

Broads Authority

Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2012

Present:

Mr M Barnard	Mr M Jeal
Mrs S Blane	Dr J S Johnson
Mrs J Brociek-Coulton.	Mr A S Mallett
Professor J Burgess	Mr P E Ollier
Mr N Dixon	Mr P Rice

In Attendance:

Mrs S A Beckett – Administrative Officer
Mr F Bootman – Planning Officer
Ms M Hammond – Planning Assistant
Mr S Hayden – Arboricultural Consultant
Ms A Long – Director of Planning and Strategy
Mr D Lowens – for the Solicitor
Mr A Scales – Planning Officer (NPS)
Ms C Smith – Head of Development Management
Ms K Wood – Planning Assistant

Members of the public in attendance who spoke:

BA/2012/0139/FUL Compartment 2, 100m Length of the Right Riverbank, River Chet , Near Nodgam End

Mr Jeremy Halls BESL Agent for Applicant.

BA/2012/0153/FUL Compartment 6 Hickling Hill Common, Adjacent to Waters Edge, Hickling

Jeremy Halls BESL Agent for Applicant
Mrs Sandra Clarke Hickling Parish Council

BA/2012/0132/FUL Hickling Parish Staithe, Staithe Road, Hickling

Ms Shirley Sainsbury Objector
Mrs Sandra Clarke, Hickling Parish Council

BA/2012/0111/EXT 13W Cantley Sugar Factory, Staithe Road, Cantley

Mr M Tolley and Mr Redhead British Sugar On behalf of Applicant

BA/2012/0148/FUL White Lodge, 3 Kingfisher Lane, South Walsham

Mr Anthony Knights Agent for Applicant

BA/2012/0127/FUL 2 Broad Road, Fleggburgh
Mr Best Applicant
Ms Rachel Balls Objector

Appointment of Temporary Chairman

In view of the absence of the Chairman and Vice- Chairman, the Director of Planning and Strategy invited nominations for the appointment of a Temporary Chairman for the meeting. Having been nominated and duly seconded, it was

RESOLVED

that Dr Stephen Johnson be appointed as Chairman for the meeting.

Dr Stephen Johnson in the Chair

The Acting Chairman invited nominations for a temporary Vice-Chairman for the duration of the meeting. Having been nominated and duly seconded it was

RESOLVED

that Mr Alan Mallett be appointed as Vice-Chairman for the meeting.

10/1 Apologies for Absence and Welcome

Apologies for absence were received from Dr J M Gray, Mr C Gould and Mr R Stevens.

The Acting Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and in particular Professor Jacquie Burgess, newly appointed by the Secretary of State and Mr Michael Jeal, appointed by Great Yarmouth Borough Council.

10/2 Declarations of Interest

Members introduced themselves and expressed declarations of interest as set out in Appendix 1 to these minutes.

10/3 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 May 2012 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Acting Chairman.

10/4 Points of Information Arising from the Minutes

Minute 9/8(5) BA/2012/0124/CU: Carlton Marshes Nature Reserve, Carlton Colville

The Head of Development Management reported that since the last meeting, some members had attended a site inspection on 8 June 2012 to consider the impact of the scheme in the context of the Development Management Policies. In addition, the Authority had received the details of the objector's representations made at Committee and had requested further information from the applicant. A report would be brought back to members in due course.

10/5 To note whether any items have been proposed as matters of urgent business

There were no items of urgent business.

10/6 Chairman's Announcements and Introduction to Public Speaking

(1) The Acting Chairman gave notice of the Fire Regulations. .

(2) Public Speaking

The Acting Chairman reminded everyone that the new scheme for public speaking was in operation for consideration of planning applications, details of which were contained in the Code of Conduct for Members and Officers, and that the time period was five minutes for all categories of speaker. Those who wished to speak were requested to come up to the public speaking desk at the beginning of the presentation of the relevant application.

10/7 Requests to Defer Applications and /or vary the order of the Agenda

No requests had been made to defer any applications.

10/8 Applications for Planning Permission

The Committee considered applications submitted under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as well as matters of enforcement (also having regard to Human Rights), and reached decisions as set out below. Acting under its delegated powers the Committee authorised the immediate implementation of the decisions.

The following minutes relate to further matters of information, or detailed matters of policy not already covered in the officers' reports, and which were given additional attention.

- (1) **BA/2012/0139/FUL Compartment 22,100m Length of the Right River Bank of the River Chet, Near Nogdam Dam**
Applicant: Environment Agency

The Planning Officer explained that the retrospective application was before members as it related to urgent works that had already been carried out on a 100metre length of existing flood defences where a section of piling had failed on the south side of the River Chet close to its confluence with the River Yare. Most of the flood defences within the main Compartment, of which this stretch was a part, had yet to be the subject of major flood defence works. The Environment Agency claimed that the work had to be carried out due to the navigation hazard of the existing piling as well as a large area of grazing marsh being at risk of flooding.

The Planning Officer reported that the Navigation Committee had considered the application at its meeting on 7 June 2012 and no adverse comments had been received. He drew attention to the objections received from Hales-with- Heckingham Parish Council particularly relating to the retrospective nature of the application. He stressed that although the application was retrospective and this was regrettable, it needed to be determined in the same way as any other application. It was clear that without the action having been taken, there would have been a severe increased risk of flooding. The scheme sought to remedy a failure in flood defences and represented a sustainable form of defences that would safeguard grazing grassland areas and properties, the ecological interest of the area, the navigational interest and the visual amenity. Officers were also satisfied that the soft treatment implemented would be satisfactory in this location and that the erosion monitoring should provide satisfactory safeguards. The application was recommended for approval.

Mr Halls, on behalf of BESL, was given the opportunity to address the Committee and explained that the work had not yet been completed due to the wet weather conditions. It was hoped that it would be completed within two weeks' time. In the meantime the current defences were holding. He reported that with regard to a wider comprehensive scheme for the whole area, BESL had carried out preliminary consultations with landowners and local councillors and would soon be undertaking wider public consultation with a view to submitting a subsequent planning application.

Although the retrospective nature of the application was regretted, members recognised that the works being undertaken were necessary and considered that subject to the monitoring conditions the scheme was acceptable.

RESOLVED unanimously

that the application be approved subject to conditions as outlined in the report to Committee together with an Informative relating to the Memorandum of Understanding between the Authority and the Environment Agency of 25 April 2003 and the possible need for separate flood defence consent from the IDB. It was considered that the scheme met the development plan provisions and requirements of the Core Strategy DPD and Development Management Policies DPD, most notably those contained in adopted Core Strategy (2007) Policies CS3, CS4, and CS20; Broads Development Management Policies DPD (2011) Policies DP13 and DP29; and the advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

(2) **BA/2012/0153/FUL Compartment 6, Hickling Hill Common adjacent to Waters Edge, Hickling**

Part-retrospective application for a change in alignment of 8m of crest piling adjacent to the quay heading outside Watersedge, Hill Common. Installation of new steps over crest piling to allow access to the water. (Revised proposal following withdrawal of application BA 2011/0337/FUL and BA/2012/0046/FUL)
Applicant: Environment Agency

The Planning Officer reminded members of the background to the application in that planning permission had been granted for a large area of flood defences in the Hickling Common area where previously no flood defences had been provided. He explained that this was the third planning application submitted by BESL that sought planning permission for steps over installed crest piling outside Watersedge in Hill Common. He reminded members that they had approved an application in March 2012 in the area, but that this element been withdrawn. He explained the retrospective nature of the application which related to the alignment of the crest piling. This was due to the detail of the crest piling on the approved drawings not matching exactly that which was constructed. When under construction, the site engineers had considered that installing the crest piling right up to the mooring edge would create too big a step up/down to the rond. Therefore the application proposed limited changes from the approved scheme in relation to the alignment of timber capped crest piling. The steps had been relocated further to the south east of the initial siting, in order to provide an improvement that would be less prominent to the objector and was considered to represent a safe alternative access to the area where the width of the rond was limited.

The Planning Officer reported that since the report had been written, further consultations had been received:

- NCC Highways – no objections;
- Environment Agency – no objections.

He drew attention to the comments and objections from the Parish Council as well as those received from the occupier of Timber Gables. He emphasised that the area had changed significantly since 2010. However, it was considered that the application represented a very small revision in relation to the whole area and the original planning permission and therefore would not have an unacceptable impact on the appearance or landscape setting of the area. It was acknowledged that the hand rail would appear above the crest piling but this was not unacceptable and it would provide assistance for those less able as well as being of materials consistent with the timber appearance of crest piling in the area. With regard to the concern about the obstruction to the highway, the Highways Authority shared officers' view that this would not have a significant impact on highway safety and would not interfere with existing rights. The steps would not project into the roadway and cause a potential obstruction. Therefore in conclusion, the Planning Officer recommended approval of the application.

Mrs Clarke, on behalf of Hickling Parish Council, was given the opportunity to address the Committee. She stated the concerns detailed in the report to committee regarding the differences in the drawings to that which had been constructed, the objections on landscape grounds and the visual intrusion into a sensitive area, the retrospective nature of the proposals especially when the occupier of Timber Gables had drawn attention to those differences while under construction, and the omission of the drainage channels and arrangements within the plans for this revised application.

Mr Halls, on behalf of BESL, apologised for the retrospective nature of the application, as detailed in the report. He admitted that the original design was flawed and that while under construction, the contractors did not consider it safe and unfortunately had not referred these findings back to the office. He explained that the owners of Watersedge had a legitimate right of access. Following objections being received from Mr Mann, the owner of Timber Gables, BESL had responded and adjusted the plans to those now before members. He considered that the substantial concerns expressed by Mr Mann had been addressed. With regard to the drainage issue raised by the Parish Council, consent had already been granted and agreement had been reached with Mr Mann and therefore they were not included as part of this application.

When considering the application, members recognised that although exceedingly disappointed at the retrospective nature of the application, it needed to be considered within the rules and on the basis of justification, landscape impact/design, highway safety and amenity. In general, members concurred with the officers' assessment and considered that, on balance, the original scheme was impractical and the revised application was justifiable and of an acceptable design. However, some members had concerns about the visual impact.

RESOLVED by 8 votes to 0 with 2 abstentions

that the application be approved subject to conditions as outlined in the report. The application was considered to meet the requirements of the development plan policy (notably Core Strategy Policies CS3 and CS4 and Development Management Policies DPD DP4, DP12 and DP28) and would not materially conflict with other policies. It was considered to represent an appropriate design of development associated with existing flood defence work in this location.

- (3) **BA/2012/0132/FUL Hickling Parish Staithe, Staithe Road, Hickling**
Renovation of Parish Staithe including 3 no additional wet moorings, a vehicular barrier at the southern access, improvements to existing slipway and landscaping of the site
Applicant: Hickling Parish Council

The Planning Assistant explained that the application site of the Staithe was owned and managed by Hickling Parish Council. Improvements to the staithe included the digging of a mooring cut to the north of the northern dyke to provide three additional moorings. The moorings would be used for long –term private moorings as within the existing dyke. In addition the application involved the realignment and extension of slipways as well as the erection of a vehicle barrier over the southern entrance which served one of the slipways. The Planning Assistant drew attention to the objections and concerns expressed, particularly relating to the character of the area and the inclusion of a barrier across the path.

Since the report had been written, comments had been received from Highways who considered that the improvements were acceptable and would take traffic away from the bend. In addition, the Local District member had updated comments giving full support to the application. A further letter of objection had been received making a total of three objections with one letter of support.

The Planning Assistant, having addressed the concerns, concluded that the application could be recommended for approval as it was considered to represent an improvement to an existing community and visitor facility through the small increase in number of available moorings. It would also improve navigational safety and security of the site.

Mrs Sainsbury, as an objector, was given the opportunity to address the Committee. She explained that there was not an objection to the slipway being renovated but there were concerns about proposed irreversible changes that were considered unnecessary. She detailed the concerns summarised within the report to Committee emphasising those relating to the lack of consultation by the Parish Council with the rest of the village community and the proposed barrier. It was considered that there were a number of details relating to consultation

and management that had not been properly addressed and therefore the application should be deferred.

Mrs Clarke, on behalf of Hickling Parish Council, the applicants, gave an outline of the history of the application, emphasising that the Staithe was a private staithe for the benefit of the people of Hickling. She provided justification for the improvements, relating to access and security as well as providing additional moorings to try and meet some of the great demand for the mooring facilities for those who lived within the village community. It was clarified that the mooring berths were exclusively for those within the village. The dry berths on land were for others. The Parish Council recognised that the slipway was deteriorating and the aim was to improve the facilities and tidy the whole area. With regard to the proposed barrier, the Parish Council was willing to work with the Authority's Landscape Officer on the plans and materials for that barrier.

The Solicitor clarified that there were a number of issues which were not material planning considerations. When considering the application, it was important to separate these out. The main issues to consider were the principle of the development, the impact on the character of the area, and the impact on navigation, access, highways and archaeology. Matters relating to consultation, provided the statutory requirements were met, and the details on management and parish funding were not planning considerations.

Members considered that the proposals would provide improved facilities for the community, recognising that the character of the staithe and the boats using it had altered over the years. It was considered that the revised access would assist navigation in close waters. Although some members had concerns and reservations over the barrier, and some landscaping, they were satisfied that the conditions recommended would safeguard those reservations. Members concurred with the officer's assessment and on the basis of planning criteria, considered the application was acceptable.

RESOLVED unanimously

that the application be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report as the application was considered to be in accordance with Development Plan Policies, in particular Policies CS1, CS10, CS14, CS15 and CS17 of the adopted Core Strategy 2007 and Policies DP2, DP4, DP5, DP12, DP13 and DP16 of the adopted Development Management Policies DPD 2011.

(4) **BA/2012/0111/EXT 13W Cantley Sugar Factory, Staithe Road, Cantley**

Extension of existing time limit of previous PP BA/2008/0307/FUL
Applicant: Cantley Sugar Factory Mr Mark Tolley

The Planning Officer explained that the application was for the extension of time for the application originally granted consent in 2009 for the construction of a new evaporator plant and for the erection of a number of new buildings to enable the processing of raw cane sugar at the Cantley Sugar Factory site and enable the site to operate 24 hours a day all year round. He commented that the original application had been contentious and been given very careful consideration, the main concerns being the increase in traffic and all year round working. He explained that unless there were significant changes in policy since the application had been approved, there should be a presumption in favour of granting permission for an extension of time.

Since the application was approved, there had been several policy changes with the publication of the NPPF, adoption of a new set of Development Management Policies and emergence of a draft Site Specifics DPD, replacing the principal policy against which the original application was assessed (CAN1 within the Broads Plan). Policy CAN1 remained extant and the policy arguments against which the application was assessed remained. There was no conflict between CAN1 and the emerging draft Site Specifics DPD. He took the Committee through each of the changes.

The Planning Officer stated that the extension of time application had been assessed against these new policies and it was considered that these did not significantly alter the policy context and there were no policy grounds for refusal for extension of time. It was considered that the NPPF document supported the decision made in 2009 to support the application.

A condition of the original permission was that a feasibility study of the viability of transport by water should be carried out and this had been completed and published in 2009, concluding that river transport would be financially and operationally feasible. Although the Authority might support the applicant in pursuing a river based transportation strategy, there was no policy requirement to ship freight by river in preference to road. Therefore there were no grounds for refusal of the application for an extension of time on this basis. In addition there were no highway objections although the requirements for a Highways and Travel Plans contributions contained in the previously signed S106 Agreement remained. Therefore, permission for the extension of time should be subject to the signing of a S106 Agreement, linking the consent to the previously signed S106 Agreement as detailed in Para 6.29 of the report (not 7.3 as stated in the recommendation). In conclusion the Planning Officer recommended approval.

Members concurred with the Officers' assessment.

RESOLVED unanimously

that the application be approved subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 Agreement as detailed at paragraph 6.29 of the report relating to Highways and detailed conditions as outlined in the report. The application was considered to be in accordance with the Broads Local Plan Policy CAN1 (still extant) and there were not considered to be any material considerations as to warrant the refusal of the granting of an extension of time for the implementation of the consent BA/2008/0307/FUL.

(5) **BA/2012/0148/FUL White Lodge, 3 Kingfisher Lane, South Walsham**

Retrospective application for a side and front extension to existing garage and erection of an open sided summerhouse
Applicant: Mr Matthew Thwaites

Mr Mallett, having declared an interest, left the room for this item.

The Planning Assistant explained that the application was before members due to objections, details of which were contained in the report. The application involved development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling that was incidental to the enjoyment of the main dwelling. These involved two lean-to extensions to the garage and the erection of a thatched open sided summerhouse on the edge of the broad where previously there had been decking. The proposals were within the curtilage of a dwelling where there was extant planning permission for a replacement dwelling. Although the application was regrettably retrospective, this was not a material consideration. In conclusion the Planning Officer recommended approval as the design scale, form and materials were considered to be appropriate to their setting and were not considered to adversely affect amenities.

Mr Knights, on behalf of the applicant, was given the opportunity to address the Committee. He confirmed that the construction of the new dwelling to which the proposals related was imminent and that the proposals would be incidental to the use of that dwelling. In response to the objections from the Parish Council he did not agree that the proposals were not in keeping with the Broads or the surrounding area but were very much within the vernacular of the character of South Walsham Broad. He referred to other properties on the broad and therefore considered that the proposals would not set a dangerous precedent. He considered that the design, scale and materials were in keeping with the advice from the Historic Environment Manager and that the proposals were acceptable in terms of Broads Authority policies and the National Planning Policy Framework. He commented that his client, not having sought advice from his agent, was under the false impression that he was able to carry out the development under

permitted development rights. He therefore apologised for the error and confirmed that his client was aware that he no longer had the benefit of permitted development rights.

Again members expressed extreme disappointment at the retrospective nature of the application. However, the Acting Chairman stated that members needed to recognise that the Authority's monitoring and enforcement procedures were now more robust and regularising such apparent breaches was a proper necessary process.. The Solicitor commented that although an unusual situation, retrospective applications had to be considered on their planning merits. If members were minded to vote for refusal and against officer recommendation, the reasons for doing so should be clear and soundly based on policy.

Although members expressed some concern at the prominence of the summerhouse, they were reassured and considered that the design of the building was in keeping with the character of the area when this was viewed against the backdrop of trees and in the context of other structures within the area. One member expressed concern about the lights on the outside structure which, appeared to him, to be incongruous and not in keeping. However, on balance, members considered the proposals to be acceptable.

RESOLVED by 8 votes to 0 with 1 abstention

that the application be approved subject to conditions as outlined in the report as the application is considered to be in accordance with Policies DP4 and DP28 of the adopted Development Management Policies Document 2011 and Policy CS1 of the adopted Core Strategy (2007) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

- (6) **BA/2012/0127/FUL 2 Broad Road, Fleggburgh**
Replacement of existing garage with timber and brick garage and replacement of existing conservatory with a brick extension
Applicant: Mr Best

The Planning Assistant explained that the application was for the replacement of an existing dilapidated conservatory with a single story brick and tile lean-to extension with upvc windows and two velux style roof lights. It also included a replacement garage on the same footprint as the existing. It was before Committee as there was an objection from the neighbour on the grounds of loss of light, concerns over size and height of the replacement garage and design not in-keeping with existing buildings.

In conclusion the Planning Assistant recommended approval as the proposal was considered to be an appropriate form of development which would visually enhance the character of the area and would not have a significant adverse impact on neighbouring amenity.

Ms Balls, the resident of the neighbouring property 2 Ruggs Lane, was given the opportunity to address the Committee detailing the comments made in the report expressing concerns about the accuracy of the drawings, the larger replacement garage and the increased ridge heights, potential loss of light into her back garden and the design not being in keeping with the existing buildings. She expressed concern that her right to privacy would be impinged.

In response Mr Best, the applicant, commented that he was gradually renovating the property and bringing it up to present day standards. He recognised that the garage and existing conservatory detracted from the area. Therefore the aim of the proposal was to improve the overall appearance and replace the unusable, non-watertight structure and unusable garage with structures more fit for purpose. He confirmed that the lean-to extension would be single storey.

Members accepted that the proposals would be an improvement on the existing structures but considered that the heights proposed would obscure the light into the neighbouring property and also have an impact on neighbouring amenity. Mr Jeal proposed that the application be refused. This was seconded by Mr Mallett although it was suggested that the applicant might reconsider the roof heights. Following further discussion, Mr Jeal, supported by Mr Mallett withdrew the motion.

Mrs Blane proposed, seconded by Mr Rice and it was

RESOLVED unanimously

that the application be deferred for further discussions between the applicant and Authority officers to address concerns over the height of the extension and light restrictions on the neighbouring property 3 Ruggs Lane.

10/9 Tree Preservation Order Legislation: Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012

The Committee received a report setting out the recent changes to the Town and Country Planning legislation relating to Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs). The new legislation followed consultation on the simplification of issuing and management of TPOs, subject of a previous Committee report in February 2008. In effect the new legislation meant that when a TPO was placed on a tree, it would no longer be temporary and would need to be confirmed within six months. It was stressed that the Authority would continue to serve notice of TPOs on adjacent landowners although this was not now a requirement.

Members welcomed the potential implications of the new regulations and the benefits in both time and resources for the management of TPOs and applications to work on protected trees.

RESOLVED

that the report and the guidance on tree preservation procedures be noted.

10/10 Consultation Documents Update and Proposed Responses

The Committee received a report setting out the planning policy consultations recently received on:

- Norfolk County Council Minerals Site Specifics Allocations Development Plan Document Pre-submission.

It was noted that the proposed site at Fritton which the Broads Authority had previously objected to was not allocated and this was welcomed.

- Norfolk County Council Waste Site Specifics Allocations Development Plan Document: Pre-Submission.

RESOLVED

that the report be noted and the nature of the responses be endorsed.

10/11 Enforcement Update

The Committee received an updated report on enforcement matters already referred to Committee. The Head of Development Management provided further updates on:

- **South Side of Thorpe Island (New Cut): Unauthorised Mooring of Vessels**
Network Rail procedures were still underway and some of the vessels had been removed.
- **“Thorpe Island Marina” West side of Thorpe Island, Norwich.**
(Former Jenners Basin) unauthorised development - moorings, pontoons and jetties, storage, containers.

The Authority had received the Inspector’s decision on the appeal that had been dealt with at Public Inquiry on 1, 2 and 3 May 2012, copies of which had been circulated to members and was now on the Authority’s website <http://pa/online-applications/appealDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=LV5WEGTB00200>

It was a split decision but the key planning arguments put forward by the Authority had been upheld ie: the previous planning permission for the basin was abandoned and planning permission was required for the mooring of vessels. The Enforcement Notice was upheld although some alterations were made. Planning permission had been granted for a low level of private moorings of up to 12 boats with no residential moorings.

However, the permission was subject to strict conditions including submission of a landscaping scheme and a scheme for access, parking and treatment of the bridge. The appellant was required to remove the pontoons and other structures within six weeks and submit the necessary details of the schemes required otherwise the planning permission granted would lapse.

The Authority would monitor the site and would ensure that the Inspector's decision was enforced. Officers had been authorised to take enforcement action in consultation with the Solicitor in relation to the site in 2010 and would do so in accordance with the Inspector's decision. Members endorsed the proposed action and wished to reinforce their delegation of authority to take enforcement action if required.

RESOLVED

that the report be noted and that the Director of Planning and Strategy, in consultation with the Solicitor, be authorised to take enforcement action in respect of the former Jenner's Basin site, Thorpe St Andrew, should this be necessary to implement the Inspector's decision.

10/12 Appeals to the Secretary of State: Update

The Committee received a table showing the position regarding appeals against the Authority since December 2011 as set out in Appendix 1 to the report and as minuted at 10/11 (above) in relation to the Jenner's Basin site (Appeal Ref E9505/C/11/2165163)

In addition, the Head of Development Management reported on:

Wayford Hotel Holiday Cottages E9505/A12/2175137 – 21757401

Appeal against the refusal of permission for use of holiday accommodation for permanent residential use.

The Inspector had decided to deal with the appeal by public inquiry.

RESOLVED

that the report be noted.

10/13 Decisions Made by Officers under Delegated Powers

The Committee received a schedule of decisions made by officers under delegated powers from 15 May 2012 to 12 June 2012.

RESOLVED

that the report be noted.

10/14 Date of Next Meeting

It was noted that the next meeting of the Planning Committee would be held on Friday 20 July 2012 at 10.00am at Dragonfly House, 2 Gilders Way, Norwich. This would be followed by a meeting of the Heritage Asset Review Group.

The meeting concluded at 13.10 pm

CHAIRMAN

APPENDIX 1

Code of Conduct for Members

Declaration of Interests

Committee: Planning Committee

Date: 22 June 2012

Name	Agenda Item/Minute No(s)	Nature of Interest (Please describe the nature of the interest)	Please tick here if the interest is a Prejudicial interest √
P E Ollier	All Items Generally	Member of Navigation Committee, Toll Payer, Member of various sailing organisations	
P Rice		Norfolk CC member for area	
M Barnard		Member of WDC and SCC	
A S Mallett	General 10/3 And 10/8(i) 10/8(v) 10/11	Minutes as per previous meeting Appointed by Broadland District Council, Member of Navigation Committee (but did not take part in the debate when considered) Applicant and Agent personal friends Enforcement Norwich Frostbite Sailing Club Commodore so will withdraw if matter discussed	√ √
N Dixon	All	General Member of Norfolk County Council	