

6 FEBRUARY 2020

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

Mrs P Grove-Jones (Chairman)
Mr P Heinrich (Vice-Chairman)

Mr A Brown
Mr C Cushing
Mr P Fisher
Mrs A Fitch-Tillett
Mrs W Fredericks
Mr R Kershaw

Mr N Lloyd
Mr G Mancini-Boyle
Mr N Pearce
Dr C Stockton
Mr A Varley
Mr A Yiasimi

Mr D Baker – Holt Ward
Mrs G Perry-Warnes – Holt Ward
Mr J Toye – Erpingham Ward

Mr J Rest – observer

Officers

Mr P Rowson – Head of Planning
Mr N Doran – Principal Lawyer
Mr G Lyon – Major Projects Manager
Mr D Watson – Interim Development Manager
Mrs C Dodden – Senior Planning Officer
Mr C Reuben – Senior Planning Officer
Miss L Yarham – Democratic Services and Governance Officer
Mr D Mortimer – Highways Officer (NCC)
Ms J Blackwell – NCC Children's Services
Mr S Clarke – Independent Highway Consultant

102 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DETAILS OF ANY SUBSTITUTE MEMBER(S)

None.

103 MINUTES

The minutes of a meeting of the Committee held on 9 January 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

104 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

105 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

<u>Minute</u>	<u>Councillor:</u>	<u>Interest</u>
108	Mrs A Fitch-Tillett	Personal friend involved in the application (will not take part)

109	Mrs W Fredericks	Known to the applicant (will speak but not vote)
-----	------------------	--

The Chairman stated that all Members had received several emails from members of the public regarding items on this agenda.

106 HOLT - PO/18/1857 - OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF UP TO 110 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE TO SERVICE 2 HECTARES OF LAND POTENTIALLY FOR A NEW TWO FORM ENTRY (2FE) 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; LAND OFF BERESFORD ROAD, HOLT FOR GLADMAN DEVELOPMENTS LTD

Public Speakers

Richard Carter (objecting)
John Mackenzie (supporting)

The Major Projects Manager presented the report, which addressed the matters relating to education, highways and climate emergency that had been raised at the meeting of the Committee on 10 October 2019 when the application had been deferred. He stated that the Committee needed to base its decision on the current report and the report that had been considered at the October meeting. He displayed plans and photographs of the site, including the proposed access points and an indicative layout plan.

The Major Projects Manager updated the Committee in respect of correspondence that had been received since the report was written. A representation had been received from Mr Carter expressing concerns relating to risk of non-delivery of the school, management of the land subject to the option agreement and viability concerns. The Major Projects Manager referred to a letter from Mr Carter dated 20 January relating to Victory Housing and clarified that Victory Housing's support for the application was based solely on the provision of affordable housing. Two representations had been received from residents of Beresford Road and Thompson Avenue objecting on grounds related to road width, impact of traffic, loss of green field, impact on wildlife, lack of need for additional housing and the need to retain a firebreak between dwellings and Holt Country Park. A letter of objection had been received from a resident of Park Barn raising concerns about the delivery of the school and impact on the surrounding area.

The Major Projects Manager referred to an email from the applicant that had been sent to Members, which addressed matters relating to the school and highways and included a letter of support from the Vice-Chairman of the Governors of Holt Primary School.

The Major Projects Manager clarified that the school did not form part of the outline proposal and the application description had been amended to make this clear. He stated that the changes were minor and did not require reconsultation.

The Major Projects Manager recommended delegated approval of this application, subject to the completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation, as set out in the report.

Councillor D Baker, a local Member, considered there had been little change since the application had previously been considered. Local people would have to live with the consequences of a bad decision if this were approved. The location was inappropriate and it was contrary to the Council's policies to build in the countryside, which was even more important given the climate emergency. He stated that school numbers were falling, despite a large increase in the number of dwellings in Holt, and there was spare capacity at the existing primary school and surrounding village schools. There was also no funding commitment to build the new school. He considered that the access was unsuitable and problems would not be mitigated by a parking and travel plan. He appreciated the need for affordable homes, but the Council had demonstrated a five-year housing land supply and he did not consider the argument stacked up. He was convinced that a better, more appropriate site would come forward for the school.

Councillor Mrs G Perry-Warnes, a local Member, supported Councillor Baker's comments. The residential element of the proposal was contrary to the Development Plan. However, Policy SS2 stated that the provision of a community facility might be sufficient to outweigh the policy and she considered that the two elements of this proposal should be considered together. She also considered that it was extraordinary that the Committee was being asked to consider only the residential element of the proposal and disregard the detrimental impact on local residents of traffic arising from school pick up and drop off. She requested that the uncertainty regarding the delivery of a school be addressed by the imposition of a condition to require an alternative community amenity so that Holt did not end up without the necessary public benefit to justify departure from the Development Plan. She had major concerns regarding the impact of traffic and road safety issues on local roads and the wider road network, including traffic contributing to an existing pinch point on Hempstead Road. She requested deferral of this application to allow the Committee to visit Sheringham Primary School at pick up and drop off times, or refusal as she considered that the cumulative benefits of the proposal did not outweigh the identified conflict with Development Plan Policy. She considered that Policy SS2 could not justify an exception to the Development Plan if the impact of the primary school on local residents did not form part of the application.

The independent Highway Consultant explained that the additional traffic arising from the residential proposal was considered to be well within normal accepted threshold levels for a residential road with a width of 5.5 metres, and it would be difficult to sustain a highway objection from the housing development alone. There were some issues relating to parking demand and tracking of school coaches, but although tight, it was possible to get a coach down Beresford Road. In conclusion, there was a need for a parking management plan and travel plan to support a future application for a primary school but he considered that there was no problem with the proposal as presented.

The Education Authority representative explained how new schools across Norfolk were planned and funded. No funding commitment was allocated to any new school until there was evidence that pupil numbers were sufficient to justify a new school and planning permission was secured. NCC Cabinet had approved a schools growth investment plan which included Holt.

Councillor Mrs S Bütikofer stated that she was speaking as a Norfolk County Councillor and not as Leader of NNDC. She considered that Councillors Baker and Perry-Warnes had expressed the issues clearly. She considered that it was wholly inadequate that the independent highways report did not take into account the impact of school traffic and a decision could not be made on the impact of traffic

without an appropriate travel plan. She was constantly being asked as a County Councillor about traffic problems in that area. A pinch point was shortly to be fitted on Hempstead Road, which was the main road feeding into the site, due to problems in the area. With regard to school numbers, she referred to a report which was due to be considered by the Planning Policy and Built Heritage Working Party regarding population growth, which showed a projected decrease in the younger population and increase in the number of elderly people. These figures supported the argument she had made to the Education Authority regarding the need to take into account the demographic of North Norfolk.

Councillor N Lloyd welcomed the applicant's attempt to address climate change issues but was disappointed that solar PV had not been proposed. He stated that this proposal was an exception, in the countryside, and a greater degree of benefit should be achieved. He considered that in general, developers should offer more on sites such as this given the pending climate crisis.

Councillor G Mancini-Boyle expressed concern that the local medical services may not be able to cope with the additional patients arising from the development.

The Major Projects Manager referred to the response from NHS England included in the October report and confirmed that the Section 106 Obligation would include a contribution of £38,167 to address the impact on the NHS.

Councillor P Heinrich referred to the positive aspects of the proposal. It was smaller than the application which was rejected in 2014, had a better proportion of affordable homes which would go some way to meet the needs of local people, improved access to Holt Country Park and provision of land for a school. The existing school was not fit for 21st century education. There appeared to be no issue with coaches. However, he was not fully convinced by the application.

Councillor N Pearce stated that he would like to see more low cost housing as there were 2000 families on the waiting list throughout the District, and to see Holt grow and prosper. However, he had severe concerns regarding traffic management and road safety. A new school was needed but there was no commitment to it, and he had concerns as to what would happen to the land if a school was not developed within 10 years.

Councillor Dr C Stockton also expressed concern with regard to the future of the land and referred to Councillor Mrs Perry-Warnes' suggestion that the land should be secured for an alternative community use in the event that a school was not built. He had grave concerns regarding traffic.

Councillor A Brown requested clarity with regard to the number of dwellings as the new Local Plan suggested an allocation of 70-100 dwellings, whereas this proposal exceeded that number. He stated that it had been known for 5 years that a new school would be required, the Inspector's report was supportive of it and yet there was no commitment to an option agreement on the land to secure the building of a school. He considered that this application demonstrated that a joint application for the development was needed. He requested clarification as to what would happen to the land if the school was not built as there appeared to be a discrepancy in the report.

The Major Projects Manager explained that the land would fall back to the developer if the option was not taken up by the Education Authority. However, the land would have nil use and a planning application would be required for an alternative use,

which would be considered by NNDC as Local Planning Authority. No planning use was being granted for the land under the current application. Whilst consideration was being given to allocating the land, no weight could be given to the new Local Plan at this stage. The land had been identified as being suitable for a new school and there was no evidence that alternative sites for a school would be available. He advised the Committee to think strategically to secure the best for Holt in the long term. There was evidence that a new school would be required within the 10 year period. The affordable housing would be for local housing to help meet the needs of Holt as it was currently in the Countryside policy area, and this application could secure benefits that might not be available if the land was allocated in the new Local Plan.

Councillor C Cushing expressed concern that the site was not currently within the planning framework and the proposal would not be considered if it did not include land for a new school. He considered that it would be appropriate to consider an application at such time as there was a requirement and need for a new school, which did not appear to be the case at the present time.

Councillor Dr C Stockton asked if it would be possible to impose a condition to require the land to be offered for community use before any other use.

The Principal Lawyer advised the Committee with regard to the requirement that applications must accord with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicated otherwise. The new Development Plan would allocate land around Holt, including land for a school, and a future application would be determined in accordance with it in the event that the school did not go ahead. It would be for the local plan process to secure the optimum future community use and not the Section 106 Obligation.

The Head of Planning stated that it was a difficult proposal but it was lawful to make the application. He advised the Committee with regard to the highway and education issues. There were no sustainable highway objections, and nothing exceptional about this application with regard to the process for the delivery of a school. He advised the Committee that the Officer's recommendation was sound and logical.

There was no proposer for the Officer's report. The Principal Lawyer advised that under the Council's Standing Orders, if considered appropriate by the Chair, the Officer's recommendation could be deemed to be proposed and seconded.

On being put to the vote, the proposal was declared lost with no votes in favour, 12 votes against and 2 abstentions.

Following a brief discussion and advice from the Officers, it was proposed by Councillor N Lloyd, seconded by Councillor R Kershaw and

RESOLVED by 11 votes to 0 with 3 abstentions

That this application be refused on grounds that it is contrary to Local Plan Policies SS1 and SS2 as the material considerations advanced in favour of this development are not sufficient to outweigh the identified conflict with the Development Plan.

DETACHED GARAGE WITH STORAGE ABOVE, INCLUDING PART RETROSPECTIVE ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING SECTION OF FRONT BOUNDARY WALL; LAND EAST OF NO.5 (FORMER READING ROOM), LANGHAM ROAD, BINHAM, NR21 0DW FOR MR BIRCHAM

Public Speaker

Jerry Stone (supporting)

The Senior Planning Officer stated that the Human Rights section of the report should refer to refusal and not approval. She presented the report and displayed plans and photographs of the site, including a plan of the visibility splay which would be required but was not part of this proposal. She advised the Committee that a long term family connection was not a material planning consideration. She recommended refusal of this application as set out in the report.

The NCC Highways Officer explained how visibility splays were assessed. He stated that in this case the visibility fell far short of the requirements for roads of this nature and he maintained his recommendation for refusal.

Councillor R Kershaw, the local Member, stated that the Parish Council fully supported the application, which would allow someone to move back into the village who could not otherwise afford to do so, and would remove an eyesore. The applicant was giving up a right of way with no visibility and the proposed splay would be safer. Although the Highway Authority would not allow the erection of a mirror on highway land, the land on the opposite side of the road was owned by the applicant and a mirror would face north west and would not reflect sunlight. He considered that the applicant had done all he could to fulfil planning and highway requirements.

Councillor P Fisher referred to the site inspection and stated that he could clearly see another Member's car whilst it was still within the site. He asked if more consideration could be given to the new Local Plan which would identify Binham as a Growth Village.

The Head of Planning stated that the emerging Local Plan was in its very early stages and it could not be given significant weight. The current Local Plan policies had to be applied to the application. Officers did not share the Local Member's view with regard to the benefits of the proposal. The Council had a five year land supply and the site was not considered to be an otherwise sustainable location which could be considered for infill development.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett stated that she had driven onto the site and did not have a problem with the access. She referred to an application at Alby which had been approved against highway advice a few years previously, although Members had to take personal responsibility if there was a problem as a result of the decision. She also referred to the NPPF and asked what weight could be given to it in respect of rural villages.

The Head of Planning stated that national planning advice required sites to be assessed against sustainability criteria. There would be a small amount of economic benefit from the building of the dwelling and bringing new residents into the village, but this was limited. As the Council had a five year land supply it would add little if anything to the land supply issue. There were environmental issues with regard to the loss of the wall. Officers considered that there were issues which prevented the site from being an otherwise sustainable location.

The Principal Lawyer advised that it was very rare that personal circumstances would amount to a material planning consideration. He advised caution against a temporary justification for a permanent impact.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett stated that Binham was a busy village. She considered that the proposal would be a vast improvement. She considered that the location was relatively sustainable, the proposal would remove an eyesore and the application should be approved.

Councillor N Pearce referred to the policy issues and stated that the Council was tasked with looking after its heritage. He proposed refusal in accordance with the recommendation of the Head of Planning.

Councillor N Lloyd stated that several cars had been parked on the site at the site inspection, which contradicted the safety concerns. The existing building was dilapidated and would decay further. The frontage wall was hardly visible as it was covered in vegetation. He disagreed with the Officers regarding the sustainability issues. As there were buildings on either side it was marginal as to whether the site was considered to be in the countryside.

The Interim Development Manager advised the Committee with regard to the spatial strategy and Policy SS1. Officers did not consider that this proposal would promote sustainable patterns of development, as required by the spatial strategy.

A number of Members commented that they had not had a problem with visibility at the site inspection.

Councillor Dr C Stockton supported the views of Councillors Lloyd and Fitch-Tillett. Councillor Mrs W Fredericks added that conservation of a village was not just about buildings, but also about keeping families with connections in villages where they could live and work.

In response to a question by Councillor A Yiasimi regarding accidents at this location, the Highways Officer stated that there was no history of recorded accidents, although this did not mean that it was inherently safe.

The Head of Planning advised the Committee that the highway safety issues were significant and there may be issues if accidents happened as a result of permission. A lack of recorded accidents did not guarantee that there would be no accidents at a later stage. He referred to the Conservation and Design comments regarding the loss of the wall.

It was proposed by Councillor N Pearce, seconded by Councillor P Fisher that this application be refused in accordance with the recommendation of the Head of Planning. The proposal was lost with 4 Members voting in favour and 9 against, with one abstention.

It was proposed by Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett, seconded by Councillor R Kershaw and

RESOLVED by 9 votes to 5

That this application be approved, subject to the flint wall being lowered and not removed, and subject to the imposition of conditions considered to be

appropriate by the Head of Planning.

Reason: This application is supported by the NPPF for village developments, it is a self-build proposal and Binham is a sustainable location.

108 COLBY - PF/19/1974 - CONVERSION OF BARN TO 2NO.DWELLINGS (PART RETROSPECTIVE); HEPPINN BARN, NORTH WALSHAM ROAD, BANNINGHAM, NORWICH, NR11 7DU FOR MRS JONES

Public Speakers

Mo Anderson-Dungar (Colby with Banningham Parish Council)
Ann Bartaby (supporting)

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report. He displayed plans and photographs of the site, including plans which had been approved under Class Q and photographs of the building prior to development and as currently existing. He recommended refusal of this application as set out in the report.

The Interim Development Manager explained that the extent of rebuilding which was required meant that the proposal was not a conversion of an agricultural building which would comply with Class Q. The proposal was considered to be new build in an unsustainable location. Other powers were available to deal with untidy sites.

Councillor J Toye, the local Member, considered Aim 1 of the Core Strategy was relevant given the personal circumstances related to service life and family members who were disabled or elderly. In addition, the proposal would meet Aim 3 of the Core Strategy to protect and enhance the environment and to protect, restore and enhance the landscape and biodiversity. He referred to the local support for this proposal. He supported the plans to include natural hedging, encourage wildlife and use renewable resources. The dwelling would replace a derelict shed, and a family home would be a welcome addition. He explained that technical difficulties and miscommunication had led to the contraventions and the applicants had stopped building as soon as they had become aware of it. The dwelling would be built on the footprint of the previously approved application and would include the remains of the existing building. He stated that policy EN8 did not specify how much of the original building could be replaced. He considered that this application should be approved.

Councillor A Yiasimi considered that the unauthorised work had not been done on purpose.

Councillor A Brown asked if the Authority had expressed sympathy for the applicant having been given incorrect advice. It was necessary to apply planning policy and having listened to the circumstances he understood the need for the project to proceed. However, he found it difficult to understand to what extent the development carried out to date was conversion and new build and what percentages constituted conversion and new build. He suggested that a site inspection may clarify the matter.

The Head of Planning explained that officers had met with the applicant and her representatives and had endeavoured at length to try to find a solution. On the basis of the advice given, the applicant had chosen to proceed with the solution which was before the Committee. Officers had expressed sympathy and had endeavoured to bring forward the applicant's proposals to Committee in a timely manner.

Councillor A Brown proposed a site inspection.

Councillor N Pearce asked if the applicant could continue to build on the original foundations and asked for clarification with regard to conversion if foundations were retained.

The Head of Planning explained that case law was divided on this issue. He was unable to give a percentage of the building which should be retained but case law required that buildings were substantially retained. Local Plan policy required that buildings should be structurally sound and capable of conversion. Officers considered that there had been a substantial level of demolition but accepted that it had come about through misunderstanding of Part Q and there had been no deliberate intention to flout the rules.

Councillor Dr C Stockton seconded the proposal for a site inspection.

RESOLVED unanimously

That consideration of this application be deferred to allow the Committee to carry out a site inspection.

109 **MUNDESLEY - PF/19/1664 - ERECTION OF TWO BEDROOM DETACHED DWELLING FOLLOWING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING TRIPLE GARAGES; LAND OPPOSITE 8 HEATH LANE, MUNDESLEY, NR11 8JP FOR MR LEES**

Public Speaker

Frank Lees (supporting)

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report and displayed plans and photographs of the site, including a plan that had been submitted following the previous meeting showing the building in context with the street scene. He also displayed two additional photographs at the request of the applicant, showing developments along Heath Lane, and photographs taken from the adjacent property showing the site in context. He recommended refusal of this application as set out in the report.

The Senior Planning Officer clarified the flood zones and stated that the Environment Agency had objected to the application. The Environment Agency had acknowledged that the site was likely to be designated as Flood Zone 1, but the maps had not been officially updated and the application had to be determined as existing.

Councillor Mrs W Fredericks, the local Member, stated that the Parish Council supported this application. The street view was extremely varied, with the only exception being the garages. The applicant wanted to build a new dwelling for his retirement, which would release a 4-bed home to accommodate a family. She referred to the flood zone review.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett referred to the lack of the required information with regard to flooding and expressed concern that water would flow through the site in a rain event and into the River Mun. She proposed refusal of this application as recommended by the Head of Planning.

Councillor A Varley considered that Heath Lane was a charming, idyllic setting and

the existing garages did not belong to the setting. He considered that the design of the proposed dwelling was ambitious and would enhance the area. However, he would hesitate to approve the application until there was certainty with regard to the flood zones.

Councillor N Pearce supported the views expressed by Councillor Mrs Fitch-Tillett. He also considered that the proposed design was not in keeping with Heath Lane as it was cramped, did not match the heritage of the site and was not conducive to good planning. Whilst he had sympathy with the applicant, he seconded the proposal to refuse this application.

Councillor A Yiasimi considered that the proposed dwelling would enhance the area and the existing garages were an eyesore. Although the new flood zone designation had not been officially confirmed, the Officers had the information in writing and he therefore supported the application.

Councillor R Kershaw noted from the photographs of other infill dwellings on Heath Lane that they were lower than the surrounding buildings and within a larger space. The proposed dwelling appeared to be higher than the adjacent dwellings, although the report stated that it was not. However, he considered that the site would be cramped.

Councillor A Brown supported Councillor Kershaw's views and noted that 3 Heath Lane would have a gable immediately contiguous with its boundary and he considered that light to the existing gable window would be severely compromised.

Councillor Mrs W Fredericks asked if it would be appropriate to defer consideration until the flood zone designation was confirmed.

The Head of Planning explained that the Council had to make decisions on the basis of the information it had. There was a current planning appeal on this site and it was likely that the Planning Inspector would rule on design and other issues which would provide a clear precedent. Deferral pending a decision on the flood zone could cause difficulties and he recommended that the application was determined on the current basis.

RESOLVED with 13 votes in favour

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

110 **SUSTEAD - PF/19/2033 - DEMOLITION OF SCAFFOLD YARD BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES AND ERECTION OF TWO DETACHED HOUSES AND DETACHED SINGLE GARAGES; THE YARD, THE STREET, SUSTEAD, NORWICH, NR11 8RU FOR WILD BOAR PROPERTIES LTD**

Public Speakers

Maggie Bolan (Sustead Parish Council)
Andrew Temperton (supporting)

The Interim Development Manager presented the report and displayed plans and photographs of the site, including elevations to the street. He reported that a bus service ran between Cromer and North Walsham via Sustead but this was unlikely to be an attractive or convenient option for the occupiers of the new dwellings as there

were only two buses in each direction per day at mid-morning and mid-afternoon. A letter had been sent to all Committee Members by the occupier of Wendy Cottage, reiterating points which had previously been made, and an email from Mr Temperton was also forwarded to the Committee.

The Interim Development Manager recommended refusal of this application as set out in the report.

Following Mr Temperton's supporting comments, the Head of Planning explained that Officers had met with the applicant, who had confirmed that he would be submitting an application for residential development. However it was not his recollection that Officers had encouraged the proposal.

Councillor J Toye, the local Member, stated that he had not called in the application and would have been happy to accept the recommendation for refusal. He referred to the history of the site, discussions he had had with the Parish Council and local residents and correspondence he had received from the applicant. He considered there were good planning reasons to refuse the application. He stated that as a local Member he supported the permanent residents of the village. The only support for the application had come from Mr Temperton and another property owner who visited infrequently. The Parish Council had unanimously objected to this application and had consulted residents who had not previously commented to gauge the opinion of the whole village. He considered that the site would be greatly improved by removing the remaining parts of the former scaffold yard as they were unsightly and there were problems with vermin.

Councillor C Cushing referred to comparisons the applicant had drawn with the application at Binham that had been considered earlier in the meeting. He considered that there was nothing in this application that would benefit the village. He proposed refusal as recommended by the Head of Planning.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett seconded the proposal. She considered that this application bore no comparison to the Binham application. The site was totally unsustainable and there was no need for additional housing in this location.

Councillor N Pearce stated that Sustead was an unsustainable village, with no connection to Cromer. He considered that the proposal would not enhance the village and was not supported by the community.

The Interim Development Manager clarified that one letter of support had been received from a local resident and the other had been sent by a person who could be a relative of the application. It had not been signed by him.

RESOLVED unanimously

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

111 APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR A SITE INSPECTION

None in addition to PF/19/1974 above.

112 APPEALS SECTION

(a) NEW APPEALS

The Committee noted item 13(a) of the agenda.

(b) INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS - PROGRESS

The Committee noted item 13(b) of the agenda.

(c) WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS APPEALS - IN HAND

The Committee noted item 13(c) of the agenda.

(d) APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee noted item 13(d) of the agenda.

The Interim Development Manager reported that the appeals in respect of wind turbine proposals at Bodham and Selbrigg had been allowed. The appeal in respect of Letheringsett with Glandford PF/18/1980 had been dismissed.

The Interim Development Manager also reported that appeals in respect of a farm access at Ridlington and a prior approval application at Southcroft, North Walsham, which had not been included in the report, had been dismissed.

The Major Projects Manager informed the Committee that Counsel's advice was being sought in respect of the wind turbine decisions and the Committee would be updated in due course.

Members expressed disappointment at the outcome of the wind turbine appeals. The Head of Planning stated that a summary of the decisions would be submitted to the next meeting.

(e) COURT CASES – PROGRESS AND RESULTS

The Committee noted item 13(e) of the agenda.

The meeting closed at 1.12 pm.

CHAIRMAN
Thursday, 5 March 2020