

THURSDAY, 15 OCTOBER 2020

Minutes of a meeting of the **Development Committee** held remotely via Zoom at 9.30 am when there were present:

Councillors

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

Mr A Brown
Mr P Fisher
Mrs W Fredericks
Mr G Mancini-Boyle
Mr A Varley

Mr C Cushing
Mrs A Fitch-Tillett
Mr R Kershaw
Mr N Pearce
Mr A Yiasimi

Mr J Toye (In place of Mr N Lloyd)

Observers

Mr T FitzPatrick
Mr V FitzPatrick

Officers

Ms S Ashurst, Development Manager
Mr N Doran, Principal Lawyer
Mr D Watson, Interim Development Manager
Owen, Planning Officer
Young
E Denny, Democratic Services Manager
Miss L Yarham, Democratic Services & Governance Officer (Regulatory)

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

An apology for absence was received from Councillor N Lloyd. Councillor J Toye attended the meeting as his substitute.

32 MINUTES

The Minutes of a meeting of the Committee held on 1 October 2020 were approved as a correct record.

33 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

34 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

A blanket declaration was made on behalf of all Members of the Committee in respect of Walsingham PF/20/0590 as both applicants were serving NNDC Councillors.

BRISTON - PF/19/1648 - ERECTION OF 9 DWELLINGS WITH GARAGES (3 NO. TWO-STOREY DETACHED DWELLINGS, 2 NO. TWO-STOREY SEMI-DETACHED DWELLINGS AND 4 NO. SEMI-DETACHED CHALET BUNGALOWS, ASSOCIATED ACCESS ROAD AND DRIVEWAYS; HOLLY HOUSE, THE LANE, BRISTON, NR24 2JX FOR OPTIONS FOR HOMES LIMITED

The Interim Development Manager presented the report and referred to the slides that had previously been circulated to the Committee. He stated that the final paragraph on page 6 should read "In respect of housing mix and housing type HO6 of the core strategy requires that *five* or more dwellings ...". He confirmed that the applicant had now agreed to the required SAC payment of £50 per dwelling. He recommended the approval of this application as set out in the report.

The Interim Development Manager read a statement in support of this application from Brad Bamfield, a representative of the applicants, who was unable to attend the meeting.

The Democratic Services Manager informed the Committee that Councillor Mrs J Stenton, the local Member, had sent her apologies and had made no statement in respect of this application.

Councillor G Mancini-Boyle requested clarification with regard to the Parish Council's concerns regarding access onto the lane.

The Interim Development Manager stated that it had been suggested that access should be through Holly House. However, the access had been approved previously in the position indicated, there had been no objection from the Highway Authority and the site allocation DPD also referred to access from Orchard Close as proposed.

Councillor N Pearce stated that he understood the concerns regarding the access and the hedge surrounding the site. However, he considered that overall this was a reasonably good proposal for a service village with a good mix of housing. He proposed approval of the application as recommended.

Councillor C Cushing seconded the proposal.

Councillor Mrs W Fredericks requested an assurance that the dwellings would be affordable for local people to buy.

The Interim Development Manager stated that the dwellings were not affordable housing as defined in the NPPF. There would be a mix of market dwellings. There was no requirement to provide affordable housing on this site as it was below the threshold.

Councillor Mrs Fredericks referred to a similar development in her Ward which had a mix of dwellings but they were not affordable for local people. She requested an explanation of the SAC payment.

The Interim Development Manager explained that it was payment towards Special Areas of Conservation to reduce the impact of visitor pressure on such areas.

Councillor P Heinrich considered that there was no reason to reject the application as permission had previously been granted for development on the site and the current application was almost identical except that it was a less crowded

development.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett gave the Committee further background on the SAC payment.

Councillor J Toye considered that it was disappointing that the proposal would not result in affordable housing given the reduced number of dwellings. However, he supported this application.

Councillor G Mancini-Boyle considered that although the lack of affordable housing was disappointing, there was a possibility that the dwellings would be available for first time buyers.

The Chairman expressed concern regarding the hedge.

The Development Manager explained that the Landscape Officer was content that the condition to retain the hedge at 3 metres was adequate.

RESOLVED by 12 votes to 0 with 1 abstention

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

36

WALSINGHAM - PF/20/0590 ERECTION OF DETACHED TWO STOREY DWELLING: ST JAMES COTTAGE, 18 BRIDEWELL STREET, WALSINGHAM, NR22 6BJ FOR MESSRS FITZPATRICK

The Planning Officer presented the report and referred to the slides that had previously been circulated to the Committee. She reported that the Parish Council continued to object to the amended application in respect of development in the historic area, materials, loss of garden space and unsafe access onto Bridewell Street. She recommended refusal of this application as set out in the report.

The Planning Officer read a statement of objection from a neighbouring resident, Mr Postgate, who was unable to attend the meeting.

Public Speaker

Richard Smith (supporting)

Councillor C Cushing stated that he was speaking as the local Member was unable to speak on this application and he was a neighbouring Ward Member. He stated that the report acknowledged that there was no reason in principle why development could not take place in this location. He considered that the proposed development was in keeping with the area and would not be intrusive, and in his opinion was in compliance with Policy EN8. He referred to the arboricultural impact assessment with regard to the trees, which were of poor quality or of low amenity value and he considered that the application should not be refused on grounds of Policy EN4, particularly as two trees were to be planted. He supported the application.

The Development Manager reminded the Committee that it was under a legal obligation to preserve and enhance heritage assets. There was more than one heritage asset to consider in this case; as well as the Conservation Area and how the building would assimilate into the area, the host building was also a Listed Building and its setting should be considered. The garden of 18 Bridewell Street

would be foreshortened and therefore its setting would be affected by the proposal.

The Conservation and Design Team Leader explained that the setting of a Listed Building was how it was experienced, and in his opinion the best way to do so was in its original context with its original garden and enclosures in place. He considered that it was difficult to consider that an additional building within the original curtilage could be seen as positive. He explained how the proposed building, and its materials, would be seen from outside the site. He was concerned that the proposed dwelling would be imposing on the yard, rather than be assimilated within it.

The Principal Lawyer read to the Committee, sections 66 and 72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act which set out the statutory duty relevant to this case.

At the request of the Chairman, the Development Manager explained the levels of harm. She stated that 'less than substantial harm' was wide ranging and the Committee had to establish where on the scale this proposal sat. It was necessary for public benefit to outweigh the harm.

Councillor G Mancini-Boyle stated that he was surprised at how modern the surrounding buildings were. The building on the opposite side of the yard had a similar finish to the proposed building. He considered that access would not be an issue.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett stated that Walsingham was a special place and internationally known, and stressed how important it was to preserve its character. She proposed the Officer's recommendation to refuse this application.

Councillor A Brown seconded the proposal. He considered that the proposed building would camouflage the Listed Building from the street. It appeared that the materials and design would not satisfy the North Norfolk Design Guide and he asked why the applicants had not been requested to redesign the building to blend into the area.

The Conservation and Design Team Leader explained that the original proposal had included timber cladding which had been removed in response to his concerns. Although render was used on another property in the yard, it was set back and the visible materials in the yard were brick and flint. In his latest comments, he had suggested using more traditional materials that would assimilate the building into the Conservation Area.

The Chairman referred to comments by Mr Smith that the proposed building would provide a uniform frontage to Chapel Yard so there would not be a gap. She asked if this was substantial.

The Conservation and Design Team Leader explained that this was a yard, framed by buildings, but was not a street scene in the conventional sense. He did not view the site as a gap site and considered that the wall around the site was a strong enclosure. He did not consider that an additional building would make a positive contribution.

Councillor R Kershaw considered that there would be harm and a loss of amenity. The reduction of the size of the garden would be detrimental, and the area provided a welcome open space in a crowded area. Whilst the trees were past their best,

they provided a welcome relief and he considered that a building on the site would be detrimental.

Councillor N Pearce considered this was an area of disused land, the trees were not worthy of retention and two trees would be planted. He considered that discussions could be held with the agent with regard to the render. He considered that the harm was at the lower end of the scale, highway concerns had been negated, and the proposal would allow another dwelling within the village. He supported the application.

The Development Manager clarified that this was not an area of disused land as it was the garden to 18 Bridewell Street and could be maintained as such.

RESOLVED by 9 votes to 4

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

37

APPEALS SECTION

(a) NEW APPEALS

The Committee noted item 9(a) of the agenda.

(b) INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS - PROGRESS

The Committee noted item 9(b) of the agenda.

The Development Manager stated that registration details for the Inquiry in respect of Holt PO/18/1857 would be circulated to Members following the meeting.

Confirmation of the hearing date and mediation date for Cley ENF/18/0164 were awaited.

A planning application had been submitted in relation to Itteringham ENF/17/0006 which if approved may result in the withdrawal of the appeal.

(c) WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS APPEALS - IN HAND

The Committee noted item 9(c) of the agenda.

The Development Manager reported that the appeal in respect of High Kelling ENF/16/0131 had been downgraded to written representations and a hearing would no longer take place.

(d) APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee noted item 9(d) of the agenda.

The Development Manager reported that the appeal in respect of Cley PF/19/1893 had been allowed as the Inspector did not consider that a temporary permission was necessary to establish impact on the highway network and had granted permanent permission.

The Development Manager referred to the appeal in respect of Hindolveston

PO/19/1751 which had been dismissed. Therefore the Council's policies continued to carry full weight in respect of development in the Countryside.

(e) COURT CASES – PROGRESS AND RESULTS

The Committee noted item 9(e) of the agenda.

The meeting closed at 10.50 am.

CHAIRMAN
Thursday, 29 October 2020