

Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party

Please Contact: Linda Yarham

Please email: linda.yarham@north-norfolk.gov.uk

Direct Dial: 01263 516019

4 April 2019

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 15 April 2019 at 10.00 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 notify the committee clerk 24 hours in advance of the meeting and arrive at least 15 minutes before the start of the meeting. This is to allow time for the Chairman 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

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, Ms V Gay, Mrs A Green, Mrs P Grove-Jones, Mr N Pearce, Mr J Punchard, Ms M Prior, Mr R Reynolds, Mr S Shaw, Mr R Shepherd, Mrs V Uprichard, Mr D Young

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

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 30 January and 11 February 2019.

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 2019

Page 28

Summary: This report seeks approval to adopt the draft Blakeney, Cley, Morston and Wiveton Conservation Area Appraisals along with the associated Management Proposals contained therein.

- Recommendations:
- 1. That Working Party recommend to Cabinet to adopt the four Glaven Port Appraisals for statutory planning purposes and for the Appraisal documents to become material considerations in the planning process.**
 - 2. That Working Party recommend to Cabinet to agree the proposed boundary changes as recommended in the draft Appraisal documents and that they be published in accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990.**
 - 3. That Working Party recommend to Cabinet to agree the proposed Local Listings as identified within the draft Appraisal documents.**

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. 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

Following the meeting officers will present an update on Local Plan consultation including the arrangements for the consultation and a summary of key aspects of the new Plan.

30 JANUARY 2019

Minutes of a meeting of the **PLANNING POLICY & BUILT HERITAGE WORKING PARTY** held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Holt Road, Cromer at 9.30 am when there were present:

Councillors

Ms V Gay (Chairman)

Mrs S Arnold	Ms M Prior
Mrs A Green	Mr D Young
Mrs P Grove-Jones	Mr R Shepherd
Mr N Pearce	Mr R Reynolds

Mr J Rest as substitute for Mr J Punchard

Observers:

Mr N Dixon
Mr S Hester
Mr M Knowles

Officers

Mr M Ashwell – Planning Policy Manager
Mr I Withington – Planning Policy Team Leader
Mr S Harrison – Senior Planning Officer
Mr J Mann - Senior Planning Officer
Miss S Tudhope – Senior Planning Officer
Mrs J Rhymes – Senior Planning Officer
Mr M Stembrowicz – Democratic Services and Governance Officer
Ms N Debbage - Local Housing Enabler

78. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs J Punchard, S Shaw and V Uprichard.

79. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT

The Chairman informed Members of the Working Group that if necessary, she would aim to end the meeting at 12.30pm to allow Members to attend other meetings.

The Working Group were informed that a suggestion had been made to create to a small editorial group of Members to review the draft Plan prior to its publication. It was suggested that Cllrs D Young, V Gay and S Arnold would be assigned to the group. Cllr D Young stated that he was happy to help edit the draft Plan, though he was conscious of the fact that he hadn't been a Member of the Working Group for very long. He then requested that any changes and/or rewrites be highlighted. The Planning Policy Manager replied that at present the draft Plan was only comprised of collated Reports, and confirmed that he would highlight any changes once they were made. He then reminded the Working Group that there were lots of items on the agenda, and that decisions must be made on these items for them to be included in the draft Plan.

It was confirmed, following a question from the Chairman, that all Members that wished to see their town centre boundaries had now done so.

80. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The Chairman informed Members that a Ms K Walker had submitted several questions concerning Hoveton, the questions have been included below:

Context to Questions

Hoveton Infrastructure & Flooding Issues

1. NNDC have had a series of meetings with Anglian Water about the ongoing sewerage infrastructure issues at Hoveton. These meetings revolve around the ability of AW to support future development in Hoveton given the serious sewerage and flooding issues in the village.

Current & Future Planning Applications - Additional Requirements & Possible Use of Holding Tanks

2. The developer for Church Fields Hoveton (PF17/1802) was required to submit details of their surface water drainage scheme for the LPA's approval in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority. A condition of approval requires details of the foul water scheme to be agreed by the LPA in consultation with Anglian Water. While the NNDC councillors approved the development over 12 months ago the applicant cannot proceed until these issues have been resolved. This is rather like closing the barn door after the horse has bolted.

Strategic Planning & Waste Water Treatment Capacity

3. From Anglian Water's capacity tool database a 'gold' standard process assessment the current assessed capacity of Belaugh WRC is 10,178pe, and the current connected total population (resident + non-resident + trade) is 9817pe.

Anglian Water state that growth projections indicate that the capacity limit at Belaugh could be breached by the year 2027 and so investment may be required at Belaugh WRC during the next AMP period and is therefore been included in their business plan (submitted to OFWAT). AW have stated that they will only invest at Belaugh if the growth happens as AW expect.

Questions:

A. What is the outcome of the meetings that NNDC and AW have had in respect to addressing the current sewerage problems?

B. If the meetings between NNDC and AW have not resulted in an agreed plan of action (including investment for resolving the sewerage and flooding issues in Hoveton) then what assurances are there that proposed 150 houses at HV01 will not compound the current sewerage problems? [If Norfolk Homes are to challenge the plan and an extra 300 dwellings are permitted, this will take Hoveton's allocation to 450 dwellings in the plan period].

C. The duration of the emerging NNDC Local Plan is from 2016-2036.

AW have indicated that from their 'growth projections' capacity at the Belaugh Waste Water Treatment Plan will reach capacity in 2027.

C.1. Consequently, does NNDC's emerging Local plan for Hoveton take into consideration and agree with AW's 'growth projections' outlined in its Business plan submitted by AW to OFWAT?

C.2 If NNDC's emerging Local Plan has not taken into consideration or accord with AW's 'growth projections' how has the district council:

(a) Calculated the upper limit to development (e.g. potentially 450 dwellings + non-resident + trade) that in totality will result in a breach of capacity at Belaugh Waste Water Treatment Plant?

(b) If a breach were to occur, in what year of the NNDC's Local plan does the authority anticipate this could happen?

Response

The Planning Policy Manager thanked Ms Walker for her questions and stated that in the draft Plan it was possible that an allocation could be made for up to 150 dwellings in Hoveton. As a result of this proposal, a number of concerns had been raised regarding drainage that would need to be addressed before any building could take place. Within the drainage concerns, it was stated that were two separate issues that related to either the drainage network, i.e the underground pipework, or the recycling centre i.e the water treatment facility in Belaugh.

On the adequacy of the network, it was noted that these issues would need to be addressed prior to any development taking place. Members were informed that conditions to ensure that drainage networks were adequate was commonplace, and that when these conditions were imposed, it would be the responsibility of the developer to fund any required network improvements. In addition, it was stated that there were a number of ways in which network improvements could be regulated through planning consents.

With regards to the recycling centre, it was stated that this facility was run by Anglian Water, and its purpose was to manage the quantity and quality of the discharge in accordance with an Environment Agency license. In this case it was stated that it would not be the responsibility of the developer to make any necessary improvements, but rather be the responsibility of Anglian Water. It was stated that Anglian Water were aware of the possibility of further development in the Hoveton area, and future investment was a possibility at the Belaugh facility. As a result, it was stated that the key point was that NNDC would be in direct consultation with Anglian Water to ensure that any issues would be resolved, should the Hoveton site be included in the draft Plan. Cllr N Dixon stated that he agreed with the answer given by the Planning Policy Manager and added that he could advise that Anglian Water were considering their position statement on what work would be carried out to accommodate new homes. He added that the basic problem was the ingress of river water into the network, and it was possible still that the organisation may or may not support the level of development being proposed.

Cllr S Arnold referred to the pipework issues and asked whether the development conditions could be expanded to ensure that adequate network improvements are made before any building took place. The Planning Policy Manager replied that the

conditions would ensure that any necessary improvements would be implemented prior to or during the development process.

Cllr P Grove-Jones stated that she had encountered problems with surface water drainage in her ward, and that developers had not complied with drainage related conditions on the Broadreach development. Therefore she questioned whether NNDC could rely so heavily on the conditions.

Cllr N Dixon stated that as local Member for Hoveton he hoped to be in attendance when Item 10 was discussed, but had another meeting to attend. It was agreed that Item 10 would be brought forward so that Cllr N Dixon could observe the discussion.

81. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

82. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

83. UPDATE ON MATTERS FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING

None.

84. LOCAL PLAN – IDENTIFICATION OF PROVISIONAL HOUSING SITES IN MUNDESLEY AND HOVETON FOR INCLUSION WITHIN THE EMERGING FIRST DRAFT LOCAL PLAN (CONSULTATION VERSION)

The Report presented further information on issues that had been deferred at previous meetings, namely for Mundesley and Hoveton.

Questions and Discussion

The Senior Planning Officer (SH) stated that there had been a lot of discussion around the proposed site in Hoveton that was adjacent to the school, where concerns had been raised that the school might require some of the land for extension work. He informed Members that he had since had discussions with the education authority and had received confirmation that the current expansion plans for Broadland High School could be achieved on the existing land, meaning that there would be no need for further land allocation.

Members were informed that the HV01 site proposed would be an allocation for 150 dwellings, and would be accessed via Tunstead road for better connections. In addition, after discussions with the landowner, it was suggested that at least one hectare of the land could be used for elderly accommodation. Cllr N Dixon stated that as it stood, he had no substantial recommendations to make, though he did wish to add that NCC had not, to his knowledge, given full assurances that no more land would be needed for educational purposes. The Planning Policy Manager confirmed that he had not had any more correspondence on this matter, but added that the conversation would continue with NCC whilst the Plan was still in its draft form through the consultation period.

On the proposed site for Mundesley, the Senior Planning Officer (SH) stated that officers were now proposing a new third option, as the landowner of the previous sites had decided that the land at the previously chosen location was not suitable for

development, and were no longer available as an option during the Plan period. As most sites within the area were owned by the same landowner, this meant that there was very limited choice remaining for Mundesley. These were MUN11, MUN08, MUN09 and MUN03. It was confirmed that three out of the remaining five sites available were considered unsuitable for a number of reasons. It was confirmed that site MUN03 had been combined with MUN04/1 to create MUN03A, and that this site had the potential to deliver up to 45 dwellings and was the preferred site.

Cllr D Young raised concerns that the parcels outlined in the policy for MUN03A were not marked on the map and asked if this could be done. He then referred to the sustainability appraisal summary and noted that the provision of high speed broadband was uncertain, and suggested that he would have expected that this would be guaranteed for a development of this size. The Senior Planning Officer (ST) replied that when checking the ISP website, there was no service listed as available at present, therefore it was listed as uncertain in the sustainability appraisal, though it could become a condition for development to include FTTH where possible. The Senior Planning Officer (SH) confirmed that he would ensure that this was reflected in the consultation document.

Cllr S Arnold stated that the open space identified as the Llama field was a very important open space for Mundesley, and asked if it would remain in perpetuity. The Planning Policy Manager suggested that it could be conditioned to remain, but he could not necessarily guarantee that it would remain forever. He added that on the consultation document the area could be shown in green as opposed to red, to highlight that this would be a mixed use allocation with a defined requirement for open space.

Cllr J Rest stated that the Report suggested that 3.5 hectares would be allocated for the 45 dwelling development, and asked if this was a generous allocation. The Senior Planning Officer (SH) replied that the area also included the previously mentioned open space and the railway site, hence it would appear generous. The Planning Policy Manager added that housing numbers attributed to each site were also approximate, and used to inform members of the public and account towards the dwelling target that makes up the Local Plan. It was stated that the number was arrived at using a density multiplier based on the amount of land available, but there could be various adjustments made to arrive at a final number.

With regards to Cromer, the Senior Planning Officer (JR) informed Members that there had been no changes proposed to the Cromer sites, but the three that remained were considered non-preferred and the Working Party were required to confirm this. The three sites were comprised of C44, which was a combination of C18 and C9, C42 which was a combination of C42/1 and C42/2, and finally C43 including -1 and -2. It was explained that these sites were considered non-preferred sites for a variety of reasons, such as being detached from the existing settlements in the area, remote from services, highly visible in the landscape and in the AONB. It was also suggested that they would have an adverse impact on the traffic situation on Roughton Road. Following a request for clarification from Cllr S Arnold, it was confirmed that the location of the sites was Roughton, not Cromer. The Planning Policy Manager reminded Members that they were required to make a clear decision on whether to designate the site as non-preferred.

The Chairman asked for the Working Party to take the recommendations outlined on page 40 en bloc, with the Hoveton site proposals subject to the additional drainage conditions. The vote was proposed by Cllr D Young and seconded by Cllr S Arnold.

RESOLVED

1. That Members consider the contents of this report and confirm the provisional preferred housing sites to be included within the First Draft Local Plan for consultation for Mundesley and Hoveton, with a requirement for drainage conditions to be strengthened for the Hoveton proposals.
2. That the additional smaller parcels of sites outlined in the Roughton (Formerly Cromer) section of this report are identified as non-preferred sites.
3. The final policy wording and content of the consultation document is delegated to the Planning Policy Manager.

85. APPROACH TO THE NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

The Senior Planning Officer (ST) introduced the Report, and stated that there were six policies outlined, of which five would be highly familiar to Members of the Working Group and as a result, were recommended to continue, having been revised to align with the new NPPF. The new policy being recommended was on trees and hedgerows, and would cover gaps in the existing policy and give more strength to help protect them. In addition, it would help with determination in applications and improve awareness for developers.

Questions and Discussion

Cllr D Young referred to the Biodiversity and Geology Policy on page 25 of the Report and asked for clarification of the term 'European Sites'. The Planning Policy Manager replied that European Sites was a generic term applied to natura 2000 designations which covered multiple environmental designations that were all covered by European legislation, and additional requirements to demonstrate no significant impact. He added that it would be a well-known term for Planning Officers, but not to the public, therefore it was useful that it had been highlighted for clarification purposes in the draft Plan.

Cllr D Young referred to the 'local list' on page 27, and asked whether there was any experience of using the list to help determine planning decisions. He added that he understood that the local list would not be as useful as policy EN8. The Planning Policy Manager replied that he did not have any direct experience of whether the local list had added any substantial value to the local development process, though he suggested that it likely would have, as it was a relevant consideration as part of planning policy. He then stated that he would review the wording to determine whether it could be strengthened. Cllr D Young replied that Policy EN8 suggested that demolition could only take place in exceptional circumstances, and was therefore stronger than the local list that suggested that re-use must be encouraged. The Planning Policy Manager confirmed that he would look to strengthen the wording before the draft Plan went to consultation.

Cllr D Young asked whether it was necessary to define what was a designated heritage asset. The Planning Policy Manager explained that there was a pre-existing glossary of terms that would be issued with the Local Plan. He added that he felt that the current wording could be changed to a more accurate representation.

Cllr D Young referred to page 28 and stated that he was pleased to see the reference to dark skies, but noted that there was no detail mentioned on whether external lighting, roof lights or picture windows would affect dark skies. The Planning Policy Manager

replied that the pre-amble had not been given alongside the quoted policy, then read it aloud for the benefit of Members as follows, 'consideration should always be given to ways of minimising light pollution from large glazed areas'. He suggested that this statement would be included in the Local Plan when published. External lighting was then discussed as being different to glazed areas, and Members were informed that it did not require planning permission, though developers could be encouraged to act responsibly in this respect.

Cllr S Arnold referred to the local list, and stated that she only recalled one occasion where this had been used in Mundesley during her time as Chair of development Committee. She noted that the designation did not carry the same weight as a listed building. The Chairman agreed and stated that the local list should be strengthened if possible.

Cllr R Reynolds said that the Council needed to introduce a definition of light pollution to clarify the position for all developers. The Planning Policy Manager replied that it would not be possible to include a definition in the Plan as the issue was too subjective, and whilst it could be measured, a definitive prescriptive policy would be extremely difficult to implement. Members accepted the difficulties that implementing such a policy would create.

The Chairman asked what would happen to the previously discussed European Sites post-Brexit. The Planning Policy Manager replied that it was expected that all European legislation would be transposed into British legislation, meaning that they would remain in place in the immediate future, but he could not be sure whether there would be future changes. The Chairman then referred to the 'protect conserve and where possible enhance' statement on page 27, and asked what the difference was between preserving and conserving, as the latter was used far more frequently. The Planning Policy Manager replied that conserve suggested that areas should be left exactly as is, whereas preserve would allow for some change or modification. He added that legislation tends to revert to preservation as opposed to conservation, but noted that he would ensure that the correct terms were used in the draft Plan. It was suggested that the editorial group would need to pay close attention to the use of this wording. Cllr A Green asked if the use of 'detract' would be useful. The Planning Policy Manager replied that various language would be helpful for different policies, and this was why delegated authority had been sought to allow control over the exact wording used in the draft Plan. He added that consistency of approach was key, considering that the draft Plan would be written by a team of individuals. Moreover, it was suggested that the use of subjective language in policy wording was often unavoidable, but it was the aim of the Planning Team to ensure that there were clear rules defined in order to inform all decisions. The Planning Policy Team Leader stated that some terms had been purposefully left ambiguous, such as 'where possible' to allow for flexibility, and that many of the perceived ambiguities that had been raised at the meeting would be covered by the preambles that were yet to be seen by Members.

The Chairman asked Members to consider the recommendations outlined in the Report, which were then proposed by Cllr S Arnold and seconded by Cllr D young.

RESOLVED

1. Members considered the contents of this report and confirm the provisional preferred policy approaches to be included within the First Draft Local Plan for consultation.

2. The final policy wording and content of the consultation document is delegated to the Planning Policy Manager.

86. LOCAL PLAN – APPROACH TO GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

The Senior Planning Officer (SH) introduced the Report and stated that at present the Council's approach to green infrastructure was mentioned in the current core policy, but there was no discrete policy, therefore the aim was to bring together a number of issues under a green infrastructure strategy.

Questions and Discussion

The Senior Planning Officer (SH) informed Members that the NPPF stated that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision for the conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure. He added that the NPPF also suggests that to assist in planning positively for green infrastructure, that local authorities may wish to prepare an authority-wide green infrastructure framework or strategy. As a result, it was the aim of the Council to implement a discrete green infrastructure strategy for North Norfolk that would be influenced by district wide issues, then focus on the three key growth areas of Cromer, Fakenham and North Walsham. It was suggested that the strategy could then be used to apply key principles to site specific allocations.

Cllr P Grove-Jones asked whether the strategy would include any mention of green corridors, as she noted that hedgerows and field verges, that acted as natural habitats for wildlife were often lost during development. The Senior Planning Officer (SH) replied that the green infrastructure strategy would be a broad document with overarching principles that would potentially cover these issues, but it would not necessarily be part of the planning regime to implement these rules, in which case partner organisations might be expected to help deliver these principles. Cllr P Grove-Jones replied that as Chair of the Development Committee, she was aware that when big developments were approved hedgerows or tress were often lost, and she asked whether protection of these areas could be made into a mandatory condition of development to be contained in the strategy.

Cllr M Prior raised the issue of green spaces in Holt, and stated that the allocation for Holt had resulted in many of the remaining green spaces being private land, to which public access was not always guaranteed. As a result, she stated that the town was left with very little public green spaces, and suggested that developers needed to be made more aware of this issue if any more development took place. The Planning Policy Manager replied that quantifying open space was slightly separate to the green infrastructure strategy, which would be a wider reaching strategy that would cover the whole district. He added that whilst the broad principles would cover all towns in the district, any focus would primarily be centred around key growth areas. Members were then informed that open space issues would be covered by a discrete policy and separate piece of work. The Planning Policy Manager agreed that he would confirm for Cllr M Prior that the private land in Holt would not be subsumed for a different purpose other than for open space.

Cllr R Reynolds stated that whilst he agreed with the policy, he assumed that Fakenham would remain in flux, as conversations were ongoing about green spaces in the areas surrounding the proposed Fakenham allocations. The Planning Policy Manager replied that Fakenham was a good example as the current Core Strategy was fairly limited on green infrastructure issues with large scale developments. As

such, the Planning Team often centred their focus on specific sites, whereas the new strategy would allow for greater consideration of wider issues, such as there being no proper passing place over the A148.

Cllr D Young stated that the minutes from the December meeting of the PP&BH Working Party had suggested that the Planning Policy Manager would report back to Members on Greshams and green space. The Planning Policy Manager apologised that he had not replied sooner on the issue. He then stated that he had discussed the issue with the Leisure and Locality Services Manager who dealt with the sports study, and it was made clear that a distinction was needed between publicly owned open space, and privately owned sports facilities that might have access restrictions. It was confirmed that this distinction would be reflected in the study, and he would pass this information on to local Members.

In reference to the policy, Cllr D Young stated that it was suggested that only the relevant growth towns would be considered, hence it might be worth making note of that. He then asked if there would be a draft green infrastructure strategy that went out alongside the draft Plan for consultation. The Planning Policy Manager replied that there would not be a consultation document for the emerging green infrastructure strategy, but the policy wording would be considered alongside other proposals. He then suggested that the final strategy document would be alluded to as upcoming in the draft Plan.

Cllr S Hester informed Members that he had been involved in a consultation the previous week on an exemption site that was planned in his ward. It was suggested that any work on the area would involve the loss of a substantial number of hedgerows. Furthermore, it was suggested that up to 95% of meadows had been lost since 1950. As a result, he asked if there was anything that could be done to protect existing meadows, from a policy perspective. The Planning Policy Manager replied that he hoped these policies were in place already, though they would likely not be in place specifically for the protection of meadows. He added that whilst there would be tensions due to the need for development growth, one of the significant strengths of British planning policy was the protection of natural habitats, and suggested that the approach needed to be maintained.

Cllr J Rest referred to Fakenham and asked who would maintain the green spaces in the long term once they had been designated. It was suggested that at present there were at least three different organisations managing green spaces in the town. The Planning Policy Manager said that he agreed with the concerns regarding future management of these areas, but unfortunately it was not an issue covered by planning policy. He added that all that the Planning Department required was a plan for ongoing maintenance, which could result in various organisations being obligated to take responsibility or in the worst case scenario, the areas being left unmanaged.

The Chairman referred to the wording of the policy on pages 16 and 17, and stated that the language was not as robust as had been hoped. The Planning Policy Manager agreed and stated that he would ensure that the wording was strengthened and included operative policy clauses. In response to a question from the Chairman, it was agreed that market town green infrastructure would be a constituent part of the green infrastructure strategy.

The vote was proposed by Cllr R Reynolds and seconded by Cllr P Grove-Jones.

RESOLVED

1. **Members considered the contents of this report and confirmed the approach to Green Infrastructure and the draft policy to be included within the First Draft Local Plan for consultation.**
2. **The final policy wording and content of the consultation document is delegated to the Planning Policy Manager.**

87. **DISCUSSION ON PUBLICATION OF CONSULTATION DATE FOR DRAFT LOCAL PLAN**

A discussion was held to determine whether the Working Party would seek to publish the notice of consultation on the draft Local Plan in-line with the Council-tax bill mail-out. Members were informed that if they did want to uphold this timescale, it would be contingent on decisions being resolved for the remaining items on the agenda, which would take a considerable amount of time.

Questions and Discussion

The Planning Policy Manager asked Members if they would like to amend the date of consultation in consideration of the amount of work that remained outstanding for the Working Party. He added that it was possible to begin consultation in early May, and that this would not have any significant impact on the process. Cllr D young asked which other policies would need to be resolved in order to maintain the current timeline of beginning the consultation in March. The Planning Policy Manager replied that the meeting's agenda included all the relevant policies that would need to be agreed, but noted that agreement on the Design Guide would not be necessary to maintain the March timeframe. He then informed Members that the decisions were needed in order for the prescribed work to be carried out prior to commencement of the consultation process, in addition to a full report being required to carry-out the Habitat Regulation Assessment.

In response to a question from the Chairman, it was confirmed that the Council-tax mail-out had originally been planned for the week commencing the 11th March, but this had now been delayed to the following week commencing 18th March. It was stated that this would be the earliest start date for the consultation, but the letter could state any date within reason. The Planning Policy Manager warned Members that once the consultation date had been published, it could not be changed.

Cllr S Arnold stated that the Committee had worked hard for three years to wrap-up the draft Plan prior to the election taking place in May, and it would be regrettable to see this timeframe delayed. Cllr P Grove-Jones stated that she was happy to continue until the required amount of work was complete.

It was confirmed that if the consultation was delayed until after the election, then it was possible that the Working Party that would consider the Local Plan could be comprised of entirely new Members. The Planning Policy Manager reiterated that if all agenda items were resolved today, it would be possible to begin the consultation from the 18th March, though it would put pressure on the Planning Policy Team. Alternately, it was stated that there was no risk associated with waiting until early May to begin the consultation.

It was proposed by Cllr S Arnold that the consultation start date be set for 18th March and was seconded by Cllr R Reynolds.

RESOLVED

Publication of the consultation date for the draft plan be set for the week commencing 18th March 2019.

88. LOCAL PLAN – RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE OF SELECTED SETTLEMENTS

The Planning Policy Manager introduced the Report and stated that it had come at the Working Party's request to review small scale development beyond the district's main towns and key service villages. He informed Members that the Report focused on infill policies, and would consider areas such as brownfield sites with existing dwellings, whilst discouraging development on private land.

Questions and Discussion

The Planning Policy Manager raised the issue of how development elsewhere in the countryside would be managed. This was referred to as common-sense infill plots, for which he had drafted a policy outlined in the Report. This would allow opportunities for small scale infill development of up to five dwellings on previously developed land, such as brownfield sites. It was suggested that development of this kind would not be allowed on private land, or in peoples gardens for example, as this could undermine existing policy surrounding access to services, which was key to identifying development locations. Members were informed that this would avoid development proposals being determined solely on whether or not their appearance was acceptable in the area. He added that the existing Local Plan already allowed significant scope for development in the countryside. Concerns were raised that increasing the possibility of infill development could diminish the amount of land available for affordable housing by raising the land value to a 'hope' value that would make affordable homes unfeasible for developers.

Cllr D Young noted that he had some concerns with the policy, and said that it might be useful to hear from the Local Housing Enabler on the issue. The Local Housing Enabler noted that several concerns had already been addressed by the Planning Policy Manager but reiterated that the unintended consequences of opening up further development outside of settlements and removing the exception scheme, could increase the possibility of raising the 'hope' value of land. Furthermore, by removing a number of cases where the only option for development would have been the exception scheme, developers may see this as a green light for market development that again could raise land values and make affordable housing unfeasible.

Cllr D Young asked whether the rural exception scheme would continue to apply alongside the updated policy. The Planning Policy Manager replied that the exception schemes could remain in place, but the ability to deliver on such schemes depends on land availability, and if land was not available as owners felt it was more beneficial to hold on to in the hopes of a future relaxation in policy, then it could significantly limit availability. Cllr D Young stated that Parish Councils had raised concerns that local residents were not able to compete with property investors from outside of the district, and as a result, villages were being left to wither. He then referred to statistics that suggested that the proportion of affordable and second homes in the district was 11%. He added that if 20% was used as a margin then this would open up to 26 villages, which seemed a reasonable number.

Cllr D Young suggested that the five dwelling maximum outlined in the policy could have a large impact on small villages, and suggested that a maximum of two might be more appropriate. With regards to the concerns of affordability he asked whether a St. Ives style restriction could again be considered that would restrict sales to permanent residents of the district only, though he did take into account the previously noted reservations regarding the policy. He accepted that such policies would limit the market value of land, but reassured Members that land with these restrictions would still be worth considerably more than agricultural plots. He then proposed that the maximum number of dwellings in the policy be limited to two. His second proposal was for a fourth bullet point to be added to the policy that stated that developments in parishes where holiday and second home ownership exceeds 20%, that dwellings must be occupied in perpetuity by those in permanent residence and with a strong connection to North Norfolk. At the very least, he hoped that the policy would mention the issue of affordability of homes in areas with a high percentage of holiday or second home ownership, for the Council to publicly note its awareness of the issue. The Planning Policy Manager replied that restricting the maximum number of dwellings in the small scale infill developments would not necessarily address the impact or possibility of large dwellings being built that could have a larger impact on the affordability of homes in the affected parishes. In addition, any principal that set to restrict the ownership of new homes would simply serve to pass the issue onto pre-existing dwellings, to which the policy would not apply. Therefore it appeared as though there were some fundamental flaws in the proposals.

Cllr S Arnold stated that sometimes areas of land designated for exception sites included market development, and asked whether in these cases the value of the land would increase. The Local Housing Enabler replied that this shouldn't be the case, however in reality it quite often did raise land prices. Cllr S Arnold then stated that whilst she respected Cllr D Young's proposals, she felt that the draft policy outlined in the Report was adequate, and therefore proposed that it remain unchanged.

In defence of his proposals, Cllr D Young stated that it should be possible to limit exceptionally large dwellings being built in small villages with the design guide or another policy already in place. He added that second home ownership could be addressed if the caveat to restrict new dwellings being used as permanent residence only was included. The Planning Policy Manager agreed that conditions could be imposed to restrict the development of exceptionally large dwellings in small villages, however, the policy proposals would still not address second home ownership in existing dwellings. Therefore it was highly likely that the issues of second home and holiday home ownership would continue, being passed on to pre-existing dwellings within these villages. He added that he did understand the importance of such restrictions to improve the reputation of the Council, but it would not address the underlying problem. The Planning Policy Manager then stated that his largest concern was undermining the sustainability of the overarching strategy by limiting the development of settlements in some areas but not others. It was suggested that opinions could be sought on the proposals during the consultation period, but he did not expect that they would be identified within the preferred options. Cllr D Young replied that if his proposals were not supported then he would welcome any mention of them in the draft Plan. He added that he did not see why his proposals should limit development in some areas but not others. The Planning Policy Manager replied that he had misinterpreted the proposal and had thought that they would only apply to developments within the AONB due to the particular pressures of building within that area.

The Planning Policy Team Leader stated that there were several potential consequences of adding to the policy that must be taken into account. First and foremost, this was the least sustainable option for growth in the district, and open ended dispersed growth had already been considered and dismissed. On the potential to undermine affordable housing, exemption sites were currently the only option available to deliver local affordable housing. The Planning Policy Team Leader then stated that one aspect that had not yet been considered was community led development. He advised Members that the Council was supportive of such development as it would allow communities that wished to address growth the ability to do so.

Cllr S Hester referred to housing exemption sites and stated that it was his understanding that a small number of market dwellings may be built if the developer is in accordance with requirements to build social and affordable housing, and that these applications would be passed if a 50% ratio of development was met. He then questioned whether developers would continue to adhere to their obligations to build affordable homes if market housing did not sell. Finally, he asked why Broadland Housing continued to build with homes with bricks and mortar when they could build cheaper and more energy efficient affordable homes from different materials.

The Senior Planning Officer (JM) informed Members that he had worked on a similar policy at Breckland District Council, and that in his opinion the NNDC version was a better-worded policy. However, he warned that under examination from the Planning Inspector, the Council had found it difficult to justify the limit on the number of dwellings and it was subsequently removed, meaning that the Council could end up with a policy that they do not necessarily want.

Cllr R Reynolds stated that whilst he agreed with much of Cllr D Young's statement, he would second Cllr S Arnold's proposal as he felt that overcomplicating the policy with additional requirements would confuse the policy.

RESOLVED

- 1. That the approach to development outside the defined settlement boundaries be limited to the criteria set out in the revised Settlement Hierarchy Policy within Appendix B.**
- 2. That the revised list of Small Growth Villages set out within the revised Settlement Hierarchy Policy within Appendix B be identified as Small Growth Villages within the settlement hierarchy.**
- 3. That the Community-led development policy and revised Settlement Hierarchy Policy in Appendix B are published for consultation.**
- 4. The final policy wording and content of the consultation document is delegated to the Planning Policy Manager.**

89. LOCAL PLAN PREPARATION – RENEWABLE ENERGY

The Senior Planning Officer (JR) introduced the Report; she informed Members that the policy covered multiple varieties of renewable energy, and that all of these would have a role to play in meeting the Government's CO2 reduction targets. She then stated that the existing core strategy included policy EN7.

Questions and Discussion

Members were then informed that since the adoption of the core strategy, there had been a shift in national policy. As a result, local authorities were now advised that they should only grant planning permission for proposals of wind energy development in areas that were identified as suitable and had the support of local residents. The 2018 NPPF was adapted to include these changes and stated that Council's should have a positive strategy for renewable energy that identifies potential sites, whilst ensuring that adverse impacts are addressed satisfactorily. The Senior Planning Officer (JR) reminded Members that this policy was presented to the Working Group last year, and that a number of options were considered. A Landscape Sensitivity Study was completed that had been used to inform the policy wording and help identify potential sites. The study showed that the district had high sensitivity to large-scale wind energy developments, and as a result, all wind turbines would be ruled out in the AONB as well as large-scale wind turbine developments across the whole district. It would not however be a blanket ban, so some small to medium developments could be approved in principle.

Cllr S Arnold stated that the policy appeared to be suitable for the area and that she felt the existing provision that any application must go to the Development Committee must remain in place. The Planning Policy Manager confirmed that this would continue as part of the usual call-in procedure, then added a note of caution that the draft policy proposed would have a default position of rejecting wind turbine applications, but this did not mean that the Council could not receive applications that challenged the policy.

Cllr J Rest asked if any work had been carried-out on wave energy, as North Norfolk had a significant amount of coastline to consider. The Planning Policy Manager stated that this may well be considered, however anything below the waterline was not the responsibility of NNDC. He added that wave, biomass and solar energy were generally supported.

Cllr R Reynolds stated that concerns had been raised about wood burners, and asked if there had been any consideration of this. The Planning Policy Manager replied that he expected the policy on wood burners to change over time.

Cllr P Grove-Jones stated that she agreed with Cllr J Rest's statement on wave energy, but acknowledged that unfortunately NNDC did not own the shoreline and could not influence development. She added that she did expect the technology to appear in the future.

The Chairman noted that on page 18 of the Report, it stated that the Council were supportive of community led developments and asked for clarification. The Planning Policy Manager confirmed that the Council would be supportive of community led renewable energy schemes, and that there had been examples of such schemes being developed around the country.

The recommendations were proposed by Cllr S Arnold and seconded by Cllr D Young.

RESOLVED

- 1. Members consider the contents of this report and confirm the provisional preferred policy approaches to be included within the First Draft Local Plan for consultation.**

2. The final policy wording and content of the consultation document is delegated to the Planning Policy Manager.

90. DRAFT LOCAL PLAN POLICES FOR CONSIDERATION

The Planning Policy Manager introduced the Report and informed Members that it was intended to cover gaps in other policies. This was working on the assumption that many of the policies included would remain unchanged.

Questions and Discussion

The Transport Impact of New Developments on page 51 was considered first, and it was noted to be an exact replica of the existing policy. There were no questions on the Safeguarding Land for Sustainable Transport Uses policy or the Parking Provision Policy.

On the Electric Vehicle Charging policy, Cllr R Reynolds asked whether any costs or charges had been considered. The Planning Policy Manager replied that it was being considered, but would be part of the development phase and he expected that it would eventually end up as part of building regulations. Cllr D Young stated that the Government's zero emissions targets were due to be achieved shortly after the expiration date of the proposed Plan; therefore he questioned whether the targets outlined in the policy were high enough. He then asked why passive charging points would be installed and asked whether developers could be asked to make these active. The Senior Planning Officer (ST) replied that she had looked at vehicle charging policies elsewhere, and expected that the consultation process would provide more information on the percentage of charging points needed, but it was worth noting that not all vehicles were expected to be electric by this point. Cllr D Young asked in reference to the communal parking, whether big bills could be expected to turn passive points into active charging stations.

Cllr S Arnold added that there would be several opportunities for the policies to be updated in the future. The Planning Policy Manager reiterated this point and informed Members that the plan would need revisiting every five years to ensure if it was up to date.

The Chairman asked what constitutes a travel plan and was informed by the Planning Policy Manager that this was a specific requirement that the Highways Authority would ask for, that included a plan for items such as bus stops and routes. He informed Members that the travel plan would be tied into developments via conditions and carry significant weight, then added that it was already commonplace on significant developments.

Cllr J Rest warned that the Council must consider how quickly electric vehicle charging technology could progress, and the Plan would need to take this into consideration. The Planning Policy Team Leader replied that the policy only sought to ensure that the infrastructure was at least considered.

The Planning Policy Manager then outlined the policies under the approach to housing. He noted that there was no change to the Agricultural, Forestry and Other Occupational Dwellings in the Countryside policy. On the Sites for Gypsy and Travellers, and Travelling Show People policy he informed Members that there was very low need in North Norfolk and that the Council very rarely received applications

for this type of development, but the policy essentially aimed to ensure that conditions were met.

On the Housing Extensions, Replacement Dwellings and Annexed Accommodation policy, the Planning Policy Manager informed Members that this extended to all forms of extensions and was intended to bring controls to all locations. It would also help to clarify definitions such as annexes. Members were informed that the current policy aimed to ensure that property additions were always subordinate to the principal residence, though many applications were approved where this was not the case, so the policy had been adjusted to allow this. Cllr S Arnold replied that she did not have any objection to the changes and Cllr D Young Agreed; he then asked whether there was any further wording to be added, as the policy appeared unfinished. The Planning Policy Manager replied that he had intended to add details about the material increase in impact, that would look to identify the prominence of the site, the character of the area, and proximity to other sites. In these cases, he informed Members that planning permission would often require reference to the design guide. Cllr D Young agreed that it was important to clarify this point if possible, and noted that Parish Councils often made reference to proportions and expressed disappointment in cases where it did not have a significant impact on planning permission being granted. He then referred to ancillary use, and asked if there was anything further to add. The Planning Policy Manager replied that it was likely that the wording would change from ancillary to incidental, as this would be more appropriate. The Chairman asked for clarification on whether the subordination principle would remain in the design guide. The Planning Policy Manager confirmed that this would remain in the design guide, though he warned that by excluding it from the policy, it would make it clear that it would not be a determining factor when granting planning permission.

The Planning Policy Manager introduced the Developer Obligations policy, he noted that at present the policy was included in the core strategy, but stated that it was silent on viability. As a result, the updated policy was intended to adopt wording that included reference to viability and seek to remove any existing ambiguity. He added that it was unavoidable that there would always be a process by which developers could challenge their obligations if circumstances had changed, though this policy would aim to narrow down the opportunities for these challenges. The Planning Policy Team Leader added that whilst the policy was not accompanied by its preamble, he wanted to make clear that the price of land should not be used as an excuse not to meet their obligations. He added that the policy would state that the viability assessment must align with the Local Plan, and that the overall aim of the policy was to make clear what was expected as part of a viability assessment.

Cllr S Arnold referred to existing obligations that required developers to build affordable housing alongside market properties, and asked whether reference had been made to this in the policy, as developers often attempted to avoid this obligation. The Planning Policy Manager replied that it would be covered by the affordable housing policy, though he could not rule out occasions where financial contributions were given instead. Cllr S Arnold stated that she was satisfied with the policy and proposed approving the recommendations. Cllr M Prior asked whether the number or percentage of affordable homes that had to be provided on developments could be further fixed in any way. The Planning Policy Manager replied that it was not possible to guarantee a number or percentage that could not be challenged, but the purpose of the policy was to narrow the scope from which these challenges could be made. He then explained to Members that 90% of the value of the land purchase must take place at the time of changeover, and it would be the landowners' responsibility to help developers if affordable housing obligations lowered profit margins to the point of unfeasibility.

Cllr D Young asked whether any reference was required to the level of evidence needed for the viability studies. The Planning Policy Team Leader replied that the viability study that would be carried out by developers would need to coincide with the requirements of the authority's viability assessment. He added that the policy requirements should be achievable. The Planning Policy Manager reassured Members that the policy would be clear when the pre-amble was included.

Cllr P Grove-Jones stated that developers often failed to meet their obligations and asked if there was anything that could be done to improve this. The Planning Policy Manager replied that often the Council had to accept a compromise when this occurred, but it was the aim of the Council to limit the use of routine excuses which often appeared.

The Chairman noted that the transparency principle was important and she was happy to see it included in the policy. She then referred to the fourth bullet point in the policy on the delivery of community infrastructure, and asked if public amenity could be added to the list. The Planning Policy Team Leader replied that the Plan would be clear on telling developers to carry-out appropriate landscaping. The Chairman asked how specific these requirements could be, to which it was suggested that the new design guide would improve landscaping guidance.

The recommendations covered all the policy approaches outlined in the discussion; they were proposed by Cllr S Arnold and seconded by Cllr D Young.

RESOLVED

- 1. Members consider the contents of this report and confirm the provisional preferred policy approaches to be included within the First Draft Local Plan for consultation.**
- 2. The final policy wording and content of the consultation document is delegated to the Planning Policy Manager.**

91. CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS FOR NEXT MEETING

The Chairman informed Members that the design guide report and plans for conducting the consultation would go to the next meeting.

It was confirmed following a question from Cllr M Prior that enough items had been resolved for the Planning Policy Team to meet the March deadline

Cllr S Arnold asked when Members would receive the edited policy excerpts. The Chairman added that it would be helpful to receive these in the order that they would appear in the draft Plan. The Planning Policy Manager replied that he would aim to release the updated document in thirds, with the first of these being sent to Members by the end of the week on paper and electronically.

The meeting closed at 1.28pm

CHAIRMAN

11 FEBRUARY 2019

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

Ms V Gay (Chairman)

Mrs S Arnold
Mrs A Green
Mrs P Grove-Jones
Ms M Prior

S Shaw
R Shepherd
D Young

J Rest – substitute for J Punchard

Observers:

M Knowles
Ms K Ward

Officers

Mr M Ashwell – Planning Policy Manager
Mr I Withington – Planning Policy Team Leader
Mr J Mann – Senior Planning Policy Officer
Mr P Rhymes – Conservation and Design Officer
Mr R Dholiwar – Planning Monitoring Officer
Miss L Yarham – Democratic Services & Governance Officer

92. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors N Pearce, J Punchard, R Reynolds and Mrs V Uprichard.

There was one substitute Member in attendance.

93. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

None.

94. MINUTES

Minute 73 – Draft Approach to Growth in Villages

Councillor D Young referred to a statement that the new service requirements imposed an obligation on service providers to provide broadband where a quantum of development was built. However, Members had since received a document which stated that this obligation related to all residential development.

Ms K Ward explained that the reason she had asked why broadband was not a criterion for selection was in the context of discussions at a previous meeting.

At the request of the Chairman, Members of the Working Party confirmed that they were satisfied with the telecommunications report which had been circulated by the Planning Policy Manager following the meeting.

Minute 74 – Coastal Policies – Draft Policies for Consultation

Councillor D Young stated that he had queried the first bullet point and not the first three as stated in the report.

Minute 75 – Approach to Town Centres and Retail

Councillor D Young stated that he was not concerned by “wholly ancillary role” in the final paragraph of the proposed policy but considered that the words “only where” were restrictive and conflicted with the proposed policy relating to the provision and retention of local facilities and services.

Councillor Young also considered that the Planning Policy Manager had agreed that the wording would be reviewed and not that it could be reviewed as quoted in the minutes.

The Minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

95. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

96. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

97. UPDATE ON MATTERS FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Planning Policy Team Leader reported that an application had been received for the designation of the parish of Wells-next-the-Sea as a Neighbourhood Plan area. This would be dealt with under delegated powers.

98. PLANNING POLICY - MONITORING REPORT 2016-18

The Planning Monitoring Officer presented an overview of the Monitoring Report 2016-18, which set out the main development trends in the District in the period 2016-2018 and measured performance against adopted Core Strategy policy and corporate objectives. He reported that the full Monitoring Report would be available on the website shortly.

Councillor D Young was concerned that the published figures would show a five-year housing land supply of 5.02 years. He requested an update on the current position.

The Planning Policy Team Leader explained that the five-year housing land supply figures were already published in the Interim Five-year Land Supply Statement. The Monitoring Report was a factual document and accurate at the time of publishing. The housing land supply figure was constantly changing as developments were completed and permissions granted. Work to monitor completions up to 31 March would commence in April and the annual figure would be again published in May. A considerable amount of work would be involved in order to produce the updated figure.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that there was a requirement to have a five-year supply of housing land and 5.02 years was sufficient to continue to attach full weight to the Council's policies. If the supply dropped below five years, there would be a presumption in favour of development until the land supply was replenished. The Government was expected to publish its revised methodology for calculating housing requirements. The forthcoming consultation on the draft plan would be on the basis of 550 dwellings per annum subject to the review of the methodology. If the housing requirement was above 550 dwellings per annum, further discussions would be required as to whether the increased number of dwellings could be delivered.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold considered that the land supply was not as robust as it was a few years ago as the allocations were coming to an end and the situation should improve when the new plan was in place. She stated that retail was not mentioned in the Employment and Retail section and she could not recall any recent retail permissions being granted.

The Monitoring Officer explained that the completions table only reported employment land. The Monitoring Report contained figures for permissions granted for 2016/17 and 2017/18 but he was not aware of any completions as yet. The Planning Policy Team leader explained that there had been limited new retail permissions.

Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones referred to permission which had been granted for residential development outside the development boundary of Stalham when the land supply had dropped below five years, and shortly afterwards the Council could demonstrate a five-year land supply.

The Planning Policy Manager stated that only one application had been affected and the Committee had been advised that it was obligated to grant permission. The five-year housing land supply had been topped up by granting the permission. However, in the event of the housing land supply falling below five years, the Council would not be obligated to grant permission in unsustainable locations.

The Working Party noted the report.

99. NORTH NORFOLK DESIGN GUIDE - SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT FOR INCLUSION ALONGSIDE THE EMERGING FIRST DRAFT LOCAL PLAN (CONSULTATION VERSION)

The Senior Planning Officer presented a report which gave an update on the review of the national policy context and set out the approach taken within the proposed design policies for the draft Local Plan, which provided hooks to the North Norfolk Design Guide.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold referred to the draft High Quality Design policy. She stated that she did not wish to see garages built in front of dwellings and considered that facilities should be provided for storage of bins. She asked if the policies could be worded to ensure that affordable housing was of good quality design and not identifiable.

Councillor Ms K Ward referred to the references to light pollution in the Protection of Amenity policy. She stated that there were significant areas which had dark sky protection and dark sky status and considered that the policy should be strengthened to protect them. She stated that domestic outside lighting was of particular concern.

The Planning Policy Team Leader explained that there was more specific reference to dark skies and light pollution in the environmental section of the draft Plan.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that the majority of lighting which was of concern to Councillor Ward did not require planning permission and there was nothing the Authority could do to control it.

Councillor Ms M Prior considered that “pepper potting” of affordable housing should be a requirement when considering mixed sites, with no separation of affordable housing.

The Planning Policy Manager stated that the pepper potting principle was contained in the draft plan in both the affordable housing and housing mix policies. It had been agreed that the maximum number of affordable dwellings in a group would be raised from 8 to 15. Design issues should relate equally to affordable and market dwellings and reference had been made in the draft Plan to “tenure blind design”. He considered that wording to that effect could also be included in the preamble to the design policy.

Councillor Mrs A Green asked if there was any reference to windmills.

The Conservation and Design Officer confirmed that there was a section on light pollution in the Design Guide, which offers guidance on external glazing and external lighting as part of the design process. The affordable housing section included information on layout of development, place-making and how affordable housing should be readily integrated into a scheme rather than in separate blocks. There was also a section which dealt with renewable technology and how it could be successfully integrated into development without harming the character and appearance of the area.

Councillor D Young suggested that the Protection of Amenity policy should make a clear distinction between the positive impacts in points 1 and 2 and the negative impacts in points 3 to 8.

Councillor Ms V Gay referred to point 6 of the High Quality Design policy which referred to *up to date* Conservation Area Appraisals. She was concerned that the wording should not appear to weaken the existing Conservation Area Appraisals.

The Conservation and Design Officer explained that the District had 81 Conservation Areas which were being reviewed on a rolling programme. There were Conservation Appraisals which were now several years old but they were meaningful documents and he agreed that the wording may require amendment to make it clear that they were included.

The Conservation and Design Officer presented the draft Design Guide. There had been significant changes since the current Design Guide was published, including national guidance and policy, development pressures, construction methods, materials and housing needs. As a result, the current Design Guide was out of date and its use and relevance had diminished. The updated Design Guide would be available as an interactive, electronic document only, which meant that it would be a living document which could be updated when necessary. It would be more accessible for all users, with more functionality. He explained the functions of the document and gave a demonstration of how it would be used. The design policies would link to the relevant sections of the Design Guide.

Councillor D Young considered that the Design Guide looked very impressive but he was concerned that it would be accessible to many individuals, although developers would be able to access it very easily. He asked if it would be possible to print pages of the document as laid out on the screen.

The Conservation and Design Officer appreciated that an electronic only version was a big step but he considered that the benefits of what could be achieved through the electronic guide far outweighed the lack of a paper version. He confirmed that it would be possible to print off individual sections. The Guide would be available for use on a smartphone or tablet so it was fully portable.

Councillor Young referred to a section of the Guide on windows which had an image of large areas of glazing. He asked the Conservation and Design Officer to comment on this in the context of light pollution.

The Conservation and Design Officer explained that the landscape and biodiversity section of the Design Guide dealt with landscape considerations, including dark skies, light pollution and noise and impact on the sensitive landscape. He would add more detail, including examples of glazing and its mitigation. He explained that he did not want to rule out certain forms of glazing at this stage without justification. Examples of good and bad design had been included in the Guide.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold asked when the Design Guide would be available. She also asked how developers would find information.

The Conservation and Design Officer explained that the Design Guide would be publicly available alongside the Regulation 18 consultation of the Local Plan.

The Conservation and Design Officer stated that the Design Guide included a materials choice and selection guide which would tell developers which materials would be acceptable.

The Chairman considered that the materials section was particularly useful.

Councillor J Rest asked if a glossary of terms would be included in the Design Guide.

The Conservation and Design Officer confirmed that a glossary had been included as many architectural terms were used.

Councillor J Rest asked for a definition of “conservation” and “preservation”.

The Conservation and Design Officer explained that conservation involved managing change by considering the value of the heritage asset, assessing how changes would impact upon it and mitigating the impact to ensure that the quality and significance of the asset was retained for future generations. Preservation meant that nothing could be changed, which was not an approach taken by the Authority.

The Chairman considered that the Design Guide was a very rigorous reference tool. Whilst she regretted the lack of a physical version, the reasons for it had been covered. She asked the Conservation and Design Officer to explain how the Guide might be used more easily both within and outside the Authority.

The Conservation and Design Officer explained that Officers wanted the Guide to be used and for it to be a living document. The existing Guide sat on the shelf and was not referred to enough in planning decisions. The new Guide was an opportunity to align decision making with the design objectives that the Authority was signed up to. It was an opportunity to re-engage with the expected design standards.

The Chairman considered that the “Comply or Justify” section of the document was very useful and made clear that there were principles which should be considered.

RESOLVED

- 1. That the provision preferred policy approaches be confirmed for inclusion within the First Draft Local Plan for consultation.**
- 2. That the final policy wording and content of the consultation document is delegated to the Planning Policy Manager.**
- 3. That the Design Guide be subject to a minimum six-week public consultation period alongside the emerging Local Plan.**

100. FIRST DRAFT LOCAL PLAN (PART 1) CONSULTATION: COMMUNICATIONS & ENGAGEMENT PLAN

The Planning Policy Team Leader presented a report which set out the draft programme of community engagement for the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1) Consultation and sought the Working Party's agreement to the proposed consultation arrangements. He outlined the engagement which had been carried out to date, the requirements of the plan making regulations and the proposed approach to consultation and engagement.

The Chairman asked if a coastal topic paper would be added to the consultation documents listed in Appendix C to the report.

The Planning Policy Team Leader explained that the coastal topic paper was a technical document which was not yet complete. The purpose of the document would be to provide clarification around the approach for the Authority and the Inspector. It would be included in the next round of consultation.

Councillor Ms M Prior asked if the Infrastructure Position Statement would include health in the same way as education.

The Planning Policy Team Leader explained that the Infrastructure Position Statement provided information on existing location and type of infrastructure but did not consider capacity. There was much more information in the Health Protocol, which the Council had signed up to under the Duty to Co-operate. Some of the proposed policies contained sections on health and promoting the Health Protocol, which would also be published as part of the Consultation background documents.

Councillor D Young referred to Table 1 of the report in relation to news releases. He commented that there were other publications covering the west of the district, such as the Glaven Valley newsletter, which were not listed. For his benefit as a recently appointed member of the Working Party, he requested clarification as to which of the documents in Appendix C had been considered by the Working Party.

The Planning Policy Team Leader explained that all except the Consultation Statement and Interim Habitats Regulation Assessment had been considered by the Working Party. The Consultation Statement was a factual record of the consultation which had been carried out to date. Its primary purpose was for the Inspector's information but it was good practice to publish it for reasons of openness and transparency. The Interim Habitats Regulation Assessment had not yet been received. It was a statutory consultation document undertaken by specialists and the findings would be brought back to this Working Party as part of the feedback process in order to refine the approach and policies.

Councillor Ms K Ward pointed out that the Rapid Review of the Local Plan had taken place in June 2018 and not October 2018 as stated in paragraph 1.3 of the report.

Councillor Ms Ward requested clarification as to the dates of the consultation events and whether or not they would be included in the letter to be sent out with the Council tax mail-out.

The Planning Policy Team Leader explained that it had been hoped to include the dates in the letter but it had not been possible given the deadline for the printers and the need to finalise times and venues for the events. The dates for the consultation would be included.

Councillor Ms Ward considered that it was important to give a time-frame in which the events would take place if it was not possible to give precise details.

The Planning Policy Manager agreed to include wording in the letter stating that it was expected to hold local consultation events in the first two weeks of the consultation period.

Councillor Ms M Prior suggested that notice of the events could be publicised in the local press and wording included in the letter to ask people to watch for details.

The Planning Policy Team Leader stated that details would be publicised on the website, via the Communications Team and through emails to Town Councils and posters in local Libraries etc. when they had been finalised.

The Chairman added that the events were likely to be publicised on social media.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold considered that the data processing issues under the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) needed further explanation for the general public.

Councillor Ms K Ward considered that it needed to be made clear that names would be published when responding to the Local Plan consultation, as people could confuse it with commenting on planning applications where names were redacted.

The Planning Policy Team Leader considered that it could be made clear on the representation form and in the information on how to engage with the process that names would be made public.

It was proposed by Councillor Mrs S Arnold, seconded by Councillor Ms M Prior and

RESOLVED

- 1. That the Communications and Engagement Plan be agreed as the basis for conducting public consultation on the First Draft Local Plan (Part 1), Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) and supporting documents.**
- 2. That final decisions as to which promotional tasks and events are carried out is delegated to the Planning Policy Manager.**

The meeting closed at 11.50 am.

CHAIRMAN

**THE GLAVEN PORTS CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISALS
& MANAGEMENT PLANS 2019**

Summary: This report seeks approval to adopt the draft Blakeney, Cley, Morston and Wiveton Conservation Area Appraisals along with the associated Management Proposals contained therein.

- Recommendations:
1. **That Working Party recommend to Cabinet to adopt the four Glaven Port Appraisals for statutory planning purposes and for the Appraisal documents to become material considerations in the planning process.**
 2. **That Working Party recommend to Cabinet to agree the proposed boundary changes as recommended in the draft Appraisal documents and that they be published in accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990.**
 3. **That Working Party recommend to Cabinet to agree the proposed Local Listings as identified within the draft Appraisal documents.**

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 At its meeting on 23 July 2018, Working Party approved the Draft Glaven Ports Conservation Area Appraisals (CAA's) for public consultation purposes. A six week period of consultation was undertaken from 10 September to 22 October 2018. As part of this consultation process, an open meeting was held at the Blakeney Village Hall on 5 October 2018. As a result of the representations received from members of the public, interested bodies and statutory consultees; the four CAA's have been amended and plans updated.
- 1.2 As resolved at the aforementioned meeting, the CAA's now come back to Working Party for consideration and final adoption by Cabinet.

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 Having a fully adopted Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan offers a number of potential benefits including: -
 - **As a tool to demonstrate the area's special interest.**
This is particularly important when considering development proposals and as part of any appeal process or site allocation.

- **As a method of community engagement**
As part of the adoption process a period of consultation is held including a public meeting which enables active community engagement, encourages dialogue and most importantly buy-in from residents for the management of the area.
- **As educational and explanatory tool**
Appraisals acts as an educational tool informing users of the historic, social and architectural importance of the area. They help to explain to property owners, local business and inhabitants the reasons behind the designation
- **As a method of understanding character**
Appraisals offer greater understanding and articulation of an areas character which will help the LPA form robust policies and planning decisions.
- **As a material consideration**
Once adopted, appraisals become a material consideration to the Secretary of State, including where urgent works are proposed to preserve unlisted buildings in a conservation area.
- **As a management tool**
The creation of management plans as part of the appraisal process can lead to important enhancements such as regeneration schemes but also smaller scale initiatives such as the addition of buildings onto the 'North Norfolk Local List'.
- **As a process of boundary review**
Most of the Districts CA's haven't been reviewed since the 1970's therefore the boundaries are often no longer relevant or are in need of some alteration to ensure they reflect what's on the ground.

4. Public Consultation

- 4.1 A six week period of public consultation was undertaken from 10 September – 22 October 2018 and included:
- Exhibitions at Blakeney, Cley, Morston and Wiveton parish churches.
 - An open meeting held at Blakeney Village Hall, attended by 35 members of the public.
 - Leaflets distributed at various locations within the villages.
 - The CAA documents and associated material made available on the Councils website.
 - Press release to various media outlets.
 - Council own social media campaign.
- 4.2 A total of 50 consultation responses were received from members of the public, parish councils and statutory consultees. These representations are summarised alongside the relevant LPA response and actions in **Appendix 1**.

4.3 All four documents have been reviewed and updated to take on board the comments received. This has included amendments to all CA boundaries, additional notes on dark skies and light pollution, changes to local listings as well as photographic content.

5. Management Proposals Overview

5.1 Blakeney – Boundary Review

5.1.2 The east boundary of the Conservation Area has been updated to more readily reflect the plot boundaries and include the listed windmill just east of the current boundary. The War Memorial on the south side of New Road has been included within the CA as one of the key historic structures on the road along with the associated alms-houses which make a contribution to the character and appearance of the area. The area of marshland to north of the Quay is covered by natural environment designations such as the SSSI and has no built heritage value. The boundary has been redrawn to cover the car park and boat mooring area on the east side of the channel, the duckpond, plus the section of the embankment adjacent, but to exclude the marsh area to the east of the embankment. The area proposed for removal from the CA can still be considered under the setting of the heritage asset and therefore still carries weight for the purposes of the NPPF.

5.2 Blakeney – Local Listings

5.2.1 Eight structures within the Blakeney CA are proposed for local listing including:

- Methodist Church, High Street
- Walls flanking Little Lane
- Blakeney Hotel
- St Nicholas' Church Hall
- Quay View, No. 9 The Quay (south granary)
- North Granary
- Wall and gateway to Whitefriar's on east side of Back Lane
- 1 Wiveton Road

5.3 Cley – Boundary Review

5.3.1 The boundary to the east of the CA runs through the middle of the car park. The car park was not deemed of sufficient merit to be included in the Conservation Area and therefore it was decided to exclude it in its entirety. Similarly, the children's play area and sports area behind the village hall was excluded. The areas proposed for removal from the CA can still be considered under the setting of the heritage asset and therefore still carries weight for the purposes of the NPPF. The area of river valley west of the village is also covered by the Glaven Valley Conservation Area. Given its primary characteristic is its relationship to the River Glaven and course it follows to the sea, it was concluded that the overlap of the two Conservation Areas was unnecessary and that by removing the river valley area from the Cley-next-the-Sea Conservation Area the focus of that Conservation Area would be the core built heritage of the village.

5.4 Cley - Local Listings

5.4.1 Thirty-six structures within the Cley CA are proposed for local listing including:

- Umgeni, Coast Road
- Rushmere, Coast Road
- Watchers Cottage, Coast Road
- Old Schoolhouse, The Fairstead
- Holly Cottage, The Fairstead
- Little Cottage, The Fairstead
- The Lodge, The Fairstead
- The Fairstead and Fairstead Cottage
- Zetland House, High Street
- The Harnser, High Street
- Lark House, High Street
- Crabpot Books, High Street
- Warehouse behind Crabpot Books, High Street
- Worthington House, High Street
- The George, High Street
- Bank Cottages, High Street
- Old Chapel, High Street
- The Old Town Hall House, High Street
- Hambleton, High Street
- Wrights Yard Cottage, High Street
- Carlton House, Anchorage, High Street
- Lime Kiln Cottage, Holt Road
- Lime Kiln Barn, Holt Road
- Loke Cottage, Holt Road
- Ingleside, Holt Road
- Hunters, Holt Road
- Picnic Fayre, Holt Road
- Northcote (New Road)
- Salt Marsh Cottage, Town Yard
- Middle Knoll and Little Knoll, Church Lane
- Church Knoll, Church Lane
- The Green, Church Lane
- Three Swallows, Cley Green
- Glaven House, Cley Green
- Newgate Cottage, Cley Green
- Green Shutters, Holt Road

5.5 Morston – Boundary Review

5.5.1 The portion of land to the south of Morston Hall Farm has been included within the CA in order to conform with property boundaries, as well as to incorporate the section of flint and brick wall at the eastern edge of this area, which continues south from the churchyard wall. The small area to west of The Boathouse has been included in the CA again to conform to the property boundary and to incorporate the stretch of wall adjacent to Morston Chase which, though

modern, is a faithful continuation of the wall stretching to the east to China Row that plays an important part of defining the streetscape here.

5.6 Morston - Local Listings

5.4.1 Seven structures within the Morston CA are proposed for local listing including:

- Church Cottage, The Street
- Church Farm House, The Street
- Church Barn, The Street
- Hall Farm Cottage and Wild Goose Cottage, The Street
- 23-25 The Street
- Coastguard Cottages, Quay Lane
- Morston Hall, Binham Lane

5.7 Wiveton – Boundary Review

5.7.1 The scheduled bridge has been included in the Conservation Area as one of only three designated heritage assets in the village. The area of the river valley that is covered by the Glaven Valley Conservation Area has been excluded from the Wiveton Conservation Area. This area is more characteristic of the River Glaven and the course it follows to the sea and the river valley on the edge of Wiveton contributes to this. It was therefore concluded that the overlap of the two Conservation Areas was unnecessary and that by removing the river valley area from the Wiveton Conservation Area boundary, the focus of that Conservation Area would be the built heritage of the village. In response to consultation comments and also to rationalise the boundary between the Wiveton Conservation Area and the Glaven Valley Conservation Area, it was decided that the area used as a car park and the new cemetery were more in keeping with the character of Wiveton village. The Conservation Area boundary has therefore been amended to include the car park and the cemetery.

5.8 Wiveton – Local Listings

5.8.1 Twenty-two structures within the Wiveton CA are proposed for local listing including:

- 8 and 9 Hall Lane
- Hall Lane House
- Wiveton Barn, Letherpool Lane
- Wiveton Barn House, Letherpool Lane
- Glaven Cottage, The Street
- The Parish Room, The Street
- Glaven Lodge, The Street
- Welcome Cottage, The Street
- Sycamore Cottage, The Street
- Church Cottage, The Street

- Church Farm House, The Street
- Church Farm Barn, The Street
- K6 Kiosk, The Street
- Church Barn, Chapel Lane
- Primrose Farm, Chapel Lane
- Double House, Chapel Lane
- White House, Chapel Lane
- Myrtle Cottage, Chapel Lane
- Rose Cottage, Chapel Lane
- Stonebridge House, Bridgefoot Lane
- Old Rectory, Bridgefoot Lane
- Wiveton Bell, The Green

6. Procedural Matters and Next Steps

- 6.1 Once adopted, the CAA's will be published on the Councils website and the relevant statutory advertisement undertaken. The documents will then become material considerations in the planning process and can be referred to and referenced as part of the development management process.

7. Budgetary Implications

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

Recommendations:

- 1. That Working Party recommend to Cabinet to adopt the four Glaven Port Appraisals for statutory planning purposes and for the Appraisal documents to become material considerations in the planning process.**
- 2. That Working Party recommend to Cabinet to agree the proposed boundary changes as recommended in the draft Appraisal documents and that they be published in accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990.**
- 3. That Working Party recommend to Cabinet to agree the proposed Local Listings as identified within the draft Appraisal documents.**

Draft Glaven Ports Conservation Area Appraisals - Consultation Responses **(consultation period 10 September – 22 October 2018)**

Total Written Representations: 50

Public Meeting Attendees: 35

Common Themes:

1) Protection of local vernacular and traditional village character.

- a. More needs to be done to ensure traditional character and appearance of the villages is conserved.
- b. Traditional details often getting eroded by unsympathetic new development.
- c. Spatial qualities and sense of isolation needs to be retained.
- d. Reference to dark skies and light pollution needed.

2) New contemporary architecture and large scale modern development harming village character.

- a. Often scale and size of new extensions and dwellings out of keeping and harmful.
- b. Pressure for housing effecting village scene.
- c. Modern materials and detailing not in-keeping.

3) Management Proposals need to be adhered to and enforced.

- a. Development must adhere with established policies and guidance.
- b. Need to ensure CAA recommendations are used and enacted by all parties.
- c. Ensure the CAA's carry sufficient weight in the planning process.

4) Well detailed documents which will leave a lasting legacy and important documentation.

- a. Generally agree with management proposals.
- b. Documents a long time coming but offer a great opportunity.
- c. Thorough and professional approach taken to review.

STATUTORY CONSULTEES		
Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated)	Council Response and Action / Recommendation	Purcell Actions
Historic England (ref: SC01)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impressed with presentation, layout and content of documents. Despite length, accessible due to formatting and links. Well illustrated with photos and graphics Once adopted, the documents will be 'exemplars' for others to follow. Cley CAA Page 83 – would benefit the defining the precise character of that area and specific recommendations/enhancements. Generally, the inclusion of the 'Conservation Philosophy' is positive. Could be too prescriptive regarding windows and opening styles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. All CAA's – recommendation pages reviewed to offer more definitive stance on recommendations. Agree All CAA's – window and openings section reviewed to offer broader description of traditional styles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review recommendations in street-by-street sections to see if anything more specific can be added- ALL DOCS – RW review for Wiveton Review Retention of Existing Features and Details sections- ALL DOCS– RW review for Wiveton DONE – reviewed Cley p83.
Norfolk Coast Partnership (ref: SC02)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst the documents refer to the AONB they do not refer to the AONB Management Plan. This Management Plan is a key reference for the strategic vision of these settlements and the areas special qualities. Some link or reference needs to be included. Reference also needs to be made to lighting and dark skies. There are two Dark Sky Discovery Sites in Norfolk at Kelling Heath and Wiveton Down. Reference to the growing problem of light pollution needs to be considered particularly in reference to external lighting, large windows, glazing and sky lights. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree All CAA's – reference to AONB management plan and link to AONB website now included. Agree All CAA's – reference to dark skies and light pollution now included. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DONE- Add ref to ANOB management plan to section 4.1- ALL DOCS DONE Add section re. dark skies and light pollution to Vulnerabilities- ALL DOCS DONE Add section re. dark skies and light

		<p>pollution to recommendations- ALL DOCS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DONE Add note re. dark skies and light pollution to Summary of Special Interest- ALL DOCS • DONE Add note re. dark skies and light pollution to 4.2 Setting- ALL DOCS •
CPRE (ref: SC03)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPRE consider the material will provide a good template for considering future consultations in the country. • Wealth of detail gone into the documents. • Highly valued area with unique characteristics. • Common issues being raised, visitor pressures, design of new development, second homes and lack of affordable homes. • New support through the revised NPPF. • Generally supportive of conservation philosophy & recommendations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. No additional action recommended. 	

PARISH COUNCILS		
Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated)	Council Response and Action / Recommendation	
Blakeney (ref: PC01)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive green open space and corridors, vernacular style buildings all key characteristics of the CA. • Overdevelopment, bad design, lack of planning policy implementation, nothing being done to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. Development pressure and the impact of large residential development has been a reoccurring theme through the consultation process. Section 8.3.4 of the CAA clearly sets out expectations regarding new development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NO ACTION NEEDED War Memorial Cottages not proposed for local listing in the document- no action needed • DONE Add section re. dark skies and light pollution to Vulnerabilities - ALL DOCS

<p>prevent or enhance are all key issues affecting the CA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the management proposals but do not want to see the War Memorial Cottages on New Road Locally Listed. • Planning policy and the enforcement process must be implemented for it to be successful. • The Mulberry Tree in the grounds of The Manor Hotel should be protected. • Article 4 Directions should be applied by NNDC to ensure permitted development rights are not allowed on unlisted properties. • Recent new builds and new developments have been harmful to the CA due to inappropriate scale, size and design. • Light pollution on new developments and effect on dark skies need to be discussed. • Overall, it is a good document. 	<p>Furthermore the North Norfolk Design Guide (SPD) is currently under review alongside the emerging Local Plan. This document and the associated design policy will include updated guidance on new development and in particular residential development which will add further clarity on design and its relationship to context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. The War Memorial Cottages have been removed from the Local List. • Agree. Details of the Mulberry Tree have been passed to the Council's Tree Officer to investigate the possibility of serving a Tree Preservation Order to protect it. • Noted/Clarification. The blanket use of Article 4 Directions across a CA is not advised and would go against Historic England guidance. If the PC would like to bring forward proposals for specific buildings or open spaces where a PD threat can be demonstrated then NNDC would be happy to consider the merits of the proposal. • Agree. References to dark skies and light pollution have been added. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DONE Add note re. dark skies and light pollution to Summary of Special Interest- ALL DOCS • DONE Add note re. dark skies and light pollution to 4.2 Setting- ALL DOCS
Cley (ref: PC02)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Really impressed with the consultation document which has given a thorough insight into the proposed changes. • Protect key views from any new development, use traditional materials to ensure new development in keeping with existing development. Development should be sympathetic to its surroundings. • Protect Old walls, especially along original thoroughfares such as Church Lane, Holt Road, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. Ancient walls are vital part of Cley CA character. Further consideration will be given to Article 4 Directions in relation to those walls which would fall under PD rights to demolish or alter. • Agree. The points raised during the consultation regarding the relationship to the Glaven Valley Conservation Area and coverage of the river catchment west of Cley CA have informed the proposals. Given that the Wiveton CA, Cley CA and Glaven Valley CA are 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DONE Reference consideration of Article 4s for historic walls • DONE Remove recommendation re. parking • DONE Update ref to saltmarshes

<p>Beach Road and along the Lokes. Therefore welcome Section 1.4 and Section 8.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect open and green spaces eg. Beer garden at the George and Newgate Green. The Parish Council are in the process of trying to formalise a parking area within the highway on the Green. This is needed for local events, and church services. Could not agree with a total parking ban on green. The Parish would not support a complete parking ban along the High Street in summer months as stated in Section 8. • Car Parking is a big issue, need to ensure renovations / development include adequate space for cars to reduce the pressure for on street parking. • Cley Parish Council would like to see the conservation area extended to include the Coast Road, even if the buildings are not in themselves significant, as a group, the parish feel as a view from the beach, the road is significant. Cley Parish Council would like to see the Village Hall Car Park still included in the Conservation Area as the car park is incredibly significant to providing off road parking for the village. • Possible Errors which have been identified in the plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Saltmarshes are no longer harvested and area only used for recreation, reedcutting is still very much evident on the marshes ○ The heritage audit and map do not include the church walls which should be listed, as part of the curtilage. • Cley Parish Council would like to see more protection for cobble pavements and would 	<p>all under review there is opportunity to regularise the anomalies surrounding Cley’s western boundary and the duplication of CA status.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. Reference to parking restriction in Section 8 removed. • Noted/Clarification. Extension of the CA further along the Coast Road cannot be justified. This area is not considered to represent sufficient quality to merit CA status which should remain focused on the historic core of the village rather than later phases of development. Including this area would potentially devalue the currency of the CA which Historic England guidance advises to avoid. • Agree. Update reference to saltmarshes. • Noted/Clarification. The heritage audit does not include all curtilage structures and the walls of the church whilst very much forming part of the listing are curtilage. Expanding the scope to include all curtilage structures would not be possible or desirable as it requires case by case tests. 	
--	---	--

<p>like to use Article 4 direction to protect ancient walls : All original Loke Walls and Walls along the original thoroughfares e.g Holt Road , the Fairstead , Anterton Hill, Church Lane, Glandford Rd.</p>		
Morston (ref: PC03)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally welcome the CAA and its proposals. • The boundary randomly cuts through various back gardens to the north east of the CA. • Can the boundary be extended to the north and include the quay car park. • Some of the Local Listings are inaccurately labeled. • Tides Reach name changed – Use 1 The Street, Morston • 43 The Street – known as Manor House • Are the ‘local landmarks’ identified really necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. The boundary of the CA has been updated to ensure it does not cross-cut any gardens. • Noted/Clarification. The area to the north of the CA is not under development pressure and covers primarily the Quay car park. There is limited justification to include this area as it is already within the setting to the CA and in the AONB. • Agree. The local listing inaccuracies have been updated. • Noted/Clarification. The local landmarks are common threads through the appraisals and identify key wayfinding and public buildings. Identification of such structures is part of the character of the village and should be retained. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DONE Update boundary on all plans to change N-E portion. • DONE Update boundary changes section to provide explanation. • DONE (NO REF TO TIDES REACH IN THE DOCUMENT) Rename buildings in street-by-street assessment • DONE Rename buildings in Audit
Wiveton (ref: PC04)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome the thorough and well-presented CAA document. • Confirmation of the documents legal status required? • Reaction from parish members has been mixed, mainly due to parts being considered to portray a ‘name and shame’ approach which is over personalised. • Local listing proposals not supported and existing statutory protection should be sufficient. The omission of several important buildings from the list. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted/Clarification. Once adopted the CAA’s will become supplementary planning documents and material considerations in the planning process. They can therefore be used by planning officers to assess applications and carry due weight in the development management process. • Noted/Clarification. The independent analysis and assessment was undertaken with the objective of being as accurate and impartial as possible; reflecting those strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats as seen 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DONE Redraw boundary to exclude river valley on all plans • DONE Update boundary changes section to add in this change • DONE Review document to check for references to this area being within the CA rather than in the setting • DONE Update Street-by-Street analysis to remove river valley area • DONE Add section re. dark skies and light pollution to Vulnerabilities- ALL DOCS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The maps used do not cover the whole built environment of the village, extension (included in inset maps 1-5) should be considered. • The importance of landscaping and ecology deserves greater focus. • The review of the Glaven Valley CAA needs to take into account the entire river catchment, with its ecology and landscape importance. • Omission of dark skies and Wiveton Downs Discovery Site • There should be more reference to working barns and farm buildings which characterise the area and opportunities they bring. • Development pressure from large new dwellings a concern. How will the CAA align with the NPPF and how affectively is existing design guidance is being implemented? • Could guidance extend to include paint colours, advertisements, parking, street furniture and telecommunications/utilities which often detract from the village? • Attempting to implement a blanket of rigid and inflexible rules to preserve the village in aspic would not serve the community well. 	<p>through the village's evolution. There was never any intention to single out owners or become personalised in it's critique. To this end, The document has been amended in light of comments received and those observations which could be deemed as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. The points raised regarding the relationship to the Glaven Valley Conservation Area and coverage of the river catchment are very informative. Given that the Wiveton CA, Cley CA and Glaven Valley CA are all under review there is opportunity to regularise the anomalies surrounding Wiveton's eastern boundary and the duplication of CA status. This river catchment is more suited to the characteristics of the Glaven Valley and it is therefore proposed to remove this area from the Wiveton CA and retain it within the Glaven Valley CA. The eastern boundary will then be redrawn to more readily reflect the built form of the village. • Noted/Clarification. In terms of the other boundary proposals put forward under inset maps 1-5. These areas are not considered to represent sufficient quality to merit CA status which should remain focused on the historic core of the village rather than disparate limbs and later phases of development. Including these would potentially devalue the currency of the CA which Historic England guidance advises to avoid. • Agree. References to dark skies and light pollution have been added. • Agree. Further reference to the importance of working agricultural buildings has been added. • Agree. Development pressure and the impact of large residential development has been a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DONE Add note re. dark skies and light pollution to Summary of Special Interest- ALL DOCS • DONE Add note re. dark skies and light pollution to 4.2 Setting- ALL DOCS • DONE Some reinforcing on p43 that agriculture has been key to the evolution of the village, which is reflected in a number of good quality vernacular farm buildings • DONE Add note on advertisement and telecommunications/utilities in negative features or pressures from development section- ALL DOCS
---	---	--

	<p>reoccurring theme through the consultation process. Section 8.3.4 of the CAA clearly sets out expectations regarding new development. Furthermore the North Norfolk Design Guide (SPD) is currently under review alongside the emerging Local Plan. This document and the associated design policy will include updated guidance on new development and in particular residential development which will add further clarity on design and its relationship to context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted/Clarification. Extending guidance to include a specific paint colour palette would seem overly restrictive and inflexible which should be avoided and there are already sections which cover parking. The issues of inappropriate advertisement and telecommunications/utilities has been taken on board and additional comments added to reflect the impact these can have on the CA. 	
--	--	--

BLAKENEY (PUBLIC)		
Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated)	Council Response and Action / Recommendation	
Anonymous (ref: B01)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charming unspoiled buildings in a village with its own character. • Much better control over development required. • Four residential developments in particular the 3 Owls, Marsh House, Bliss and the 'wooden box' are a disgrace. All contravene NNDC policy and guidance. • Agree with the management proposals as long as they can be achieved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with observations made (see comments above re. development pressure and deign). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A

Anonymous (ref: B02)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The marsh, the character of the brick and flint houses and separate nature of the villages all special characteristics. Pressure of housing, interference from outside bodies in marsh activities and NNDC's lack of commitment all issues affecting the CA. Agree with the management proposals as long as they adhered to. NNDC planning officers seem to disregard their own guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. Comments welcomed and taken into consideration in updating the draft. No additional action recommended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Anonymous (ref: B03)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The vernacular architectural a key characteristic Inappropriate development the key issues affecting the CA Agree with the Management Proposals provided they are adhered to. Much more needs to be done to restore the character of Blakeney Quayside 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. Comments welcomed and taken into consideration in updating the draft. No additional action recommended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Anonymous (ref: B04)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The vernacular buildings need to be preserved. Whilst majority of buildings have retained their character, there is evidence of 'gentrification' creeping in. Agree with the management proposals The demolition of a site and the construction of much larger building or buildings adds huge pressure. Developers should not be allowed to destroy what makes Blakeney so unique. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with observations made (see comments above re. development pressure and deign). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Anonymous (ref: B05)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The balance between conservation, economic sustainability and diversity of the village. Local employment is at the heart of sustainability. There is a section missing from the document regarding the importance of local businesses and the contribution made to the CA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. Comments welcomed and taken into consideration in updating the draft. Agree. Further consideration given to the important of local businesses and sustainability. Agree. The Anchor has been added as Grade II LB 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DONE Add ref to section on commercial buildings p45 r.e. importance of local businesses DONE Update listed buildings list p68 DONE Add reference to coronation car park being free and the need for a parking strategy in 7.3 and 8.3.7

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ‘renaissance’ of Blakeney post 1950 is largely due to tourism and this should be acknowledged when discussing vulnerabilities, opportunities, recommendations in the management plan. • Section 2 & 3 are well researched and would make a very useful publication in their own right. • Section 4 is a thorough review. • Section 6 (High Street) - The Anchor is missing as a Grade II LB. • 7.2 – Wheelie bins are a blight to the village, agree with uPVC comments, proliferation of temporary signage due to PC not implementing a tasteful and holistic approach to signs. • 7.3 – Traffic a major concern. The removal of free parking at Coronation Car Park has negative impact on High Street. A destination tourist village without a parking strategy risks losing its popularity and ability to attract and retain visitors. • 7.4 – The threat here is the Blakeney channel silting up resulting in there being no, or very little Quay at high tide. There is no mention of this or the boating activity here. • 7.5 – Saying that holiday cottages generate ‘some’ local jobs and revenue is a gross understatement. They are an important provider of tourist accommodation. Whilst second homes make far less contribution they still make a meaningful one. • 8.3.3 – Solar panels even on secondary slopes have still impacted on views. • 8.3.4 – The Pastures is an underutilised open space. Should rate more mention. • 8.3.5 – Discouraging parking on High Street and Westgate Street will have a negative impact on businesses. • 8.3.7 - A comprehensive parking strategy is required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. Reference to visual blight caused by wheelie bins included. • Agree. 8.3.7 covers traffic and a note regrading a parking strategy has been added. • Agree. The silting up of the channel has been noted in the document. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add ref to silting of Quay, boating activity and telegraph poles in 7.4 (and recommendations?) • DONE Remove ‘some’ from 7.6- important provider of tourist accommodation • Pastures an underutilized open space- more mention? • DONE New recommendation for bins “New development should have wheelie bin space/storage included. For existing buildings screening with planting, fences or walls would help to reduce their impact where it is feasible” in 8.3.5? • Signage strategy recommendation?
--	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wheelie bins are completely inappropriate for many characterful lokes in Blakeney. 		
Anonymous (ref: B06)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very thorough document which we could have used since these villages were first designated. • The document will serve Blakeney well in future and hopefully undo some of the mistakes over recent decades. • Both Blakeney PC and NNDC have been poor custodians of the CA due to lack of appreciation of the villages historic character. Including, inappropriate signage, plastic bollards, telecommunications, telegraph poles which have harmed the quayside. • No mention of ambient lighting. The floodlit sports pitch and Church cause significant pollution of the dark sky in winter. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. References to dark skies and light pollution have been added. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DONE As above re. dark skies • Reference to telegraph poles on Quay
Anonymous (ref: B07)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to the CAA's recommendations for The Pastures and objection to the way The Pastures is described and delineated. The land to the northern end has an entirely different character. It is not publically accessible and is fenced off. This area should be removed from the description. The use of the site for driveway access and parking should also be acknowledged in the CAA. • The proposal to 'avoid development on The Pastures' should not apply to this land. • Objects to the Blakeney Hotel's inclusion on the Local List unless it can be demonstrated that it won't affect the buildings current status and planning requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. The differing characteristics of the northern area of The Pastures has been noted in the document. • Agree. The Blakeney Hotel is a prominent landmark structure of the Quay and deserves recognition through Local Listing. The implications of Local Listing has been added to Section 5. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update Street-by-Street assessment with details of the housing and driveway to north of pastures, and to east • DONE Add implications of the local listing to section 5- ALL DOCS
Anonymous (ref: B08)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We express our support and appreciation for the thorough analysis and sensible recommendations in the draft Blakeney CAA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. Comments welcomed and taken into consideration in updating the draft. No additional action recommended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We're pleased to see that the importance of maintaining the distinction between villages has been put on record. • The rural break between villages should not be eroded. 		
Anonymous (ref: B09)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CAA is long overdue and NNDC officers must give them proper regard and weight. • The CAA's do not reflect the important role of Article 4 Directions. There are areas under threat from permitted development which directions would help to conserve. • The re-naming of houses and areas should be avoided as it divorces them from their historical connections and references. • The use of terms such as 'pastiche' and 'preserved in aspic' by applicants/developers should be challenged. • The 450 year old Mulberry Tree in the gardens of Manor Hotel should be listed. • Bliss, Quay Cottage, Three Owls, Arcady have all been harmful. • Overall the CAA's are a significant achievement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. Details of the Mulberry Tree have been passed to the Council's Tree Officer to investigate the possibility of serving a Tree Preservation Order to protect it. • Noted/Clarification. The blanket use of Article 4 Directions across a CA is not advised and would go against Historic England guidance. If the community would like to bring forward proposals for specific buildings or open spaces where a PD threat can be demonstrated then NNDC would be happy to consider the merits of the proposal. • Agree. See comments above re. development pressure and design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
Anonymous (ref: B10)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This work is really appreciated, the CAA's are long overdue and unfortunately there are many examples where heritage has already been eroded by unsympathetic developments. • It is hoped that NNDC planning officers will read the CAA's and acknowledge how fortunate they are to work in such a special and beautiful area. • NNDC should appreciate how, on many occasions it has let down the resident of the Glaven Ports in their disregard for these protections. • Disagree with comments made on P.91 of the Blakeney CAA. Article 4 Directions should be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted/Clarification. See comments above re. Article 4 Directions. The Pastures could be considered if it had sufficient local support. • Agree. References to dark skies and light pollution have been added. 	<p>DONE As above re. dark skies</p>

<p>applied to ensure permitted development rights are not allowed to be used on unlisted properties and on important open space like The Pastures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Light pollution in Blakeney has become increasingly prevalent and must be challenged. 		
Anonymous (ref: B11)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enjoyed reading the architectural detail in regard to Blakeney houses and cottages. The 'gentrification' has seeped in though. • Blakeney has retained much of its rugged and rural look. • Generally, new architecture in Blakeney has been good. • Vital to retain vernacular appearance whilst bringing cottages into 21st century. • Developers must adhere to NNDC policies. • It is hoped the CAA's will be implemented and used as guide lines in assessing future applications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. Comments welcomed and taken into consideration in updating the draft. No additional action recommended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A

CLEY (PUBLIC)		
Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated)	Council Response and Action / Recommendation	
Anonymous (ref: C01)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation of vernacular buildings is paramount. • Urbanisation through enlargement, extensions, new builds out of proportion with neighbouring properties. • Strict adherence to conservation/environmental policies is essential. • Overuse of solar panels and brick setts is not in-keeping. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. Comments welcomed and taken into consideration in updating the draft. No additional action recommended. 	<p>N/A</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequent use of solid and impersonal gates to driveways on the increase. • Too easy to destroy vernacular buildings, for instance Arcady has completely ignored local context. • Agree to comments on the Quay regarding balconies and picture windows. • Agree to preservation of open green space. 		
Anonymous (ref: C02)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attractive Coherence • Traffic, too many buildings in gardens, holiday homes • Proposals likely to be inadequately enforced. Not a plan with specifics • House opposite church on Cley Green should not never have been passed. Despite opposition it has been built and is much higher than on the plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. Comments welcomed and taken into consideration in updating the draft. No additional action recommended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
Anonymous (ref: C03)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street Pattern, palette of materials • Speculative development, unsympathetic 'contemporary' architecture • New Build in Cley is unsympathetic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. Comments welcomed and taken into consideration in updating the draft. No additional action recommended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
Anonymous (ref: C04)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beautiful marshes • Large wooden house opposite church • Reject Planning permission and enforce on wooden house opposite the church 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. Comments welcomed and taken into consideration in updating the draft. No additional action recommended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
Anonymous (ref: C05)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unique architecture specific to the character of the surrounding buildings, special attention to materials • Wooden build opposite the church does not preserve or enhance the special architectural or historic interest of Cley • Yes – however, needs to be enforced in order to protect and enhance this area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. Comments welcomed and taken into consideration in updating the draft. No additional action recommended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The above building does not meet the criteria for conservation area designation , does not positively contribute to the character or provide any enhancement. 		
Anonymous (ref: C06)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local building materials Poor quality new housing Overbearing timber clad house looks very out of place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. Comments welcomed and taken into consideration in updating the draft. No additional action recommended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Anonymous (ref: C07)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preservation of vernacular buildings, is of paramount importance. Yes, but strict adherence to Conservation/ environmental polices essential. This has not always been done. It is too easy to destroy a vernacular building. The property opposite the Church has affected this important landscape forever, particularly viewed from the south. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. Comments welcomed and taken into consideration in updating the draft. No additional action recommended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Anonymous (ref: C08)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserving vernacular of buildings – making new development limited to preserve green spaces New modern oversized ‘grand design’ homes unusually hated by people who live here. Weak planning department which fails to enforce. Yes but limited Limitation of oversized homes, limitation of stuffing half dozen houses on what was once curtilage of house. More affordable housing . 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. Comments welcomed and taken into consideration in updating the draft. No additional action recommended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Anonymous (ref: C09)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brick and Flint walls, pantile roof tiles, wooden windows and doors, views, lokes and holly hooks Out of scale new development and rebuilds, brilliant white uPVC and Brilliant white paint 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. Document updated to reflect open areas raised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DONE – see response to C14 for further deatils

<p>'suburbanisation' and 'gentrification' , overhead wires and poles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – but there are a number of minor errors and omissions in various sections of the document. • The public open areas between Coast Road and Hilltop with public footpaths created as 'Wastes of the Manor' by the enclosure awards should be designated as 'significant green space' – pg 141 		
Anonymous (ref: C10)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key issues – the protection of the historic fabric of the village. Resist the pressure from high value development, ensure NNDC has the resources to challenge developers. Any proposals must be achievable and supported by the community. And example of an unrealistic proposal is to suggest that existing solar panels be removed from a building. • Boundary Review – Village Hall • The present conservation boundary does not include the playing field adjoining the children's play area. This field is an important Green Space, and is the only area in the village for adult sports activities. This space is maintained by the committee in the same way as the children's play area. • The proposed exclusion of the main car park, by the suggested arbitrary subdividing of the Village Hall property, appears illogical. Although this car park is not particularly aesthetic, it is an essential asset to the village. • There could be problems, at present unknown, unless the entirety of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted/Clarification. The Village Hall car park makes little overall contribution to the CA and still lies within the setting of the CA. Its inclusion seems unjustified. The playing field does represent important green space and its is again part of the setting of the CA. Inclusion would add little to the quality or understanding of the villages evolution. • Agree. Reference to parking restriction in Section 8 removed. Car parking significant issue in Cley • Agree. Development pressure and the impact of large residential development has been a reoccurring theme through the consultation process. Section 8.3.4 of the CAA clearly sets out expectations regarding new development. Furthermore the North Norfolk Design Guide (SPD) is currently under review alongside the emerging Local Plan. This document and the associated design policy will include updated guidance on new development and in particular residential development which will add further clarity on design and its relationship to context. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DONE- remove ref to preventing parking in summer

<p>Village Hall is either fully within or fully excluded from the conservation area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cley – Hill Street • Traffic congestion in the High Street during the summer season is the major issue that Cley faces now, and in the future, unless serious solutions are put in place. • Until NNDC and Norfolk Highways recognise that the congestion problems are not just a minor local issue, and funds are made available, the problems will increase year on year. • The authorities insist that any traffic management improvement must be paid for by our impoverished Parish Council. Why spend thousands of pounds on a conservation review, when there are no funds available to implement the conservation recommendations. • The Parish Council has piloted selective no parking in the narrowest parts of the High Street, by the use of temporary cones, this has noticeable improved the traffic flow. Highways Norfolk, for many years, has insisted that there is no solution. • The report recommendations is for having no parking during the summer. To achieve this would require yellow lines along the length of the High Street, at a cost of tens of thousands of pounds in legal traffic management orders. Surely, for this review to have credibility, and not purely aspirations , 		
---	--	--

<p>it must present practical suggestions that have some chance of implementation.</p>		
Anonymous (ref: C11)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report has identified negative features that detract from the village. Arcady is correctly identified to be of unsympathetic scale and mass. The development must be seen as a classic example of the failure of the local planning process. This recent high value development obtained planning permission from SoS above the heads of local opinion. The fact that the elevation drawings of the proposed development and the adjoining existing building were not accurately drawn to scale appears negligent and bewildering. • Until NNDC planning insist on requiring all proposed developments, located in this sensitive conservation area, to submit accurate elevations that include the adjoining properties, problems like Arcady will continue to occur. Without such drawings, how can the Planning Committee make a reasoned judgement. A more proactive approach is needed to ensure that large scale projects are in keeping with the key conservation values presented in the review. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. Development pressure and design as mentioned above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
Anonymous (ref: C12)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nocturnal character is important and not covered in report. North Norfolk famed for its dark skies and views of stars. More guidance needed to control external lighting on new developments. Measures needed where possible, to address excessive light pollution on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. References to dark skies and light pollution have been added. Development pressure and design as mentioned above. Need for the effecting enforcement and implementation or recommendations noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DONE As above re. dark skies • DONE Add in 8.3.1 r.e. repairs should be high quality- ALL DOCS

<p>existing buildings e.g. Swallows pub which has harsh bright lighting at high level which is highly intrusive from distant views.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The natural setting of the village , its relationship to the sea/ marshes, glaven valley, rolling landscape/ agricultural land to the south and east. Collective value to existing buildings. The 'setting' of important buildings as much as the buildings themselves. Local characteristics such as the lokes and gable ends of houses onto the high street. Boundaries – especially the old, and good quality newer, flint walls. Views within, into, from the village. Views incorporating the three Glaven Valley churches. ● Issues effecting the conservation area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increasing pressure from development - Inappropriate scale of a new building – should be easier to control than subjective issues such as design. It must be as important to assess how it will positively enhance the existing character as considering the harm. Very important that there is room for good modern design that respects its context. ○ Avoid the villages becoming too precious and exclusive. Not to focus on preservation but to conserving the character of the villages aswell as keeping them real, live, working villages. ○ Car parking impacts on the townscape character. E.g it is uncontrolled on 		
---	--	--

<p>Newgate Green, is unsightly and causes damage to verges. Can parking be restricted on the green to residents and acquiring some screened land adjacent for pub and visitor parking e.g on the marsh side of the Glandford / Holt Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Installations/ works by statutory authorities e.g telephone/ electricity poles and wires – any chance of moving services underground? Where appropriate , insist that public authority works are submitted for approval e.g sections of flint wall between the church field and church lane collapsed twice. Highways installed concrete retaining wall and metal railings; this year an earth bank and timber fence. Surely they could have been made to rebuild the wall re-using the existing flints. ○ Protection and maintenance of important tree/ tree groups identified. How is this to be done other than by applying TPO? ○ The quality of materials and workmanship is crucial. Eg Flint work – type/ size of flints, gritty lime mortar, coursing, good quality bricks, preferable no brickwork in boundary walls etc. ○ Publicly visible solar panels eyesore. ○ Summer season traffic causes congestion. Church lane is single width, used by large delivery work vehicles , could this be restricted use/ one way only? 		
--	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management proposals / 4. Other issues in relation to the CAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consider the proposals are appropriate, but will need to be enforced. There are already a number of policies that aim to protect this special area but have failed, in notable cases, to safeguard the area from totally inappropriate developments. An example is Arcady which was approved on appeal, then constructed with little regard to the approved design, so it totally fails to meet any of the current policies, and has become a drawn out enforcement case. The key issue stems from inadequate and inaccurate information on the original application drawings. Hopefully this appraisal, and management plan will give added back up in these cases. But in first instance, council should demand higher quality planning submissions including checking, some obvious basic requirements that applications should meet before they will even be considered. The comment includes a list of how this should be done. ○ Then, should an application be refused, the council should give a full and detailed explanation that will be taken on board by an inspector if it goes to appeal. ○ The PA need to regularly inspect/ monitor buildings under construction and post completion rather than relying only on a member of public. 		
---	--	--

<p>Then to respond quickly on non-compliance issues.</p>		
<p>Anonymous (ref: C13)</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment with regards to the suggested Local Listed Building proposals, Peggottys Cottage on the Coast Road, recently renovated but not sure of the architectural merit for it to be proposed as a local listed building. • The description is incorrect, there is no single storey extension, this is an attached building that is owned by Hillside and not within Peggottys curtilage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. Remove Peggottys Cottage from Local Listings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DONE Remove Peggottys from Audit and street by street and HA plan
<p>Anonymous (ref: C14)</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inclusion of views into, and out of, the conservation area are a useful addition as long as the planning officers and SoS pay full regard to them and prevent the reoccurrence of some of the negative and inappropriate changes and new builds that have been allowed. • Building footprints in Cley are not all accurate: The lodge does not show the staircase projection of 1950 or the extension completed in 2011. Varaness does not show any building on pg 137, but original structure are shown on pg138 and new house is not occupied. • Conservation Area Boundary – agree that half of the car park does not justify being in the conservation area. This should also apply to the adjacent play area (in conservation area) and sports fields (not in 	<p>Agree. ‘Significant Green Space’ reviewed. The plotted trees have been reviewed to be as accurate as possible. The ‘flint wall’ to Cley Hall has also be adjusted.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DONE Varaness was not on the last Cley plan we received from NNDC. We did notionally mark it on some plans. We will do that consistently across all plans. It reflects the issue of the constant building and rebuilding that occurs in Cley. • DONE Play area has been excluded. • DONE The public green space between Hill Top and Coast Road has been identified as significant green space. • DONE Flint wall adjusted so it is not shown across the Cley Hall driveway • We have tried to show trees as accurately as we can. Without an arboricultural survey plan, it is not possible to be more accurate on the plans. • DONE Researching individual buildings was not part of the remit of the

<p>conservation area) and both areas are shown as significant green space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Townscape Analysis pg141 – ridiculous to split the ‘significant green space’ behind the Village Hall. Conservation Area boundary should include all ‘significant green space’. • Public area of land between Hill Top and Coast Road around public foot paths, pg 141 as pedestrian routes should be ‘significant green spaces’. • Difficult to know which trees are being shown as ‘Important Trees’ at The Lodge. A description should be included of each highlighted tree. Could you confirm what these trees are? • The ‘important group of trees’ green area is too large encroaching into the walled garden and covering over half of The Lodge itself and most of the lawn to the north of property. • Pg 141 shows purple line ‘Flint Wall’ from The Fairstead to The Lodge - this is inaccurate as it appears to block the drive to Cley Hall and no wall has existed here. 		<p>commission and providing more information for some buildings than others would make the listings unbalanced. The other main exception is about outbuildings. Access to buildings in Cley, as we discussed at the time, is very difficult with many buildings, especially outbuildings, not being visible from public paths. Where we felt it appropriate, we have noted the age of outbuildings but others we do not know for sure and so felt it better not to include. For the same reason, we have generally not excluded extensions from locally listed buildings because we cannot necessarily see exactly what is the extension and how modern it is.</p>
--	--	--

MORSTON (PUBLIC)		
Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated)	Council Response and Action / Recommendation	
Anonymous (ref: M01)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Conservation Area boundary does not align with any form and cuts across a garden. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. The boundary of the CA has been updated to ensure it does not cross-cut any gardens. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DONE Update boundary review section, boundary plan
Anonymous (ref: M02)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very interesting document but will it be adhered to. P.69 Section 8.2 'agricultural farmland east, south, west' – north area missing. The viewpoints shown on P.25 view 05, P. 24 view top right and P. 27 bottom right all show views of agricultural land to north of the village. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. The CAA has been updated to take into account the agricultural land to the north. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DONE Update references to agricultural land to north btwn village and coast
Anonymous (ref: M03)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Congratulations on a good piece of work which we support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. Comments welcomed. No additional action recommended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

WIVETON (PUBLIC)		
Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated)	Council Response and Action / Recommendation	
Anonymous (ref: W01)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 121 of CAA – the plots of land adjacent to and north of Sycamore Cottage along with land between Rushes Point and Glaven Cottage/Rosemede have been incorrectly labelled as River Valley. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. The CAA 'street by street' map has been updated to reflect the comments and areas specified now included under 'Green Open Space: Other'. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DONE - Update street by street map and thumbnail DONE- update Street by Street section 8
Anonymous (ref: W02)		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All references to the climbing wall on Glaven Lodge should be removed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree . All references to the climbing wall have been removed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DONE Remove all references to the climbing wall, including photographs (NB Photograph of Glaven Lodge as example of a brick residential building on p41)
Anonymous (ref: W03)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The many flint walls are a key characteristic Hedges becoming overgrown and walls not being maintained. The village signs 'Slow You Down' are inappropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. The importance of the historic flint walls are recognised within the CAA. Agree. Good maintenance is also raised under section 8.3. Noted/Clarification. The highways signs could be changed with consultation with County Council and Parish Council. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Anonymous (ref: W04)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wiveton needs a dog bin and a public litter bin. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted/Clarification. These items could be secured through consultation with the Parish Council and lie outside of the scope CA appraisal. No additional action recommended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Anonymous (ref: W05)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High quality vernacular buildings and good green spaces Flint wall maintenance an issue Hard landscaping should be avoided Agreed with the management proposals Wiveton is a lovely rural village which has adequately retained its character and identity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. Good maintenance is also raised under Section 8.3. This would include flint walls. No additional action recommended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Anonymous (ref: W06)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Glaven Lodge should not be included on the Local List 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. Glaven Lodge has been removed from the proposed Local List 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DONE Remove Glaven Lodge from Street-by-Street assessment, audit and HA plan
Anonymous (ref: W07)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The omission of any reference to dark skies and light pollution. New applications could include light impact assessments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. Reference has been included to AONB Partnership Management Plan and link to AONB website now included. Agree. Reference to dark skies and light pollution also now included. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DONE Add refs to AONB as above DONE As above re. dark skies

Anonymous (ref: W08)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well presented, clear and easy to navigate CAA. • Lack of: Aims and Objectives, the qualifications and experience of the authors, methodology, remit and legal status. • Conflicting and confusing terminology used. Need for a glossary of terms to aid use. • Section 1.2 - inclusion of 'maintain property prices' is outside of the CAA remit and social comment should be removed. • Section 1.4 - includes ref to 'must positively conserve' an overstatement in terminology which should be moderated. • There is no 'cluster' of buildings around the green. • The Wiveton Downs do not envelope the village. • What is the Local Listing Criteria and how have these buildings been assessed? • What are the implications of Local Listings? • Could the village community put forward its own Local List? • The area around 'Bridgefoot Lane' is not the centre of the village. • Overlap between Sections 6, 7 and 8. • Impact of telecommunications and cables. • Too many assumptions, subjectivity, repetition and inaccuracies hampering the documents quality. • Reference to HIA should be qualified in relation to Wiveton CAA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted/Clarification. The authors of the document are suitably qualified and experienced heritage practitioners, including their personal experience within the documents would seem to serve limited use. The tender process was robust and competitive. Purcell were selected on their basis of their wealth of experience in undertaking CAA's amongst other qualifying criteria. • Noted/Clarification. The methodology used complies with the Historic England's established guidance and best practice (see comments from HE regional office above). • Agree. Introducing a glossary of common terms could help to reduce confusion. • Agree. Reference to maintaining property prices removed. • Agree. Terminology has been moderated to 'should'. • Agree. Reference to 'cluster' of buildings removed. • Agree. Reference to 'envelope' removed. • Agree. The Local Listing criteria has been published on the Council website. • Agree. The implications of Local Listing has now been included under section 5.3. • Agree. The issues of telecommunications/utilities has been taken on board and additional comments added to reflect the impact these can have on the CA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DONE Add glossary of terms- check use of terms such as preservation, conservation, etc ALL DOCS • DONE Remove reference to property prices section 1.2- ALL DOCS • DONE Change ref from must to should in section 1.4- ALL DOCS • REPHRASED Remove reference to cluster in summary of special interest • DONE Amend reference to enveloping of Wiveton Downs • DONE check detail in comments by Rachel Hamilton on summary of special interest for more detail on the above two points and others raised • Add reference to NNDC local listing criteria- ALL DOCS (need to know where on website) • DONE As above- Included implications of local list in 5.3- ALL DOCS • REPHRASED -Check area around Bridgefoot Lane is not the centre of the village • DONE telecommunications/utilities (see above? ALL DOCS?) • DONE Amend HIA definition to say when this is relevant- ALL DOCS
Anonymous (ref: W09)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CAA is overly critical of local residents and personal decisions made by homeowners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. All references to the Glaven Lodge climbing wall have been removed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DONE As above- remove refs to climbing wall

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reference made to Glaven Lodge are particularly inappropriate. • The photo references to a windows on page 72 and 78 again identify individual owners. • The land between Glaven Cottage and Rushes Point is an eyesore and should be referenced within the document. • Objection on the basis of the current draft, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. The photos of the windows in question have been removed. • Agree. The land in question has now been referred to as a rather unsightly storage and car park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DONE Remove photos on p72 and 78 • add reference to unsightly storage/car park.
Anonymous (ref: W10)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very thorough and professional document • Comprehensive and protective approach will serve the village well. • Can be overly nit-picky in places • Needs to mention dark skies and light pollution • Needs more reference to natural environment and ecology • The old wharf walls to the rear of the church need to be mentioned. • Church Farm House worthy of Local Listing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. Comments re. personal property have been moderated. • Agree. References to dark skies and light pollution have been added. • Agree. Church Farm House has been considered for Local Listing • Agree. Further reference to landscape and ecology added. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DONE As above re. dark skies • ALREADY ON THE LIST- Add Church Farm House to local list (street-by-street section, audit and plan)? • DONE Ecology and landscape- a couple more mentions of this in section 2 and 4.1 and its contribution to the CA • NB Many of the consultee's suggestions for boundary changes relate to wildlife and landscape protection. This is not the function of a Conservation Area and the protection offered by the SSSI and AONB is more relevant.
Anonymous (ref: W11)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What will be status of the document once agreed – will be statutory. • Thorough document but quite text heavy at 122 pages. Perhaps could be shortened by taking out the personalized remarks and making it more generic. • What is the impact and purpose of local listing. • Needs more reference to natural environment and ecology • The boundary should be extended to include the entire built form of the village and right up to Wiveton Hall. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted/Clarification. Once adopted the CAA's will become supplementary planning documents and material considerations in the planning process. They can therefore be used by planning officers to assess applications and carry due weight in the development management process. • Noted/Clarification. See response to Wiveton PC re. boundary extensions. • Agree. Further reference to landscape and ecology added. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DONE Ecology and landscape- a couple more mentions of this in section 2 and 4.1 and its contribution to the CA • DONE - mention of dispersed settlement pattern and open spaces needed.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plans should include designations from Natural England e.g. woodlands, orchards, grazing, SSI etc. Management plans should include enhancement and protection of ecology/wildlife value. 		
Anonymous (ref: W12)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9 Hall Lane should not be Locally Listed as it does not meet the adopted criteria. Conservation Area status should be sufficient. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. 9 Hall Lane removed from Local Listing proposals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DONE (8 and 9) Remove from audit and street-by-street
Anonymous (ref: W13)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In broad agreement with the conservation plan for Wiveton Flint walls a key feature The village should not be preserved in aspic The wooden only approach to windows etc. is onerous and leaves the village vulnerable to second home owners Hedgerow maintenance is an issue. The village signs 'slow you down' are inappropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments welcomed and taken into consideration in updating the draft. Noted/Clarification. See response above re. village signs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Anonymous (ref: W14)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The boundary should be extended to include all of Wiveton including Wiveton Hall and Marsh. The Local Listings are random and not comprehensive. Why do we need Local Listings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted/Clarification. See response to Wiveton PC re, northern extension. Noted/Clarification. The contribution of local listing is set out within Section 5. A local list can be a very valuable tool in identifying local heritage and its contribution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Anonymous (ref: W15)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wiveton would benefit from a dog bin and public litter bin. Agree that decking at Wiveton Bell should be removed and the grass reinstated. There are good open spaces in Wiveton with sparse development but rightly point out the flint walls need attention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. Comments welcomed and taken into consideration in updating the draft. No additional action recommended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pressure from development, avoid hard landscaping. • Wiveton is a charming village and a joy to walk around. 		
---	--	--

Further Actions

Document	Action	
ALL	Update front cover dates	DONE
ALL	Change references to 'proposed' boundary changes	DONE
ALL	Change references to 'Proposed' LLBs	DONE
ALL	Change text of boundary review section and LLBs section to past tense	DONE
ALL	In 5.3 add: The designation does not affect a property's permitted development rights. However, when planning applications for changes outside of these permitted rights are submitted to NNDC this designation will be a material consideration in the planning process, to ensure that the special interest of the buildings and their setting within the Conservation Areas is preserved.	DONE
CLEY	Image of Lark House in Cley out of date- remove	DONE
ALL	Change boundaries on all plans to show the amended boundary	DONE- Blakeney, Morston, Wiveton and Cley
ALL	Check if Wiveton Downs referenced – add to SSSI map	DONE
ALL	Layered pdfs in appendix and a separate pdf with separate plans	
Blakeney	Check what I discussed with Paul at meeting regarding The Pastures designation as Amenity Green Space	DONE
ALL	Update 1.6 with details of consultation	DONE
ALL	Update with new HE guidance if this is published	DONE
Blakeney	Blakeney - ensure the Mulberry tree in response ref.B09 is plotted on the relevant map (Tree Officer can't TPO unless there is an actual threat).	
ALL	In retrospect Section 8.3 recommendation regarding uPVC windows not being permitted is somewhat overly prescriptive and reads as a blanket ban. Update to read: ' <i>uPVC windows and doors are seldom appropriate within a</i>	DONE

	<i>Conservation Area and will not be permitted on listed buildings'</i> . The rest of the para is fine.	
Morston	Reference to Village Design Statement	DONE
Wiveton	Reference to Village Design Statement	DONE
Morston	Follow up on copyright of NWHCM images	
ALL	Re-hyperlink and check links	