

## DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Development Committee held on Thursday, 23 March 2023 in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 9.30 am

**Committee** Cllr P Grove-Jones (Chairman) Cllr P Heinrich (Vice-Chairman)  
**Members Present:**

Cllr A Brown	Cllr P Fisher
Cllr A Fitch-Tillett	Cllr R Kershaw
Cllr N Lloyd	Cllr G Mancini-Boyle
Cllr N Pearce	Cllr M Taylor
Cllr J Toye	Cllr L Withington

**Members Present:** Cllr W Fredericks (Local Member for Item PF/22/1649)

**Officers in Attendance:** Assistant Director - Planning (ADP)  
Development Management (DM)  
Principle Lawyer (PL)  
Planning Officer – AW (PO-AW)  
Senior Planning Officer (SPO)  
Planning Officer – MA (PO – MA)  
Planning Officer – MB (PO – MB)  
Planning Officer - IM (PO-IW)

### 120 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllr V Holliday and Cllr A Varley.

### 121 SUBSTITUTES

None present.

### 122 MINUTES

- i. Cllr P Heinrich proposed a correction to Minute 114, and clarified he had declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of the Caravan and Motorhome Club, not the Caravan and Camping Club.
- ii. Cllr N Pearce questioned the outcome of Planning Application RV/22/0308, and sought advice when it would be appropriate to discuss his concerns.
- iii. The PL advised that the Committee were asked under this agenda item to consider whether the Minutes were an accurate reflection of what was said.
- iv. Cllr N Pearce commented that his concerns also related to the accuracy of the Minutes but that he would be content to discuss later.
- v. Cllr A Brown stated that the conduct of contributor in the February meeting would be discussed later in the meeting, as a matter of urgent business.
- vi. The DM reiterated the advice offered by the PL and noted there was no agenda item to specifically discuss the Holt application on the agenda. This matter had not been raised as an item of urgent business prior to the

meeting, but could be added if Members considered they required clarification.

- vii. Cllr N Pearce affirmed that RV/22/0308 should be discussed as an urgent item, particularly in light of a written article which required urgent clarification.
- viii. The Chairman advised that the Hopkins Home development for Holt (RV/22/0308) would be added as an urgent item, with this item being taken at the end of the meeting.

**The Minutes of the Development Committee on 23<sup>rd</sup> February were approved as a correct record subject to the amendment put forward by Cllr P Heinrich.**

## **123 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr A Fitch-Tillett declared a non-pecuniary interest for Planning Application PF/22/1708, she is a friend of the applicant, and therefore affirmed she would abstain from voting on the application.

## **124 NORTHREPPS - PF/22/1708 - SITING OF 2 GLAMPING PODS FOR HOLIDAY USE AT SHRUBLANDS FARM CAMPING SITE, CRAFT LANE, NORTHREPPS.**

### Officer's Report

The PO-AW introduced the Officers report and recommendation for refusal. She advised that the application was a scaled down resubmission of PF/21/2263 which came before the committee in 2021 and seeks full planning permission for the siting of 2 self-contained timber glamping pods to be constructed on a rectangular parcel of land at Shrublands Farm to the south of Northrepps village.

It was noted that the application site does not have planning permission and currently operates under a 'Certified' Camping and Caravanning license. This license is a permitted development exemption which allows land to be used for the purposes of camping for up to 28 consecutive days at any one time, for up to 10 tent pitches and 5 motorhomes. The glamping pods do not qualify under this exemption and therefore are required to be assessed against Planning Policy.

The PO-AW affirmed the sites location, images of the site and its context in its local surroundings.

In terms of the key issues for consideration, the proposal is located in an area designated as countryside within the Norfolk Coast AONB where Policy EN 1 of the Core Strategy recognises the impact of individual proposals and their cumulative impact on the AONB, stating that proposals which would be significantly detrimental to the special qualities of the AONB and their setting should not be permitted.

Polices EC 7 and EC 10 deal specifically with controlling the location of new tourism development, EC 7 gives specific reference that new build un-serviced holiday accommodation in the Countryside should be treated as permanent residential dwellings and should not be permitted. Policy EC 10 further states that new static caravan sites and woodland holiday accommodation (which would also cover glamping pods) will only be permitted in limited circumstances, and not where they are located within sensitive landscape designations such as the Norfolk Coast AONB. Extensions to existing sites are tightly controlled and only where they

demonstrate a high standard of design and have minimal adverse impacts upon their surroundings. Given its certified status Officers conclude that the land at Shrublands farm cannot be treated as an existing site and that the scheme should be assessed as a new camping site under Policy EC 10, and is considered contrary to the aims of this policy.

With respect on landscape matters, the PO-AW stated that the proposed pods would occupy the site year round making them permanent structures. Landscape Officers are of the opinion that, whilst wider visual impact would be relatively contained by the enclosed wooded setting, as permanent structures the pods would be visible in the winter months. This, together with the increased human activity, light spill and vehicle movements that the development would generate would not conserve or enhance the valued features or the defined special qualities of the Norfolk Coast AONB, particularly 'a sense of remoteness and tranquillity.

The Case Officer advised that the benefits of the proposal would need to be balanced against the harm which would result from new tourist accommodation being permitted within this sensitive landscape designation, and noted there would be some economic benefits from the scheme. However, however there is little detail in the submitted farm report as to how much the pods themselves would generate and given they are already in use on a different part of the farm and the application only seeks to relocate these, little weight can be afforded to this economic benefit.

Further, there was also an objection to the proposal in terms of highway safety. Highways officers consider that the traffic impact of a 28-day Certified Camping site does not provide an adequate fallback position in highway terms to justify or enable permanent all-year glamping pods which would intensify highway movements. They consider the road serving the site to be inadequate due to restricted width, lack of passing provision, restricted visibility and lack of pedestrian facilities. The proposal, if permitted, would be likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to highway safety contrary to Development Plan Policy CT 5 and Highways officers recommend the application for refusal.

The PO-AW advised that the authority had not received GIRAMS payment and therefore the application fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not result in adverse effects on the European Sites and so the proposal is currently contrary to the requirements of Policies SS 4 and EN 9 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy.

The Case Officer reaffirmed Officers' recommendations and stated that the proposal is considered contrary to Policies EN1, EN 2, EC 7, EC 10 CT5, SS4 and EN 9 of the Adopted Core Strategy.

### Public Speakers

Alistair Mackay - Chairman of Northrepps Parish Council  
Matthew Rooke - Supporting

### Member's Question's and Debate

- i. The Local Member – Cllr A Fitch-Tillett – expressed her support for the recommendation and affirmed her reasons as outlined of P.60 of the Agenda Pack. She stated that the application would entice tourism away from the coastal hotspots within the AONB which accorded with adopted core strategy policies.

With respect of the suitability of Craft Lane, the Local Member advised that this road was used by a mini bus service between North Walsham and Cromer 3-4 times a day both ways. If the road was considered unsuitable by the Highways Authority, this bus route would not have been permitted.

Cllr A Fitch-Tillett considered the benefits the additional footpath from the rear of the camping site would bring. Such benefits would not be limited to users of the proposal, but also to local residents including allotment holders, who do not currently have access to paved routes into the village.

The Local Member advised that the application had been discussed by Norfolk Coast Partnership within the last week, and noted P.62 of the Agenda Pack which detailed that the Partnership neither objected to, nor supported the application. She stated that the proposal was not considered to have a significant detrimental impact to the AONB. Further, any potential light pollution would be controlled, and the Local Member commented that the Parish Council held their own 'Dark Skies' Policy which the proposal would accord with.

Cllr A Fitch-Tillett noted that Development Committee had approved Planning Application PF/22/1337 located within the West Runton AONB at the last meeting, which she considered had set a precedent.

- ii. The DM clarified that the pathway discussed by the supporting speaker did not form part of the proposed scheme. He cautioned Members in attributing weight to this consideration when it was not included in the formal application. Should the applicant wish to include the pathway in the scheme, they would be required to submit amended plans and have that secured as part of any decision.

He noted that the supporting speaker referred to a 12-month Caravan use of the site, but advised this was not Officer's understanding and they had been provided no evidence to indicate 12-month use was permitted. This formed an important consideration when weighing the highway impacts, as going from 28 days permitted use to 365 days was a significant increase.

With reference to Cllr A Fitch-Tillett's comments on the West Runton application, the DM advised with respect of that scheme it did not propose additional pitches, rather it was an enhancement of the existing site. It was therefore not a straightforward comparison with the proposal presented.

- iii. Cllr R Kershaw thanked officers for their advice, and affirmed that the distinction between 28 days and 365 days permission was important in decision making. He noted that the pods would not be available all year round and would run March - October. He questioned the Highways objection as the pods were already located on the site in an alternate location, and expressed his preference for cars to make use of Craft Lane as opposed to caravans or motorhomes.

From an economic perspective, Cllr R Kershaw spoke favourably of the application, the need to support farmers, promote diversification, and in attracting visitors away from coastal hotspot areas.

Cllr R Kershaw affirmed that clarification was needed regarding the footpath

and the conflicting opinion about the 28 day vs 52 week designation. He therefore proposed deferment of the application.

- iv. The Chairman permitted the applicant to make a representation. The Applicant advised the site was open 365 days a year.
- v. The DM advised no evidence had been provided as part of the application to establish that the site had the full 365 day permission. The DM recommended that this item be deferred, and cautioned Members from reaching a decision on potentially incorrect information.
- vi. Cllr A Brown seconded the recommendation for deferment.

**RESOLVED** by 11 votes for and 1 abstention

**That Planning Application PF/22/1708 be DEFERRED to clarify whether the site had 12 month Caravan permission, and if the footpath was to form part of the proposal.**

**125 SHERINGHAM - PF/22/1660 - 37 SUITE APARTMENT HOTEL (CLASS C1) WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING LAND TO EAST OF, THE REEF LEISURE CENTRE, WEYBOURNE ROAD, SHERINGHAM FOR MORSTON PALATINE LTD**

Officer's Report

The SPO introduced the Officers report and recommendation for approval subject to conditions. He affirmed the location plan for the site and its relationship with neighbouring surroundings including AONB, proposed site plan, floor plans and elevations which included 9 EV parking spaces 2 of which were accessible, as well as cycle and motorcycle parking and solar array to the roof. Photographs were offered to better demonstrate the site's context. Access to the car park would be obtained via the car park on the adjacent Reef Leisure Centre.

The SPO stated that the scale and design of the proposal had been chosen to accord with the Reef, making an overall cohesive development. The extensive proposed landscaping scheme would aid to obscure aspects of the development, in addition, as the development would sit lower in the landscape than the nearby residential area and football club, it's the visual impact was considered to be less noticeable.

The Case Officer outlined the key areas of consideration and reiterated the recommendation subject to conditions. He noted that GIRAMS payment had been secured since the publication of the Officer Report, however matters of surface water drainage were outstanding.

Public Speakers

None

Member's Question's and Debate

- i. Cllr L Withington, Member for Sheringham North, speaking on behalf of Local Member Cllr C Heinink for Sheringham South, acknowledged the positive and negative impacts the proposed development would result in. She stated

that whilst there would be economic benefits, there remained concern in the local community that the development would have the opposite effect. There were misgivings about the nature of the apartment-hotel model, and in missed opportunities for the town's economy. Cllr L Withington stated, given the limited availability of land in Sheringham for development, there was some scepticism that the proposal was the best use of land to bring the greatest benefit to the local economy. The Local Member considered an expansion of the adjacent industrial site was desperately needed, allowing smaller businesses to expand and potentially bring additional employment opportunities and more resilience to the community. Alternatively, a housing scheme which included an assisted living complex would have brought a synergy with the new residential home being built at Westwood (adjacent to the Reef site).

Reflecting on the application, Cllr L Withington stated that there had been concerns expressed about the density of the development, and that the design would be far more imposing than the neighbouring Reef development. The proposed development was considered to result in a marked change in the town's character and tourist accommodation offering. Views from the western entrance to the town would be impacted, and the Northern elevation 'block-like' design she contended lacked in design quality. Cllr L Withington affirmed that many felt that the landscape design was disappointing, and although extensive hedging was utilised, this was considered an easy option with little thought as to how the large construction could be immersed in its AONB setting.

With respect of drainage, the Local Member advised that there were already concerns about the drainage, and that there had been significant flooding to properties to the rear to the development associated with changes linked to climate change.

Cllr L Withington asked if a cycle path to the town could be included in the proposal as a S106 condition, which had been requested by the Town Council at the time of the Reef development, and argued that there was a greater need given the increased volume of traffic from the development

Further, concerns had also been raised regarding the speed of traffic on this section of road, which would be worsened by increased traffic flow from the proposal. Cllr L Withington stated it would be beneficial to move the 30mph zone further west, beyond Cemetery Lane, allowing for safer access for pedestrians and vehicles.

- ii. Cllr A Brown expressed his disappointment in the design, size and simulated art-deco style which he was uncertain accorded with the design guide. Given the proposals status in the AONB, he considered that the applicant could have submitted a much improved scheme. His principle concern for the proposal related to the lack of documentation on the sustainable urban drainage system, particularly at this late stage. He was concerned how this scheme would be agreed, as believed a S106 agreement should be conditioned. Cllr A Brown argued that as there remained outstanding drainage concerns, this justified reasons for deferment.
- iii. Cllr R Kershaw spoke favourably of the application, which he reflected would bring economic benefits to Sheringham. Further, he considered the site was well suited to siting a hotel. Cllr R Kershaw expressed his surprise to the

Local Members comments on community sentiment, and reflected on the lack of objections raised within the Officers report. He did not consider the hotel objectionable, and contended it would be in keeping with the Reef, both in height and size. He argued that it was preferable to have the brownfield land developed, particularly given the need for tourist accommodation in Sheringham, than for it to sit vacant. Cllr R Kershaw proposed acceptance of the Officers recommendation.

- iv. Cllr N Lloyd contended it was difficult to see what would fit in well within the local environment given as the site was located between the Reef Leisure Centre, an Industrial site, and Football Pitch. He considered the applicant had gone some way to make the scheme attractive, though taste was subjective.

As the Portfolio Holder for climate change, he spoke positively that the application had considered EBPC and solar, and noted within the Officers report that the scheme exceeded the minimum energy performance building standards, however stated this had not been evidenced. Cllr N Lloyd affirmed his preference that an energy efficiency report be provided by the applicant, something he considered pertinent given the size of the property. Whilst he understood that the building would be heated by gas, this had not be explicitly stated within the report. Cllr N Lloyd seconded the Officers recommendation, and asked that an energy report be provided by the applicant.

- v. The DM advised that Officers were reviewing the local validation list and the suite of documents required by applicants when submitting proposals. At present, Policy EN6 of the Adopted Core Strategy was the key policy lever. The DM noted Members suggestion that the local list be updated to reflect how applicants were positively responding to the Climate Emergency. But advised that the applicant had demonstrated compliance with current policies.
- vi. On reflection, Cllr N Lloyd stated that he was dissatisfied that the developer had not provided information he considered critical with relation to the Climate Emergency, and whilst noting the DM advice that the Developer had satisfied building regulations, he withdrew his seconding of the Officers recommendation. Cllr N Lloyd stated it was shocking, in light of the IPC report, that a 4 storey property could be approved without information on energy usage.
- vii. The DM advised the recommendation was for one of delegated authority subject to conditions and that additional conditions could be applied, should the Committee be minded to do so, that information on energy use be provided by that applicant to ensure full policy compliance.
- viii. Cllr P Heinrich expressed his concerns for the proposal both in its design, to a lesser extent, but also how the building would be managed to ensure the 90 day restriction was enforced, noting that this was not a traditional hotel model. He contended that the apartment owners may not live locally or in the County, and asked how compliance could be ensured. Cllr P Heinrich further shared in Members concerns raised regarding the drainage situation and sought assurances that such issues would be considered and resolved under delegated authority. He considered that more could be done to ensure the building was Carbon neutral including the introduction of additional solar

panels on the roof and in the car park by way of solar car ports.

- ix. The DM advised that the apart-hotel model was not a new concept and were used elsewhere in the Country, particularly as these types of schemes de-risked development costs for developers. The hotel would be designated under C1 hotel classification, and if approved would be subject to C1 restrictions including the prohibiting of the apartments from being used as someone's sole or main residence. Further, a register of lettings would confirm occupancy, verifying that the accommodation did not exceed the restriction. The DM advised that the Councils enforcement team would be able to attend the site (if approved) to ensure compliance. He was satisfied that the aforementioned conditions would be met.
- x. Cllr J Toye supported Cllr N Lloyd representations, and agreed that whilst the proposal would be policy compliant, he would be unable to support the proposal. He argued that in the absence of the flood report and evidence on energy usage and how the development would positively respond to the Climate Emergency, that a deferment was necessary.
- xi. Cllr W Fredericks asked, as Portfolio Holder for Housing, if S106 money could be conditioned through the development, and commented it was important that this development gave back to the community.
- xii. The DM advised that there were no S106 requirements as this was not a residential scheme. The C1 classification did not trigger S106 contributions. The proposal would require GIRAMS tariff payments, which had been paid by the developer.
- xiii. The Chairman seconded the Officers recommendation

**THE VOTE WAS LOST** by 3 votes for, 7 against, and 2 abstentions.

- xiv. Cllr A Brown proposed and Cllr P Heinrich seconded, that the application be deferred to enable Officers and the Applicant to address issues raised by the Committee.

**IT WAS RESOLVED** by 6 votes for, 5 against, and one abstention.

**That Planning Application PF/22/1660 be DEFERRED to enable the receipt of drainage scheme proposals and information on energy use, and how the proposal would respond the Climate Emergency.**

**126 MUNDLESLEY - PF/22/1649 - REMOVAL OF EXISTING PIN TILES FROM CHANCEL ROOF AND INSTALLATION OF SLATE ROOF INCORPORATING SOLAR SLATES. ALL SAINTS CHURCH, CROMER ROAD, MUNDLESLEY FOR THE PCC OF ALL SAINTS CHURCH MUNDLESLEY**

Officers Report

The PO-MA introduced the Officers report and recommendation for approval. He outlined the sites context, location plan, areal views, as well as photographs of the various elevations.

The SPO-MA provided photographic evidence of the proposed roof tiles on the Northern roof, comprised of traditional Spanish style slate tile, and the proposed



photovoltaic Solar Slates on the Southern Elevation, which would not be subject to the same glint and glare issues associated with traditional PV panels. He advised that the applicant had provided information on their energy consumption for the last full year which was 2018 (later years were impacted by COVID-19) amounting to 3683kWh. The proposed PV slate roof was expected to generate 6754 kWh, with the new electric heating and replacement lighting expected to consume 756 kWh. The proposal was therefore expected to approximately generate a net gain of 2315 kWh to the National Grid per year.

The SPO-MA affirmed the main issues for consideration; the principle of development; the effect of the proposed development on the significance of designated heritage assets; effect on residential amenity, highway safety and biodiversity; and Coastal Erosion.

### Public Speakers

Mr White - Supporting

### Member's Question's and Debate

- i. The Local Member – Cllr W Fredericks – spoke in support of the application which she considered to be a trailblazer for other churches, noting that the Bishop of Norwich's vision for all churches in the County to be greener. She commended the application for being common sense, and if approved would see the removal of the old oil boiler and leaking tank.
- ii. Cllr N Lloyd expressed his support for the application, and reflected that this type of scheme was taking place across the Country including historic locations and buildings within Cambridge University. He argued that the panels would not be distinguishable from a typical slate tile to many observers. Whilst understanding why the Conservation Officer had objected to the proposal based on current NNDC adopted core strategy policies, Cllr N Lloyd stated that the policies were outdated and in need of addressing. He proposed acceptance of the Officers recommendation.
- iii. Cllr A Brown seconded the Officers recommendation, and agreed with Cllr N Lloyd that having declared a Climate Emergency it was important the Council support applications which looked after the environment.
- iv. Cllr P Heinrich reflected that whilst the proposal would amount to a minor change in appearance, it would make a significant and positive difference to the environment.
- v. Cllr L Withington considered the application in relation to the Coastal Transition and Acceptation Programme, and stated that it was important to consider the retrofitting of existing infrastructure to ensure they were fit for the future.
- vi. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle stated this was a fantastic scheme which he hoped would be replicated across the district.
- vii. The Chairman noted that replacement/repairs to the roof and heating system would ensure that the Church be more amenable for community use, noting that that active lunch club could be accommodated in the church.

**IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED** by 12 votes for.

**That Planning Application pf/22/1649 be APPROVED subject to the imposition of conditions detailed in the Officers report. Final wording of conditions to be delegated to the Assistant Director – Planning.**

**127 TUNSTEAD - PF/22/3026 - INSTALLATION OF A GROUND MOUNTED SOLAR PV ARRAY (1083 KWP) CONSISTING OF 1900 PANELS AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE (INCLUDING FENCING AND CCTV) AT R & JM PACE LTD, CHURCH ROAD, TUNSTEAD, NORWICH**

Officers Report

The PO-MB introduced the Officers report and recommendation for approval, subject to conditions. He updated the Committee and advised that the Council were in receipt of the Landscape implementation and management plan, satisfying condition 4. The PO-MB outlined the sites location, aerial plan, site plan, images of the proposed panels, associated infrastructure, and images of the site visible from the road.

The PO-MB advised that the site was well contained and noted the proposal would not be visible within the wider landscape, being located away from public rights of way.

He highlighted the main issues for consideration as detailed in the Officers report and reaffirmed the Officers recommendation.

Public Speakers

None.

Member's Questions and Debate

- i. The Local Member – Cllr G Mancini-Boyle - Proposed acceptance of the Officers recommendation and noted the lack of objections as set out in the Officers report. He stated that such schemes were the future, and that he was glad to see more schemes of this nature coming forward. The Local Member asked if the threshold for bringing such items to Committee could be reviewed, as he considered these could be approved under delegated authority.
- ii. The DM advised that the call in requirements were in the process of being reviewed, and would be brought back the Committee for consideration.
- iii. Cllr R Kershaw spoke positively of the application, and noted that the applicant was a large employer in the district and had been suffering with the effects of Brexit, restrictions of employment as well as issues of water extraction. Cllr R Kershaw expressed his support for the business, which was very popular in its local community, and so seconded the Officers recommendation.
- iv. Cllr N Lloyd agreed that the threshold for call ins for schemes of this nature be re-assessed and only be called in if objected to by the Local Member.

- v. Cllr A Brown noted that the Council could consider its validation list, and assess the process for schemes in specific areas i.e. within the AONB. He considered that something more prescriptive was needed rather than Members calling in applications, and argued for the application of permitted development.
- vi. Cllr N Pearce noted that the design of Solar Panels had changed in last 15 years, with newer models having the ability to be disposed of or recycled more easily. He asked if this information could be included in the Officers Report going forward.

**IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED** by 12 votes for.

**That Planning Application PF/22/3036 be APPROVED subject to conditions detailed in the Officers Report. Final Wording of conditions to be delegated to the Assistant Director – Planning.**

**128 HEMPSTEAD - PF/23/0198 - INSTALLATION OF 316KW OF GROUND MOUNTED SOLAR PANELS AT HOLE FARM HOUSE, HOLE FARM ROAD, HEMPSTEAD, HOLT, NORFOLK, NR25 6TT FOR NETHERGATE FARMS**

Officers Recommendation

The PO – IM introduced the Officers report and recommendation for approval subject to conditions. She outlined the sites location, relationship with neighbouring dwellings, proposed site plan, aerial photos, proposed elevations and photos of the site, as well as the main issues for consideration.

Public Speakers

None

Member's Question's and Debate

- i. Cllr N Lloyd proposed acceptance of the Officers recommendation.
- ii. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle expressed his support for the recommendation and reiterated earlier comments that the threshold for call in's be reviewed.
- iii. Cllr J Toye seconded the Officers recommendation.

**IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY AGREED** by 12 votes for.

**That Planning Application PF/23/0198 be APPROVED subject to conditions detailed in the Officers Report. Final Wording of conditions to be delegated to the Assistant Director – Planning.**

**129 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE**

- i. The DM introduced the Development Management Performance Update Report and spoke positively of the Planning Service's performance, with both major and non-major performance being 100% in time or with an agreed extension of time for the month. He noted that the 24 average for majors had diminished but commented this was due to older applications dropping off the list. The DM commended Officers for their continued hard work, and

management of high caseloads. He advised that work was ongoing with respect of the Planning Service Improvement Plan. Further, it was hoped in future to reduce the reliance on extensions of time, and to review the scheme of delegation to streamline the items being brought to Committee.

- ii. Cllr A Brown thanked Planning Officers for their dedication and in producing improved figures. It was hoped that with better application of the Uniform system by Officers that additional improvements could be made.
- iii. The Chairman noted that it had been a difficult period for the department, noting staff shortages, changes in operational systems, working from home and more. She thanked Officers for their hard work.
- iv. The PL advised that there were 7 current S106 obligations, and that she remained hopeful that the Crisp Malting S106 would be completed by the next meeting.
- v. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle spoke highly of the recently appointed S106 Officer, and the positive way she had engaged with him.

## 130 APPEALS SECTION

### New Appeals

Nothing to add.

### Inquiries and Hearings – In progress

The DM advised that the outcome for the Arcady hearing was due around early April, and that the Members would be informed once this had been received.

### Written Representations Appeals – In hand

Nothing to add.

### Appeal Decisions

The DM noted the Officers report and affirmed that in addition to those detailed application PF/21/3353 and ENF/20/0095 had also been dismissed.

- i. Cllr N Lloyd noted the ongoing case (not included in the Officers report) with regard to the Mural dedicated to footballer Lauren Hemp within the Conservation Area in North Walsham, and which had garnered significant media interest. He asked for an update on this matter.
- ii. The ADP advised that Officers had visited the site and that a report had been compiled for the Planning Enforcement Panel. A review of the mural had been undertaken, and it was considered that the Mural could fall under S215 or alternatively be defined as graffiti. The Panel took a view that this was not untidy land nor was the mural graffiti. Officers were working with the building owner on the building enforcement matter, with positive discussions taking place.
- iii. Cllr N Lloyd supported the recognition of Lauren Hemp but argued that the location of the mural had upset many local residents. He cautioned against individuals for failing to abide by planning rules and stated if everyone was able to do what they wanted it would amount to chaos. He concluded that there may have been better ways to pay tribute to Lauren Hemp.

## 131 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

- i. Cllr N Pearce advised that an article had appeared in one of the Local papers, the Crab Tales, regarding application RV/22/0308 which had been discussed at the last Development Committee meeting. The article detailed that a decision had been reached that there would be no low cost homes on the site, despite Members agreeing for deferment with the item expected to be brought before Committee once more. Cllr N Pearce asked for clarity if a decision had been reached, and to confirm that the item would be returned to Committee.
- ii. The DM advised that since the deferment of the application at the last meeting, no decision had been reached, and the item would be presented again to the Development Committee provided that the Applicant did not appeal against non-determination based on the expiry of the proposal. The extension of the time for the proposal had been since agreed to the end of April. He advised that two further meetings had taken place between Officers and the Applicant following the last Committee Meeting, to discuss particular issues on delivering affordable houses on the site, and to negotiate a successful way forward. These negotiations were ongoing.
- iii. Cllr A Brown noted that there was a free press in the UK, though perhaps it may be better that reporters gain a greater insight into the planning process before reporting. He asked if the head of Communications at NNDC could follow up on this matter with the editor of the Crab Tales.
- iv. The ADP advised, subject to the discretion of the Chairman, he would be pleased to refer the matter to the Communications team, and ask that the editor be contacted. As a matter of public record, he confirmed that the public access system is available which confirms that no decision had been reached on this application. The ADP advised that it remained the case that the application would be returned to Committee as agreed.
- v. Cllr N Pearce thanked Officers for the clarification that no decision had been reached. He noted that the provision of low-cost housing was of significant concern locally, and that the way the case had been reported in the Crab Tales had resulted in a number of distressed calls made by residents to himself. Further, he considered that the conduct of the Applicant, contacting Officers during the Committee meeting, but not being in attendance themselves, to be poor.

*Cllr N Lloyd left the meeting at 11.23am.*

- vi. Cllr A Brown affirmed that as Portfolio Holder for Housing he had asked that the manner in which the applicant had engaged with the Committee at the last Committee Meeting be reviewed. He argued that representations should be made in person to the Committee, as an act of deference to the Committee in their decision making. He was not satisfied with the conduct of the Applicant at the last meeting. Cllr A Brown thanked Cllr P Heinrich for his competent Chairing of the meeting which had been challenging.
- vii. The Chairman shared her thanks for Cllr P Heinrich for deputising in her absence. She agreed that it was a sign of respect to the Committee and Officer's that large developers attend Development Committee, and that she as Chairman would expect a representative to attend in person to support

their application. To not do so, she considered, was disrespectful.

- viii. Cllr R Kershaw reflected that Members were expected to attend Committee in person, and stated it was underhanded of the Applicant to conduct themselves in the manner they had done at the last meeting.
- ix. The ADP advised the current position, that representations were made through the discretion of the Chairman, and that the Committee, both in terms of Officers and Members, try to be flexible in receiving those representations. Following the Portfolio Holder meeting he had engaged with the Committee support team, and affirmed that it was clear that the Committee could refuse to accept written representations which are made after the commencement of the Development Committee meeting. A review of public speaking representations and attendance at committee would be undertaken in the new administration. The ADP further advised this matter had been followed up with the Applicant, and it was his expectation that when this item was re-presented at Committee a representative for the developer would be in attendance. He advised that Officers would continue to encourage the representations of applicants in articulating their case, but advised that attendance could not be enforced.

## **132 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

None.

The meeting ended at 11.30 am.

---

Chairman