

## **PLANNING POLICY & BUILT HERITAGE WORKING PARTY**

**Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party held on Monday, 7 August 2023 at the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 10.00 am**

<b>Committee</b>	Cllr A Brown (Chairman)	Cllr G Bull (Vice-Chairman)
<b>Members Present:</b>	Cllr M Batey Cllr M Hankins Cllr V Holliday	Cllr N Dixon Cllr P Heinrich Cllr A Varley
<b>Substitute Members Present</b>	Cllr H Blathwayt	
<b>Officers in Attendance:</b>	Planning Policy Team Leader (PPTL) Senior Planning Officer – CD (SPOCD) Senior Planning Officer – MG (SPOMG) Assistant Director for Planning Democratic Services Officer - Regulatory	

### **17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr P Fisher, Cllr L Paterson, Cllr J Punchard and Cllr J Toye. Cllr H Blathwayt was present as a substitute for Cllr J Punchard.

### **18 PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

None received.

### **19 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party Meeting held Monday 10<sup>th</sup> July were approved as a correct record subject to a minor typographical amendment on p.8 viii.

The Chairman thanked the Vice-Chairman for deputising at the July Meeting.

### **20 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

### **21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr M Batey declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 6 – he is the Local Member for Holt and a Member of Holt Town Council.

Cllr A Varley declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 7 – he is the Local Member.

Cllr G Bull declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 10 – he is one of the Local Members for North Walsham.

Cllr P Heinrich declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 10 – he is one of the Local Members for North Walsham.

Cllr H Blathwayt declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 7 – he is the representative for the Broad's Authority, and Chairman of the Broad's Authority Planning Committee.

## **22 HOLT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REPORT**

- i. The PPTL introduced the Officers report and recommendation to endorse the making of the Holt Neighbourhood Plan. The Plan had been subject to public consultation and referendum with 552 votes in support, around 80% of the total turn out.
- ii. The Chairman noted the recommendations, which included sequential amendments to policies.
- iii. The PPTL confirmed that amendments would need to be made, noting changes required to the policies map. This would ensure that the Neighbourhood Plan appeared in constraints when planning searches were conducted.
- iv. Cllr M Batey – The Local Member – expressed his support for the Neighbourhood Plan, and affirmed that he did not consider this to be a controversial matter.
- v. Cllr P Heinrich proposed and Cllr M Hankins seconded acceptance of the Officers recommendations.

### **IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED**

**1. Members of the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party recommend to Cabinet that having been subject to successful local referendum;**

**a. The Holt Neighbourhood Plan be made (brought into force) as part of the statutory Development Plan for North Norfolk in accordance with section 38A(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) on the 25th August 2023;**

**b. The issuing of the Decision Statement required under Regulation 19 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) in order to bring to the attention of the qualifying body, the people who live, work and or carry out business in the Neighbourhood Plan Area is delegated to the Assistant Director of Planning in conjunction with the Planning Policy Team Leader;**

**2. Acknowledge that the required consequential amendments to the adopted policies map and the required minor consequential changes to the referendum version of the neighbourhood plan through delegated powers to the Planning Policy Team Leader.**

- i. The PPTL introduced the Officers report and recommendation. He advised that the joint position statement would aid decision making on development proposals in Horning. The PPTL noted that there was currently an embargo on new homes in the Horning catchment, primarily as the Horning waste water recycling centre lacked the capacity to accommodate further foul flows, which remained significantly above the permitted limit set by the Environment Agency (EA) and license limit.

In 2022 Anglian Water issued a statement of fact and subsequently withdrew from the existing process. Further, since the original joint position statement was signed, Anglian Water had undertaken a number of investigations regarding excessive flows and had concluded that unstable ground conditions in the area were causing structural failures in the public sewage network and privately owned sewage networks. This, in addition with the combined high water table, frequent over topping and high levels of ground water, resulted in infiltration inundations in private and public water systems at multiple points. Significantly, this was estimated to be 200% above the licenses amount and Anglian Water had concluded that there was no single engineering solution.

NNDC had worked with the Broad's Authority and EA to update the position to remedy the situation. It was considered that there was a real risk of nutrient loading downstream on nationally and locally significant land.

The position would remain that the EA would continue to maintain their objection to development proposals, Anglian Water would still invest and seek solutions, though would not do so in isolation, and would work with the Norfolk Strategic Alliance. The PPTL noted that £5.2 million had been set aside by Anglian Water to improve capacity at the local recycling centre, details of which were available in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Ultimately, the settlement was not considered sustainable for long-term growth.

- ii. The Chairman commented that he was surprised that there was no reference to Nutrient Neutrality in the report.
- iii. The PPTL advised that the catchment was located outside of the Nutrient Neutrality Zone.
- iv. Cllr A Varley – The Local Member – Thanked Officer's for their work and engagement. He considered that this was an important issue and argued that the joint position statement would continue to have a significant impact on the community of Horning. The Local Member noted that Horning had a high water environment which provided an ideal habitat for many species of flora and fauna, further improving the quality of life for residents. Cllr A Varley thanked Anglian Water for their comprehensive investigatory works, but concluded that that the issues remained outstanding and expressed his disappointment that Anglian Water had pulled out of the joint statement. Whilst encouraged by mentions of the proposed investment, the Local Member affirmed that additional details including a time scale were required. He noted that the joint statement maintained to serve as an embargo for development, which it was noted would have a significant effect on the ability of the Local Planning Authority to ensure the delivery of affordable and social housing within the Parish. Cllr A Varley affirmed his concern that this would

have on residents who were being priced out of their community, and further noted that householder applications would not permit additional WC provision. Cllr A Varley stated that although this was necessary, it was a frustrating situation. The Local Member considered a collaborative approach was needed, and urged that this be resolved.

- v. Cllr H Blathwayt affirmed the importance of the River Ant with respect of national recreation, with both voluntary and involuntary human immersion. He stated it was important that the river be kept as clean as possible and that the Council had a responsibility to do all in its power to keep the quality of the water in the River Ant and River Bure to be the best it can be.
- vi. Cllr V Holliday considered that Anglian Water were getting off fairly lightly, and was disappointed more couldn't be done. She reflected on the situation in Cley which resulted in an additional treatment tank being cited which had resolved the villages issue. She argued that pressure needed to be applied and Anglian Water held to account. Cllr V Holliday considered other examples around the globe; the Everglades, Venice and Somerset Levels and contended that Anglian Water would benefit from taking note of innovative solutions used elsewhere. With respect of the pledged investment, Cllr V Holliday asked whether this would be earmarked for this area or would be used across the network more broadly.
- vii. The PPTL advised that details of the investment were located in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and the long-term investment plan was still awaiting sign off from off-watt. The PPTL shared Members concern about Anglian Water, but commented that they had, from their perspective, gone above and beyond their remit. There had been a series of illegal connections and an illegal pumping station in the area which Anglian Water were seeking to dismantle and redirect flows back into the river. The PPTL advised that pressure could be applied through the joint parties of the flood alliance. He stated that he was hopeful that a legal requirement would be imposed to ensure investment along the lines of Nutrient Neutrality which would ensure that companies invest in technological advancements to remove nutrients at source.
- viii. The Chairman noted the commitment to review the joint position statement in 12 months.
- ix. Cllr P Heinrich considered that this was a typical example of Anglian Water failing to invest in its facilities, whilst at the same time giving money to foreign investors which he argued should be spent locally. He commented that the Local Authority had little power to change things, and endorsed water services being brought back under state control. Cllr P Heinrich stressed that investment was needed in Horning and elsewhere in the district to support current and future housing developments. He stated that Anglian Water must be held to account and that they must ensure appropriate infrastructure was in situ. Cllr P Heinrich contended that Anglian Water should be brought before the Overview & Scrutiny Committee and explain their actions.
- x. The Chairman reflected that Anglian Water often supported development applications and guarantee connections, however the reality was that there were issues of capacity in many areas of the district.
- xi. Cllr N Dixon considered that the strategic context needed to be understood.

He affirmed that he had spent several years looking into issues of this ilk in Hoveton, which also suffers the same problems as Horning. Cllr N Dixon stated that he had worked with Anglian Water to understand the problem and to look at solutions, whilst technically the problems could be solved through engineering means, this would involve a huge proportion of investment. With other issues of water quality and water cycle, hard choices needed to be made where investment was committed. He noted that money had been spent in Horning to try and address the leaky laterals, but this was an ongoing process which Mother Nature would continue to present ongoing work.

Cllr N Dixon stated the need to be realistic, and commented that it was important not to lose sight of the big picture. He contended that whilst the Council could criticise the actions of Anglian Water and other water companies, with respect of this particular problem at Horning, would likely not be any different under a different arrangement with water companies. The issue remained that development had taken place in an area with a high groundwater level, leading to water getting in the system, therefore whatever system was introduced at Knackers Wood or Beeler wouldn't tackle the issue, particularly under heavy rainfall conditions.

- xii. Cllr H Blathwayt recalled the construction of Knackers Wood and mains drainage being introduced to Horning. He noted that it was agreed at that time, before Anglian Water took over, that Knackers Wood would be inadequate.
- xiii. Cllr A Varley proposed acceptance of the Officer recommendation, he stated that he was a realist and was aware that, for the time being, the statement needed to be taken into effect to ensure that no development took place which may have a detrimental impact on the river and the special environment.
- xiv. Cllr H Blathwayt seconded the Officer's recommendation.

#### **IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED**

**Members of the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party note the contents of the updated Joint Position Statement and recommend to Cabinet that it authorises the Assistant Director of Planning in conjunction with the Planning Policy Team Leader as signatory to the updated JPS and incorporation of any minor changes as a result of EA or other LPA sign off process.**

## **24 WEIGHT TO BE GIVEN TO THE EMERGING LOCAL PLAN**

- i. The PPTL introduced the Officer's report and recommendation. He advised that, at present, limited weight was given to the emerging Local Plan as a whole, with policies used on a case-by-case basis by developers to justify development. As detailed in paragraph 2.3 of the Officer's report, the NPPF established that Local Planning Authorities may give weight to policies in an emerging local plan due to the stage of production, with greater weight attributed to the more advanced plans, with high degrees of consistency and fewer unanswered objections.

The PPTL confirmed that 30 policies of the emerging Local Plan had been

identified which Officers considered could now be given weight in the consideration and determination of Planning Applications alongside the existing development plan. The PPTL stated that it would remain the case that it would be individual Officers to conclude the appropriate planning balance and judgement based on the specific circumstances of each Planning Application. A further 3 policies could only be given partial weight, as they establish a contested strategic position, with substantive objections which challenge the principle of the approach.

The PPTL advised that the Plan was at a significantly enhanced stage, having been in the public domain for over 18 months, undergone significant consultation, and in accordance with the NPPF. Officers therefore sought the views of Members as to the level of weight the Council wishes to apply to the emerging plan in decision making. Notably, the Environment Act 2021 makes biodiversity net gain mandatory for all but small sites and some exemptions from an as-yet in November 2023 and for small sites from April 2024. The emerging Local Plan included policies to address this mandatory requirement, and would provide Officers guidance on how this should be implemented.

The PPTL confirmed what would occur should Members choose not to support the Officers recommendation, as set out in paragraph 48 of the Officers report. Should Members be minded to support the Officers recommendation, there will be a transition period to allow for Officers to be briefed, provided appropriate training along with Members, internal systems updated, developers informed on the change of emphasis on policies and a decision made on how to address applications already in the system.

- ii. The Chairman asked, if a Local Planning Authority was unable to demonstrate a 5 year Housing Land Supply, what impact this would have on the weight applied to an emerging Local Plan.
- iii. The PPTL advised that the Council's 5 year Housing Land supply position was not taken into consideration in the Officers report and recommendation. If the Council were unable to demonstrate a 5 year Housing Land Supply, the relevant policies would still apply. The spatial strategy and housing figures were contested and should not be relied upon, and the presumption of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF would still apply.
- iv. Cllr P Heinrich welcomed the Officers recommendation and considered many of the existing policies to be outdated, being some 15 years old. He considered a steady transition would take the load off from Officers instead of implementing the new Local Plan all at once.
- v. Cllr N Dixon endorsed the Officers recommendation and stated that a huge effort had been invested in preparing the emerging Local Plan over many years. He supported steady progressive implementation, and noted that those 'big ticket items' contained in the emerging Local Plan would be subject to enhanced examination, and may not emerge intact.
- vi. The Chairman asked whether Planning Officers had been consulted on the proposed evolutionary change, noting that this was a significant change. He was supportive of the Officer's recommendation provided Planning Officers were supplied with appropriate guidance and training. The Chairman spoke positively of the document and the time it had taken to prepare.

- vii. The PPTL affirmed that there had been collaboration across the planning policy team to assess the level and significance of objections and conformity with the NPPF before forming a recommendation.
- viii. The ADP echoed the comments of Members, that from a Case Officers perspective and to the outside world more broadly, having some simple clarity would be helpful about which policies were effected and to what extent weight would be applied. The ADP considered the three point scale detailed in the Officers report to be pragmatically sensible. He confirmed his intention, subject to the agreement of the Development Committee Chairman, to present a similar report to Development Committee in the coming months. The ADP affirmed that the alternative of not accepting the Officers recommendation, would not prevent the emerging Local Plan from existing and going through examination, at some point matters would need to be addressed.
- ix. The Chairman agreed that Development Committee Members would need to be informed and made familiar with the proposed changes in order to maintain the Councils strong record at appeal. He asked if a mechanism would be put in place to review how the department was coping with the transition.
- x. The PPTL advised that the situation would be monitored by the development management team and the ADP. It was noted that many of the emerging policies were similar to that of the Core Strategy more broadly, and would better align with wording and provided more up-to-date evidence. Those larger strategic policies were not considered to be adopted at this stage, and would be subject to the examination process first.
- xi. Cllr A Varley proposed acceptance of the Officers recommendation, Cllr N Dixon seconded.

#### **IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED**

**Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party recommend to Cabinet that as soon as reasonably practical weight is given the emerging Plan policies in line with para 48 of the NPPF as detailed in appendix 1.**

## **25 ADOPTION OF COASTAL ADAPTATION SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

- i. SPOCD introduced the Officers report and recommendation to accept the coastal adaptation supplementary planning document (SPD). She confirmed that the purpose of the SPD was to build upon the statement of common ground on coastal zone planning, formally signed by Norfolk and Suffolk Coastal Authorities in 2018, by seeking to provide consistent planning guidance through a whole coast approach.

The SPD had been subject to two rounds of public consultation, the first in the form of a questionnaire, the second consultation took place between January-March 2023 with 52 respondents forming 185 comments. The Main themes of the second consultation were set out in paragraph 3.5 of the Officers report, with responses offered in 3.6.

Since the close of the consultation the steering group had spent the intervening period refining the document, taking into account responses supplied. Officers considered the final SPD to be well balanced both in terms of its scope and content, further, it had been written in such a way that it could be applied to all relevant authorities. The SPD would support both the existing and emerging Local Plan policies in relation to development in the coastal change management area and provide comprehensive advice for both rollback and relocation proposals.

If adopted the Coastal Adaptation SPD would supersede the 2009 Development Control guidance. The SPOCD noted that the final SPD was due to be considered at all relevant authorities which may result in some minor changes. Officers were seeking to have the SPD adopted by the end of September 2023.

- ii. The Chairman asked about the relationship of the Local Plan and a SPD.
- iii. The PPTL advised that a SPD was guidance which added detail to policies and how they work.
- iv. Cllr H Blathwayt endorsed the revised Coastal Adaptation SPD and proposed acceptance of the Officers recommendation. As the Portfolio Holder for Coast, he advised that whilst he was in attendance in the capacity of a substitute, he would have otherwise attended the meeting as Portfolio Holder. Cllr H Blathwayt noted that the Council had, in principle, endorsed the SPD at Full Council. He considered that implementing the SPD in practice would call for hard decisions to be made. Cllr H Blathwayt noted that there was a planning application which had been deferred at Development Committee, and asked that those Members properly consider the SPD when reaching their determination.
- v. Cllr V Holliday was pleased that more detail had been offered to the sensitive environment. She noted that her Ward was subject to risk of flooding and not erosion.
- vi. The Chairman thanked Officers for their hard work, and stated that it was a major undertaking to work with several authorities.
- vii. Cllr G Bull seconded the Officers recommendation.

**IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED.**

**Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party recommended to recommend to Cabinet that the Coastal Adaptation SPD is adopted.**

**That the Planning Policy Manager, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning, is authorised to make any presentational or typographical amendments to the Coastal Adaptation Supplementary Planning Document prior to it being published.**



- i. The SPOMG introduced the Officers report and recommendation. Officers considered that the North Walsham Development Brief (DB) was far enough progressed to engage in public consultation, with the Council due to form its opinion at a later date after public consultation had been concluded.

Since the last meeting Members had been provided advance notice of the DB and were provided the opportunity to engage and discuss the DB with the Planning Policy Manager (PPM). The SPOMG noted that feedback received from these briefings was positive.

The DB was formed in collaboration with the promoters, the Council, and NCC Highways – who had expressed their approval to the DB and the detailed Highways proposals. The Planning Policy Team considered that the DB was policy compliant with the emerging Local Plan, and specifically allocation NW62-a. The SPOMG advised that the PPM had previously explained that through the consultation of the DB, the Council would be able to demonstrate to the Planning Inspector for the Local Plan that the scheme was achievable, and the allocation viable.

The SPOMG detailed the sites location and the three core themes of the DB; open space, community and economy. Open space in the DB had been designed to become more linear in nature and act as a soft edge to development whilst also promoting active travel, with Weaver's Way incorporated in the green infrastructure to enhance the overall development. Link Road, which formed the spine of the development was to be flanked by tree-lined avenues, with built in foot and cycle paths separate to the road to enable better permeability by foot and cycle across the site and beyond, compliant with GIRAMs requirements. The development would provide playing pitches, play areas for children, and allotments. At the centre of the site would be a new school, a community hub and elderly care facility, creating a nexus point for the community.

It was noted that part of the DB included details of a proposed access over the railway line to the North of the site to facilitate a further Northern Expansion. However, it was considered that the benefits from such extension would not justify the high costs. NNDC were engaging with Norfolk County Council with regards the upcoming infrastructure delivery plan to include a dedicated project for delivering North Walsham West. It was considered that the new link road would help direct traffic and alleviate current traffic pressures. The SPOMG noted that the new roads would not remove HGV movements for Aylsham Road entirely, but would significantly reduce movements by redirecting those that need to access facilities in the centre of North Walsham. Bespoke traffic models forecasted a 50% reduction in HGV movements in the town centre, this was endorsed by NCC Highways. Aylsham Road had been modelled to account for pedestrian use access and traffic improvements, with the DB proposing the introduction of traffic lights for one way use, this would enable the widening of footpaths and ensure larger vehicles were able to make use of the space under the centre of the bridge for safety and better access.

In addition, the SPOMG confirmed that the junction at Coltishall had also been modelled, with the proposed removal of a parking bay to help alleviate congestion issues.

The SPOMG noted that there was a commitment to ensure the delivery of off-site improvements early, with an expectation they occur in the early phases of the development.

- ii. The Local Member - Cllr P Heinrich stated, having spoken at length with the developers and the PPM along with Cllr G Bull (also a Local Member) in fine detail, that he considered the overall scheme was remarkably good for a development of this nature. He commended the developers for having listened to representations and taken these in account through the DB. Whilst he was positive about the scheme more broadly, and for going to public consultation, Cllr P Heinrich stressed the importance of the extension of the link road to the industrial estate. He stated that he was unconvinced by some of the HGV modelled figures, and considered the extension of the link road pivotal, though stated that he did appreciate that that land was not owned by the consortium. Cllr P Heinrich sought assurances that the intention to build out the link road to the industrial estate remained within the Local Plan and that the Council would continue to make best efforts to progress this over the course of the development. Cllr P Heinrich proposed acceptance of the Officers recommendation.
- iii. The Chairman reflected that he was uncertain how the Council could govern if/when the link road was expanded. He noted that, due to the size of the development, it would be built out in phases, and it was conceivable that some elements remained outstanding by the time the Council commenced work on the next local plan.
- iv. Cllr P Heinrich agreed that the link road would be the most difficult part of the whole development. He considered that the link road, as set out in the DB, would reduce the number of traffic movements through the town centre and endorsed this be developed as soon as possible. He considered this a priority to the scheme, and urged that conversations needed to continue to carry out that final link to the back of the industrial estate, though accepted this would be neither easy nor quick.
- v. Cllr M Hankins understood that there were issues in North Walsham with the capacity of schooling. He noted that the delivery of the school would be with the remit education authority, and commented co-ordination and forward planning did not always ensure delivery.
- vi. Cllr P Heinrich advised, based on the most recent figure he had seen, that there was significant capacity at the secondary school (around 2/3 full) and there was additional capacity in the 2 primary schools. He considered that opposition would centre on the provision of health services not schools.
- vii. The Chairman sought confirmation that S106 contributions would be put towards school provision.
- viii. The PPTL confirmed that, as the site was developed, the usual discussions regarding viability and appropriate contributions would take place. It was noted that County Council were committed to the delivery of a new school.
- ix. Cllr V Holliday reflected on the proposed Health Care Provision. She noted that 85% of the population lives within a 20 minute walk of their GP, which may not be achievable for occupants on this site. She further considered the

bus route east to west did not appear as good as the provision north to south, for those elderly residents and those reliant on public transport it may not be early to go to the main GP surgeries. Further, she questioned whether there was capacity to take on the extra GP's and whether this had been considered.

- x. The Local Member - Cllr G Bull echoed the comments of Cllr P Heinrich and agreed that the meeting with the PPM and developers was very informative. He commented, as a former Member of North Walsham Town Council that he was encouraged that the Town Council's views had been considered. He was supportive of the expansion of the link road, and noted that the package of land went either side of the railway bridge. Cllr G Bull considered that whilst the cost of the bridge would be extortionate, he saw benefit in developing the highway network either side of the bridge with a view the bridge may be constructed at a later stage. He further acknowledged that there was concern within the community about the provision of healthcare.
- xi. The Chairman asked, if agreed, when the consultation would start.
- xii. The PPTL advised that dates weren't fixed and that there would be a commitment to deliver member briefings. The developers had taken into account feedback received from the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party last meeting, and the consultation was therefore not expected to commence to September at the earliest.
- xiii. Cllr N Dixon stated that he supported the scheme in principle, which he considered to be the right solution to a raft of problems. Secondly, he commented that the consultation documents for the DB were likely as good as they could get with respect of readiness and fitness for public consultation. Cllr N Dixon affirmed that he was aware of some major challenges, many of which centred on North Walsham which had been well covered off, however concerns relating to the impact of traffic through Coltishall, Worstead and the B1150 should not be overlooked. Cllr N Dixon considered, at this early stage, the mitigation outlined in the DB to be woeful, and stated that he was unconvinced that the scale of the problem had been properly assessed. Though he was not the Ward Member, he expressed his keenness that those neighbouring villages be consulted and be given greater focus.
- xiv. Cllr H Blathwayt supported Cllr N Dixon's comments and agreed that the impact of traffic on the bridge in Coltishall to be immense. He considered that this area, which already had traffic problems, had the potential to become a major issue. He encouraged consultation with the Broads Authority and with Broadland District Council.
- xv. The Chairman noted that the proposed adjustment in Coltishall was set out in the report as being minor. He questioned whether this minor adjustment may be sufficient.
- xvi. The PPTL advised, once the consultation had concluded that the detailed response and feedback would be supplied to Members. Opportunity would then be available to have a further discussion. Studies had been undertaken on the road network, and the methodology agreed, and findings endorsed by the County Council.

- xvii. Cllr P Heinrich commented that the Highways modelling in this instance looked good and the change would seem to address the problem. His expectation was that this view would not be shared in any representations from Coltishall residents.
- xviii. The Chairman asked whether there would be any additional benefits to Coltishall through the scheme.
- xix. The PPTL confirmed any planning applications would need to consider off-site mitigations. There were no proposals for off-site improvements and open spaces beyond North Walsham through the scheme.
- xx. Cllr N Dixon noted the pitch points in Coltishall; the bridge and the approach road from the old railway to the village, which was very narrow and winding. He argued that consideration needed to be given to all 4 points detailed, and greater mitigation given.
- xxi. The Chairman asked if Coltishall residents would be able to participate in the consultation.
- xxii. The PPTL advised this would be a public consultation and would not be limited to North Walsham only.
- xxiii. Cllr G Bull seconded the Officers recommendation.

**IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY AGREED.**

**Members agreed the Draft version of the North Walsham West Development Brief as a basis for a period of public consultation.**

**27 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

None.

The meeting ended at 11.43 am.

---

Chairman