

## DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Development Committee held on Thursday, 11 January 2024 in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 9.30 am

**Committee Members Present:**

Cllr P Heinrich (Chairman)	Cllr R Macdonald (Vice-Chairman)
Cllr M Batey	Cllr A Brown
Cllr P Fisher	Cllr A Fitch-Tillett
Cllr M Hankins	Cllr G Mancini-Boyle
Cllr P Neatherway	Cllr J Toye
Cllr K Toye	Cllr A Varley

**Substitute Members Present:**

Cllr K Bayes
Cllr T Adams

**Officers in Attendance:**

- Assistant Director for Planning (ADP)
- Principle Lawyer (PL)
- Development Management Team Leader – DW (DMTL-DW)
- Development Management Team Leader – RS (DMTL – RS)
- Senior Planning Officer – JB (SPO-JB)
- Senior Planning Officer – BC (SPO-BC)
- Senior Planning Officer – JS (SPO-JS)
- Democratic Services Officer - Regulatory

**Also in attendance:**

Cllr P Porter
Cllr H Blathwayt

### 101 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr L Vickers and Cllr V Holliday.

### 102 SUBSTITUTES

Cllr K Bayes was present as a substitute for Cllr L Vickers, and Cllr T Adams was present as a substitute for Cllr V Holliday.

### 103 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Development Committee meeting held Thursday, 7<sup>th</sup> December, were approved as a correct record subject to Minor typographical changes including to the text – part xviii on page 17 to change the last ‘of’ to ‘or’ , changes to p.8 xxi (land line ) to replace ‘of’ with ‘to’, p.17 xiv ‘as’ to ‘and’

And clarification to the recommendation for Thursford to read “That Planning Application PO/23/1526 be Approved with conditions and / or section 106 to be delegated to the Assistant Director – Planning to finalise (including relating to occupancy)”

### 104 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

## 105 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr P Fisher declared a non-pecuniary interest for item 10, he is a friend of the application, and item 12; he is a member of the National Trust.

The Chairman declared a pecuniary interest in item 13 to which he is the applicant, he confirmed he would therefore vacate the room for the item, with the Vice-Chairman (Cllr R Macdonald) deputising for the item. The Chairman confirmed a non-pecuniary interest for item 12, he is a member of the National Trust.

Cllr P Neatherway declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 12, he is a member of the National Trust.

Cllr K Bayes declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 12, he is a member of the National Trust.

## 106 HAPPISBURGH - PF/22/2510 - ACCESS TRACK TO LIGHTHOUSE LANE TO SERVE EXISTING PUBLIC CAR PARK AND NEW CAR PARK TO ALLOW FOR ROLLBACK OF EXISTING CAR PARK; ANCILLARY WORKS AT LAND OFF LIGHTHOUSE LANE HAPPISBURGH FOR HAPPISBURGH PARISH COUNCIL

### Officers Report and Presentation.

The SPO-JB introduced the Officer's report and recommendation for approval subject to conditions. He confirmed the application had been returned to committee following deferment in July 2023 to enable further discussion about impact on the Highway network.

The Case Officer provided an update to the circulated report and advised that communication had been received from the Highways Authority who expressed no concern to the delivery of the carriage way widening to the North of the site, though held some concern about the deliverability of all envisaged passing bays. The SPO-JB summarised conditions provided by the Highways Authority should the scheme be approved including the removal of permitted development rights for gates and bollards unless otherwise agreed with the Highways Authority, provision of visibility splays before first use of the development, provision of turning area and facilities for the parking area, construction traffic management plan and access route to ensure minimised disruption during construction, and offsite highways improvement works.

The SPO-JB outlined the site location plan and proposed layout for the scheme. He provided aerial and photographic images in and around the area demonstrating the scope and speed of costal erosion, and the impact this had on the existing access way to the car park.

Following deferment, as a result of additional highways consideration, the application now included enhancement measures, to be secured via condition and or Highways agreement where applicable including; The provision of at least 2 Passing Bays along Lighthouse Lane between the access and Whipwell Street, Carriageway widening to the east of Lighthouse Lane between the new access road and the dwellings to the North, and, positive signage to encourage right turns when leaving the car park.

### Public Speakers Representation

David Mole - Happisburgh Parish Council

Mark Sanders – Objecting  
Robert Roffey – Objecting  
Marilyn Howland – Objecting  
Francis Batt – Objecting  
Michelle Robinson – Supporting  
Bryony Nierop-Reading – Supporting  
Thomas Love – Supporting  
Clive Stockton – Supporting

#### Local Member Representation

The Local Member was unable to attend the meeting. He provided a written submission which was relayed by the ADP:

*Access to the beach car park is currently via Beach Road, Beach Road is hard up against the properties on Beach Road, with some front doors only being 12m from the road, by moving the access to the rear of properties the track to the car park is up to 90m away, which seems a reasonable proposal.*

*We need to keep these relatively cheap family days out, and access to the beach for wellbeing, general health and fitness which includes dog walking. And by keeping this car park open we are doing so. I've lost count of the days as family we have used this car park, there's a great playground and fossil hunting on the beach, all of which cost the parking fee. For example; This car park is only 6 miles from Dilham, 14 mins in a car. It is not possible to get the bus there and back in a day. Meaning car and car park are both a necessity – as is often the case in rural Norfolk.*

*What's the alternative? Where do cars park if this roll back scheme is not allowed? With a beach good for fossil hunting due to the ongoing erosion and one of the UK's most known lighthouses, Happisburgh is a destination for locals and holiday makers alike - not surprising when you add the oldest evidence of human occupation anywhere in the UK was also discovered here.*

*The street, has no double yellow lines, therefore the parking issue will be compounded along this stretch of road.*

*I believe this scheme is the part of living with a transitional coastline, while it may not suit everyone, I believe Happisburgh Parish council have put a viable option in front of us. The scheme also boasts a 40% BNG.*

*I support the officer's recommendation to approve this roll back scheme.*

#### Members Debate

- a. Cllr H Blathwayt, Portfolio Holder for Coast, expressed his support for the scheme which would be of benefit to the tourist economy and the management of the coastline. He reflected the Council had, in principle, already demonstrated its support for the scheme through the Corporate Plan. With regards to allegations made by objecting speakers that this had been an undemocratic process, he reflected that the scheme was submitted by the democratically elected parish council to the democratically elected district council for consideration. Further, the application accorded with Local Plan policies SD11 and SD12, which had been through a democratic process. Cllr H Blathwayt reflected on his recent negative experience elsewhere in the

Country exacerbated by the lack of Car Parking facilities leading to accumulation of waste and difficulties with delivery lorries in providing services, he cautioned this may be the fate for Happisburgh should the scheme not be approved. The Portfolio Holder stressed the critical importance of application to enable the continued management of erosion in a safe manor.

- b. The Chairman reflected that, as of last week, the entrance to the carpark was only meters away from the cliff edge and was at imminent risk of being lost with any future winter storm. Given the urgency to secure access, the Chairman asked if the conditions may be softened to speed up delivery of the scheme.
- c. The SPO-JB acknowledged concerns regarding the need for swift delivery of the application. He stated the recommendation as detailed included conditions which were either prior to commencement or prior to first use. The scheme included some phasing for the relocation of the car park when the current site was rendered unsafe, and there was scope for further phasing for other elements of the application. Ultimately, any connection back to the network must be approved with details supplied and considered acceptable by Highways prior to opening of the access track.
- d. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation. As the current longest serving member of the Council, and a long-time resident of the district, she recalled the history of the area and of the blight affecting Happisburgh village in the 1990's due to a lack of investment in the village and concerns about its future because of coastal erosion. In 2010's the village was re-vitalised through the 'Pathfinder' project -funded by central government. Through Pathfinder, the current car park was established which had boosted the local economy, brought benefit to the village school, secured safe access to the beach, relocated the caravan site to a safe distance, and provided a future to the Pub and Village Shop. She argued that should the application not be approved, Happisburgh risked losing all of the benefits attributed with Pathfinder. With regards comments made by public representatives, Cllr A Fitch-Tillett commented that National Planning Policies do not necessarily consider coastal erosion, but this was something which special interest groups were looking to address.
- e. Cllr A Varley thanked officers for their hard work and speakers for their representations. He expressed his support for the application, which he considered was fundamental for ensuring the future viability and vitality of the village and for the management of coastal erosion. Cllr A Varley was satisfied with the mitigations and conditions outlined, and noted the inclusion of new hedgerows and trees would enhance and protect biodiversity. Cllr A Varley seconded the officer's recommendation.
- f. Cllr J Toye accepted and supported the principle of rollback, but struggled with the irony that rollback in this instance was being applied to a carpark which would enable vehicle users to come and see the negative impact that cars, noting that 20% of global emissions were linked to cars. Cllr J Toye thought it was important that wider factors including the link between global emissions and climate change be considered. He further expressed his frustration with the lack of electric vehicle charging in the scheme.
- g. Cllr A Brown agreed the application was significant for the village and

thanked speakers for their contribution to a meaningful debate. He stated that a central car park was essential in Happisburgh, noting that many tourist visitors came to the village to see the Happisburgh Lighthouse. Cllr A Brown considered that the scheme had been improved following deferment and was broadly satisfied with the Highways improvements outlined. Additionally, he argued that the impact of the development to residents on Lighthouse Lane when compared to the current arrangement to residents on Beach Road would be lesser as the properties were further set back from the road. With regards to comments from objecting speakers, he commented that local sentiment and tension may have been eased through adoption of a Neighbourhood Plan, which would have consulted residents earlier in the planning process.

- h. The SPO- JB stated officers were confident that the improvement works identified to the network would be sufficient.

**RESOLVED** by 13 votes for and 1 abstention.

**That Planning Application PF/22/2510 be APPROVED in accordance with the officer's recommendation.**

**107 WALCOTT - PF/23/2259 - DEVELOPMENT OF 23 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING, LAND ON OSTEND ROAD, OSTEND ROAD, WALCOTT FOR FLAGSHIP HOMES**

Officers Presentation

The SPO-BC introduced the officer's report and recommendation for approval subject to conditions. The case officer confirmed that updated plans, which sought to address Highways concerns had been submitted following circulation of the agenda, alterations included, a single point of access to the southern dwellings, realigned footpath to the road, visitor parking relocated, viability splays and turning heads added, traffic calming measures, and flat blocks being relocated. In response to Highways comments, officers considered that the traffic in and around the area was limited and considered, on balance, there would not be an unacceptable impact on highways safety nor would the residual cumulative on the highways network be considered severe as set out in para 115 of the NPPF. Further, a traffic management order would significantly increase highways safety in and around the area.

An additional change to the scheme had been requested by the Fire Service to ensure that a fire hydrant be added to the scheme itself and not by way of S106 agreement.

The SPO-BC outlined the site's location, site constraints and relevant history, noting that the principle of the development had been established through permission granted for PF/20/1582 for 18 dwellings.

The Case Officer provided images and details of proposed elevations and floor plans, and confirmed the details set out in the officer's report including landscape plans, coastal erosion projections, amenity space, use of materials, energy efficiency, heritage impacts, biodiversity considerations, GIRAMS, Flood Risk, Environmental considerations including contamination and lighting matters, Highways comments and concerns.

The SPO-BC confirmed that the scheme was supported by the Housing Strategy team who considered the property mix reflected local housing need, the Landscape team, the Coastal Partnership Team, and no objection had been raised by the Conservation and Design Team who considered that whilst the scheme would not enhance the area, it would not cause significant harm.

The Case Officer reiterated the key issues for consideration and recommendation that the application be approved.

#### Public Speakers

None.

#### Local Member

Cllr P Porter expressed her support for the application in principle though raised concerns about the supporting infrastructure, particularly the lack of parking, and questioned whether the development may have a detrimental impact on water pressure and electric supply following unsubstantiated comments regarding low water pressure and regularity of power cuts. In addition, the Local Member queried if the water storage area was sufficient.

#### Members Debate

- a. The ADP issued a correction to the recommendation regarding provision of fire hydrant from S106 to condition and confirmed an update to the numbering of drawings. He stated, should members be minded to approve the application, as ADP he would be granted delegation to correct the wording of the recommendation as appropriate to reflect conditions for the fire hydrant.
- b. The SPO-BC stated that concerns over water pressure was not a planning matter, rather it was a matter for Anglian Water, who had not objected to the application. Matters of flooding had been satisfactorily addressed, and the parking provision complied with the Council's policies.
- c. Cllr H Blathwayt - Portfolio Holder for Coast, made no objection to the scheme. He considered it was, in essence, an infill development and noted no objection had been raised by coastal officers.
- d. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett considered the current shoreline management plan was produced in the early 2000's, well before the sand-scaping project, and was due a refresh. She contended it was only a small section of the site which was projected to be affected in 100 years' time. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation.
- e. Cllr R Macdonald thanked the case officer for his thorough report and expressed his support for the provision of affordable housing. Cllr R Macdonald seconded the officer's recommendation for approval.
- f. Cllr J Toye stated he was supportive of the scheme but was disappointed that the current proposal was environmental conscious that the original design, notably the scheme was not carbon-zero, and now was located (although to a limited extent) within the 100-year epoch.

- g. Cllr A Brown recognised the scheme represented a departure from a number of planning policies as detailed in the officer's report but considered there was a demonstrable justification to depart from policy on this occasion to ensure the provision of affordable homes. He agreed with Cllr J Toye that more could be done regarding the eco credentials of the scheme. Cllr A Brown noted on p.67 'Monitoring fee' that a monitoring charge would normally be payable on commencement, and asked if wording could be strengthened.
- h. The PL advised this wording was dictated by the County Council.
- i. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle stated it was fantastic that so many affordable homes would be achieved through the development but expressed disappointment these weren't for passive housing, which would have made the homes truly affordable for people to live in. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle was encouraged by the surface water strategy detailed on p.77 appendix 24.a.
- j. Cllr M Hankins was supportive of the development of affordable homes given the national and local shortage for this type of housing. He noted that the scheme would discharge effluence to the Mundesley water recycling centre, which had experienced issues in recent years, and sought assurance from officers regarding this matter.
- k. The SPO-BC confirmed that Anglian Water had informed the Council that there was adequate capacity at the Mundesley treatment centre to accommodate flows from the development.

**UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED** by 14 votes for.

**That Planning Application PF/23/2259 be APPROVED subject to conditions outlines in the officer's recommendation.**

*The meeting was adjourned at 11.00am and reconvened at 11.15am*

- 108 SHERINGHAM - RV/23/2222 - 37 SUITE APARTMENT HOTEL (CLASS C1) WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING WITHOUT COMPLYING WITH CONDITIONS 3 (USE FOR HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION PURPOSES ONLY), 5 (REQUIRING ACCOMMODATION TO BE MADE AVAILABLE FOR COMMERCIAL HOLIDAY LETTING FOR AT LEAST 140 DAYS A YEAR), 6 (INDIVIDUAL LETS NOT TO EXCEED 31 DAYS IN CONTINUOUS DURATION) AND 7 (NO INDIVIDUAL TO LET ANY OF THE UNITS FOR MORE THAN 31 DAYS IN ANY CALENDAR YEAR) OF PLANNING PERMISSION PF/22/1660 TO ALLOW AMENDMENTS OF HOLIDAY OCCUPANCY DETAILS AT LAND TO EAST OF THE REEF LEISURE CENTRE, WEYBOURNE ROAD, SHERINGHAM FOR MORSTON PALATINE LIMITED**

Officer's presentation

The SPO-JB introduced the officer's report and recommendation for approval.

The Case Office confirmed the site's location and provided images in and around the site for context. He confirmed the key provisions of the development which remained unchanged and confirmed the proposed variation of conditions 3,5, 6 and 7. Officers did not support the variation of condition 5; this condition tied was to business rates and referred to the 140 days letting rule. However, Officers were supportive of

variation to conditions 3, 6, 7 per the officer's report.

Public Speakers

None.

Local Member

None present.

Members Debate

- a. Cllr A Brown proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation.
- b. Cllr P Neatherway seconded the motion.

**IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED** by 14 votes for

**That Planning Application RV/23/2222 be APPROVED in accordance with the officer's recommendation.**

- 109 BINHAM - PF/23/1513 - ERECTION OF TWO-STOREY DETACHED DWELLING (AMENDMENT TO DESIGN OF DWELLING ON PLOT 1 PREVIOUSLY APPROVED AS PART OF PLANNING PERMISSION PF/15/1221 AND PF/19/0002) AT 10 WALSINGHAM ROAD, BINHAM, NORFOLK FOR MR RUPERT YOUNG.**

Officer's presentation

The SPO-JS introduced the officer's report and recommendation for approval subject to conditions. She advised the proposal was an alteration to a previously approved design scheme, therefore there was extant permission on the site, with principal of development already established for a two-storey detached dwelling.

The Case Officer confirmed the site's location, relationship within its local context, proposed floor plans and elevations and noted the difference between this and earlier schemes.

Public speakers

Jordan Cribb- Supporting

Local Member

The Local Member Cllr S Butikofer was unable to attend the meeting. Cllr J Toy spoke on behalf of the Local Member, and confirmed he was relaying the local member's comments, and not his own views. The Local Member considered the application didn't accord with the three distinctive building styles within the estate and would be an anomaly amongst the streetscape within the sensitive location. Further, the scale of the development towards the rear extended beyond that of neighbouring properties. The Local Member expressed preference that the Committee consider limiting any further increases in scale should the application be granted.

Members Debate



- a. Cllr A Varley proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation.
- b. Cllr A Brown seconded the officer's recommendation, he considered the scheme an improved design with the inclusion of brick and flint within the conservation area.
- c. Cllr P Neatherway commended the positive working relationship between officers and the applicant to develop a better scheme.

**UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED** by 14 votes for.

**That Planning Application PF/23/1513 be APPROVED in accordance with the officer's recommendation.**

**110 MORSTON - PF/23/1764 - USE OF LAND FOR STATIONING OF A FOOD AND BEVERAGE TRAILER FOR NO MORE THAN 56 DAYS PER ANNUM FOR A TEMPORARY PERIOD OF 5 YEARS (RETROSPECTIVE) AT NATIONAL TRUST INFORMATION CENTRE, QUAY LANE, MORSTON, HOLT NR25 7BH FOR NATIONAL TRUST**

Officer's presentation

The DMTL – DW introduced the Officer's report and recommendation for approval subject to updated conditions. He provided an update to p.117 following the publication of the revised NPPF that wording for the title of chapter 12 had changed, further, he advised an additional two conditions had been added to the officer's recommendation to remove permitted development rights for the temporary use of the land and to limit the stationing of the trailer on the land to no more than 56 days in any calendar year.

The case officer confirmed the site's location and context within its local setting and adjacent designated areas. He offered images in and around the site and of the proposed van and reminded the Committee of the main issues as set out in pages 117 to 120 of the agenda pack.

Public Speakers

Roberta Hammond – Mortson Parish Council  
Robert Metcalf – Objecting

Local Member

The Local Member – Cllr V Hollday was unable to attend the meeting and so submitted a written statement which was relayed by the DMTL-DW :

*The community objects to this application.*

*It is felt - and I quote - 'to destroy the strong sense of remoteness, tranquillity, and wildness which until recently was characteristic of MORSTON Quay and surrounding marshland.', and 'The NTs application seems designed to specifically increase visitor pressure at MORSTON Quay.'*

*This proposal is thought to be completely unsuitable for this highly protected location. It will commercialise and suburbanise what is meant to be a tranquil and wild area with a sense of remoteness. Visitors come for the natural landscape and*

wildlife. There already is a pub in the village and a kiosk on the Quay. The proposed hours of operation will increase footfall, the increased staffing will require more corporate infrastructure, and there will be an increase in refuse and litter, all of which diminishes the natural surroundings.

We are entrusted the duty to conserve, protect and enhance the Norfolk AONB. In the Norfolk Coast AONB Management Plan, updated in 2022, of the seven Key Qualities of Natural Beauty of the AONB, 5 are rated as amber ( ie having some grounds for concern) and 2 as green ( ie the key quality is being conserved and enhanced).

The relevant Key Qualities rated as amber are:

- Strong and distinctive links between land and sea;
- Diversity and integrity of landscape, sea scape and settlement character;
- Exceptionally important, varied and distinctive biodiversity; and
- Sense of remoteness, tranquillity and wildness.

Surely these 4 Key Qualities of Natural Beauty are to a certain extent within development control?

One of these most critical Key Qualities has dropped from green to amber during the recent period 2014-22

- Exceptionally important, varied and distinctive biodiversity, based on locally distinctive habitats.

This is worrying considering the importance of the nationally and internationally designated habitats within the AONB.

The explanation for the downgrading of these Key Qualities of Natural Beauty is given in the AONB Management Plan as:

*'Significant developments have adversely affected the character of the coast... These have impact on the setting of the AONB as well as increasing recreational pressure...'*

*'Some of the most high profile, characteristic bird species are affected by pressure from coastal visitors.'*

*'The population in and close to the AONB has risen significantly. Visitor numbers have increased significantly since designation and have remained high.'*

As stated in the officer's report, 'visitor pressure in sensitive locations such as this can be a concern'.

The downgrading of the Key Qualities of Natural Beauty the AONB, and the reasons given, leads me to disagree with the officer's assessment that this proposal would not result in any material harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape or have any adverse effects on the designated sites.

I find this proposal does not comply with the new National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 180-184, which refer to the need to protect Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Heritage Coast.

And that it does not comply with current Local Plan policies EN 1, EN 2, ENV 3, ENV 4 and ENV 9.

I also find that it does not comply with the following policies in the New Local Plan: ENV 1 - the highest degree of protection will be given to the designated landscapes

*of the AONB;*

*ENV 2 - proposals for development should be informed by and be sympathetic to the key characteristics and valued features of distinctive Landscape Types and Character Areas; and*

*ENV 3 - heritage and undeveloped coast - development will only be permitted ...which is not detrimental to the open coastal character.*

### Members Debate

- a. The Chairman sought clarification regarding the use of the van whether it would be a 'burger-van' or sell Tea, Coffee, Sandwiches and cakes as was typical for the National Trust.
- b. The DMTL- DW advised the van was not envisaged to be used as a 'burger-van'.
- c. The PL advised that there was no impediment to the van being a 'burger-van' in future as this was within the same class designation.
- d. The Chairman asked about the current permitted rights, that the National Trust could, if they so wished, park the trailer for 28 days in any one calendar year without permission.
- e. The DMTL-DW confirmed the permitted development rights, and advised the application represented 28 additional days.
- f. Cllr K Toye considered that Morston Key and other such areas should be maintained as a natural environment and not be commercialised or treated as a playground, as such she was unable to support the proposal.
- g. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett supported comments by Cllr K Toye and the Local Member and expressed her disappointment that the Norfolk Coast Partnership had failed to submit any comments as the custodian of the natural landscape. She implored officers to pursue comments from the Partnership in future.
- h. Cllr A Brown considered the landscaping analysis and business case to justify the proposal to be lacking and relayed his distain that permitted development rights were treated the same in this sensitive location as they would for a site outside of the AONB.
- i. Cllr M Hankins asked about the relationship and proximity between the proposed trailer and the existing café.
- j. DMTL-DW confirmed the takeaway café was located in the adjacent lookout building, a few meters away.
- k. Cllr P Neatherway reflected on the officer's report and argued that space in the existing café was not being properly utilised. Given there was already a café in situ, he did not see the need for the food and beverage trailer.
- l. The DMTL-DW advised that the applicant sought to meet additional demand and prevent complaints about speed of service.
- m. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett considered the existing café should be better optimised

and resourced to accommodate need rather than creating additional harm to the sensitive landscape.

- n. The Chairman proposed and seconded the officer's recommendation for approval.

**THE VOTE WAS LOST** by 1 vote for, 11 against and 2 abstentions.

- o. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett proposed the application be refused as it does not comply with current adopted Local Plan policies EN 1, EN 2, EN 3, EN 4 and EN 9.
- p. Cllr P Neatherway seconded the motion for refusal.

**RESOLVED** by 12 votes for, 1 against and 1 abstention.

**That Planning Application PF/23/1764 be REFUSED for failing to comply with current Local Plan Policies EN 1, EN 2, EN 3, EN 4 and EN 9**

**111 NORTH WALSHAM - PF/23/2479 - ERECTION OF A PORCH AND SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO FRONT OF DWELLING AT 26 THIRLBY ROAD, NORTH WALSHAM, NORFOLK FOR MR & MRS HEINRICH**

*The Chairman vacated the meeting at 11.58am as he had a pecuniary interest in application PF/23/2479.*

*Cllr R Macdonald as Vice-Chairman assumed the role of Chairman for this and the remaining items.*

Officers report

The DMTL -RS introduced the officers report and recommendation for approval. He confirmed the application had been referred to committee as the applicant was a serving member. He advised there had been an update to the report to reflect changes to wording within the NPPF – this did not alter the officer's recommendation.

The DMTL-RS confirmed the sites location, proposed floor plan and provided images of the site.

Public Speakers

None

Local Member

No representation made – this application was not referred to committee by the Local Member.

Members Debate

- a. Cllr J Toye proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation.
- b. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle seconded the officer's recommendation.
- c. Cllr P Neatherway sought confirmation the extension would not extend past

the front building line.

- d. The DMTL-RS confirmed the proposal would not extend beyond the front building line.

**RESOLVED** by 13 votes for.

**That Planning Application PF/23/2479 be APPROVED in accordance with the officer's recommendation.**

*Cllr P Heinrich (Chairman) returned to the meeting at 12.53pm*

## **112 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE**

It was noted no report had been provided this month due to the Christmas Period. A report would be issued for the 8<sup>th</sup> February Committee meeting.

## **113 APPEALS SECTION**

- a. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett noted the volume of appeals, and reflected this was an expanding list.
- b. Cllr A Brown asked how fast 'fast track', referenced in the appeals report, was.
- c. The ADP commented it was apt to call it 'faster' track.
- d. Cllr J Toye asked if learnings could be made from the appeals lost.
- e. The ADP confirmed that officers had regard for applications won and lost, he assured the Committee that learnings would be taken.
- f. The DMTL-RS confirmed the appeals lost in Barton Turf were for the Broads Authority.
- g. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle asked if the speed of appeals could be hastened as some remained outstanding many years later.
- h. The ADP advised that the Planning Authority could not control the timeline and how long it takes for the Planning Inspectorate to reach its decisions. The Council could however control the resources it dedicated to appealing decisions.
- i. Cllr M Batey noted the appeal at Holt which and the local feeling about large infrastructure structures.
- j. The ADP recognised the need for good telephone and internet coverage and reflected that telegraph communication structures were often a contentious issue locally and nationally.
- k. Cllr P Neatherway questioned whether telephone masts could be placed on church spires, given Norfolk had an abundance of churches.
- l. The ADP noted there would be challenges in placing masts on a listed

building, though it would not be impossible.

- m. Cllr A Brown remarked on an instance where a mast had been added to a Grade, I listed church in Norfolk. He noted the telecoms companies often considered such structures unsuitable for various reasons.
- n. Cllr J Toye reflected on his over 20 years' experience installing radar and communications, and advised there were technical considerations which discounted use of certain building structures. It was not a simple case of placing an aerial on a building and it operating as intended. This would be made more challenging with the roll out of 5G in North Norfolk, as 5G did not propagate as far, requiring additional aerials.

**114 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

None.

The meeting ended at 12.15 pm.

---

Chairman