

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Development Committee held on Thursday, 23 January 2025 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 M Hankins
Cllr V Holliday	Cllr P Neatherway
Cllr J Toye	Cllr K Toye
Cllr L Vickers	

Members attending: Cllr M Taylor
Cllr A Fletcher

Officers in Attendance: Assistant Director of Planning (ADP)
Principal Lawyer (PL)
Development Management Team Leader (DMTL)
Planning Officer (PO) Lawyer, Assistant Director for Planning and Democratic Services & Governance Officer

1 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors A Fitch-Tillett, G Mancini-Boyle and A Varley.

2 SUBSTITUTES

Councillor K Bayes was present as a substitute.

3 MINUTES - THURSDAY 14TH NOVEMBER 2024

The minutes of the Development Committee held on Thursday 14th November 2024 were agreed as a correct record subject to the following amendment proposed by the Chairman, Councillor P Heinrich:

Page 5 – Clause q. The Chairman stated a site visit at this time of year presented challenges and would be result in a speedy resolution.

Change to:

The Chairman stated a site visit at this time of year presented challenges and would not result in a speedy solution.

4 MINUTES - THURSDAY 12TH DECEMBER 2024

The minutes of the Development Committee held on Thursday 12th December 2024 were agreed as a correct record.

5 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There was none.

6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor L Vickers declared a direct pecuniary interest in item 14, as this was a house she was renovating to live in.

Councillor K Bayes declared an interest in items 10 and 11 and asked for the opportunity to speak and vote on the applications. The Chairman, Councillor P Heinrich sought clarification from the Council's Solicitor, Fiona Croxen. Councillor K Bayes confirmed that he was not predetermined, and it was agreed that Councillor K Bayes could speak and vote on those applications.

Councillor J Toye advised he was a Member for Erpingham and confirmed he was not predetermined in respect of item 13.

7 STALHAM - PF/21/1532 (APPLICATION 1) - EXTRA CARE DEVELOPMENT OF 61 INDEPENDENT ONE AND TWO BEDROOM FLATS, WITH SECURED LANDSCAPED COMMUNAL GARDENS, ASSOCIATED VISITOR AND STAFF CAR AND CYCLE PARKING, EXTERNAL STORES AND A NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS ONTO YARMOUTH ROAD.

Officers report

The ADP introduced the report and advised he would present applications PF/21/1532 and PF/21/2021 together.

The ADP reminded the Committee that both applications had been presented at a Development Committee meeting in March 2022 and the Committee decided that they were happy with both applications and authorised officers to grant permissions prior to the conclusion of a S106 agreement and conditions. He added that the scheme was affected by Natural England's position on nutrient neutrality and officers took the view at the Development Committee meeting in March 2022 that they could not issue those decisions without the nutrient neutrality position being resolved. The ADP confirmed that this had now been resolved.

The ADP explained that all other matters had largely unchanged and commented that the National and Local Policy position would be more in favour of approving housing schemes now than back in 2022.

Officers took the Monitoring Officer's view that these applications would need to come back to the Development Committee for determination.

The ADP outlined the site location and explained that the application sites were just off Yarmouth Road with Ingham Road to the north/west and highlighted to the Committee that there was an existing and completed Hopkins scheme to the north of the application sites. The ADP added that the application for the extra care development was located at the centre of the site and the application for the new residential development was located to the north and south of the site.

Photographs of the site from 2025 and 2022 were shared to the Committee showing various views of the site and the overall site and landscaping plans were presented

for both applications.

Public Speakers

John Daulby - Sutton Parish Council

Katie Newman - Objecting

Lynn Weisner - Objecting

Local Members

Councillor M Taylor explained that he and Councillor K Bayes had met with the ADP following concerns received from residents that process was not properly followed and that the applications had been rushed and pushed through without re-consultation. Councillor M Taylor commented that he was not surprised that local people were concerned about the scale of the development. He added that this development would place more pressure on the existing water supply and drainage, highways infrastructure and social infrastructure. Councillor M Taylor commented that they could not allow for this development to move forward without significant contributions to offload and control the added pressure and asked for the creation of a Stalham infrastructure fund funded through S106 agreement to be built up throughout the coming years and reinvested into the community of Stalham to address pressing highways issues. Councillor M Taylor also made comments in relation to the materials.

Councillor K Bayes echoed the comments which Councillor M Taylor. He added and highlighted the failures of the last developer Hopkins. Councillor K Bayes asked if the affordable housing was the original intention of the developer or whether it was seen to help increase the probability of the supported living happening.

The ADP addressed comments raised by speakers in relation to issues with drainage and surface water and explained that within the report, there were comments from all the statutory authorities confirming the development would be ok to approve subject to conditions and added that both approvals had relevant conditions included with them.

The ADP referred to Councillor M Taylor's suggestion of a Stalham infrastructure fund and commented that he did not think it would be viable for the development at this time. He also referred to comments made by Councillor M Taylor in relation to the materials and explained that these could be controlled by conditions. The ADP explained that units 1 to 6 which Councillor M Taylor specifically referred to were currently proposed as red brick at ground floor level, cream render at first floor level and red pantile roofs which was not out of keeping with Stalham.

The HSM referred to the independent living care and clarified to the Committee this was 61 affordable housing, social rent units for older people with care on site as required. She explained the aim of the independent living was to prevent residential care and to provide better and suitable homes for residents struggling to live on their own. The HSM explained employment would be care jobs and available on site. She commented an estimate of 35 to 40 jobs including café workers and hairdressers.

The HSM advised 40 general needs scheme were being considered for families in housing need and in detail clarified the extend of the housing need within the district. She highlighted to the Committee there was a housing crisis and availability of rental properties was scarce. She outlined there was 60 households in B&B as there was not affordable housing. She stressed the importance and impact of 101 affordable houses in this scheme.

Members debate

- a. Councillor M Hankins asked what was covered under the S106 agreement in respect of the application.
- b. The ADP referred to page 69 of the Committee report and explained the S106 agreement would cover four different components:
 - Ensure both applications deliver affordable housing
 - GIRAMS contribution
 - Green infrastructure related
 - Predominantly in a separate S106 agreement would be related to nutrient neutrality
- c. Councillor M Hankins raised a further question and asked what compensation the landowners would expect to receive for giving up the land.
- d. The ADP commented that the agricultural land was owned by a third party to the development and added that any financial agreements or other agreements which the developers come to with that party would be a matter for those two organisations, not the Council. He added that the Council had legal confidence that the land would be taken out of agricultural use and that nutrient neutrality would be delivered.
- e. Councillor J Toye referred to nutrient neutrality and commented that ponds of a certain size needed planning consent and asked if challenges would arise in terms of timescale. Councillor J Toye also referred to the landscape management plan and asked whether it would be tied up in a legal agreement to ensure someone maintained it in the future to meet the targets which were set.
- f. The Senior Landscape Officer explained as it was related to the nutrient budget calculator, one of the definitions that Natural England gave was water which would be for the pond use and added if they wanted to come forward with that, it would require permission. In respect of the landscape management plan, the Senior Landscape Officer confirmed it would be part of the section 106 agreement.
- g. Councillor J Toye commented that the town centre would benefit from footfall and proposed the officer's recommendation for both applications.
- h. Councillor V Holliday asked if the employment land could be resuscitated.
- i. The ADP explained if the Committee went with the recommendation to approve and an approval was issued, it did not guarantee the development to happen. The ADP advised that there was nothing to stop the landowner from coming back in with an employment proposal and added there was a historic approval for employment.
- j. Councillor V Holliday referred to the report in which it stated 194 residents would need affordable elder care by 2028 and sought clarification how many people were in need currently.
- k. The HSM explained the number of applicants which were on the housing list were older was different to residents who needed housing with care or

independent living because it was not a housing need until it was a care need. She added a resident may be housed but the house may not suit their need. The HSM confirmed there was 840 residents who showed an interest or included Stalham as a place they wished to live. She confirmed 203 of those households were of pensionable age.

- l. Councillor V Holliday referred to appendix F and nutrient neutrality and sought clarification as there was discrepancy in mitigation and was it the difference being provided by suds. She questioned if it was not sufficiently mitigated for nitrogen until 2030.
- m. The Senior Landscape Officer confirmed the accurate figures for nitrates was 219 kilograms of nitrogen per year before 2030. He referred to appendix F and explained because land parcel A and B were removed and parcel G was part of the mitigation strategy. He advised the table showed pre and post 2030.
- n. Councillor V Holliday sought clarification on the average water usage and asked for reassurance there was to be a reduction in usage.
- o. The Senior Landscape Officer explained the 110 litres per person per day was the higher optional water efficiency standard however this wasn't in the current local plan but was included in the emerging local plan. He advised this standard could be set by a planning condition.
- p. Councillor P Neatherway referred to sewage works and asked if there was any intentions to expand along with any sewage issues the Committee should be aware of.
- q. The ADP commented Anglian Water had been consulted and were satisfied with the proposal and there was capacity in the system. He commented further Anglian Water had been doing works within the district.
- r. Councillor K Toye expressed her concern was drainage and the effect it would have on current local residents. She understood the drainage had been considered and there were mitigations in place but was concerned whether this was maintained by Anglian Water. She commented the lack of services was a national shortage and therefore it was difficult to identify any area with the capacity to take on additional service users. She highlighted these issues were out of the Council's control and therefore seconded the officer's recommendation for both applications.
- s. Councillor K Bayes sought clarification in the contributions made by North Norfolk and Norfolk County Council and was affordable housing part of the original intention or was this added to help the probability of the applications being approved. He commented a local farmer had been in contact and provided evidence of pumping into dykes and river where there was no rain for 6 weeks. He questioned if there had been previous applications which had been approved where it was then proven, that Anglian Water have then not had capacity.
- t. Councillor Heinrich highlighted to the Committee, Anglian Water had attended an Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting over these issues.
- u. The HSM referred to Councillor Bayes comments on affordable housing and she clarified this scheme was 100% affordable housing from day one and purely an

affordable development. She explained the developer only develops affordable extra care which Norfolk County Council only funds by grants.

- v. The ADP confirmed the scheme was delayed by nutrient neutrality and the application had not previously been approved or refused. He confirmed there was previously authority given to Officers to approve it subject to conditions before nutrient neutrality caused a delay. He commented further drainage and surface water has improved in terms of planning and it is considered in detail. He commented he was not aware of proof in relation to Anglian Water having capacity and if there was an issues It was hard to determine this would be Anglian Waters issue.
- w. Councillor A Brown highlighted he voted to approve the application back in 2022 when he was a member of the Committee. He agreed with Councillor K Toye the focus needed to be on nutrient neutrality and to resolve this issue. He commented the balance which needed to be considered and there was a pressing need for affordable housing and the most elderly demographic in county has increased since 3 years ago when the previous application was presented. He added the importance of housing for the elderly would allow housing for families and the non-elderly population. He highlighted the function of this committee was to look at the wider benefits and needs of the district. He further added the Economic Development team confirmed this land was not viable as employment land site. He further added if the application was to be approved, he hoped more vernacular materials fronting Yarmouth Road would be addressed and encouraged the Town Council to come forward with a neighbourhood plan.
- x. Councillor J Toye commented as the Portfolio Holder for sustainable growth, commented he attend a webinar with Advanced Regional Water Resources Planning in which the plan was to go down to 90 litres in the future instead of 110 litres. He commented the role of the Committee was to work with the professional advice given by Anglian Water.
- y. Councillor K Bayes advised Stalham had submitted a neighbourhood plan. He commented there had been changes in Stalham since the application had been submitted where the Primary School had closed and school traffic went through Yarmouth Road and therefore heavily impacted by traffic. He questioned if there would be improvements to the pavements as they were not suitable for access.
- z. The ADP confirmed the Highways team have recommended conditions as part of the approval.
- aa. Councillor R Macdonald referred to a condition for Flint on units one to six which Councillor K Bayes referred and commented this was not an unreasonable request and suggested his support in approval of the application.
- bb. Councillor P Heinrich referred to the surface drainage and questioned if the Committee could impose a condition for rainwater harvesting.
- cc. The ADP commented if the Committee wished the material observation to be conditioned then this could be in application PF/21/2021 and explained the conditions which would need to be amended. The ADP asked if Councillor J Toye wished to amend his proposal.
- dd. Councillor J Toye proposed both conditions to be included.

- ee. Councillor V Holliday questioned if there were any health obligations for 100 dwellings and if there wasn't, then should there be.
- ff. The ADP confirmed there was no health obligations and none had been sought, he explained if they had been sought then as included on page 63 of the report, there was marginal viability would override any health obligations.
- gg. Councillor P Heinrich sought clarification the heating will be by air source heat pumps and if an assessment was completed to determine the noise which these might create.
- hh. The ADP confirmed this was unknown but building regulations standards needed to be met which would control any issues such as the noise from the air source heat pumps.

RESOLVED: by 11 for and 1 abstention.

That Planning Application PF/21/1532 be APPROVED in accordance with the Officers recommendation.

RESOLVED : by 11 for and 1 abstention.

That Planning Application PF/21/2021 be APPROVED in accordance with the Officers recommendation.

- 8 STALHAM - PF/21/2021 (APPLICATION 2) - A NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF 40 AFFORDABLE HOUSES COMPRISING 22 AFFORDABLE/SHARED OWNERSHIP HOUSES AND ONE BLOCK OF 18 AFFORDABLE FLATS CONSISTING OF 9, ONE BEDROOM FLATS AND 9, TWO BEDROOM FLATS WITH ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING, INFRASTRUCTURE AND ACCESS. LAND NORTH EAST OF YARMOUTH ROAD, STALHAM**

This application was present with application PF/21/1532 in which Members Debated and voted on.

The meeting adjourned at 11:08am and reconvened at 11:24am

Councillor M Taylor left the meeting.

- 9 BRISTON - PF/24/1030 - ERECTION OF 9 DWELLINGS WITH GARAGES (4 NO. TWO-STOREY DETACHED DWELLINGS, 3 NO. 1 ½ STOREY DETACHED DWELLINGS AND 2 NO. SEMI-DETACHED BUNGALOWS); ASSOCIATED ACCESS ROAD AND DRIVEWAYS; DETACHED AND ATTACHED GARAGES AT LAND TO THE REAR OF, HOLLY HOUSE, THE LANE, BRISTON**

Officers Report

The PO-RS presented the report and explained the application was for the erection of nine dwellings. He highlighted to the Committee there was two previous planning applications on this site which was an allocated site according to the site allocation document 2011 BRI24. He commented credits were purchased from the Norfolk environmental credit scheme to address the nutrients impact. He highlighted there were no objections from Highways but conflicts to policies HO1. He referred the

Committee to page 150 of the agenda which sets out in detail, the planning balance concludes the benefits or would not significantly demonstrably outweigh the benefits associated with the scheme.

The PO-RS advised the recommendation was for approval subject to the conditions outlined in the report. He highlighted to the Committee the location and access of the site. He explained to the Committee the proposed site layout along with the lapsed proposed and approved layouts. He advised of the proposed floor plans and elevations along with photos of the access.

Public Speakers

John Davies- Parish Council

Local Member

Councillor A Fletcher- Local Member expressed his concern and explained the site was unsuitable as it was less than a hectare. He added this exempts developers from the rules of affordable housing and biodiversity net gain. He added the proposed housing would not accommodate young families who were in need of housing. He expressed further concern of another designated development zone within Briston resulting in inadequate services and dependence on surrounding villages and towns.

Members Debate

- a. The PO-RS referred to page 149 of the report and clarified this was not a major development therefore in line with the NPPF, affordable housing should not be sought for such developments. He explained discussions had taken place with the applicant to see if units could be secured as affordable housing. He added in terms of policy the application was compliant. He explained Biodiversity Net gain was mandatory by statutory legislations and there were penalties for this being delivered further away. He confirmed there was no objections from Highways as this site was allocated and in relation to community infrastructure, he confirmed the application fell below the government's threshold.
- b. Councillor P Heinrich sought clarification on biodiversity net gain being conditioned within the village.
- c. The PO-RS explained there was a condition of delivery but not a condition of where. He explained there was a hierarchy with the starting point being biodiversity net gain on site.
- d. The ADP provided further information on biodiversity net gain and commented the authority were heavily constrained by the national position.
- e. Councillor L Vickers sought clarification on the internal layout of the property to gather an understanding on the proposed houses not being suitable for families. She echoed Councillor Fletcher comments on the congestion and traffic surrounding the school.
- f. Councillor A Fletcher clarified his point the proposed houses were not affordable for families and did not mean the layout was not suitable.

- g. The PO-RS highlighted to the Committees the proposed affordable houses and showed the layout designs.
- h. Councillor V Holliday commented she understood the concerns for the highway access as Orchard Close looked congestion already. She sought assurance the access would be satisfactory as there was no visitor parking included in the proposal.
- i. The PO-RS highlighted two visitor parking spaces at the access of the site which met the requirements.
- j. Councillor A Brown commented he was familiar with the site and agreed with highways pressure from the school was chronic and this scheme highlighted affordable housing was used in a financial term rather than planning policy. He commented the benefit of approving the application was this would be the first scheme in North Norfolk which qualified for nutrient neutrality certificate.

The Officer Recommendation was proposed by Councillor A Brown and seconded by Councillor L Vickers

RESOLVED: by 10 for and 2 against.

That Planning Application PF/24/1030 be APPROVED in accordance with the Officers recommendation.

Councillor A Fletcher left the meeting at 11:52am

10 **ERPINGHAM - PF/22/0801 - REMOVAL OF STABLES, TENNIS COURT AND OUTBUILDINGS, AND THE CREATION OF SELF-HEATED DWELLING WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS AND LANDSCAPING WORKS AT 1 WALPOLE BARN, THWAITE COMMON, ERPINGHAM, NORWICH**

Officers Report

The DMTL referred the Committee to third party objections after the agenda was published with the Chair's permission. He outlined the objection was from the Occupiers at Nutmeg Cottage which included the concerns on the conservation area for Mannington and Wolterton, along with concerns on the tree clearance in a county wildlife area. The objectors outlined the contradictions to planning policy SS2, landscape policy EN2 and design policy N4.

He introduced the report and outlined the extensive application site which lead to forms of mitigation offered by the applicant. The DMTL advised the focus was on the characteristics and the settlement of the site in accordance with Countryside Policy and NPPF paragraph 84. He explained the points of the access of the site and highlighted photos of the site along with the proposed dwelling. He added as part of the Landscape Management plan there was improvements to biodiversity. The DMTL provided a presentation which identified the proposed floor plans and elevations. He highlighted to the Committee the application was to be considered as an exceptional form of design under the exemptions policy in the NPPF.

The DMTL outlined the key issues, which were principle of development, impact on character of the area, heritage and design, fallback and planning balance.

Councillor M Taylor rejoined the meeting at 11:58am.

Public Speakers

Will Cutts- Parish Council
Alistair Mackinnon – Supporting

Local Member

Councillor J Toye- Local Member- thanked officers for their consultations and balancing on this application. He commented he believed Officers have dealt with the paragraph 84 NPPF as it is neither remote or significantly innovative and has been done before as shown in the documentations with the grand design example. Councillor J Toye outlined to the Committee the comparison of this application to the grand design. He referred to the proposal including an air source heat pump and questioned the need. He commented if the applicant cared for the environment, the applicant could use what they currently have instead of removing this delicate and sensitive area.

Councillor J Toye highlighted the use of GGBS concrete instead of zero carbon concrete. He commented one property in a remote location will not make a difference to the housing land supply. He explained this application would not provide environmental benefits and offer nothing to the community.

Members Debate

- a. Councillor L Vickers commented the refusal was counterintuitive and there was a possibility of a hanger where helicopters resulting in high fuel consumption and noise pollution or a house which in accordance with the climate and environmental policy team identifies the application as above and beyond the planning requirements. She outlines the policies in which the application does support and questioned the recommendation for refusal and suggested her approval for the application.
- b. Councillor K Toye commented she supported building to people's own design with conditions and advised she believe the application did not meet the correct criteria in her opinion due to the impact on neighbouring dwellings. She expressed her support in refusal of the application and proposed the recommendation.
- c. Councillor P Fisher commented this was a difficult application but advice from Officers has been helpful. He highlighted the application did not meet criteria and seconded the proposal.
- d. Councillor M Hankins commented he felt it was difficult to make a decision on this application. He added the application was for a innovative and modern building which was zero carbon and efficient. He advised he was going to vote against the recommendation for refusal.
- e. Councillor R Macdonald sought clarification on the late objection from the occupiers of Nutmeg Cottage.
- f. The DMTL summarised the objections made; concerns on the impact of the conservation area for Mannington and Wolterton, along with concerns on the

tree clearance in a county wildlife area. The objectors outlined the contradictions to planning policy SS2, landscape policy EN2 and design policy N4. The DMTL stressed the importance of the strategic policies as they identify where the development can go and are key when decisions are made. He explained to the Committee, if paragraph 84 of the NPPF is applicable, the Committee must consider that the site is isolated and the design is innovative.

- g. Councillor A Brown sought further clarification on paragraph 84 and the proposal has to be innovative or not and or of very high quality design.
- h. The ADP provided the Committee with the relevant part of paragraph 84 which included; planning decision should avoid the development of homes in the Countryside unless the design is of exceptional quality in that it is truly outstanding reflecting the highest standards in architecture and would help to raise standards of design in rural areas and significantly enhance its immediate setting and the defining characteristics of the local area.
- i. Councillor A Brown asked if the site location was in the Conservation Area of in the shadow of a boundary and therefore outside.
- j. The DMTL provided the aerial view of the conservation area and the location plan which clarified the dwelling will sit immediately adjacent to the conservation area. He explained the site area will impact the Conservation area and the County wildlife site.
- k. Councillor A Brown commented planning policy needed to be applied strictly and if the application was not paragraph 84 compliant, there was no material considerations to go against the planning policy and there was no wider benefit for the community. He advised he would be voting in accordance with the recommendation.
- l. Councillor P Heinrich highlighted an application for a very large neoclassical country house that was deemed small which some members would recall.
- m. Councillor K Bayes commented he would be voting to approve the application but questioned, the comment made by the Parish speaker on the industrial nature of the building.
- n. The DMTL highlighted to the Committee the amount of road side screening from existing hedge rows in and around the site, the hanger building was approved in context with additional planting in which officers were satisfied this would not have a significant impact on the landscape.
- o. Councillor V Holliday sought clarification on the glazing being electrochromic as implied.
- p. The DMTL clarified the design and access statement did not include glass within the building which was specifically designed to reduce visible light transmission. He explained the building was presented with a screen in front of the large glaze panel which was designed to create refraction and stop elements of light pollution.
- q. Councillor J Toye clarified he was not against innovative design however it needs to be in the right place. He explained his concern the proposal was

already on the edge of the protected area this was going to be damaged to potentially get some gain however the damage is not quantifiable.

r. Councillor P Netherway agreed with Councillor Vickers comments.

Councillor K Bayes left the meeting .

RESOLVED 7 For and 6 against including the additional vote of the Chair.

That the Planning Application PF 22/0801 be APPROVED in accordance with the Officers Recommendation.

Councillor L Vickers and A Brown left the meeting.

11 WALSINGHAM - LA/24/2551 - CONSTRUCTION OF LIGHTWEIGHT FIRE-RESISTANT PARTITION IN GROUND FLOOR AT MILL HOUSE, 5 SCARBOROUGH ROAD, WALSINGHAM, NORFOLK, NR22 6AB

Officer Reports

The PO presented the application for a fire resistant partition new door in a grade two listed building. She explained the application was in front of the Committee today as it was made by Councillor L Vickers. The PO presented the existing and proposed site location plan. The PO showed photos of the existing dwellings and explained the partition was to be placed in front of the stairs and the new door way. The PO highlighted the existing and proposed floor plans and the key issue of the application was the impact on the heritage asset.

The PO advised the recommendation was for approval with the conditions relating to the matters, time limit, development in accordance with approved plans, materials and appearance of kitchen door as requested by the Conservation Team.

Members Debate

No questions were asked by the Committee.

Councillor M Batey proposed and Councillor R Macdonald seconded the Officer recommendation.

RESOLVED: 10 For and 1 Abstention

That the Planning Application LA/24/2551 be APPROVED in accordance with the Officers Recommendation.

12 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE

The ADP presented the performance update on page 185/186 of the agenda and highlighted they were all positive. He drew the Committee attention to Section 106 agreements on page 187 of the agenda, specifically the Paston College Field Development at North Walsham which has been approved.

Councillor A Brown thanked the Planning Team on the performance and the Planning Solicitor efficiency.

13 APPEALS SECTION

The ADP introduced the report and highlighted the appeal which was allowed on page 193. He advised the appeal was allowed in regard to feedback position of a caravan so the inspector took the view if a caravan was allowed then so was a holiday lodge.

14 MHCLG WORKING PAPER - PLANNING REFORM: MODERNISING PLANNING COMMITTEES

The ADP explained previous comments have influenced the report and explained Central Government were informally consulting on modernise Planning Committees and provided options for Council's to comment on. He commented and referred to the report, Committees can be constructed in a manner that facilitates faster delivery of quality homes and places that our community need buy in greater standardisation over the operation of Committees in turn to give greater certainty to applicants.

He explained in Appendix 2 were drafter answers in response to question asked by Central Government. The ADP invited comments from the Committee.

Councillor J Toye asked if the Council could send links to their YouTube and training then they would received a better understanding.

The ADP advised policies would be shared with Councillor P Heinrich, Councillor A Brown, Councillor V Holliday and Councillor M Hankins before determining if circulation was needed to the rest of the Committee

Councillor A Brown would encouraged Members to comment if asked to do so and advised if the Chair and himself was copied in to these emails.

Councillor V Holliday proposed and Councillor J Toye seconded the recommendation.

UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED

The meeting ended at 12.59 pm.

Chairman