

PLANNING POLICY & BUILT HERITAGE WORKING PARTY

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party held on Monday, 18 January 2021 remotely via Zoom at 10.00 am

Committee Mr A Brown (Chairman) Mrs P Grove-Jones (Vice-Chairman)
Members Present: Mr T Adams Mr N Dixon
Mr P Fisher Ms V Gay
Mr P Heinrich Mr G Mancini-Boyle
Mr N Pearce Mr J Toye

Mrs A Fitch-Tillett (in place of Dr C Stockton)

Members also attending: Mrs W Fredericks
Mr N Housden
Mr R Kershaw
Mr J Rest

Officers in Attendance: Planning Policy Manager, Democratic Services Manager and Democratic Services & Governance Officer (Regulatory)

64 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J Punchard and Dr C Stockton. One substitute Member was in attendance as shown above.

65 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

None.

66 MINUTES

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

67 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

68 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

<u>Minute</u>	<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Interest</u>
70	A Brown	Involved in the preparation of the Corpusty & Saxthorpe Neighbourhood Plan (as Parish Councillor)
70	Mrs A Fitch-Tillett	Resident of Overstrand but designation does not affect her property

Councillor P Fisher stated that he was the Ward Member for Wells (Minute 71).

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

None.

70 LOCAL PLAN DRAFT SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES FOR SMALL GROWTH VILLAGES

The Planning Policy Manager presented a report that recommended the inclusion in the Local Plan of revised settlement boundaries around each of the Small Growth Villages.

The Chairman requested that the settlement boundary identified in the Corpusty & Saxthorpe Neighbourhood Plan be used as the Local Plan settlement boundary for Corpusty. He requested clarification as to how the Local Plan would be consulted upon and the approximate timescale.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that development boundaries that had been identified in existing or emerging Neighbourhood Plans would generally be used as a policy tool. He explained that the Local Plan was currently a working draft and would be revised prior to consultation. He stated that plans for Corpusty would be included, and a clear explanation given of the status of Neighbourhood Plans and how boundaries were defined in them.

With regard to the consultation process, it was expected that the review of the remaining policies would be completed by the middle of the year, with a working target of July to commence consultation. However, there was a great deal of work required to meet that target. The development boundaries would be published as a separate background paper and referred to in the Local Plan document and publicity material. A number of background papers would be published to provide the reasoned justification and supporting evidence for the key policy approaches.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett commented on the extended boundary for Overstrand around the garden centre. She considered that the land should be used for employment, and asked why the land immediately to the east of the garden centre had not been included within the boundary.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that the Planning Policy Team had followed a methodology in drawing up the settlement boundaries. The garden centre was part of the built up fabric of the village and its inclusion on those terms was reasonable. If built up areas such as garden centres were excluded, it would possibly mean excluding other facilities that were part of the structure of the village, which would be a different approach to the one that had been taken. He considered that it would be best to take a view based on the responses to the Regulation 19 consultation. There would be an opportunity to make modifications to the Plan if necessary between the Reg. 19 consultation and submission for examination and to request that the Inspector considers those modifications.

Councillor N Dixon requested clarification of the existing and proposed boundaries for Badersfield as he could not see any difference between them.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that there were some settlements where there had been little or no change that would justify moving the boundaries, and therefore the existing boundary had been used. He explained that boundary lines were not as critical as they had been in the past as the policies would allow more flexibility to develop outside the boundary where proposals were adjacent or closely related to the settlement.

Councillor Dixon considered that the document was confusing and it would be better to state that the future boundary would remain as already established.

The Planning Policy Manager agreed that it would be a useful amendment. He suggested that 'retain existing boundary as formerly defined' would be better terminology which would focus attention on the modifications instead of trying to amend the existing boundaries. He confirmed that the amendment would be made prior to consultation and stated that there would need to be significant changes to the consultation document to make it easier for the public to understand.

Councillor J Toye asked if the revised boundaries would be brought back before the Working Party prior to consultation, bearing in mind the timescales.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that he was seeking delegated authority to make the amendments so there would be no requirement to bring them back before the Working Party prior to consultation.

The Chairman referred to a planning application that had been refused at a recent meeting of the Development Committee as the site lay just outside the development boundary for North Walsham, which may have been acceptable under the new policy. An appeal decision was awaited on another site outside the development boundary of Holt.

Councillor J Rest asked if the boundary changes were likely to open up opportunities for developers to resubmit previously refused schemes. He had in mind a large scheme at Sculthorpe that had been refused.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that the approach would apply only to the Growth Villages and be subject to a caveat that there could be no more than 6% housing growth over the existing number of dwellings. The number of completions would be monitored. All proposals, regardless of location, would have to meet all other criteria, such as design, highways, landscape etc. It would provide modest opportunities for infill or rounding off on sites adjacent to the development boundary. It would not open up large scale development opportunities around towns and villages, such as the Sculthorpe proposal. There was a risk that this policy approach could lead to unsuitable proposals coming forward, but it would be for the Development Committee to consider and make a reasoned judgement.

Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones referred to a site at Catfield on the former mushroom farm, part of which the Parish Council would like to see developed for residential use. She asked if it could be argued under this policy.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that the site in question would continue to be designated as employment land in the new Plan. Although the Parish Council considered that there was a good case for residential development, the employment designation was a key policy hurdle and this policy approach would not affect it. It was a matter for an applicant to make a case to the Development Committee that the benefits of residential development outweighed the loss of employment land. It was not a matter for the Working Party to consider.

Councillor N Dixon considered that the reference to Tunstead Road in relation to Horning was incorrect. The Planning Policy Manager stated that he would check prior to publication.

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

RECOMMENDED

1. That Cabinet agree the settlement boundaries for the Small Growth Villages as a basis for Regulation 19 consultation and inclusion in the new Local Plan.
2. That Cabinet gives delegated authority to the Planning Policy Manager to produce boundaries for Sea Palling, Walcott and Potter Heigham in accordance with the methodology.

71 LOCAL PLAN OPEN LAND AREA DESIGNATIONS - WELLS-NEXT-THE-SEA

The Planning Policy Manager presented a report in respect of additional open land designations at Wells-next-the-Sea.

The Chairman stated that the site photographs at page 93 and 94 of the report should be numbered AGS/WEL22.

The Planning Policy Manager referred to representations that had been submitted by Mr Peter Terrington, which had been circulated to the Working Party, in support of the designation of the three areas of land that had been identified in the report. Whilst Mr Terrington had acknowledged that two of the sites did not qualify for designating as Open Land Areas, he had requested that other controlling mechanisms, such as Article 4 Directions, be applied to those sites. The Planning Policy Manager explained that Article 4 Directions were used to limit specific types of development that would otherwise be permitted and could be applied at any time. He advised the Working Party that it was not appropriate to consider them in relation to Local Plan preparation. He offered to prepare a separate report for the Working Party with regard to Article 4 Directions if required. The development potential of the two sites in question was already limited as they were subject to other policy constraints, being within the AONB, Conservation Area and high flood risk area. He stated that he would write to Mr Terrington following the meeting.

Councillor P Fisher, the local Member, reported that the Town Clerk had indicated support for the recommendation to designate the site opposite the sailing club and that there were no issues with the other sites that were not recommended.

At the request of the Chairman, the Planning Policy Manager expanded further on the background to Article 4 Directions.

Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones asked if restrictive covenants were a limiting factor.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that restrictive covenants were separate legal controls that were nothing to do with the Local Planning Authority and could only be enforced by the person that had imposed them. Often there was an overlap with planning conditions, which were enforceable by the Local Planning Authority.

The Planning Policy Manager presented the recommendation as set out in the report. He suggested that a training event for all Members on the broader issue of planning controls, to include Article 4 Directions, might be appropriate. The Working Party supported this suggestion.

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

RECOMMENDED unanimously

That Cabinet includes the additional Open Land Area Designation for site WEL22 (Wells East Quay) in the Local Plan.

The meeting ended at 11.04 am.

Chairman