

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

**Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party held on Monday, 15 August 2022 at the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 10.00 am**

## **Committee**

### **Members Present:**

Cllr A Brown (Chairman)	Cllr N Dixon
Cllr P Fisher	Cllr V Gay
Cllr R Kershaw	Cllr G Mancini-Boyle
Cllr N Pearce	Cllr J Toye

### **Substitute**

### **Members Present:**

Cllr W Fredericks  
Cllr A Fitch-Tillett

### **Officers in Attendance:**

Planning Policy Manager (PPM)  
Senior Conservation and Design Officer (SCDO)  
Democratic Services Officer - Regulatory

## **1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received by Cllrs P Heinrich, P Grove-Jones and J Punchard, with Cllrs W Fredericks and A Fitch-Tillett present as substitutes for Cllrs P Grove-Jones and J Punchard respectively.

## **2 PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

None.

## **3 MINUTES**

Cllr P Fisher proposed an amendment to the Minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> May, his attendance had not been reflected in attendees listed. Cllr V Gay proposed a grammatical amendment to the Minutes of 23<sup>rd</sup> May, Item 8, line xiii, which should read "Conservation Officers" and not "Conservation Officer's". Subject to the two amendments, the Minutes of the 25<sup>th</sup> April 2022 and 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2022 were approved as a correct record.

## **4 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

## **5 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The Chairman declared a non-pecuniary interest for Agenda Item 7, he is the Local Ward Member for a substantial portion of the land subject to the Glaven Valley Conservation Area Appraisal.

## **6 UPDATE ON MATTERS FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING (IF ANY)**

None.

## 7 THE GLAVEN VALLEY CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL & MANAGEMENT PLAN 2022

The SCDO presented Glaven Valley Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan report to Members and outlined policy context, benefits of the review, structure of the review and affirmed the Officer Recommendations. She advised that the review was much larger than prior Conservation Area Appraisals, and relayed the major changes proposed within the appraisal document at its current stage.

The SCDO, with reference to the Map located on P.137 of the Agenda Pack, advised that the land marked in orange was proposed for exclusion from the Conservation Area Boundary, including the Salt Marshes marked 'Q' which were considered to align better with a natural area designation rather than a built heritage designation, land parcel 'H', and land parcels 'K', 'L' & 'M' surrounding Holt which consisted of more modern buildings. Proposed areas for inclusion within the Conservation Area Boundary were marked in blue and included areas 'I', 'J', 'N' and 'G' which would bring in areas surrounding Edgefield to the Conservation Area. The SCDO affirmed that only 3 buildings were currently proposed for Local Listing which were considered to be fairly prominent.

The SCDO commented on the next stages of the Consultation, subject to Members approval and the approval by Cabinet, and reiterated process would look different to the former Conservation Area Appraisal's as it was on a larger scale.

- i. The Chairman reflected on the listed Villages detailed on P. 41 of the Agenda Pack, and expressed his surprise that Sharrington village had not been considered for inclusion within the boundary given prior discussion at the May meeting. He referenced a groundswell of opinion from residents that the Glaven Valley Conservation Area should encompass Sharrington and specifically Valley Farm. He asked the SCDO why Sharrington had been missed from the appraisal and management plan, and whether this was an oversight?
- ii. The SCDO advised that Sharrington was not considered by Purcell's to fall within the Glaven Valley, however if public opinion differed, the public could make their representation's known through the Consultation process, which would influence the final draft.
- iii. The Chairman considered that, as Sharrington had tributaries of the river Glaven, it was geographically linked with the Glaven Valley, which merited its consideration within the appraisal.
- iv. Cllr N Pearce expressed his full-hearted support for the representation made by the Chairman, and requested that Sharrington be placed within the Glaven Valley Conservation Area Boundary. He commented that he too was aware of the groundswell of opinion, and expressed his concerns that, should Sharrington not be included within the Conservation Area, it would become a prime area for development, something he considered could significantly destroy local history.
- v. Cllr J Toye thanked Officers for their detailed and informative report, and commented that the Glaven Valley should be protected for the sake of the Glaven Valley, not for other reasons. Referencing the description of the Glaven Valley as detailed on page 47, para 7, of the Agenda pack, he noted the picturesque postcard imagery being conveyed, and whilst he did not

dispute the accuracy or the current description, he considered it did not portray the depth of history of the Glaven Valley and its industrious heritage. Adding, this too was absent from Pages 65 and 120 of the Officers report. He reflected on the significance of the land during the medieval period, its busy harbour, and the many working mills which formed part of its history. He considered that the entire history of the land should be considered for preservation rather than its more recent history, and current vision. Cllr J Toye affirmed this was a matter for the Local Plan to determine, but expressed his concern about losing sight of the real history of the land. He considered that if a modern mill were to open within the Glaven Valley, which was environmentally innovative but in keeping with its setting, it shouldn't be seen unfavourably as it would be aligned with the lands heritage.

- vi. Cllr V Gay thanked Officers for their report, which she considered to be outstanding and offered interesting insight. She supported the comments made by Cllr J Toye, and stated that until recently, she was unaware of the prosperous and industrial medieval heritage of the area.
- vii. Cllr N Dixon reflected on Members discussion and considered that a balance must be struck. He agreed with Cllr J Toye that history was very important, and that the Working Party should not super-impose the recent history of the land on the area. He considered history to be dynamic and expressed the need for the land to reflect a raft of eras.
- viii. The Chairman acknowledged planning legislation and procedure, and the need to protect and enhance designated areas. He agreed that the appraisal and management plan was not an assessment of the where the land is at in its current history, and that great care was required to ensure the appraisal stood the test of time. With reference to Page 128, 7.3.8 – Boundary Review; The Chairman considered expanding certain areas, but acknowledged the document was a work in progress and would return to the Working Party for more detailed consideration after the consultation process and any subsequent revisions.
- ix. The SCDO clarified that if the document was agreed for approval to Cabinet, and supported by Cabinet, that the consultation would be launched later in the year.
- x. Cllr N Pearce stressed his belief that Sharrington be included within the Glaven Valley Conservation Area Boundary, and that, notwithstanding others comments, the discussion had shifted away from Sharrington and the opinion of residents.
- xi. The SCDO advised that Purcell's had exercised their professional judgement that Sharrington be excluded from the appraisal.
- xii. The PPM affirmed that the Public Consultation would enable individuals to make their representation, which may include opinion regarding Sharringtons designation. He reminded Members that they were not being asked to vote upon a final document, rather Members were asked to approve to Cabinet to initiate with public consultation of the appraisal, with responses from the consultation informing decision making. He considered it better to amend the report subject to the consultation, as opinion could be evidenced to Purcell's. The PPM advised that Conservation Area status designation must be granted for the right reasons and not as a means to dismiss large housing

development.

- xiii. Cllr N Pearce reiterated his concern regarding the exclusion of Sharrington and the groundswell of public opinion of its inclusion within the Glaven Valley Conservation Area.
- xiv. The Chairman, reflecting on Cllr N Pearce comments, expressed his disappointment that Sharrington had not been included within the appraisal at this stage, particularly given discussions at the May meeting, however acknowledged that this was a fluid consultation and was subject to change.
- xv. Cllr R Kershaw supported the comments raised by the PPM, and stated that the purpose of the consultation was to gather opinion.
- xvi. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett proposed acceptance of the Officers recommendation and additionally noted problems with determining Sharringtons status with the Glaven Valley Conservation Area based on its watercourse, noting that this argument could apply to many other villages also which may not be appropriate.
- xvii. Cllr V Gay seconded the Officers recommendation.

**UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED** by 10 votes for.

**That the draft appraisal, as set out within the body of this report, be recommended to Cabinet for approval for public consultation.**

**That following consultation, the amended appraisal be brought back to Working Party for consideration and subsequent adoption by Cabinet.**

**8 ANY OTHER BUSINESS AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIRMAN AND AS PREVIOUSLY DETERMINED UNDER ITEM 4 ABOVE**

None.

**9 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

None.

**10 TO CONSIDER ANY EXEMPT MATTERS ARISING FROM CONSIDERATION OF THE PUBLIC BUSINESS OF THE AGENDA**

None.

**11 ANY OTHER URGENT EXEMPT BUSINESS AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIRMAN AND AS PREVIOUSLY DETERMINED UNDER ITEM 4 ABOVE**

None.

The meeting ended at 10.49 am.

---

Chairman