

PLANNING POLICY & BUILT HERITAGE WORKING PARTY

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party held on Monday, 12 October 2020 remotely via Zoom at 10.00 am

Committee	Mr A Brown (Chairman)	Mrs P Grove-Jones (Vice-Chairman)
	Mr T Adams	Mr D Baker
	Mr N Dixon	Mr P Fisher
	Ms V Gay	Mr P Heinrich
	Mr J Punchard	Dr C Stockton

Members also attending:

Observers:
Mr H Blathwayt
Mrs A Fitch-Tillett
Mrs W Fredericks
Mr J Rest
Miss L Shires
Mr J Toyne
Mrs L Withington

Officers in Attendance: Planning Policy Manager, Planning Policy Team Leader, Senior Planning Officer, Conservation and Design Officer, Conservation and Design Team Leader, Democratic Services Manager and Democratic Services & Governance Officer (Regulatory)

33 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

33 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

34 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

None.

35 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Working Party held on 14 September 2020 were approved as a correct record.

36 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

37 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor C Stockton declared an interest under item 39 as he was a resident of Happisburgh and the owner of a heritage asset.

38 UPDATE ON MATTERS FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING (IF ANY)

None.

39 LOCAL PLAN DRAFT POLICIES SD11: COASTAL EROSION, SD12: COASTAL ADAPTATION AND ENV3: HERITAGE & UNDEVELOPED COAST

The Chairman thanked those involved in the recovery from recent storm damage.

The Senior Planning Officer presented a report relating to draft coastal policies SD11: Coastal Erosion, SD12: Coastal Adaptation and ENV3: Heritage & Undeveloped Coast, which summarised the feedback received in response to the Regulation 18 public consultation and the Officer responses, and recommended that Cabinet endorse the policy approaches as set out in the report.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett, Coastal Portfolio Holder, requested an amendment to the recommendation to delegate responsibility for drafting the policy approach, including that of finalising the associated policies, to the Planning Policy Manager in conjunction with Coastal Manager. She stated that she was very proud of the document, and was relieved that coastal erosion and adaptation were covered in depth in the new policies. She explained that the protection of the coast was not always possible for engineering and cost reasons, and coast protection schemes must not have a wider impact on the coast. She stated that adaptation allowed communities to thrive, and referred to schemes that had been undertaken in Happisburgh that had benefited the village. She referred to paragraphs 166 and 167 of the NPPF as being particularly relevant.

Councillor Ms V Gay asked how geology had been addressed in the policy.

Councillor Mrs Fitch-Tillett stated that the effect of ground water pushing the cliffs outwards caused coastal erosion, and not the sea itself. She referred to a report from the British Geological Survey which the Coastal team would be happy to share.

The Officers explained that it had not been considered necessary to use the word 'geology' specifically in these policies, but it would be included as part of the coastal and adaptation supplementary planning document. Express reference would be made to geological interests in Policy ENV4: biodiversity and geology, which was an overarching policy that would apply across all development proposals. Policy ENV4 would be brought to the Working Party at a later date.

Councillor D Baker requested officer comments on a representation from Timewell Properties, which was a large employer in the area.

The Planning Policy Manager stated that the general thrust of the representation was for flexibility in the principles of roll back, to reflect the difficulties of rolling back large pre-existing uses such as caravan sites, and specifically to allow roll back within the risk area albeit mitigating that risk by locating further back from the cliff top. In his opinion, it was better to keep the policy as written and treat such applications as an exception to the policy where there was evidence to justify the exception.

The Senior Planning Officer explained that the reason for lengthening the time period in which properties were at risk was to allow for long term planning for relocation.

The Planning Policy Team Leader explained that the proposed policy was a strategic approach against which proposals would be judged. Tourism policies for caravan

sites and static caravans would come forward to a future meeting. Whilst those policies would seek to relocate caravans outside the Coastal Change Management Area, they would also allow for movement within it provided proposals took into account landscape and amenity.

Councillor C Stockton stated that he should have declared an interest at the beginning of the meeting as he was a resident of Happisburgh and the owner of a heritage building. He stated that one of his greatest concerns was the loss of irreplaceable heritage. There were three listed heritage buildings in Happisburgh that would be at risk from coastal erosion in the immediate future, including the Grade I listed Norman church. It was important to consider how those assets could be recorded to ensure they were not entirely lost and that future generations could see what had been there. Heritage was extremely important, but was not always taken into consideration as it was difficult to put a price on it.

It was proposed by Councillor A Brown, seconded by Councillor P Heinrich and

RESOLVED unanimously

That the recommendation be amended to include delegation to the Coastal Manager.

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

RECOMMENDED unanimously

That Cabinet endorses the revised Policies SD11: Coastal Erosion, SD12: Coastal Adaptation and ENV3: Heritage & Undeveloped Coast and delegates responsibility for drafting such an approach, including that of finalising the associated policies, to the Planning Policy Manager and Coastal Manager.

40 PROGRESS ON NORTH WALSHAM WESTERN EXTENSION

The Planning Policy Manager gave a verbal update on progress on the North Walsham Western Extension. He reported that there had been progress on the first draft of a highway evidence document in respect of the impact on the local highway network and it had now gone back to the consultants for clarification. The promoter had prepared an overarching viability assessment which indicated that the scheme was broadly viable. Discussions were taking place with the landowners of adjacent land which was critical to the delivery of the scheme. A revised visioning document had been prepared which established a broad set of visionary principles for the development brief. The draft development brief would be produced over the next few weeks, following which public consultation would be carried out.

41 GLAVEN VALLEY CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISALS & MANAGEMENT PLANS 2020

The Conservation and Design Officer presented a report in respect of Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans for Baconsthorpe, Glandford, Hempstead, Holt and Letheringsett. She outlined the changes to the Conservation Area boundaries and local listings. She informed the Working Party that it was intended to carry out public consultation in January and February in order to avoid the Christmas period and in the hope for more clarity regarding the situation with Covid-19. Whether or not a public exhibition could be held as part of the process would

depend on Government advice at the time and it may be necessary to consider other options. Following consultation, comments would be considered and amended documents brought to the Working Party in April 2021 for approval and recommendation to Cabinet for adoption.

Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones considered that that the documents were very good. However, whilst she appreciated that Conservation Areas should be kept as pure as possible, it was very costly to replace timber windows and difficult to find someone who could make an exact copy of the original. She considered that uPVC replacements could be acceptable in buildings of lesser importance if the original design could be copied.

Councillor C Stockton drew attention to paragraph 1.2 of the Officer's report which listed in detail the reasons why heritage was important.

Councillor D Baker stated that two of the Conservation Areas were within his Ward, and he totally agreed with the report.

It was proposed by Councillor P Heinrich, seconded by Councillor D Baker and

RECOMMENDED unanimously

- 1. That Cabinet approve the draft Conservation Area Appraisals for Baconsthorpe, Glandford, Hempstead, Holt and Letheringsett for public consultation.**
- 2. That following consultation, the amended appraisals be brought back to the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party for consideration and subsequent adoption by Cabinet.**

The meeting ended at 11.00 am.

Chairman