

# Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party



**Please Contact:** Linda Yarham

**Please email:** [linda.yarham@north-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:linda.yarham@north-norfolk.gov.uk)

**Direct Dial:** 01263 516019

13<sup>th</sup> July 2018

A meeting of **Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party** will be held in the **Council Chamber** at the Council Offices, Holt Road, Cromer on **Monday 23 July 2018 at 9.30 am**.

At the discretion of the Chairman, a short break will be taken after the meeting has been running for approximately one and a half hours.

Members of the public who wish to ask a question or speak on an agenda item are requested to arrive at least 15 minutes before the start of the meeting. It will not always be possible to accommodate requests after that time. This is to allow time for the Committee Chair to rearrange the order of items on the agenda for the convenience of members of the public. Further information on the procedure for public speaking can be obtained [here](#) or from Democratic Services, Tel: 01263 516010, Email: [democraticservices@north-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:democraticservices@north-norfolk.gov.uk)

Anyone attending this meeting may take photographs, film or audio-record the proceedings and report on the meeting. Anyone wishing to do so must inform the Chairman. If you are a member of the public and you wish to speak on an item on the agenda, please be aware that you may be filmed or photographed.

**Emma Denny**  
**Democratic Services Manager**

To: Mrs S Arnold, Mrs S Bütikofer, Mrs A Fitch-Tillett, Ms V Gay, Mrs A Green, Mrs P Grove-Jones, Mr N Pearce, Ms M Prior, Mr J Punchard, Mr R Reynolds, Mr S Shaw, Mrs V Uprichard

All other Members of the Council for information.

Members of the Management Team, appropriate Officers, Press and Public



**If you have any special requirements in order to attend this meeting, please  
let us know in advance**

If you would like any document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact us

**Heads of Paid Service:** Nick Baker and Steve Blatch  
**Tel** 01263 513811 **Fax** 01263 515042 **Minicom** 01263 516005  
**Email** [districtcouncil@north-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:districtcouncil@north-norfolk.gov.uk) **Web site** [www.north-norfolk.gov.uk](http://www.north-norfolk.gov.uk)

## AGENDA

### 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive apologies for absence, if any.

### 2. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

### 3. MINUTES

Page 4

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of a meeting of the Working Party held on 18 June 2018.

### 4. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

To determine any other items of business which the Chairman decides should be considered as a matter of urgency pursuant to Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972.

### 5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members are asked at this stage to declare any interests that they may have in any of the following items on the agenda. The Code of Conduct for Members requires that declarations include the nature of the interest and whether it is a disclosable pecuniary interest.

### 6. UPDATE ON MATTERS FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING

### 7. THE GLAVEN PORTS CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISALS & MANAGEMENT PLANS 2018 (page 13)

Summary:

This report seeks approval for the draft Blakeney, Cley, Morston and Wiveton Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans to be taken forward to public consultation in line with national policy and best practice.

Recommendations:

1. That the draft appraisals as set out within the body of this report be approved for public consultation.
2. That following consultation, the amended appraisals be brought back to Working Party for consideration and subsequent adoption by Cabinet.

Cabinet Members(s)	Ward(s) Affected
All Members	All Wards
Contact Officer(s), telephone number and email: Paul Rhymes, Conservation & Design Officer, 01263 516367	

**8. COASTAL PLANNING – STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND**

(page 19)

Summary: This report explains Statements of Common Ground and how they support the Local Plan preparation process and seeks authority to complete a Statement relating to Coastal Planning.

Recommendations: **That the Working Party recommend to Cabinet that the Coastal Zone Planning Statement of Common Ground is signed on behalf of North Norfolk District Council**

Cabinet Members(s)	Ward(s) Affected
All Members	All Wards
Contact Officer(s), telephone number and email: Mark Ashwell, Planning Policy Manager, 01263 516325	

**9. VERBAL UPDATE – PROGRESS ON RESIDENTIAL SITE ALLOCATION**

To receive a verbal update from the Planning Policy Manager

**10. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

To pass the following resolution (if necessary):

“That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A (as amended) to the Act.”

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

**18 JUNE 2018**

Minutes of a meeting of the **PLANNING POLICY & BUILT HERITAGE WORKING PARTY** held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Holt Road, Cromer at 10.00 am when there were present:

Councillors

Mrs S Arnold (Chairman)

Mrs S Bütikofer  
Mrs A Fitch-Tillett  
Ms V Gay  
Mrs A Green

Mrs P Grove-Jones  
N Pearce  
R Reynolds  
S Shaw

Mrs V Uprichard

Observers:

N Dixon (Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Business & Tourism)  
N Lloyd  
E Seward  
B Smith  
D Young

Officers

Mr M Ashwell – Planning Policy Manager  
Mr I Withington – Planning Policy Team Leader  
Mr S Harrison – Planning Policy Officer

**11. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ms M Prior and J Punchard.

**12. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

Questions and comments from members of the public were taken at minute 18 as they related to that item.

The Chairman accepted a comment from Councillor D Young relating to provision of housing in villages.

Councillor Young stated that he represented several small villages in the countryside which had well above the average level of second homes. It was almost impossible to find available sites which would be large enough to make a viable exceptions site. There could be no building in the countryside unless exceptions sites were available, and it was not possible to mitigate second homes and allow families to find housing in the villages. He suggested that future policy could allow small developments of one or two dwellings adjacent to village envelope. These would preferably be affordable dwellings but they could otherwise be market dwellings with restrictions that they were occupied as permanent dwellings and only available to people with a connection to North Norfolk. He considered that this would prevent those dwellings from becoming second homes and would address the situation where a landowner wanted to provide a home for a family member. He considered that such occupiers were more likely to play an active part in village life.

The Planning Policy Manager stated that the approach to development in villages and infill development would need to be revisited. Members were unhappy with the current approach which was very restrictive to growth in villages. There had been some discussion at the previous meeting and Members had been advised that it would be preferable to consider the broader issue of tenure controls rather than simply focus on second homes. A detailed paper would be brought to the Working Party in due course.

### **13. MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 21 May 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the inclusion of apologies for absence from Councillor N Dixon and the insertion of the words “as it was in the AONB” under Councillor Mrs S Bütikofer’s comments relating to C10/1.

### **14. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

There was one item of urgent business relating to a verbal update on the Corpusty and Saxthorpe Neighbourhood Plan. The reason for urgency was to seek delegated authority to respond to the document within the prescribed consultation period in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Chairman of the Working Party.

### **15. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

### **16. UPDATE ON MATTERS FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

None.

### **17. FIVE YEAR LAND SUPPLY 2018-2023**

The Planning Policy Manager presented a report which compared the latest evidence in relation to the requirement for new homes in the District with the amount of deliverable housing land that is available. The report explained the approach to identifying the requirement in terms of new dwellings and how the deliverable supply is calculated.

National policy required that at all times a deliverable housing land supply of at least five years must be demonstrated. There was significant uncertainty regarding the current year’s statement due to ongoing consultation around a proposed new method for establishing housing needs and the pending publication of new Household Projections by the Office for National Statistics in September 2018. The household projections were derived from the population projections which had already been published. The population projections indicated a significant slowdown in the rate of population growth which was likely to result in a reduction in the housing requirement for the District over the next five year period. Whilst it would be possible to delay publication of the Five Year Land Supply Statement until the publication of further information in September, it was considered important that the Council understood and published its current position as it was a major consideration in determining planning applications and appeals, and in the absence of a five year housing land supply there was a presumption that planning permission should be granted on unallocated sites provided they were sustainable. The Planning Policy Manager recommended the publication of an Interim Position Statement pending the publication of the new National Housing Projections in September 2018 which were likely to impact on the local housing requirement.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that the current methodology, based on current household projections, would require 538 dwellings to be delivered per year and at this figure the five year land supply would be marginal at 5.02 years. The current target was 409 dwellings, which represented a 5.8 year supply. The expected household forecast was likely to result in a requirement to deliver around 420-430 dwellings per year.

Councillor R Reynolds asked the Planning Policy Manager to explain in detail what would happen if the 5 year land supply was lost.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that there would be a presumption that planning permission would be granted on sustainable unallocated sites until the five year supply was restored. It was likely that anyone with a potential site anywhere in the District could take the opportunity to seek planning permission. It was important to maintain a five year supply.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett proposed that the Council should maintain its target of 409 dwellings. She expressed concern that there was too much reliance on infrastructure providers to support additional development.

The Planning Policy Manager requested that Members avoid setting numbers without understanding the detail behind it. He agreed that the target of 409 dwellings could be retained for the five-year housing supply purposes pending publication of the new methodology and that any change be published in the interim statement.

Councillor Mrs A Green asked if there could be a decrease in the target from 409 if household projections fell.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that there would still be growth but the incline would be shallower. However, it was necessary to be cautious because of wide fluctuations in the statistics and it would be wrong to rely to heavily on a single forecast to set the housing target in the Local Plan.

Councillor D Young asked if it was realistic to presume that some of the potential sites in the new Local Plan would come to fruition in five years' time.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that it was not possible at this stage to say whether or not sites would be delivered. There would be more certainty following consultation as to which sites would go through to the Local Plan and enter the deliverable supply.

Councillor N Lloyd asked how localised the current five year supply was. He was aware that the five year allocation had been reached in some areas. He also asked what impact the emerging plan currently had.

The Planning Policy Manager stated that the five year land supply requirement related to the District in its entirety. It was not necessary to demonstrate a five year supply in individual settlements. The emerging plan currently had no legal status. The emerging plan period covered 2016 – 2036 and any development which took place after 1 April 2016 would come off the target.

Councillor N Dixon emphasised that loss of supply could result in the loss of mixed sites and the opportunity to provide employment and supporting infrastructure. There was a need to think more broadly than just in terms of housing.

Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones expressed concern that if the five year land supply were lost, there was a large number of dwellings which could potentially be put forward by developers and asked how long the problem would last.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that the impact of a shortfall in the five-year land supply would continue only until the situation was corrected by granting planning permission for a deliverable supply.

The Working Party discussed the possible annual delivery target for housing.

Councillor R Reynolds proposed that an interim position statement is published confirming that the Council has a Five Year Land Supply. This was seconded by Councillor S Shaw.

The Planning Policy Manager stated that it was important that a formal five year land supply position was published, based on the current position, but also to publish a revised statement based on the new projections.

It was proposed by Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett, seconded by Councillor Ms V Gay that the interim position statement be published to confirm that the Council has a five year land supply based on the current position of 409 dwellings per year and to publish a revised statement based on the new household projections.

Councillor R Reynolds and S Shaw indicated that they accepted the suggestion. Councillor Reynolds emphasised the importance of maintaining flexibility.

#### **RESOLVED**

**That the interim position statement be published to confirm that the Council has a five year land supply based on the current position of 409 dwellings per year and to publish a revised statement based on the new household projections.**

#### **18. LOCAL PLAN – IDENTIFICATION OF PROVISIONAL HOUSING SITES IN NORTH WALSHAM FOR INCLUSION WITHIN THE EMERGING FIRST DRAFT LOCAL PLAN. (CONSULTATION VERSION)**

The Planning Policy Team Leader explained the process, methodology and criteria for selection of the provisional preferred sites for consultation. The Chairman requested that a copy of his slide presentation be circulated to Working Party Members after the meeting.

The Planning Policy Officer presented the provisional preferred and non-preferred sites in North Walsham which were fully appraised in the report.

#### Public Speakers

Mary Seward (North Walsham Town Council)  
Elaine Addison (local resident)  
Bernie Marfleet (Save our Streets)  
Michelle Banville (local resident)

Mary Seward stated that North Walsham Town Council was firmly of the view that major housing development to the west of the town, as recommended by officers, should be accompanied by appropriate infrastructure improvements, which should be reflected in the Local Plan. It was essential that a new link road was built from Norwich Road to Cromer Road and that it should be extended to the Lyngate industrial estate to remove increased traffic from the new housing development as well as removing heavy through traffic from the town centre. The link road should be built at an early stage in any new housing development and could be expected to require some form of public funding with Section 106 contributions from developers to cover much of the funding. Additional Section 106 contributions should be required, eg. for schools, traffic signage and improved health facilities. Whilst the Town Council recognised that other sites in the town would be identified for housing, at this stage it was opposed to the land at the end of Mundesley Road being allocated for housing because of poor highway access, unacceptable damage to the landscape and being outside the existing settlement boundary. The Town Council also considered that the Local Plan should require developers to provide a level of affordable housing to help meet local need. The Town Council wished to have a continuing dialogue with the District Council on the Local Plan as it considered that it would improve what was ultimately agreed for North Walsham.

The Planning Policy Manager confirmed that the options were provisionally preferred and further work was required with regard to deliverability.

Elaine Addison considered that the link road would only be used if it connected directly to the industrial estate, and if so it should result in a reduction in unsuitable traffic using the town. She requested that unsuitable roads be made "access only". She stated that retail house prices were significantly lower in North Walsham than in other parts of the region, which impacted on developers' opportunities to contribute towards planning gains. She stated that large developers had not made contributions and the lack of investment had impacted on local residents. Schools were oversubscribed and local children had to go to school in Hoveton. She considered that robust Section 106 contributions were needed with a legal obligation to ensure that commitments were met.

The Planning Policy Manager stated that Persimmon had made contributions but another developer had not.

The Planning Policy Manager stated that care was needed with phasing agreements and clear triggers were needed for infrastructure. Land value would determine what could be delivered. There may be a need for public investment and forward funding if the road had to be delivered in its entirety.

The Chairman asked if Norfolk County Council (NCC) was prepared to fund the road.

Councillor E Seward, a NCC Councillor, reported that NCC had identified 5 Norfolk market towns with projected housing growth. Studies had been authorised to look at the implications of such growth and funding of 1.7m would be available for which bids could be made. It was hoped that the study would provide evidence regarding the need for highway improvements. NCC Members representing the North Walsham area had indicated that funding may be required and evidence would be needed to bid for the money.

Bernie Marfleet welcomed the emerging Plan. He supported the views expressed by Mary Seward and Elaine Addison. North Walsham was a growth town but it needed to be taken forward in a way that suited the town and made it healthy and safe. The



main issues concerned the need for a relief road. Traffic going through the town from Cromer to the Norwich Road was a concern. A large number of schoolchildren used the road, which was not healthy or safe. Additional traffic going through the town was unacceptable. The access for HGVs was a constraint on economic development. The increase in traffic was an issue which local people felt strongly about and needed to be addressed in the proposals. Evidence was needed of traffic impacts, how the link road and traffic controls would be incorporated into the proposals, and how they could be secured.

Michelle Banville stated that she was very fearful of developers reneging on their promises and requested assurance of the legal framework and the means the Council would have to ensure that developers delivered on their promises.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that the only power the Council had was to refuse to grant planning permission until the applicants could demonstrate they could meet the requirements. It was essential not to overpromise and under-deliver. The next phase before public consultation would be very important for the Council and the promoters to show they could deliver.

Councillor Mrs V Uprichard expressed concern that sites occupied by Ladbrooks Engineering and the Garden Centre, which were successful businesses, were considered as an option for housing development. She considered that they should be removed. She also considered that the site at Mundesley Road should be removed as it was a greenfield site, a long way from the town centre, unsustainable and surrounded by countryside and would impact on Paston Way and the canal.

Councillor Ms V Gay supported the western extension, provided the link road continued to the industrial estate and included traffic restrictions, 20 mph speed limits and restricted access on residential streets. She considered that there should be a clear demonstration of sustainability and attractive development. Medical infrastructure was extremely important. She stated that the Football Club wished to remain on its current site at the moment and if the status of the land as a green area changed the club should be given a suitable alternative. She understood that there was a possibility of the businesses referred to by Councillor Mrs V Uprichard relocating from their current site and requested clarification of this matter. She supported the removal of the Mundesley Road site. She considered that the mushroom farm site to the south should not be preferred as the Highway Authority did not agree to access onto the Yarmouth Road and traffic would be channelled into the residential streets. She welcomed the removal of The Lawns site. She considered that it was very important to have a consistent strategy and to consider the sites in a holistic and sustainable manner as adjustments to one site would affect the situation elsewhere.

Councillor E Seward considered that any extension to the link road should go over the railway line and into the industrial estate. He stated that there was a speculative developer who was interested in the Mundesley Road site and considered that marking the site as a possible reserve would encourage speculative development. A Highway Engineer had advised him that a link road associated with the site would need to cross the historic Paston Way, which was not acceptable. He stated that the site was distant from the town and the local school was full.

Councillor N Lloyd stated that the western extension was the largest proposal in the District and had to be considered carefully. Incremental development around the town had had a detrimental effect. He agreed that the link road had to connect with the industrial estate. He considered that every encouragement should be given to

developers to link up as incremental development would not deliver the link road or other benefits required by the town. He stated that he lived on Mundesley Road and the proposed site was used for walking and was very picturesque. The canal was an attraction for the town. Paston Way was widely used and very peaceful and it would be a shame if a road cut through it.

Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones considered that it might be necessary to apply for Government funding for the road given the high cost of road development. She was concerned that it was often the case that developers applied to delete some of their Section 106 obligations once they had received planning permission. She was concerned that the western extension would be built in a piecemeal fashion and that some developers might withdraw. There were some very large developers who would be able to develop out the site but she had concerns regarding the design of such developments.

Councillor N Dixon referred to a speaker's question regarding sanctions and the Planning Policy Manager's response that the Council only had power to hold back planning permission. He considered that much of the damage was done at delivery stage and there were many examples where developers built the dwellings but did not provide what was expected. It was not always in the Council's gift as to how contributions were spent, eg. it did not have power over the delivering capacity of clinical commissioning groups. He asked what sanctions the Council had at the end of the build to ensure that obligations were met.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that there were legal powers to enforce conditions and agreements, however it took a great deal of resources to pursue the requirements. He considered that one of the key issues was to ensure that the allocated sites were deliverable and viable. Delivery of large scale infrastructure in North Walsham was necessary whether or not development took place and it was therefore unreasonable to expect it to be funded in its entirety by private developers. The public sector had a role to play in delivery of the infrastructure.

Councillor N Dixon reminded the Working Party to consider the Local Enterprise Partnership.

Elaine Addison asked if alternative sites would be allocated if additional preferred sites were not included.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that the sites were not being allocated as preferred at the moment. They were additional sites which might need to be considered if a high housing target was set by the Government or if other sites could not be delivered. A clear demonstration of deliverability was essential before public consultation could take place. There was an issue across North Norfolk as to whether the Local Plan would deliver sufficient dwellings in the event of a high housing target being set and if so, it could be necessary to revisit other towns and the strategy as a whole. The Council could not risk examination of a plan with insufficient growth.

Councillor E Seward clarified that the NCC market town initiative had two funding stages. The £1.7 m to which he had referred was for early gains and not large scale long term funding. For the longer term funding it was necessary to build up evidence. The extension of the link road could become a separate funding bid over a longer period.

The Planning Policy Manager stated that the Ladbrooks Engineering and Garden Centre sites were being promoted by the owners of the sites. Ladbrooks wanted to relocate and required residential land value to fund an alternative site. He suggested that the Working Party provisionally allocate those sites subject to alternative provision within North Walsham.

#### **RESOLVED**

- 1. That NW01A (land at Norwich Road and Nursery Drive) be allocated as a provisionally preferred site subject to the relocation of the existing businesses within North Walsham.**
- 2. That NW44 (Paston College Lawns Site) and ED1 are not carried forward from the existing Local Plan.**
- 3. That site NW16/1 and NW24 & 43 are not allocated as provisional preferred sites.**
- 4. That NW62 (North Walsham Western Extension) is identified as a provisional preferred option, subject to further demonstration of deliverability and sustainability, attractive development, further consideration of the extension of the road network to serve the industrial estate which would include a traffic plan, exclusion of the football ground and that a comprehensive master plan brought back to the Working Party prior to public consultation.**
- 5. That the final policy wording and content of the consultation document be delegated to the Planning Policy Manager.**

#### **19. CORPUSTY AND SAXTHORPE DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

This matter was considered as an item of urgent business.

The Planning Policy Team Leader reported that the Corpusty and Saxthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Group had been submitted its draft plan, which would now be subject to a six week period of consultation, followed by examination. Costs associated with the process and much of the work would now fall on the District Council. The consultation period was anticipated to commence on 25 June, and the Planning Policy Team Leader outlined the publicity arrangements. An independent examiner would be appointed to carry out the examination.

The Planning Policy Team Leader outlined the legislation under which the Plan would be examined. Following the examination and receipt of the examiner's report, the Council would come to a formal view as to whether or not the draft plan met the basic condition tests and should proceed to referendum.

As part of the consultation, the Council was required to make its own representations to the inspector. The Planning Policy Team Leader recommended that authority to make representations be delegated to the Planning Policy Manager in consultation with the Portfolio Holder. He explained that it was not the Council's role at submission to judge the content or whether or not the draft plan met the basic conditions tests.

The Planning Policy Team Leader reminded the Working Party that feedback was previously provided to the Group at pre submission stage and that officers had

worked with the group to explain these. Some, but not all, of the comments had been taken on board and some new material had been added to the plan. There were no fundamental objections to the draft plan as a whole. However, there remained individual policy objections, and concerns remained which the group had not wished to address. The risks of this approach had been explained to the group. The Council's response would be to highlight these continued areas of policy concern along with areas of concern around duplication, conformity with national policy and the structure of the document, its usability and the evidence base that underpinned the document. There was a risk that the examiner would make modifications to the draft plan and it was assumed that the Group accepted the risk.

In response to a question by the Chairman the Planning Policy Team Leader confirmed that previous advice had been given to the Group in writing.

It was proposed by Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones, seconded by Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett and

**RESOLVED**

**That authority to make representations be delegated to the Planning Policy Manager in consultation with the Portfolio Holder.**

The meeting closed at 12.17 pm.

---

CHAIRMAN

**THE GLAVEN PORTS CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISALS & MANAGEMENT PLANS 2018**

Summary: This report seeks approval for the draft Blakeney, Cley, Morston and Wiveton Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans to be taken forward to public consultation in line with national policy and best practice.

- Recommendations:
- 1. That the draft appraisals as set out within the body of this report be approved for public consultation.**
  - 2. That following consultation, the amended appraisals be brought back to Working Party for consideration and subsequent adoption by Cabinet.**

Cabinet Members(s)	Ward(s) Affected
All Members	All Wards
Contact Officer(s), telephone number and email: Paul Rhymes, Conservation & Design Officer, 01263 516367	

**1. Introduction**

1.1 As well as its picturesque coastline, rural landscape and big skies, the District is known for its rich historic environment. The District's heritage is an intrinsic part of its character and stands as testament to how the area has been shaped and evolved over time. This heritage significance manifests itself in many different forms and this is reflected in the quantity and variety of designations found across North Norfolk including:

- 81 Conservation Areas
- Over 2,200 Listed Buildings
- 33 Registered Parks and Gardens
- 86 Scheduled Monuments
- Nearly 200 Local Listings

1.2 The quality of the environment brings with it many benefits for those living, working, visiting and seeking to invest in the area. Proper management of our shared heritage is therefore vital for a whole range of reasons including:

- **Sense of Place**  
Heritage provides the unique character that helps to make communities distinctive.
- **Economic Prosperity**  
Heritage attracts visitors and these in turn help to bring wealth and prosperity to the area.
- **Regeneration**  
Heritage can support the revitalisation of deprived or run down areas through character, location and use.
- **Civic Pride**  
Heritage contributes to a joint sense of pride. The legacy and past reinforces our history and echoes of the past.
- **Sustainability**  
Physical lie of heritage assets is often greater than their functional life – bringing them back into use is an effective use of resources.
- **Education**  
Opportunities to access and understand heritage can have a positive impact on learning and attainment.
- **Leisure and Tourism**  
Heritage can provide a focus for leisure activities from simply visiting and enjoying a place to providing a focus for detailed research and interpretation.
- **Health and Well-being**  
Exploring heritage helps people in maintaining a healthy physical life-style and can help reduce stress and mental health issues.

1.3 As part of the ongoing management of the Council's 81 Conservation Areas, funding was received for the outsourcing of a small grouping of conservation areas focusing on the Glaven Ports. To this end, the Councils appointed specialist consultants 'Purcell' have produced draft Conservation Area Appraisals and Managements for the following four settlements:

- Blakeney
- Cley
- Morston
- Wiveton

These four conservation areas were chosen for review as they were considered priority cases:

- All four conservation areas were designated in the 1970's and 80's and have not been reviewed since this time. During this intervening period, significant change has taken place and the conservation areas must adapt to any prevailing changes.
- All four settlements are under increasing development pressure and are in need of robust definition and understanding to ensure the Conservation Area status remains meaningful and justified.
- As a result of recent controversial planning applications within the area, it was felt that the additional information and guidance provided by an adopted appraisal would help inform and assist future decision making.

## **2. Statutory Background**

2.1 Conservation Areas are designated under the provisions of Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. A Conservation Area is defined as 'an area of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance'.

2.2 Section 71 of the same Act requires local planning authorities to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of these conservation areas. Section 72 also specifies that, in making a decision on an application for development within a conservation area, special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

2.3 The appraisal documents now being considered conform to current Historic England guidance (Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management 2016). Additional government guidance regarding the management of historic buildings and Conservation

Areas is set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).The District's adopted Local Development Framework (LDF) provides the local planning policy context.

### **3. What is a Conservation Area Appraisal?**

3.1 To assist in the preservation and enhancement of Conservation Areas and their settings, all Local Planning Authorities are required to review their Conservation Areas from 'time to time'. The preparation of Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Proposals is a key element in this process. They play a central role in the Council's efforts to safeguard the environment, which is one of the stated priorities of the Council in its Corporate Plan: 2015-2019.

3.2 A Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan has two primary objectives;

1. Firstly, it defines the special characteristics or historic interest of the Conservation Area and identifies the issues that threaten these special qualities.
2. Secondly, it offers guidelines to prevent erosion of character and achieve enhancement.

In practice, the benefits of reviewing a Conservation Area often extend much further;

- a) A fully adopted Appraisal and set of Management Proposals provides additional support and guidance for decision-making through the Development Management process, since they become, on adoption, a material consideration for the Local Planning Authority when dealing with applications for development.
- b) Having an up to date conservation area boundary which reacts to and reflects the position on the ground is easier to defend and becomes a more meaningful and justified designation.
- c) An up to date Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan provides the backcloth, together with the planning policies contained in the North Norfolk Local Development Framework, to good decision-making, particularly in respect of applications for development.
- d) Experience has shown that the preparation of Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans can offer a real and practical opportunity for local communities to engage in the future management of their local environment and as such the process contributes positively to community empowerment.



#### **4. Assessment and Methodology**

4.1 Purcell in association with NNDC officers have drafted the conservations area appraisals after a detailed period of research, site assessment, survey analysis and collation of key sources. The structure and format of the Conservation Area Appraisals are consistent across the four documents. Each appraisal includes:

- A Summary of the special interest of the area;
- A review of the areas historic development;
- An overall character assessment;
- A summary of the heritage assets contained within the conservation area;
- A 'street by street' assessment;
- An overview of the areas vulnerabilities and future opportunities;
- A robust management plan to protect the area;
- A guide for further information and sources.

With the above in mind, the documents will set out the planning policy context; special interest including location and setting; historic development and archaeology; layout and plan form; architectural and townscape character; spatial analysis and key views; character analysis including the qualities of buildings; prevailing uses and the contribution of green spaces and suggested boundary changes.

*However; it should be noted that no character appraisal can ever be completely comprehensive and the omission of any particular building, feature or space should not be taken to imply that it is of no interest.*

4.2 The documents aim to be user friendly, accessible and easy to navigate. To this end, they have been designed primarily as an online resource to be accessed as interactive PDF's.

#### **5. Timetable for public consultation and formal adoption**

5.1 It is advised that a six-week public consultation period be undertaken. This would include exhibitions at each settlement as well as an open meeting for members of the public to attend. The documents would be placed on the Council's website and comments invited. It is anticipated that following public consultation, an amended document would be brought to the Working Party for approval and adoption by Cabinet by 15 October 2018.

#### **6. Budgetary Implications**

6.1 There are no further budgetary implications to consider at this stage.

**Recommendations:**

- 1. That the draft appraisals as set out within the body of this report be approved for public consultation.**
- 2. That following consultation, the amended appraisals be brought back to Working Party for consideration and subsequent adoption by Cabinet.**

**Coastal Planning – Statement of Common Ground**

Summary: This report explains Statements of Common Ground and how they support the Local Plan preparation process and seeks authority to complete a Statement relating to Coastal Planning.

Recommendations: **That the Working Party recommend to Cabinet that the Coastal Zone Planning Statement of Common Ground is signed of behalf of North Norfolk District Council**

Cabinet Members(s)	Ward(s) Affected
All Members	All Wards
Contact Officer(s), telephone number and email: Mark Ashwell, Planning Policy Manager, 01263 516325	

**1. Background**

1.1 Coastal Partnership East is a consortium of Norfolk and Suffolk Coastal Planning Authorities. Planners and officers from the coastal management teams from the Authorities and the Broads Authority held a series of meetings in 2017/18 to share knowledge and experience and identify common interests around coastal planning

processes and related policies. The Coastal Zone Planning Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) is the outcome of those meetings.

## **2. What is a Statement of Common Ground?**

2.1 Statements of Common Ground are a formal way of documenting agreements between two or more parties. They are regularly used in the plan making process and are a useful mechanism at examination to explain to the examining Inspector where agreement has been reached. Agreements are not legally binding but signatories in completing such agreements are making public statements that they agree with their content and will use their best endeavours to comply with any agreements that are reached. It is likely that a number of such agreements will be produced to support the Local Plan examination.

## **3. Coastal Zone Planning – Purpose**

3.1 The purpose of the Coastal Zone Planning SOCG is to set out an agreed set of high level principles in relation to coastal planning which will provide the framework for more detailed policy development at a local level in each of the partner authorities Local Plans.

3.2 Completion of the Statement will:

- Help to ensure that the authority demonstrates how it is discharging the duty to co-operate in relation to this important cross boundary policy area.
- Agree a set of high level principles and approaches for the land use management of the coast based on whole coast intergrated management and coastal adaptation, shared understanding and best practice, and preparing and using the latest available evidence to inform policy development.

3.3 It is not the purpose of the statement to produce the detailed policy context for Local Plans. These detailed policies may vary at a local level and remain a matter for each signatory authority to decide.

3.4 The draft Statement is attached as Appendix A.

## **4. Financial Implications and Risks**

4.1 None, the Statement does not commit the authorities to any additional expenditure.

5. **Rec.** That the Working Party recommend to Cabinet that the Statement is signed on behalf of North Norfolk District Council.

# Norfolk and Suffolk Coastal Authorities

## Statement of Common Ground

### Coastal Zone Planning

This statement of common ground is between:

- Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk
- North Norfolk District Council
- Great Yarmouth Borough Council
- Suffolk Coastal District Council
- Waveney District Council
- The Broads Authority

The purpose of this statement is to set out an agreed approach to coastal planning in relation to:

- Demonstrating compliance with the "Duty to Cooperate";
- Agreeing shared aims for the management of the coast;
- Maintaining and develop a shared evidence base; and
- Recognising the importance of cross-boundary issues in relation to coastal management.

### Background

The risk of coastal flooding and vulnerability to erosion along the coast does not respect local planning authority boundaries, and therefore coastal change needs to be considered across a wide geography. There are significant potential benefits to joint working across administrative and professional disciplines in addressing the issues of coastal planning.

A strategic approach to coastal land use and marine planning can benefit from the sharing of both issues and solutions, and inform planning practice. This is particularly the case in light of the similarity and commonality of coastal issues across the signatory planning authorities, the planning duty to cooperate, and the opportunity to build on the benefits of the existing joint Coastal Authority approach such as Coastal Partnership East.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that in coastal areas, local planning authorities should apply Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) across Local Authority and land/sea boundaries, ensuring integration of the terrestrial and marine planning regimes.

ICZM is a process which requires the adoption of a joined-up and participative approach towards the planning and management of the many different elements in coastal areas (land and marine). The recognised key principles which should guide all partners in implementing an integrated approach to the management of coastal areas are:

- A long term view
- A broad holistic approach
- Adaptive management
- Working with natural processes
- Supporting and involving all relevant administrative bodies
- Using a combination of instruments
- Participatory planning
- Reflecting local characteristics



Within the development planning system, local planning authorities should reduce risk from coastal change by; avoiding inappropriate development in vulnerable areas or adding to the impact of physical changes to the coast, as set out in the NPPF. Any area likely to be affected by physical changes to the coast should be identified as a Coastal Change Management Area.

The Flood and Coastal Change Planning Practice Guidance also identifies that land can be formally allocated through local plans for the relocation of both development and habitat affected by coastal change.

Note: Physical change to the coast can be (but is not limited to) erosion, coastal land slip, permanent inundation or coastal accretion.

## Shared Aims

- A holistic and “whole coast” approach will be taken, recognising **coastal change** is an inevitable part of a dynamic coast. A naturally functioning coastline is desirable in principle, but may not be appropriate in every location.
- The signatory Authorities will consider the value of **aligning policy approaches**.
- To have regard to the well-being of **communities** affected by coastal change and minimise blight.
- To **protect** the coastal environment, including nature conservation designations and biodiversity.
- To work with local businesses and the wider economy to maximise productive use of properties and facilities for as long as they can be safely and practicably utilised to promote **investment, viability and vitality** of the area.
- Adopt a balanced **risk-based approach** towards new development in Coastal Change Management Areas, in order to not increase risk, while at the same time to facilitate affected communities’ adaptation to coastal change.
- To promote **innovative approaches** such as techniques that enable anticipatory coastal adaptation, removal of affected structures and property roll-back or relocation.

## Agreed Approach

The signatory authorities agree to work together on coastal planning issues to:

- a) Implement the principles of Integrated Coastal Zone Management;
- b) Develop shared **understanding** of coastal processes and the development planning implications of these;
- c) Share experience, **best practice** (including planning policies) and ideas for innovation;
- d) Use the adopted **Shoreline Management Plans** as a basis for development planning, recognising that defined areas may change in future and giving appropriate regard to emerging replacement Shoreline Management Plans, updated predictions of the impact of climate change or other relevant evidence;
- e) Acknowledge the importance of **coastal communities and their economies**, and foster their resilience, innovation and vitality;
- f) Recognise the need to **relocate or protect infrastructure** likely to be adversely affected by coastal change;
- g) Note the need for strategic policies on coastal change, in order to guide **neighbourhood planning**.
- h) Encourage development which is consistent with anticipated coastal change and its management, and facilitates **adaptation** by affected communities and industries.



- i) Consider adopting policies to facilitate **rollback and/or relocation**, potentially including local plan site allocations or facilitating ‘enabling’ development;
- j) Consider adopting policies which require the use of **risk assessments** to demonstrate that a development on the coast will be safe for its planned lifetime, without increasing risk to life or property, or requiring new or improved coastal defences; and
- k) Consider adopting policies that seek to ensure that new or replacement **coast protection schemes** are consistent with the relevant Shoreline Management Plan and minimise adverse impact on the environment or elsewhere on the coast.

**This Statement of Common Ground has been endorsed by the following:**

Cllr. Ian Devereux  
 Cabinet member for Environment  
 Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk

Cllr. Richard Blunt  
 Cabinet member for Development  
 Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk

Cllr. Hilary Cox  
 Cabinet member for Coastal Management  
 North Norfolk District Council

Cllr. Susan Arnold  
 Cabinet member for Planning  
 North Norfolk District Council

Cllr. Carl Smith  
 Chairman, Environment Committee  
 Great Yarmouth Borough Council

Cllr. Graham Plant  
 Leader and Chair, Policy & Resource Committee  
 Great Yarmouth Borough Council





Cllr. Andy Smith  
Cabinet member for Coastal Management  
Suffolk Coastal District Council

Cllr. Tony Fryatt  
Cabinet member for Planning  
Suffolk Coastal District Council

Cllr. David Ritchie  
Cabinet member for Planning and Coastal Management  
Waveney District Council

Melanie Vigo di Gallidoro  
Chairman, Planning Committee  
Broads Authority

