

18 JULY 2019

Minutes of a meeting of the **DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE** held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Holt Road, Cromer at 9.30 am when there were present:

Councillors

Mr P Heinrich (Vice-Chairman) in the Chair

Mr A Brown
Mr P Fisher
Mrs W Fredericks
Mr R Kershaw
Mr N Lloyd

Mr G Mancini-Boyle
Dr C Stockton
Mr A Varley
Mr A Yiasimi

Mr N Housden – substitute for Mrs A Fitch-Tillett

Officers

Mr P Rowson – Head of Planning
Mr N Doran – Principal Lawyer
Mr G Lyon – Major Projects Manager
Miss L Yarham – Democratic Services and Governance Officer

18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DETAILS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mr D Baker, Mrs A Fitch-Tillett, Mrs P Grove-Jones and Mr N Pearce . There was one substitute Member in attendance.

19 MINUTES

The Minutes of meetings of the Committee held on 6 June and 20 June 2019 were approved as correct records and signed by the Chairman.

20 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Where appropriate the Planning Officers expanded on the planning applications; updated the meeting on outstanding consultations, letters/petitions received objecting to, or supporting the proposals; referred to any views of local Members and answered Members' questions.

Background papers, including correspondence, petitions, consultation documents, letters of objection and those in support of planning applications were available for inspection at the meeting.

Having regard to the above information and the Officers' reports, the Committee reached the decisions as set out below.

Applications approved include a standard time limit condition as condition number 1 unless otherwise stated.

22 CLEY-NEXT-THE-SEA - PF/19/0168 - Enlargement of window in front elevation; enlargement of opening in rear elevation to allow for replacement of window with glazed sliding doors. New entrance gate to front boundary; Marshlands, Coast Road, Cley-next-the-Sea, Holt, NR25 7RZ for Mr Lamont

The Committee considered item 7 of the Officers' reports.

Public Speakers

Victoria Holliday (Cley Parish Council)
Calum Lamont and Tomas Klassnik (supporting)

The Head of Planning reported that two further representations had been received in respect of this application from the objector whose earlier comments were included in the report. The main points of the further representation were:

- the design and materials were inappropriate in the Cley Conservation Area and AONB;
- local and national policy guidance in respect of the protection of designated assets should be respected;
- he did not agree with the judgement of the Conservation and Design Team Leader;
- the gates would not facilitate waste collection and deliveries when the owners were not in residence;
- the visualisations were not an accurate representation of the proposal and its impact; and
- lack of consultation with the Norfolk Coast Partnership.

The Head of Planning reported that the Norfolk Coast Partnership (NCP) had since been consulted and considered that the enlargement of the windows was minimal and light pollution could be mitigated by blinds or tinted glass. The NCP had expressed a preference for timber gates but considered that the proposed gate would not add or detract from the Cley Conservation Area or AONB, the red brick and colour of the gate would respect the area and the flint wall should be retained.

The Head of Planning reported that on 8 July the Cabinet had resolved to adopt the Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans for Blakeney, Cley, Morston and Wiveton and they were now material considerations in the planning process.

The Head of Planning presented a location plan indicating the site and coastal path, photographs of the previous gates which had been removed, the existing opening and visualisations of the proposed gate. He explained that planning permission was required for the gates due to their proximity to the highway and the gates which had been removed would also have required planning permission. Stone sculptures which had been erected on the gate piers required planning permission but did not form part of the current application. He referred to the objector's concerns regarding the visualisations and explained that their purpose was only to give an impression of what the development would look like. They were not intended to form part of the approved plans.

The Head of Planning referred to the main issue of design set out in the report. He referred to the content of the newly adopted Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan relating to design and materials. Officers considered that the proposed materials reflected the colour palette of the local area and that the visual elements of the proposal reflected the street scene. He recommended approval of this application as set out in the report.

The Chairman read to the Committee the comments of Councillor Ms K Ward, the local Member, who was unable to attend the meeting. She had referred to the objections raised by David Young, the former local Member, the Parish Council and local residents in respect of the urbanisation of the rural coastal setting. She had commented that the structure had no practical purpose as a flood defence due to its design and the site was highly visible in a sensitive landscape. She considered that the structure went against the grain of the adopted Conservation Area Appraisal and the desire for dwellings to be integrated into the landscape rather than cut off from their surroundings. She had requested refusal of the application unless the plans were substantially altered.

Councillor N Lloyd considered that the applicants had done well to work with the Conservation and Design Team and that there was nothing wrong with the proposed design.

It was proposed by Councillor N Lloyd, seconded by Councillor G Mancini-Boyle and

RESOLVED with 10 Members voting in favour

That this application be approved in accordance with the recommendation of the Head of Planning.

23 APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR A SITE INSPECTION

RESOLVED

That the Committee undertakes the following site inspections:

HOLT - PO/18/1857 – Outline planning application for the erection of up to 110 dwellings with 2 hectares of land for a new primary school, public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) with main vehicular access point from Beresford Road and secondary pedestrian, cycle and emergency access from Lodge Close. All matters reserved except for means of access on Land of Beresford Road, Holt.

BACONSTHORPE - PF/18/1921 - Proposed change of use of land from agricultural to tent-only campsite for a maximum of 63 units of tents-only camping with associated electric hook-up points. Erection of 6 camping pods. Retrospective erection of camp site reception/shop building, shower and wash-up block, two toilet blocks, utility block and children's play area; Baconsthorpe Meadows Campsite At Pitt Farm, The Street, Baconsthorpe, Holt, NR25 6LF

TRIMINGHAM - PF/18/2051 - Installation of 56 static holiday lodge bases, with associated access, services, veranda, car parking spaces and landscaping; Woodland Holiday Park, Cromer Road, Trimmingham, Norwich, NR11 8QJ

24 THE GRAHAM ALLEN AWARD FOR CONSERVATION AND DESIGN

The Committee considered item 9 of the Officers' reports.

Councillor N Lloyd was disappointed that the Graham Allen Awards did not include reference to environmental design and sustainability of the buildings and he considered that it would be beneficial to include it as a material consideration in the future, particularly given the Council's approach to climate change.

The Head of Planning stated that Officers would liaise with the Cabinet Member for the Environment as to how this could be taken forward in future Awards.

Councillor G Mancini-Boyle asked if the Graham Allen Award winners would be taken forward into a national award scheme.

The Head of Planning explained that the Awards were specific to North Norfolk. Some schemes went forward to national schemes but this was not through the Graham Allen process.

RESOLVED

That the judging of entries takes place on 22 August 2019, with the presentation to take place on 10 October 2019.

25 APPEALS SECTION

(a) NEW APPEALS

The Committee noted item 10(a) of the agenda.

(b) INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS - PROGRESS

The Committee noted item 10(b) of the agenda.

(c) WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS APPEALS - IN HAND

The Committee noted item 10(c) of the agenda.

The Head of Planning reported that the appeal in respect of Hoveton PF/18/1848 had been dismissed and a summary of this case would be submitted to the next meeting.

(d) APPEAL DECISIONS – RESULTS AND SUMMARIES

The Committee noted item 10(d) of the agenda.

Hindolveston PO/19/1436 - The Head of Planning informed the Committee that Counsel's advice had now been received in respect of a possible challenge to the Inspector's decision and it was considered that the Inspector had addressed all the material planning considerations and he had weighted them. The fact that Officers did not agree with the weighting was insufficient reason to challenge the decision.

Councillor N Housden asked what the principal reason was that the Head of Planning considered the Inspector's decision was flawed.

The Head of Planning explained that there was no single reason, but it was a question of the way in which the weighting had been applied.

Bodham and Selbrigg wind turbines – The Major Projects Manager reported that the applicant had requested an extension of time and the Council was now required to submit its case by 30 September instead of 30 July as previously reported. The Landscape Character Assessment would now be adopted prior to the Inspector's decision.

Councillor N Lloyd considered that a great deal of time and effort had been put into these appeals and asked what would be needed to change the Council's view on the proposals.

The Major Projects Manager explained that there had been a significant delay because of legal challenges but the appeals were in their final stages. The Council would defend its decisions and he advised the Committee of the implications of a change in view. The Council had to consider its position in terms of representing the wider community.

The Principal Lawyer advised the Committee that the parties in an appeal normally paid their own costs, but the Inspector could award costs if there had been unreasonable behaviour which put another party to unnecessary expense.

The Major Projects Manager referred to the climate change declaration recently made by the Council. He stated that renewable energy was supported provided it was the right option without causing significant harm to landscape and heritage assets. In the case of the wind turbine proposals at Bodham and Selbrigg, the amount of energy generated would be low but the proposals would have a high impact on the landscape and heritage assets. Officers considered that the benefits did not outweigh the harm in this case but Members were entitled to come to a different conclusion.

(e) COURT CASES – PROGRESS AND RESULTS

The Committee noted item 10(e) of the agenda.

The meeting closed at 10.17 am.

CHAIRMAN
15 August 2019