be caused to the appearance and character of the park, and thus to the setting of the Grade II listed North Lodge Building, and to the overall significance of the Cromer Conservation Area.

In terms of quantifying the level of this harm, it must still be considered 'less than substantial' for NPPF purposes and Conservation and Design Officers consider that it has unquestionably

been reduced on this spectrum following revisions. However, great weight must still be given to the conservation of heritage assets and the harm identified will need to be weighed in the planning balance against public benefits.

3. Landscape and Visual Impacts

The Park is a valued green space within the town and is designated as Open Land Area within the Local Plan. Policy CT 1 Open Space Designations states that 'development will not be permitted on Open Land Areas except where it enhances the open character or recreational use of the land'. Officers consider that the flexible community use proposed and the enhancement of a neglected area of the park would comply with this policy requirement.

In terms of Landscaping and wider visual impacts of the scheme, the hard landscaping would remain the same, with the current surfacing made good where disturbed and jet washed. The applicant has stated that when further funding becomes available, a new porous surface to replace the existing would be laid. The details of which can be controlled by condition.

In terms of soft landscaping, additional boundary planting is proposed along Overstrand Road and the site plan shows a central circular planting bed and beds surrounding the entertainment area to be maintained by the Friends of North Lodge Park. Officers consider enhanced landscape planting in the form of semi-mature trees with under-planting along the south site boundary with Overstrand Road is appropriate and would also help deliver biodiversity net gains within the park.

4. Residential Amenity

Core Strategy Policy EN 4 supports development proposals where they would not have a significantly detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of nearby occupiers. There are several private properties within the park and a number along Overstrand Road who overlook the Park.

Policy EN 5 requires that within areas designated as Public Realm proposals will be expected to enhance the overall appearance and usability of the area, the proposed alterations and improvements including the provision of accessible Public toilets are considered to have both public and operational benefits by increasing the sites usability and enhancing the facilities available.

Environmental Protection Officers were consulted and offered no objection to the scheme subject to any external lighting details being secured via condition. Given the intended uses, the frequency of use and the hours of operation there is not considered to be any significant detrimental impact in terms of noise, lighting, overlooking or overbearing.

As such, it is considered that subject to the proposed conditions, the proposed development would broadly comply with the requirements of Policies EN 4, EN 5 and EN 13 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy in respect of protecting residential amenity.

5. Highway Safety

Highways access to the site would be via Carriage Drive from Overstrand Road with vehicular

access to the site controlled with 1.2m high five bar lockable gates. Seven Parking spaces are shown on the site plan which are intended to be used for occasional pop-up markets to be held in the multi-use area. The Traffic management Plan submitted states the parking would not be for general use and would only be available to stall holders when setting up and vehicles would have to remain until the event has finished. Vehicular access will be restricted to arrival before 8.00 am, and leave after 4.00pm (depending on the duration of market) where vendors will be encouraged to arrive and depart within a limited time slot of 30 minutes and vehicle movements during these times will be marshalled.

As presented initially, Highways officers were concerned that the proposed uses would engender an increased use of the narrow gated access to 'Carriage Drive' which has restricted width, a very tight turning radii and it would be shared with pedestrians who regularly and predominantly use this route.

However, the revised scheme proposes to only permit a maximum vehicle size on the site for the pop up markets, which are proposed at a scale and frequency which could fall under permitted development. Traffic movements would also be limited under the terms of the submitted Traffic Management Plan, permitting only relevant vehicles at specified times and marshalling the access on entry, exit and parking. Highways Officers consider that this would significantly reduce any potential impacts subject to adequate management.

Officers consider that the proposal accords with the aims of Core Strategy Policies CT 5 and CT 6.

Conclusion and Planning Balance

Harm has been identified in terms of impact on the setting of heritage assets (North Lodge) and the Cromer Conservation area given the concentration and appearance of structures within the Parkland setting. However, there are a number of public benefits associated with the proposal including:

- the revitalisation and improvements to a currently unused area of the park in order to facilitate new public toilets; and
- a number of flexible community uses to help ensure the future viability of the park.

As such, it is considered that the public benefits of the proposal would significantly outweigh the identified harm to heritage assets.

In all other respects, subject to conditions, the development is considered to accord with the relevant policies of the adopted Development Plan as listed above. No consultees have raised objections to the proposals.

The issues raised in letters of representation received (summarised above) following publicity and consultation carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), have been considered. They do not raise material considerations which outweigh the recommendation to approve.

RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVAL subject to conditions to cover the matters listed below (and any others subsequently considered necessary by the Assistant Director – Planning):

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

Reason for the condition

As required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents, except as may be required by specific condition(s) and as listed below:

Reason for condition

To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the expressed intentions of the applicant and to ensure the satisfactory development of the site, in accordance with Policies EN 2, EN 4 and EN 8 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy

3. The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in accordance with the details submitted in the application.

Reason for condition

To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development in accordance with Policy EN 4 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy.

4. Prior to replacement of the hardstanding details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The hardstanding shall thereafter be installed in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason for condition

To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development in accordance with Policy EN 4 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy.

5. Prior to the installation of any external lighting, details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting shall thereafter be installed in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason for condition

To ensure that the development minimises light pollution and reduces glare, in the interests of highway safety, and to minimise the potential impact on biodiversity in accordance with sections 12 and 15 of the NPPF, and policies EN 2, EN 9, EN 13 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy.

6. The pop-up market use proposed shall only be held a maximum of twice per month in any given year and open to members of the public between the hours of 07:30 and 17:00.

Reason for condition

In the interests of Highway Safety and residential amenity in accordance with CT5 and EN 13 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy.

7. The means of vehicular access to and egress from the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Traffic Management Plan received on 05/06/23.

Reason for condition

In the interests of highway safety and traffic movement in accordance with Policy CT 5 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy.

8. No development shall commence until a scheme for hard and soft landscape proposals has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The proposals shall include plans at no less than 1:200 showing the following details:

Proposed Soft Landscape Details

- a) existing trees, shrubs and hedgerows on the site, indicating those to be removed
- b) accurate plotting of those to be retained (including species and canopy spread), including measures for protection during the course of the development to BS5837:2012
- c) Details of all new planting including: species, location, number and size of new trees and shrubs
- d) Measures for protection of new planting

Proposed Hard Landscape Details

- e) Surface materials for vehicle and pedestrian areas
- f) Boundary treatments, including fencing, walling, etc

Implementation and Retention

- g) An implementation programme laying out a timescale for the completion of all landscape works
- h) A landscape management plan, stating management responsibilities and a schedule of retention and monitoring operations for all landscaped areas for a minimum of five ten years following implementation.

Reason for condition

To protect and enhance the visual amenities of the area, in accordance with the requirements of Policy EN 4 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy.

8. No development shall commence until a Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason for condition

To protect and enhance the visual amenities of the area, in accordance with the requirements of Policy EN 4 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy.

9. No removal of hedgerows, trees or shrubs, or works to, or demolition of, buildings or structures that may contain breeding birds shall take place on or between the 1st March to 31st August, inclusive, in any calendar year.

Reason for the condition

In accordance with the requirements of Policy EN 9 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy and paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and for the

undertaking of the council's statutory function under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006).

10. Prior to demolition of the existing bandstand the soffits shall be removed by hand.

Reason for the condition

In accordance with the requirements of Policy EN 9 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy.

Final wording of conditions to be delegated to the Assistant Director – Planning

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTHREPPS – PF/22/1708 - Siting of 2 glamping pods for holiday use and creation of permissive footpath at Shrublands Farm Camping Site, Craft Lane, Northrepps.

Minor Development

- Target Date: 9th September 2022

- Extension of time 23rd June 2023

Case Officer: Miss A Walker

Full Planning Permission

RELEVANT SITE CONSTRAINTS:

Countryside

Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

Landscape Character Area Type RV6 (River Valley)

County Wildlife Site – Templewood Estate

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

PF/21/2263

Siting of four glamping pods for holiday use at Shrublands Farm Camping Site

Refused by Committee 17.12.2021

PF/92/0781

Siting of 5 self-contained holiday lodges (Land Part of Shrublands Farm, Church Street Northrepps)

Refused 30.07.1992

Appeal Dismissed 07.01.1993

THE APPLICATION

Is a resubmission of PF/21/2263 and seeks full planning permission for the siting of 2 no. self-contained curved timber glamping pods to be constructed on a rectangular parcel of land at Shrublands Farm on Craft Lane to the south of Northrepps village.

The two glamping pods are currently in use unlawfully, without the benefit of planning permission within the applicant's farm site on Hungary Hill. This application is therefore seeking to relocate and regularise the pods.

The glamping pods would be arranged informally with each pod providing self-contained holiday accommodation including bedroom, bathroom and kitchen facilities, and measuring approximately 3.3 metres in width, 7.2m in length, with a maximum height of 2.8 metres. On-site parking would be provided to the front of each pod, along with an area of decking proposed to the north of each pod, with indicative details provided. Since its submission to the March Committee of this year, members should be made aware a permissive footpath is also proposed to run along the eastern side of Craft Lane on the applicants land, providing a footpath into the centre of Northrepps village.

The application site is currently used as a 'Certified' Caravanning and Camping Site to the east of Craft Lane which allows the site to be used all year round for up to 5 Caravans and 10 tents at any one time and each may stay for a period of up to 28 days. To the north-west of the site lies a parcel of grassed land within the Applicants ownership. Access to the glamping

Pods would be via an existing forked vehicular access off Craft Lane, currently used to serve the Certified site.

REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE:

At the request of Councillor Fitch-Tillett who confirmed support for the application for the following reasons.

In respect of harm to the AONB it is my understanding that these pods will be serviced (by this I assume you mean cleaned and topped up with provisions as required) and as Vice Chairman of the Norfolk Coast Partnership, one of our policies is to entice tourism away from the hot spots and this would seem to comply with this. Any additional potential light pollution can be controlled by condition.

In respect of the dangers of traffic in Craft Lane, I understand that the applicant will be providing a footpath link from within the site to link to the paved part of Craft Lane thus making a safe pedestrian access to the village centre. It is to be noted that Craft Lane is served by the OurBus service taking passengers to either North Walsham or Cromer. This site is infinitely preferable for access than the current siting at the top of Hungry Hill.

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL:

Northrepps Parish Council – Fully Support

CONSULTATIONS:

NNDC Landscape Officer – **Object** to the proposal for the following reasons:

‘The proposed installation of 2 permanent glamping pods for year round use (as stated on the Shrublands Farm website) within this exempted camping site at Shrublands Farm within the Norfolk Coast AONB and designated Countryside raises significant policy conflict.

It is understood that the wider Shrublands campsite offering tented pitches, motorhomes, caravans and shepherd huts and glamping pods from March to November has no formal planning permission and operates under the 28-day exempted site legislation. Given this context, the current proposal for two glamping pods must be considered as a new tourist facility, engaging Local Plan Policy EC10 Static and Touring Caravan and Camping Sites. This policy clearly states that new tourist facilities will not be permitted within the Norfolk Coast AONB due to the landscape impact and additional visitor pressure that may result. Given the site location within the AONB this raises a principle policy conflict.

The site is located off Craft Lane, a small, narrow rural lane that connects Northrepps to Southrepps, via Frogshall, and is wholly within the Norfolk Coast AONB. The road is typical of the quiet rural lanes that are prevalent in this part of the District and is itself part of a Sustrans Cycle route. The site is located within the River Valleys Landscape Character Type (North Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment, LCA, January 2021, SPD), specifically within Mundesley Beck (RV6), and is characteristic of the valued features and qualities of the defined Landscape Type. For example, small field sizes that provide an intimacy and a strong sense of place on the valley floor, woodland edge

and sense of rurality and historical continuity.

The increase in domestic tourism and the demand for new facilities and infrastructure (including camping and glamping sites) is cited as a key force for change for the landscape type, which can increase traffic levels, recreation pressure and light pollution, all of which detract from the prevailing landscape character.

Although any wider visual impact would be relatively contained by the enclosed wooded setting around the pods, the permanent structures would be visible in the winter months. This, together with the increased human activity, light spill and vehicle movements that the development would generate year-round would not conserve or enhance the valued features of the Landscape Type or the defined special qualities of the Norfolk Coast AONB, particularly 'a sense of remoteness, tranquillity and wildness'. The development would not conserve or enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of this designated landscape, as required under para 176 of the NPPF, and to which 'great weight' should be afforded in the planning balance. For the same reasons, and as set out above, the development would conflict with Local Plan Policy EN2: Protection and Enhancement of Landscape and Settlement Character and Local Plan Policy EN1: Norfolk Coast AONB and the Broads.

The Landscape section therefore conclude that any economic benefits resulting from this development are not outweighed by the considerable national and local policy conflict, particularly in relation to the designated landscape of the AONB.

No further response was provided to the amended plans/ description of the 18th April 2023.

Norfolk County Council (Highways) – **Object** to the proposal for the following reasons:

"I note that this is a revised application to [application reference: PF/21/2263] with the number of proposed glamping pods reduced from four to two. I attach below my comments in relation to that application:-

'Further to my response to your Authority of the 21 September 2021 I have been made aware that this overall site has only permission for camping units based upon a Certificated Camping licence granted under the Camping & Caravan Act rather than via any Planning consents.

Accordingly the agents suggestion that these glamping pods will replace existing camping units is flawed in that any additional units, above that allowed under the Certificate' would appear to have been unlawfully accommodated on the site. There is also no suggestion that the camping allocation granted under the Certificated Camping licence would be given up should this application be allowed.

I also have been made aware of a previous similar application [application reference: PF/92/0781] on this site that was refused and dismissed at Appeal (T/APP/Y2620/A/92/212496/P5) with the reasons for dismissal being in part related to highway matters.

I include below a copy of part of the Appeal Inspectors assessment which again reflects the current situation regarding the vehicular access route to the site:-

'Turning to the second main issue, I saw that Craft Lane is a single track road with limited opportunities for vehicles to pass each other. It is also without footways and is unlit.

A small number of dwellings to the north-west and the southeast of the appeal site take access from the lane. In my view Craft Lane provides a poor access to the present caravan site because of the restricted width and the length. I appreciate that the present use by the Caravan Club is permitted development and therefore outside the control of the Council and the Highway Authority. You argue that the proposed development would generate less traffic than the present use of the site because the occupiers of the proposed lodges would be less inclined to leave the site.

I do not find this to be a compelling argument. I would expect a greater use of the site over a longer period as a consequence of the permanency of the lodges.

Moreover, it is reasonable to expect that visitors would wish to avail themselves of the wide range of tourist attractions and the quality of the landscape no less than the occupiers of caravans. In my opinion the proposal would lead to a greater use of the lane.

This could cause a degree of inconvenience, particularly for nearby residents who regularly use the lane. Moreover, because of the absence of footways and street lighting, an increase in traffic flows would add to the dangers faced by pedestrians. I conclude that the proposed development would, as a consequence of increased traffic, cause a deterioration in highway safety'.

The present proposal, on the basis that any camping/caravan units to be replaced are unlawful, is therefore detrimental to highway safety on the approach road to the site and should be refused for the following reason:-'

(SHCR 07) The road. Craft Lane (C292), serving the site is considered to be inadequate to serve the development proposed, by reason of its poor alignment / restricted width / lack of passing provision / restricted visibility at adjacent road junctions and lack of pedestrian facilities. The proposal, if permitted, would be likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to highway safety. Contrary to Development Plan Policies.

In the absence of definitive evidence that any mitigating reduction of existing lawful camping accommodation will result, the proposal must be seen as increasing the traffic use of the narrow and severely sub-standard Craft Lane and I must therefore recommend the application for refusal as before.'

In response to amended plans/ description:

'As alluded to in my earlier response letter, which recommends refusal of this application, should this application be evidenced and able to be conditioned to remove a commensurate scale of existing lawful camping accommodation from the site which is served from Craft Lane then I would be in a position to remove the present recommendation.'

Norfolk Coast Partnership – Confirmed they neither object to nor support the application. Comments as follows;

“Our original concerns as to the growth of the site remains, the pods will be more of a permanent feature in the landscape albeit well screened. The actual physical impact of the pods on the landscape and AONB may be negligible. However there will be added cars on site as well as potential light pollution if not mitigated and movement creating visual disturbance.

EC 10 states ' Extension of, or intensification of, existing static caravan sites (including replacement with woodland lodges) and touring caravan / camping sites will only be permitted where the proposal: conclusively demonstrates a very high standard of design and landscaping and minimal adverse impact on its surroundings; is appropriate when considered against the other policies of the plan'. This was the main reason for refusal at the last submission and I suspect will be the same for this proposal even though the number has reduced. I don't feel I can fully support the proposal as it will not 'conserve and enhance' the AONB in line with NPPF para 176 and there are questions around EC3 and EC7 and being fully compliant.

However it is difficult to object given the precedent of other development on the site. In landscape terms and looking at the proposal as it stands I don't believe there will be a significant impact on the AONB however in terms of Local Plan policy there is a direct conflict and Highways have also objected.

The buildings are relatively modest and screened therefore if approved we would not want to see additional infrastructure on site or sub urbanisation of the area with artificial boundary treatments etc. We would also ask that no external lighting is included to safeguard our dark skies, a special feature of the AONB.”

No further response was provided to the amended plans/ description of the 18th April 2023.

Environmental Protection - Provided no comment

Economic Growth Team - **Support** the application and provide the following comments as follows;

‘The Economic Growth Team has reviewed the application and further discussed the proposal with the applicant.

The proposed erection of 2 glamping pods will complement the farm’s existing camp site and provide an all year offer to visitors. This is key to providing the farm with a degree of economic sustainability outside of the peak summer holiday period and strengthen the resilience of the business.

The Economic Growth Team recognises the importance of the applicant’s business in contributing to the north Norfolk visitor economy. It recognises that there are potential economic benefits that would be derived by such a proposal – such as supporting the local supply chain, local spend from visitors, supporting local businesses etc.’

REPRESENTATIONS:

One public representation received, neither objecting nor supporting the application. However comments were submitted relating to

- Management of the hedge and tree boundary between the property and the site
- Restricting months of footpath use.

HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

It is considered that the proposed development may raise issues relevant to

Article 8: The Right to respect for private and family life.

Article 1 of the First Protocol: The right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions.

Having considered the likely impact on an individual's Human Rights, and the general interest of the public, refusal of this application as recommended is considered to be justified, proportionate and in accordance with planning law.

CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998 - SECTION 17

The application raises no significant crime and disorder issues.

LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS

Under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the council is required when determining planning applications to have regard to any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application. Local finance considerations are not considered to be material to this case.

RELEVANT POLICIES:

North Norfolk Local Development Framework Core Strategy (September 2008):

Policy SS 1 Spatial Strategy for North Norfolk

Policy SS 2 Development in the Countryside

Policy SS 4 Environment

Policy SS 5 Economy

Policy SS 6 Access and infrastructure

Policy EN 1 Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and The Broads

Policy EN 2 Protection and enhancement of landscape and settlement character

Policy EN 4 Design

Policy EN 9 Biodiversity and geology

Policy EN 13 Pollution and hazard prevention and minimisation

Policy EC 1 Farm Diversification

Policy EC 3 Extensions to existing businesses in the Countryside

Policy EC 7 Location of New Tourism Development

Policy EC 10 Static and Touring Caravan and Camping Sites

Policy CT 5 The transport impact of new development

Policy CT 6 Parking provision

Material Considerations:

Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance:

North Norfolk Design Guide (December 2008)

North Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment (January 2021)

North Norfolk Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (January 2021)

National Planning Policy Framework (2021):

Chapter 2 Achieving sustainable development

Chapter 4 Decision-making

Chapter 6 Building a strong, competitive economy
Chapter 9 Promoting sustainable transport
Chapter 12 Achieving well-designed places
Chapter 14 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
Chapter 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Other relevant documents/considerations

National Design Guide (September 2019)
Norfolk Green Infrastructure and Recreation Impact Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy –
Habitats Regulations Assessment Strategy Document (March 2021)
Natural England's letter to local planning authorities dated 16th March 2022 regarding nutrients

OFFICER ASSESSMENT:

MAIN ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION:

- 1. Principle and site history**
- 2. Design and landscape impacts including upon the AONB**
- 3. Residential amenity**
- 4. Highway safety**
- 5. Other matters**

1. Principle and Site History

This application seeks to construct 2 no. glamping pods on a parcel of land belonging to Shrublands Farm on Craft Lane in Northrepps and a permissive footpath on land running parallel to a section of Craft Lane.

The application site lies within a rural location on the periphery of Northrepps village, on land designated as 'Countryside' under Policies SS 1 and SS 2 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy. Policy SS 2 of the North Core Strategy limits the types of development to those requiring a rural location, with the principle of 'recreation and tourism development' (such as that being proposed) supported, subject to compliance with other local and national planning policies.

Policies EC 7 and EC 10 deal specifically with controlling the location of new tourism development, with EC 7 requiring a sequential approach to its location, with specific reference that new build unserviced holiday accommodation in the Countryside should be treated as permanent residential dwellings and should not be permitted. Policy EC 10 further states that new static caravan sites and woodland holiday accommodation (which would also cover glamping pods) will only be permitted in limited circumstances, and not where they are located within sensitive landscape designations such as the Norfolk Coast AONB, with extensions to existing sites being tightly controlled where they demonstrate a high standard of design and have minimal adverse impacts upon their surroundings.

In this case, the site, whilst used as a caravan/camping site, does not benefit from planning permission, but instead has operated for many years as a Certified Camping site, over which the Council has no control subject to it operating within the parameters of the exemption licence. The pods would replace and relocate the two existing pods located within the farm

site on Hungary Hill which also appear to be in use unlawfully, without the benefit of planning permission.

The site lies within the Norfolk Coast AONB where Policy EN 1 of the Core Strategy recognises the impact of individual proposals and their cumulative impact on the designated AONB and its setting, stating that proposals which would be significantly detrimental to the special qualities of the AONB and their setting should not be permitted.

Therefore, given the sites certified status, Officers would conclude that the scheme should be assessed as a new camping site under Policy EC 10, as opposed to a scheme for the extension or intensification of an existing site, with its location within the Norfolk Coast AONB, therefore resulting in the scheme being contrary to the requirements of Policy EC 10. This view is also reflected in the Landscape Officers objection to the principle of such a development being permitted in this location. The self-contained nature of the holiday accommodation being proposed would also result in the creation of new-build unserviced holiday accommodation in the Countryside, which would also be contrary to Policy EC 7. Members attention is drawn to the planning history section which refers to a similar proposal for the siting of 5 no. self-contained holiday lodges to be sited on this land (Ref: PF/92/1086). Whilst some years ago and thus determined under different policies, the application was refused and dismissed at Appeal on the grounds of principle, detrimental impacts upon the AONB/landscape and highway safety. A 2021 application (Ref: PF/21/2263) for the siting of four holiday Lodges was refused by committee due to the same concerns.

In any case, the benefits, including economic benefits of the proposal would need to be balanced against the significant harm which would result from new tourist accommodation being permitted within this sensitive landscape designation. The certified camping site is run by a separate company 'Shrublands Farm' which supports the Farm business 'Northrepps Farming Company' via a rental agreement. Whilst a detailed economic farm report has been submitted which states the farming enterprise is rather reliant on the "rental support" from Shrublands Farm in order to return a profit, no specific details regarding the economic benefits accruing from this proposal have been submitted and given the application would relocate existing pods located within the farm site itself there is unlikely to be a significant additional economic benefit resulting from this proposal.

Notwithstanding this, the revised application now includes a permissive footpath which would run along the applicants land adjacent to Craft Lane and provide pedestrian access into Northrepps village from the site available for both holiday makers at the Shrublands camp site and local residents, to provide connectivity to and from the village. The Footpath would be considered to provide some public benefit. However the footpath is accessed from Craft Lane and therefore users of the path from the site will still be required to walk along Craft Lane to meet the footpath.

2. Design and Landscape Impacts Including upon the Norfolk Coast AONB

A site layout has been provided in support of the application, along with visualisations of the external appearance of the two proposed glamping pods. However, no proposed elevation drawings or detailed floor plans have been submitted. Details such as external appearance and materials could be conditioned in the event of approval and, from a purely design

perspective, Officers consider that the proposed glamping pods and decking areas would likely be acceptable in design terms to enable compliance with Policy EN 4 and Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

Notwithstanding this, due to their location within the designated AONB, Landscape Officers objected to the scheme, along with the concerns raised by the Norfolk Coast Partnership. These concerns relate to compliance with Policy EC 10 and the resulting impacts that the addition of 2 no. permanently sited glamping pods would add to the traffic levels, recreation pressure and light pollution, all of which detract from the prevailing landscape character in this part of the AONB, eroding key features such as tranquillity and dark skies.

The pods would occupy the site year round making them permanent structures which could be occupied throughout the year. The Planning Statement references a gate which could be locked from the end of the summer season. Landscape Officers are of the opinion that, whilst wider visual impact would be relatively contained by the enclosed wooded setting around the pods, as permanent structures the pods would be visible in the winter months. This, together with the increased human activity, light spill and vehicle movements that the development would generate would not conserve or enhance the valued features of the Landscape Type or the defined special qualities of the Norfolk Coast AONB, particularly 'a sense of remoteness, tranquillity and wildness'.

Officers consider that the development proposals would be contrary to Policies EN 1, EN 2, EC 7 and EC 10 of the Core Strategy as they would fail to protect or conserve the valued features of the Norfolk Coast AONB or defined Landscape Character.

3. Residential Amenity

Core Strategy Policy EN 4 supports development proposals where they would not have a significantly detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of nearby occupiers.

It is noted that existing residential properties lie to the north-west and south of the site. Notwithstanding this, given the degree of separation from this proposed site, the presence to the existing established vegetation and the fact that the application site is already largely used for tourism purposes, it is not considered that the proposals would result in any significantly detrimental impacts upon the residential amenities of the occupants of the existing properties in respect of privacy, light or disturbance. Lighting could be controlled through the imposition of conditions. The permissive footpath, due to its location is also not considered to result in any significantly detrimental impacts on residential amenity and would also provide the occupiers of the properties with a pedestrian route to the village.

As such, it is considered that subject to the proposed conditions, the proposed development would broadly comply with the requirements of Policies EN 4 and EN 13 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy in respect of protecting residential amenity.

4. Highway Safety

Highways access to the site would be via an existing unmade access off Craft Lane which currently serves the Certified Camping site.

It is noted that under previous application PF/21/2263, NCC Highways officers raised concerns regarding the suitability of the surrounding road network (due to it being accessed by narrow single-track roads) to cater for the proposed development but did not raise a formal objection.

However, since the consultation of 21 September 2021 NCC Highways were made aware that the overall site only has permission for camping units based upon a Certificated Camping licence granted under the Camping & Caravan Act rather than via any Planning consents.

Highways Officers consider that the traffic impact of a Certified Camping site does not provide an adequate fallback position in highway terms to justify or enable permanent all-year glamping pods which would intensify highway movements. The road serving the site (Craft Lane), is considered to be inadequate to serve the development proposed, by reason of its poor alignment, restricted width, lack of passing provision, restricted visibility at adjacent road junctions and lack of pedestrian facilities.

When further consulted with the plans for the permissive footpath, Highways Officers maintained their recommendation for refusal unless the application were to remove a 'commensurate scale' of the existing lawful camping accommodation from the site. The applicants are not proposing to cease use of or reduce the scale of the certified site and so the two proposed Glamping Pods would be additional permanent units on the site, resulting in an intensification of use and increased volumes of traffic.

Therefore it is considered that the proposal, if permitted, would be likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to highway safety contrary to Development Plan Policy CT 5 and Highways officers recommend the application be refused.

5. Other Matters

GIRAMS

A new Norfolk wide Green Infrastructure and Recreational Impact Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (GIRAMS) came into effect from 1 April 2022. This is a strategic approach to ensure no adverse effects are caused to European sites across Norfolk, either alone or in combination from qualifying developments and ensures that applicants and local planning authorities meet with the requirements of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). The GIRAMS Strategy applies to all net new residential and tourism-related growth. The proposed development would result in the creation of two new self-contained units of tourist accommodation and a RAMS tariff of £ 421.68 is required in line with the above strategy. The required £421.68 tariff has not been received, neither has the applicant demonstrated that this development would not have localised and in-combination effects and ensure no adverse impact on the European sites.

In the absence of evidence to rule out likely significant effects and in the absence of suitable mitigation measures to address likely significant effects, the proposal is contrary to the requirements of Policies SS 4 and EN 9 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy and approval of the application would conflict with the legal requirements placed on the Local Planning

Authority as competent authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).

Conclusion and Planning Balance

In conclusion, it is considered that the principle of new tourist accommodation in this location, due to its siting with the sensitive AONB designation resulting in conflict with Policy EC 10, its self-contained nature in the 'Countryside' conflicting with Policy EC 7 and the resulting landscape harm due to the introduction of a more intensive use of the site, would if carried out, result in an unacceptable level of harm to the Norfolk Coast AONB and wider landscape character. These local policy aims are also reflected at a national level whereby paragraph 176 of the NPPF states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The access road (Craft Lane) is also considered inadequate to serve the development as proposed and would likely give rise to conditions detrimental to highways safety conflicting with Policy CT 5.

In respect to protected species (GIRAMS), in the absence of evidence to rule out likely significant effects and in the absence of suitable mitigation measures to address likely significant effects, the proposal is contrary to the requirements of Policies SS 4 and EN 9 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy as well as the requirements contained within the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).

Officers consider that the development would fail to comply with relevant Development Plan policies and the guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Whilst there are undoubtedly economic benefits attributable to the proposal, these have not been clearly articulated by the applicant and, as such, can only be afforded limited weight in the planning balance. Having considered the other benefits and harms associated with the proposals, Officers consider that the adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

RECOMMENDATION:

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority:

- 1. The scheme would result in introduction of new build tourist accommodation on land designated as 'Countryside' in Policies SS 1 and SS 2 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy, where Policy EC 7 states that Proposals for new build unserviced holiday accommodation in the Countryside will be treated as though they are permanent residential dwellings and will not be permitted and Policy EC 10 specifically prohibits the principle of new caravan and camping sites within sensitive landscape designations including the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.**

- 2. A development of 2 no. glamping pods in this location would constitute an unacceptable form of development within the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and would harm its special qualities, contrary to the requirements of Policies EN 1, EN 2 and EN 4 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy, Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the principles set out in the North Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment (2021) and the North Norfolk Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.**
- 3. The access road (Craft Lane) is considered to be inadequate to serve the development proposed, by reason of its poor alignment, restricted width, lack of passing provision, restricted visibility at adjacent road junctions and lack of pedestrian facilities. The proposal, if permitted, would be likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to highway safety contrary to Policy CT 5 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy.**
- 4. The proposed development falls within the Broads Sites, East Coast Sites, North Coast Sites, North Valley Fens and The Wash Zones of Influence and affects European Designations as set out in the Norfolk Green Infrastructure and Recreational Impact Avoidance Mitigation Strategy. The application has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not result in adverse effects, either alone or in combination on the integrity of European Sites arising as a result of the development including in relation to recreational disturbance. In the absence of evidence to rule out likely significant effects and in the absence of suitable mitigation measures to address likely significant effects, the proposal is contrary to the requirements of Policies SS 4 and EN 9 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy, and approval of the application would conflict with the legal requirements placed on the Local Planning Authority as competent authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).**

Final wording of reasons for refusal to be delegated to the Assistant Director for Planning.

CLEY-NEXT-THE-SEA – PF/22/1843: Change of use of outbuilding from shop (Use Class E(a)) to self-contained annexe (Use Class C3) for use in conjunction with West Cottage with extension and external alterations at West Cottage, New Road, Cley-next-the-sea by Mr and Mrs A Russo

Minor Development

Target Date: 22 June 2023

Extension of Time:

Case Officer: Rob Arguile

Full planning application

RELEVANT SITE CONSTRAINTS

Countryside LDF
Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
Landscape Character Area
Undeveloped Coast
Conservation Area
Flood Zone 2
Flood Zone 2 SFRA
Flood Zone 3
Flood Zone 3A SFRA
Flood Alert Area SFRA
Fluvial 1% AEP + 35% CC SFRA
Flood Warning Area SFRA
Areas Susceptible to Groundwater SFRA
Tidal 0.1% AEP + CC SFRA
Tidal 0.5% AEP +CC SFRA

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

PF/14/0497 - Change of use from residential outbuilding to A1 (retail shop)
(Approved 17.06.2014)

THE APPLICATION

The application seeks planning permission for the conversion of an outbuilding from a shop to a self-contained annexe, to be used in conjunction with West Cottage. The outbuilding is proposed to be enlarged and extended.

REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE:

The application has been called in by Councillor Victoria Holliday on the grounds that the application mitigation against flooding is sufficient to address the concerns of the Emergency Planner and Environment Agency. Furthermore, the occupant would be able to seek safe refuge within the main dwelling and will be conditioned so that the occupant is a relative of the main dwelling. Furthermore, the proposal reuses an existing building within a 'Countryside' location and will enhance the local character of the area.

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL:

Cley-next-the-Sea Parish Council: - Support.

CONSULTATIONS:

Conservation and Design Officer: - No objection.

Highways Authority: - No objection.

A condition is proposed to ensure that the annexe remains incidental to West Cottage and not used independently.

Environment Agency: - Objection.

The proposal would be at risk of flooding from overtopping of the defences by 1.64m depth at the end of the development lifetime, with a 0.5% (1 in 200) annual probability flood level including climate change of 5.84m AOD. Consequently, the building is considered to be unsafe for the occupants at the end of the development lifetime, unless the LPA consider that the mitigation measures proposed, including higher refuge and Flood Response Plan, are sufficient to ensure the safety of the occupants.

Emergency Planner: - Objection.

The location of the proposed development is within the area which would be flooded during a significant flood event. This would make evacuation routes away from the property to the evacuation centre unsafe, unless undertaken well before the event took place which is not able to be guaranteed.

The height of internal flooding set out in the Environment Agency's consultation response, would be significant and in very extreme events would be just below the height of the mezzanine floor as safe refuge, it is likely that wave action due to extreme weather associated with storm surges would cause additional water height. The only potential egress from this refuge point is through a roof light onto the roof of the property. There are no further means of escape from the roof, without entering flood water. This would expose the occupants to extreme weather and present the possibility of having to be rescued by emergency services personnel. Whilst the Emergency Flood Plan does set out the actions to be taken in the event of a flood, there is no ability for future residents to have any regard to it and this would potentially, in combination with the issues associated with the internal refuge set out above, lead to danger of loss of life for the occupants and the emergency services.

REPRESENTATIONS:

To date, no public representations have been received.

HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

It is considered that the proposed development may raise issues relevant to

Article 8: The Right to respect for private and family life.

Article 1 of the First Protocol: The right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions.

Having considered the likely impact on an individual's Human Rights, and the general interest of the public, refusal of this application as recommended is considered to be justified, proportionate and in accordance with planning law.

CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998 - SECTION 17

The application raises no significant crime and disorder issues.

LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS

Under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the council is required when determining planning applications to have regard to any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application. Local finance considerations are not considered to be material to this case.

RELEVANT POLICIES

North Norfolk Core Strategy (September 2008):

Policy SS 1 - Spatial Strategy for North Norfolk
Policy SS 2 - Development in the Countryside
Policy HO 8 - House Extensions and Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside
Policy EN 1 - Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and The Broads
Policy EN 2 - Protection and Enhancement of Landscape and Settlement Character
Policy EN 4 - Design
Policy EN 8 - Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment
Policy EN 10 – Development and Flood Risk
Policy CT 5 - The Transport Impact of the Development
Policy CT 6 - Parking Provision

National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021):

Chapter 2 - Achieving sustainable development
Chapter 4 - Decision making
Chapter 12 - Achieving well-designed places
Chapter 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
Chapter 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
Chapter 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance:

North Norfolk Design Guide (December 2008)

OFFICER ASSESSMENT:

MAIN ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

1. Principle
2. Design
3. Amenity
4. Landscape impact
5. Heritage impact
6. Flood Risk
7. Highway impact

1. Principle (Policies SS 1 and SS 2):

The site lies within the village of Cley-next-the-Sea, which is located within designated 'Countryside' under Policy SS 1. Policy SS 2 permits certain types of development within this designation which includes the re-use and adaptation of buildings for appropriate uses as well as the extension and replacement of dwellings. Given that this will be a change of use from a

redundant shop to ancillary residential use, the proposed development is considered acceptable in principle in this location, subject to compliance with other relevant Core Strategy policies and is therefore compliant with Policies SS 1 and SS 2 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy.

2. Design (Policy EN 4)

Policy EN 4 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy requires that all development will be designed to a high quality, reinforcing local distinctiveness. Design which fails to have regard to local context and does not preserve or enhance the character and quality of an area will not be acceptable.

The proposed external alterations to the existing building, to include more contemporary replacement doors/windows, the addition of a small area of timber cladding and a standing seam roof, are generally considered to be acceptable given the context of the existing site and low-key nature of the building. The proposal does include a sizeable flat-roofed extension to the existing building in order to increase the living area of the proposed 1-bedroomed annexe, to include a walk-in wardrobe, plant room and gym/studio. An argument could be made that the introduction of a gym/studio onto what is an ancillary outbuilding is an unnecessary addition to what should remain a subservient and modest annexe. However, it is considered that these additions, whilst uncomfortable, would not result in any significant visual harm (being largely hidden from public view) nor, on balance, result in a disproportionately large building harm to the proposal.

On this basis the scale, design and appearance of the proposed annexe is considered appropriate and in accordance with Policy EN 4 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy in terms of design.

3. Amenity (Policy EN 4)

Policy EN 4 requires that development proposals should not have a significantly detrimental effect on the residential amenity of nearby occupiers and new dwellings should provide an acceptable level of residential amenity.

The amenity level provided between both the annexe and host dwelling are acceptable as they share a reasonably sized amenity space. The proposed development will result in any significantly detrimental overlooking or overshadowing of any neighbouring properties.

Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed development complies with the requirements of Policy EN 4 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy in terms of amenity.

4. Landscape impact (Policies EN 1 and EN 2)

The proposal lies within the Norfolk Coast AONB as part of the wider landscape. It is considered that the proposed development, given its position within a largely built up context, and with acceptable external alterations, would not negatively impact upon the surrounding landscape nor special qualities of the AONB.

On this basis the proposed development is considered to be acceptable under Policies EN 1 and EN 2 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy.

5. Heritage impact (Policy EN 8)

Policy EN 8 states that development proposals, including alterations and extensions, should preserve or enhance the character and appearance of designated assets, other important historic buildings, structures, monuments and landscapes, and their settings through high quality, sensitive design. Development that would have an adverse impact on their special historic or architectural interest will not be permitted.

The proposal will be located within Cley Conservation Area. No objections have been raised by the Conservation and Design Officer as the proposal will be secluded behind other dwellings. The proposal will not result in harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

On this basis the proposed development is considered to be acceptable under Policy EN 8 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy.

6. Flood Risk (Policy EN 10):

The site lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3A as identified by the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the Environment Agency. Under Policy EN 10 proposals for changes of use to a more vulnerable category (where there is no operational development) are permitted. It is noted that this proposal is changing from a 'less vulnerable' category as a shop to a 'more vulnerable' category as residential (this classification being based upon the self-contained nature of the proposed accommodation, akin to a separate dwelling, rather than being considered as a minor residential extension).

The proposal is not listed as a permitted type of development under Policy EN 10 as the proposal includes extension and alteration to the building (constituting operational development) in addition to its change of use to a higher category. Notwithstanding this, a balanced approach can be taken to such conversions, given the overall scale and size of potential works. It is also worth noting that some development may need to occur to ensure the feasibility of a scheme or to overcome other material planning considerations.

Given that the proposal is within the higher flood risk zone of 3A the 'sequential test' and 'exception tests' are required (as per paragraphs 23 and 31 of National Planning Practice Guidance and paragraph 161 of the NPPF) to be applied under Policy EN 10. The purpose of the 'sequential test' is to guide development to areas at lowest risk of flooding, by requiring applicants to demonstrate that there are no alternative lower risk sites available where the development could take place. As this proposal is for conversion of an existing building to ancillary residential use, there are clearly no other suitable locations, with the entirety of the site covered by the same flood risk classification. 'More vulnerable' proposals within Flood Zone 3A require the 'exception test'. Paragraph 164 of the NPPF requires that both elements of the exceptions test must be passed for a proposal to be permitted, these being the following:

- development that has to be in a flood risk area will provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk; and
- the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall.

The proposal is supported by a Flood Risk Assessment and has been designed to address flood risk and amendments have been made following discussions with the Environment Agency and the Emergency Planner. The latest amended plans have included the provision of small mezzanine floor in order to provide a first-floor refuge along with an escape window

to access the flat roof and the proposed extension. Following consultation with the Environment Agency and the Emergency Planner it is considered that the proposal would not meet the exception criteria, their objections remain in place.

It is recognised that proposed ground floor levels are 4.20m AOD (Above Ordnance Datum) which is under the expected flood levels of 5.84m AOD for a flood event with a 1 in 200 annual event probability. This takes into account both climate change levels and the overtopping of current flood defences. In the event of a flood, the only potential egress is through a roof light from the proposed refuge onto the roof of the property. There is no further means of escape from the roof, without entering flood water. This would expose the occupants to extreme weather and present the possibility of having to be rescued by emergency services personnel.

Whilst the Emergency Flood Plan does set out the actions to be taken in the event of a flood, there is no ability to force future residents to have any regard to it and this would potentially, in combination with the issues associated with the internal refuge as set out above, lead to danger of loss of life for the occupants and the emergency services.

There are no recognised wider sustainability benefits of the proposed development, other than perhaps the reuse of a currently redundant building within the village centre, nor any recognised wider local community benefits, so it can be considered that the proposal does not meet the criteria of the exceptions test as set out above.

It is recognised that the applicant and agent have gone to some length to try and overcome the concerns raised, however, in light of the maintained objection from both the Environment Agency and Emergency Planner, noting the residual flood risk matters as outlined above, it is considered that the applicant has not been able to satisfactorily demonstrate that the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable increase in risk to life or property.

With considerations of the above matters, it is concluded that the proposed development would be contrary to Policy EN 10 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy and Paragraph 164 and 167 of the NPPF.

7. Highway impact (Policies CT 5 and CT 6):

The proposal includes no changes to the existing parking arrangements and delineates two spaces for use by the proposed annexe and West Cottage. It is also noted that off-street parking is present, though not ideal along High Street to the front of the site. Following consultation with the Highways Officer, no objections have been raised providing that the annexe is conditioned to remain incidental to the use of West Cottage. It is noted that an existing Public Right of Way (PROW) unusually bisects the site, however, it is considered that the proposed development would not have any material impact upon this PROW, with the existing access/driveway having been long established and serving the existing property.

Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed development complies with the requirements of Policies CT 5 and CT 6 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy.

Conclusion

The proposed development is acceptable in principle, with no overriding concerns in respect of matters relating to design, amenity, landscape, heritage or highways impact. However, given the self-contained nature of the proposed accommodation which includes operational development classified as 'more vulnerable' and within Flood Zone 3, the applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated that the proposed development has passed the exceptions test nor

adequately demonstrated that it would be safe for its lifetime, and accordingly, would result in an unacceptable increase in risk to life and property. The proposed development therefore fails to meet the requirements of Policy EN 10 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy and Paragraphs 164 and 167 of the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION:

REFUSE

The District Council adopted the North Norfolk Core Strategy on 24 September 2008, and subsequently adopted Policy HO9 on 23 February 2011, for all planning purposes. The following policy statements are considered relevant to the proposed development:

Policy EN 10 – Development and Flood Risk
National Planning Policy Framework – Paragraphs 164 and 167

Given the self-contained nature of the proposed accommodation which includes operational development classified as 'more vulnerable' and within Flood Zone 3, the applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated that the proposed development has passed the exceptions test nor adequately demonstrated that it would be safe for its lifetime, with no safe escape/evacuation route having been provided to an area outside of the flood risk zone. Accordingly, the proposed development would result in an unacceptable increase in risk to life and property and, as such, fails to meet the requirements of Policy EN 10 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy and Paragraphs 164 and 167 of the NPPF.



The material considerations advanced in favour of the development are not considered sufficient to justify a departure from the Development Plan.

This page is intentionally left blank

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE – JUNE 2023

1. INTRODUCTION:

- 1.1 This report briefly sets out performance in relation to the determination of planning applications in both Development Management and Majors teams for the month up to 31 May 2023.
- 1.2 The table below sets out the figures for the number of cases decided within the month and percentage within time set against the relevant target and summary of 24-month average performance.
- 1.3 The table also sets out the percentage of the total number of decisions made that are subsequently overturned at appeal as 24-month average performance.
- 1.4 In addition, the table sets out the number of cases registered and validated within the month (up to 31 May 2023).

Performance Measure	Actual Performance	Target	Comments
(Speed) Decisions Made (Month up to 31 May 2023.)	Major 1 decision issued. 100% within time period	60% (80% NNDC)	24 month average to 31 May 2023 is 97.44% 
	Non-Major 77 decisions issued 100% within time period	70% (90% NNDC)	24 month average to 30 Apr is 90.78.% 
(Quality) % of total number of decisions made that are then subsequently overturned at appeal (Month up to 31 May 2023.)	Major	10% (5% NNDC)	24 month average to 31 May 2023 is 2.56%
	Non-Major	10% (5% NNDC)	24 month average to 31 May 2023 is 0.38%
Validation (Month up to 31 May 2023.)	246 applications registered 206 applications	3 days for Non- Major from date of receipt 5 days for	Datasets do not currently breakdown validated apps by Major / Minor or those on PS2 returns, but performance data retrieval being reviewed.

	validated	Majors from date of receipt	
--	-----------	-----------------------------------	--

2. S106 OBLIGATIONS

2.1 A copy of the list of latest S106 Obligations is attached. There are currently 7 S106 Obligations being progressed. One has been completed and can be removed from the list.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS:

3.1 Members are asked to note the content of this report.

SCHEDULE OF S106 AGREEMENTS
UPDATE FOR DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE:
22 June 2023

Application reference	Site Address	Development Proposal	Parish	Planning Case Officer	Committee or Delegated Decision	Date of Resolution to Approve	Eastlaw Officer	Eastlaw Ref:	Current Position	RAG Rating
PF/20/0523	Land North Of Fakenham Road Great Ryburgh Fakenham NR21 7AN	Construction of 15 no. grain silos and 1 no. 5,574 sqm (60,000sqft) warehouse with associated drainage, access and external lighting	CP080 - Ryburgh	Geoff Lyon	Committee	24/11/2022	Fiona Croxon	21423	Draft s106 is substantially agreed and being signed.	
PO/20/0524	Land North Of Fakenham Road Great Ryburgh Fakenham NR21 7AN	Hybrid application for creation of HGV access road to serve an expanded Crisp Maltings Group site (Full Planning permission) and construction of buildings and structures required to increase the maximum output tonnage of malt of the Maltings site in any one calendar year to 175,000 tonnes (currently 115,000 tonnes) (Outline application with all matters reserved except for access).	CP080 - Ryburgh	Geoff Lyon	Committee	24/11/2022	Fiona Croxon			
PF/22/1596 & PF/22/1784 (Duplicate)	Land South Of Norwich Road North Walsham Norfolk	Hybrid planning application, comprising the following elements: 1. Full Planning Application for the construction of 343 dwellings (including affordable homes), garages, parking, vehicular access onto Ewing Road and Hornbeam Road, public open spaces, play areas, landscaping, drainage and other associated infrastructure; 2. Outline Planning Application with all matters reserved for a phased development comprising 7 serviced self-build plots and associated infrastructure; and 3. Outline Planning Application with all matters reserved for the construction of an elderly care facility and associated infrastructure, landscaping and open space	CP071 - North Walsham	Phillip Rowson	Committee	Not Yet Determined	Fiona Croxon	21830	Draft s106 Agreement is awaited from applicant's solicitors. Costs undertaking received.	
PF/21/3458	Land At Woodland Browns Covert Hindolveston Road Fulmodeston Norfolk	Erection of two one-bed tree houses with external works and servicing (to include biorock drainage system and solar panels)	CP034 - Fulmodeston	Jamie Smith	Committee	26/01/2023	Fiona Croxon	21829	Draft circulating. Woodland Management Plan awaited.	

[illegible]

OFFICERS' REPORTS TO DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE 22 JUNE 2023

APPEALS SECTION

NEW APPEALS

FAKENHAM – ADV/22/2704 - Installation of 1 No. static non-illuminated advertisement
Land Off A148, Fakenham (Just Prior To R/Bout Adjacent To Thorpland Rd),
Fakenham, NR21 0HB
For Mrs Joanne Woodward, Marketing Force Limited
Commercial Appeal Service (CAS)

HOLT – ADV/22/2707 - Installation of 1 No. static non-illuminated advertisement
Land Off A148 Cromer Road, Holt (Prior To Lovell Development), Holt NR25 6GJ
For Mrs Joanne Woodward, Marketing Force Limited
Commercial Appeal Service (CAS)

NORTH WALSHAM – PPTDC/21/2650 - Technical Details Consent following from Permission in
Unit 1, Melbourne House, Bacton Road, North Walsham, Norfolk NR28 0RA
Technical Details Consent following from Permission in Principle (PP/20/0160) for the demolition of
the existing buildings on site and the erection of four dwellings with associated parking and gardens.
For Mr David Taylor
WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

SCULTHORPE – ADV/22/2705 - Installation of 1No. static non-illuminated advertisement
Land Off A148 Creake Rd, Fakenham (From East Rudham Opp Shell Garage),
Fakenham NR21 9HT
For Mrs Joanne Woodward, Marketing Force Limited
Commercial Appeal Service (CAS)

SHERINGHAM – PF/22/1377 - Creation of additional second floor to form two one bedroom flats,
internal alterations to allow for new staircase access to second floor, change of use of ground floor
from A3 to mixed A3 and A5.
44C/44D Station Road, Sheringham, Norfolk NR26 8RG
For Mr & Mrs Moss
WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

SHERINGHAM – ENF/18/0286 - Change of use of the land for the storage of building material and
the erection of new gates
Land South Of Priory Maze & Gardens, Cromer Road, Beeston Regis
For Mr Tim Perry
WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

SOUTHREPPS – ENF/22/0281 - Stationing of caravan and associated works including installation of
septic tank and engineering works.
Land Rear Pit Street, Southrepps, Norwich, Norfolk NR11 8UX
For Charlotte Daniels
WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS – IN PROGRESS

NORTH WALSHAM – ENF/20/0088 - Appeal against Enforcement Notice for Occupation of the site ,
bungalow structure and operating an LGV from within the site
Sewage Works, Marshgate, North Walsham NR28 9LG
For Mr Luke Jackson
INFORMAL HEARING – Awaiting date for Hearing

THURNING – ENF/19/0307 – Appeal against breach of planning control
(and RV/21/2645 linked with the above) - Removal of Condition 3 of planning permission
PF/13/1048 the condition to be simply deleted and not included in the the new permission
Courtyard Barn, Roundabout Farm, Hindolveston Road, Thurning, NR20 5QS
For Mr & Mrs Kerrison
INQUIRY - Awaiting date for Inquiry

THURNING – ENF/19/0307 - Appeal against breach of planning control
(and CL/20/2055 linked with the above) - Certificate of lawfulness for existing use of "The Office"
at Courtyard Barn as a residential dwelling (C3)
The Office, Roundabout Farm, Hindolveston Road, Thurning, NR20 5QS
For Mr & Mrs Kerrison
INQUIRY - Awaiting date for Inquiry

WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS APPEALS - IN HAND

BRISTON – PO/21/2294 - Erection of two storey detached 3 bedroom dwelling (outline - all matters reserved)
26 Providence Place, Briston, Norfolk NR24 2HZ
for Mr Simon Mavilio
WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

EAST BECKHAM – ENF/22/0289 - Appeal against Enforcement Notice Re: Material change of use
of agricultural to land to storing of machinery and creation of a bund
Land North Hwrc, Holt Road (a148), East Beckham, Norwich, Norfolk NR11 8RP
For Mr Eamon Denny
WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

FAKENHAM - ENF/21/0002 - Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Material change of use of the Land
for the siting of a static caravan to provide overnight accommodation for security staff
Unit 4, RS Car Sales, Hempton Road, Fakenham. Norfolk NR21 7LA
For Mr Shaun Brooker
WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

FAKENHAM – PF/21/3158 - Siting of a static caravan to provide overnight accommodation for a security staff

RS Vehicle Hire, Hempton Road, Fakenham NR21 7LA

For RS Vehicle Hire Shaun Brooker

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

FAKENHAM – CL22/1552 - Certificate of Lawful Development for existing use of land for storage purposes (Class B8)

Unit 4, RS Car Sales, Hempton Road, Fakenham. Norfolk NR21 7LA

For Mr Shaun Brooker

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

HOLT - CD/21/3325 - Discharge of condition 42 (cycle store) of planning permission PF/17/1803 (Residential development of 52 dwellings (including the removal of No.67 Hempstead Road), provision of new vehicular access to Hempstead Road; associated landscaping, open space, pumping station and electricity substation)

Land Rear Of 67 Hempstead Road, Holt Norfolk

For Hopkins Homes Limited

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

LUDHAM – PF/21/2851 - Conversion of garages into a single dwelling

Land North Of Magnolia Cottage, Staithe Road, Ludham, Norfolk

For Mrs Val Enever

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

RUNTON – PF/21/0694 - Change of use of land to provide for the siting of eight holiday lodges for use as guest accommodation in association with The Links Hotel; provision of infrastructure and pedestrian links to the hotel and parking

The Links Hotel, Sandy Lane, West Runton, Cromer, Norfolk NR27 9QH

For Mr Marc Mackenzie, Mackenzie Hotel Ltd

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

SHERINGHAM – PF/22/0443 - Erection of potting shed and greenhouse (part retrospective)

Morley Grange, 14 Cremers Drift, Sheringham, Norfolk NR26 8HY

For Mr Stephen Pigott

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

STIBBARD – PF/22/0624 - Two storey detached dwelling

3 The Glebe, Stibbard, Fakenham, Norfolk NR21 0LU

For Mr Shaun Kerr

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

SUSTEAD – PF/22/1738 - Change of use of the first floor of outbuilding (detached triple garage) from annexe to Church Barn to holiday let (retrospective)

Church Barn, The Street, Sustead, Norwich, Norfolk NR11 8RU

For Mr Adrian Sellex

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

WALSINGHAM – PF/21/3302 - Two storey detached dwelling; new vehicle access off Chapel Yard
St James Cottage, 18 Bridewell Street, Walsingham, Norfolk NR22 6BJ
For Mr Vincent Fitzpatrick
WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

WELLS-NEXT-THE-SEA – PF/22/0275 - Demolition of outbuilding and erection of single/two storey rear extension; replacement dormer to rear
Seawood House (Formally Known As Brig Villa), 56 Freeman Street, Wells-next-the-sea Norfolk NR23 1BA
For Mr S Doolan
WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

WELLS-NEXT-THE-SEA – ENF/21/0061 - Appeal against breach of Planning Control - Material change of use of the land for takeaway
Land Adj. 19 The Glebe, Wells-next-the-Sea, Norfolk NR23 1AZ
For Adrian Springett – Pointens
WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

APPEAL DECISIONS - RESULTS AND SUMMARIES

CLEY-NEXT-THE-SEA - ENF/18/0164 - Alleged further amendments to an unlawful dwelling
Arcady, Holt Road, Cley-next-the-Sea, Holt, NR25 7TU
for Mr Adam Spiegel
INFORMAL HEARING – 24th-26th January 2023
APPEAL PART ALLOWED

CLEY-NEXT-THE-SEA – PF/21/0882 - Erection of dwelling and associated external works and landscaping
Arcady, Holt Road, Cley-next-the-Sea, Holt, NR25 7TU
For Adam and Gay Spiegel
INFORMAL HEARING – to be linked with ENF/18/0164 – 24th-26th January 2023
APPEAL DISMISSED

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
Replace plan 2317-11b with Plan 1660-00-008 as it has been established that the original plan 2317-11b is considered to be inaccurate
Arcady, Holt Road, Cley-next-the-Sea, Holt, NR25 7TU
For Adam and Gay Spiegel
INFORMAL HEARING – to be linked with ENF/18/0164 – 24th-26th January 2023
APPEAL DISMISSED

NORTH WALSHAM – ENF/21/0146 - Appeal against enforcement notice - Erection of single-storey garden annexe building
1 Millfield Road, North Walsham, Norfolk, NR28 0EB
For Mr Robert Scammell
APPEAL DISMISSED

ROUGHTON – PF/20/1659 - Relocation of public house car park and development of the existing car parking area for the erection of 2no. two-storey 3-bedroom detached dwellings, with new boundary treatment; installation of a patio area to rear beer garden, and associated minor alterations and landscaping - [Amended Plans- Revised Scheme]
New Inn, Norwich Road, Roughton, Norwich NR11 8SJ
For Punch Partnerships (PML) Limited
APPEAL DISMISSED

This page is intentionally left blank