

20 DECEMBER 2017

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 A Fitch-Tillett (Chairman)
Mrs V Uprichard (Vice-Chairman)

Mrs S Arnold	N Pearce
Mrs A R Green	R Reynolds
B Hannah	S Shaw
N Lloyd	R Shepherd
B Smith	

Mrs S Bütikofer – substitute for Mrs P Grove-Jones
Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds – substitute for Ms M Prior

J Rest – observing

Officers

Mr G Lyon – Major Projects Manager
Mr J Dougan – Planning Officer (Major Projects)
Miss L Yarham – Democratic Services and Governance Officer

94. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DETAILS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs M Prior, Mrs P Grove-Jones and Mr P Rice. Two substitute Members attended the meeting as shown above.

95. MINUTES

The Minutes of a meeting of the Committee held on 26 October 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

96. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

97. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

<u>Minute</u>	<u>Councillor:</u>	<u>Interest</u>
86	B Smith	Had spoken to the applicant and agent regarding this matter.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Where appropriate the Planning Officers expanded on the planning applications; updated the meeting on outstanding consultations, letters/petitions received objecting to, or supporting the proposals; referred to any views of local Members and answered Members' questions.

Background papers, including correspondence, petitions, consultation documents, letters of objection and those in support of planning applications were available for inspection at the meeting.

Having regard to the above information and the Officers' report, the Committee reached the decisions as set out below.

Applications approved include a standard time limit condition as condition number 1 unless otherwise stated.

98. **HOVETON - PF/17/1802 - Erection of 25 dwellings with associated roads, landscaping and drainage, off-site highways works, extension to church graveyard, and construction of new 12-space church car park; Church Field for FW Properties**

This application had been deferred.

99. **PASTON - PF/16/1743 - Demolition of existing Block 3 (16 units) and replacement with 8 units (6 no.2 beds and 2 no.3 beds) of holiday accommodation; Mundesley Holiday Centre, Paston Road for Mundesley Holiday Village Ltd**

The Committee considered item 2 of the Officers' reports.

The Planning Officer presented plans and photographs of the site. He drew attention to the key issue of coastal erosion and displayed photographs of the existing sea defences and annotated photographs showing the site in relation to the coastal constraints areas. He explained that the Shoreline Management Plan, a material planning consideration, proposed non-intervention and non-replacement or retention of the existing sea defences, and at predicted rates of erosion parts of the holiday village would be lost by 2025. The proposed replacement units would be larger than those which would be demolished with a potentially greater risk to life. Officers considered that great weight should be applied to the evidence in the Shoreline Management Plan, but that temporary permission as recommended would be a pragmatic way forward in this case.

Councillor B Smith, the local Member, stated that whilst there was some damage to the revetments, on the whole they were working quite well. The cliff had been stable for 30 years. He had brought the application to Committee to allow the applicant to explain the financial situation with regard to the site but he was not present. The applicant was concerned that he would not be able to sell the units with a short term lease of 38 years and would prefer to be able to offer a 99 year lease for the proposed units, which was applicable to other units on the site.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold commended the site owner's aspirations and commented that the existing units were not suitable for modern living. She asked how the Council could control the occupation of the proposed units to ensure they were not occupied as permanent dwellings, and what responsibilities the Council would have if the structures were permanent.

The Major Projects Manager explained that residential dwellings had an assumed life expectancy of 100 years and the Authority did not want to be left with the cost of removing the buildings from the site. A distance of 30 metres was required for safe removal. Officers considered that a mobile home solution would be preferable but it was not what the applicant was proposing. The units were not supposed to be sold as permanent residences and although it was possible to check occupancy, it was resource intensive to do so.

Councillor Arnold stated that there was normally an 11 month occupancy condition imposed on holiday units. She expressed concern at the implications for the Council if the buildings had to be re-sited under the roll back policy.

The Chairman stated that the applicant would have the right to apply for planning permission under the roll back policy. This was currently tied to service villages but was due to be considered under the Local Plan review. However, the Committee had to consider the planning application and not what would happen in the future.

The Major Projects Manager explained that roll back would be a greater issue if permanent permission were given. The recommendation was for temporary permission with an option to extend the permission if there was a significant reduction in the rate of erosion.

Councillor R Reynolds stated that the applicant's financial situation was not a matter for consideration. The Shoreline Management Plan was unlikely to be revised and he considered that a permanent permission could not be considered. The rate of erosion was unknown and a large amount of cliff could be lost in one event. He proposed that this application be approved for a period of 15 years. This was seconded by Councillor R Shepherd.

At this point in the meeting the applicant and his agent arrived. The Chairman agreed to allow the applicant to speak.

Public Speaker

Mr T Hay (supporting)

In response to Councillor Reynolds' proposal, the Major Projects Manager stated that 15 years was less than Officers were recommending. He reminded the Committee that Officers were recommending a 38 year time limit or when the buildings were 30 metres from the cliff edge. A 15 year time limit could mean that development did not happen. He asked the Committee to consider a compromise.

As an amendment, Councillor Mrs S Arnold proposed that this application be approved for a period of 30 years. This was seconded by Councillor S Shaw.

Councillor Mrs V Uprichard indicated that she would wish to propose a site inspection.

Councillor Reynolds stated that he would be prepared to withdraw his proposal subject to further debate.

Councillor N Pearce supported a site inspection.

Councillor N Lloyd stated that he had worked at the Bacton Gas Site for many years. He considered that the fact that the top had not moved for several years was not necessarily a good thing and could mean that erosion could occur more rapidly. He stated that the base of the cliff had become increasingly vertical, which suggested it could fall back to its natural level. He expressed concern at any new development in close proximity to the cliff line. He supported a site inspection.

Councillor R Reynolds stated that the Committee had visited the site in the past and considered that Members would see no more than was shown on the photographs. He considered that the situation was dangerous and wished his proposal to stand.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold withdrew her amendment as she considered that a site inspection would be beneficial.

As an amendment, it was proposed by Councillor Mrs V Uprichard, seconded by Councillor N Pearce that consideration of this application be deferred to allow the Committee to inspect the site.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was declared carried by 7 votes to 5 and on being put as the substantive proposal it was

RESOLVED by 7 votes to 5

That consideration of this application be deferred to allow the Committee to inspect the site.

100. APPLICATION RECOMMENDED FOR A SITE INSPECTION

The Committee considered item 3 of the Officers' reports.

RESOLVED

That the Committee undertakes the following site inspection:

NORTH WALSHAM - PF/17/0902 - Conversion of stable/barn to create dwelling; Agricultural Building, Adjacent to Bells Cottage, Holgate Road, White Horse Common for Mr F Knights

101. NEW APPEALS

The Committee noted item 4 of the Officers' reports.

102. INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS - PROGRESS

The Committee noted item 5 of the Officers' reports.

103. WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS APPEALS - IN HAND

The Committee noted item 6 of the Officers' reports.

104. APPEAL DECISIONS – RESULTS AND SUMMARIES

The Committee noted item 7 of the Officers' reports.

105. COURT CASES – PROGRESS AND RESULTS

The Committee noted item 11 of the Officers' reports.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold reported that the Council's decision to allow the demolition and replacement of Blakeney New Rectory had been upheld by the High Court.

The meeting closed at 10.20 am.

CHAIRMAN
25 January 2018