DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Development Committee held on Thursday, 16 December 2021 in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 9.30 am

Committee Members Present:	Mrs P Grove-Jones (Chairman)	Mr P Heinrich (Vice-Chairman)
	Mr A Brown	Mr P Fisher
	Mrs A Fitch-Tillett	Dr V Holliday
	Mr R Kershaw	Mr N Lloyd
	Mr G Mancini-Boyle	Ms L Withington
Members also attending:		
Officers in Attendance:	Assistant Director for Planning, Principal Lawyer, Democratic Services & Governance Officer, Development Management Team Leader, Senior Planning Officer and Democratic Services and Governance Officer - Scrutiny Democratic Services & Governance Officer – Regulatory	
Also in attendance:	Darren Mortimer – Highways Development Management Officer for Norfolk County Council (HDMO)	

56 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Committee Member, Cllr A Varley, and from the local Member for Holt Ward, Cllr G Perry-Warnes.

57 SUBSTITUTES

None arranged.

58 MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting held on 18 November 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

59 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None received.

60 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr A Fitch-Tillett declared an interest with relation to Agenda Item 8, Planning Application PF/21/2263. As the local ward Member for Northrepps, Cllr A Fitch-Tillett had indicated her support for application and advised she would abstain from voting on this matter.

61 NORTHREPPS - PF/21/2263 - SITING OF FOUR GLAMPING PODS FOR HOLIDAY USE AT SHRUBLANDS FARM CAMPING SITE, CRAFT LANE, NORTHREPPS FOR MR J YOUNGMAN

The DMTL introduced the report to Members and reiterated the officer's recommendation for refusal of the application located within AONB for reasons outlined in the report. The DMTL noted the revised response from Norfolk County Council (NCC) Highways Department, from no objection to objection, which had been received retrospective to the publication of the Agenda Pack. NCC Highways cited concerns that access via Craft Lane would be inadequate to serve the proposed development by reason of its poor alignment, restricted width, lack of passing provision, restricted visibility at adjacent road junctions and lack of pedestrian facilities.

Public Speakers

Alistair Mackay – Chairman, Northrepps Parish Council
Jeremy Youngman (Supporting)
Amber Slater (Supporting)

Questions and Discussion

i. The Local Member – Cllr A Fitch-Tillett affirmed her support for the application. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett referenced two letters, the first from NNDC dated 5 April 1982 permitting development for camping at Shrublands Farm. The second, a letter of support from the licensee of the Foundry Arms in Northrepps, commending the investment and diversification of businesses to attract tourists in the backdrop of financial difficulties associated with the Covid-19 pandemic. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett stated that discussion should focus on the application only, and questioned the references made to adjacent land also owned by the applicant. The local Member commented that Craft Lane, whilst narrow, was in use as part of the Bus Route to North Walsham and that the applicant was prepared to install a footpath on land they owned to connect with footpaths owned by County Council in centre of Northrepps village. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett noted her understanding that the application was a change from camping, which had been permitted for 30 years, to site of glamping pods rather than a new development. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett stated that diversification was vital for the farming community, and referred to DEFRA's recommendation for farms to diversify, in part, due to the phased withdrawal of EU Basic Payment Scheme subsidies.

ii. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle stated his support for the application in that he did not believe that the inclusion for 4 glamping pods to be a substantial change to the site. Additionally, that farmers should be applauded for diversification of business and in helping to grow the economy during difficult financial times.

iii. Cllr P Heinrich noted concerns that maintaining access for Campsite Licence (CL) albeit with restrictions to campervans and caravans, in addition to possible use of the adjacent site located to the north, created potential for intensification of use. He added that the glamping pods would also serve as permanent structures within the AONB.

iv. Cllr R Kershaw asserted his support the diversification of farming as recommended by DEFRA, and noted the difficulties within the hospitality sector during Covid-19 pandemic. Cllr R Kershaw spoke in favour of the application and noted that he was familiar with the site which was located within a hollow. He added that the instillation of glamping pods would reduce volume of caravans using Craft Lane, would not contribute to light pollution,

and he could not determine the harm to the AONB.

v. Cllr A Brown echoed Members support for diversification of farming businesses to aid recovery from the Covid-19 pandemic. He raised issue with the potential over intensification of tourist provision to the north of the site, with reference to existing permissions for this land. Cllr A Brown reiterated that it was Members duty to respond to applications in accordance with planning policy, unless there was material consideration which would outweigh the harm, and asked whether there was anything which could prevent proliferation of the site.

vi. The ADP stated the importance of applications which depart from policy and relayed that officer's identified harm to the AONB in their report. The ADP responded to Cllr A Brown's question and suggested that it was primarily a matter for the land owner and their representatives, though unilateral undertaking could be made between the applicant and NNDC to support reduced use, or no use of camping on the adjacent land. The ADP advised members to consider the land detailed in this application rather than adjacent land.

vii. The PL endorsed advise supplied by the ADP, in that the adjoining land was not part of the application, and whilst legal options could be considered, they were not relevant to discussion.

viii. Cllr N Lloyd noted concerns with relation to the permanent nature of the glamping pods within the AONB.

ix. Following questions from the Chairman, the HDMO commented that should the proposal be considered as replacement of existing caravans this may not lead to an increase of vehicles. However, the HDMO noted that the route was not ideal and would support objection if the application was an overdevelopment of the site, rather than replacement, which would be treated differently.

x. Cllr R Kershaw proposed, Cllr P Heinrich seconded the officer's recommendation for refusal.

RESOLVED by 6 votes for, 3 against, and 1 abstention.

That application PF/21/2263 be refused in accordance with the recommendation presented in the Officers Report.

62 HOLT - PF/21/2573 - EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING BUNGALOW INCLUDING FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION; ERECTION OF DETACHED DWELLING TO REAR AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT 21 PEACOCK LANE, HOLT FOR A MR AND MRS ROBERTS

The SPO introduced the report to members and reiterated recommendation for refusal with respect to NCC Highways objection located on P.22 of the Agenda Pack.

<u>Public Speakers</u>
Stephen Roberts (Supporting)

Questions and Discussion

i. The ADP, with the consent of the Chairman, relayed a statement prepared by the Local Member- Cllr G Perry-Warnes who was unable to attend the meeting which detailed her support for the application. The statement noted that the applicants and their agents had adapted a prior proposal with the assistance of the NNDC Planning team to bring their proposal into compliance with planning policy. Cllr G Perry-Warnes had also noted that the recommendation for refusal was based exclusively on the submission from NCC Highways, and reflected that the objection was not proportionate for a single household.

ii. Cllr N Lloyd stated his support for the application as he did not believe there to be sufficient reason for refusal. Cllr N Lloyd added that it would have been preferable to see environmental considerations made within the application to address the Climate Emergency.

iii. Cllr L Withington clarified that the prior designation for no further development from NCC was made in relation to the suitability of Peacock Lane to serve an additional 100 properties rather than 1.

iv. The HDMO affirmed comments submitted by NCC Highways on the unsuitability of the junction with Cromer Road to cater for additional traffic and footfall, given the junction's constraints. The HDMO noted that recent building developments erected on Peacock Lane had been replacements of existing dwellings, and added that development of 19 Peacock Lane had been consented on the condition that a footpath be implemented to mitigate risk to pedestrians. The HDMO referred to the NPPF, Section 9 – Sustainable Transport, paragraph 112 subsections a, b and c and cited these conditions would not be met by the application.

v. The ADP noted that Members should reflect on the proposed application rather than other historic planning developments, and that Members should consider the balance between the professional advice received and representations made from the applicant.

vi. Cllr A Brown indicated his support for the application and expressed his belief that the impact of one new development was not so substantial as to put highways safety in jeopardy. Additionally, due to the nature of the junction between Peacock Lane with Cromer Road, road users approached with care, and this had been reflected in the absence of accident statistics.

vii. Cllr P Heinrich expressed his support for the application noting that the only reason given for refusal was the NCC Highways submission, and whilst Peacock Lane was narrow, he questioned whether the increase of road usage posed a real additional danger.

viii. Cllr V Holiday spoke in favour of refusal of the application, noting that she was familiar with the road which she believed to be unsafe, particularly at the junction with Cromer Road.

ix. In response to questions by the Chairman, the HDMO confirmed that there had been no accidents on the road in the last 20 years, but Highways considerations were not based solely on statistics, and there were other

considerations made when determining whether to object to an application.

x. Cllr V Holiday proposed, the Chairman seconded, refusal of the application for the reasons as detailed in the officers report

VOTE WAS LOST by 4 votes for, 6 votes against.

xi. The ADP detailed options which Councillors had available to them including to consider a different recommendation from that contained within the Officer's recommendation, or to defer the application.

xii. Cllr N Lloyd reiterated prior comments that the lack of accident data was an important influencing factor for voting in favour of the application, and that the perception of danger had not been reflected in the statistics. Cllr N Lloyd proposed approval of the application, subject to conditions placed by officers.

xiii. Cllr A Brown seconded the proposal that the application be approved subject to conditions for disabled access and energy efficiency.

xiv. Cllr R Kershaw enquired whether signage could be erected to alert road users that this was a shared space.

xv. The HDMO, in response to Cllr R Kershaw, noted that whilst there was limited space for signage, this was something that NCC Highways could consider.

xvi. The ADP noted that the matter of signage would be added as an informative at the recommendation of the Development Committee, as this stood beyond the remit of Planning.

RESOLVED by 6 votes to 4

That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to disabled access and energy efficiency.

63 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE

i. The ADP stated that there had been continued improvements across the Development Management and the Major Projects Teams, with the team working above the national standard on both Major and non-major applications. The ADP advised that the quality of decision making remained very good, even with the high case load.

ii. Cllrs thanked officers for their hard work, and improvements made in spite of challenging circumstances.

64 APPEALS SECTION

i. <u>New Appeals</u>

ii. No questions.

iii. <u>Inquiries and Hearings – In Progress</u>

iv. The ADP stated that with respect to ENF/18/0164 for Cley, the appellant and

District Council were in negotiation about a revised appeal hearing date, rather than early March as suggested, as this date had been unsuitable for the appellant.

v. The ADP informed members that the planning inspectorate would be moving to virtual hearings and enquiries in the coming months in response to the rising risk of Covid-19, and that ENF/20/0231 for Ryburgh would be taken virtually.

vi. Written Representations Appeals – In Hand

vii. No questions.

viii. Appeal Decisions – Results and Summaries

ix. The ADP highlighted to members application PF/19/1576 for Hindringham where the appeal had been allowed on the inspectors consideration. The ADP noted the conversion was allowed under the prior notifications process, and that the conversation had proceeded despite the building going beyond the point in which it was readily convertible. It was noted that the appellant had continued with the development and exceeded the prior notification process. The planning inspector was persuaded that there was limited harm to grant planning permission for the continued development to complete the change of use for the building. The ADP acknowledged that this was extraordinary, and not a position which the Council had anticipated. He advised that this would be reviewed by the Councils legal team and they would report back to the Committee on any precedent created for cases with prior notification to become change of use applications for conversions of buildings to dwellings.

65 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

The meeting ended at 11.20 am.

_____
Chairman