

Broads Authority

Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 21 June 2013

Present:

Dr J M Gray – in the Chair

Mr M Barnard	Dr J S Johnson
Miss S Blane	Mr P E Ollier
Prof J Burgess	Mr R Stevens
Mr C Gould	Mr P Warner
Mrs L H Hemsall	

In Attendance:

Mrs S A Beckett – Administrative Officer
Ms N Beal – Planning Policy Officer
Mr S Bell – for the Solicitor
Mr B Hogg – Historic Environment Manager
Mr F Bootman – Planning Officer
Ms M Hammond – Planning Assistant
Ms A Long – Director of Planning and Resources
Ms C Smith – Head of Development Management
Ms K Wood – Planning Officer

Members of the Public in attendance who spoke:

BA/2013/0072/FUL Cantley Sugar Factory, Station Road, Cantley

Mr N Tuck	Vice-Chairman of Cantley Parish Council
Mr A Proctor	District Council Ward Member
Mr M Tolley	British Sugar, Cantley
Mr S Lynn	British Sugar, Cantley

BA/2013/0089/CU Church Farm, Church Road, Burgh Castle

Mr Craig Page	Agent On behalf of the Applicant
---------------	----------------------------------

BA/2013/0100/FUL White Lodge, Kingfisher Lane, South Walsham

Mrs Thwaites	The Applicant
--------------	---------------

13/1 Apologies for Absence and Welcome

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs J Brociek-Coulton, Mr N Dixon and Mr C Fox.

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the Planning Committee meeting and gave an outline of its composition, currently 12 members. It was noted that

there had been a number of changes to membership following the recent County Council elections as well as the annual meetings of the Local Authorities. Colin Fox had been appointed by Great Yarmouth Borough Council but Norfolk County Council had not yet confirmed their representation.

13/2 Declarations of Interest

Members introduced themselves and expressed declarations of interest as set out in Appendix 1 to these minutes. The Chairman declared interests on behalf of all members relating to Item 13/8(1) BA/2013/0072/FUL having been lobbied by objectors as well as supporters of the application and agenda item 13/8(4) BA/2013/0126/FUL on being lobbied by objectors.

13/3 Minutes: 24 May 2013

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2013 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman subject to an amendment to Minute 12/8(1) Page 4 para 3 re the number of alternative sites examined to read "8".

13/4 Points of Information Arising from the Minutes

There were no points of information to be reported.

13/5 To note whether any items have been proposed as matters of urgent business

No items had been proposed as matters of urgent business.

13/6 Chairman's Announcements and Introduction to Public Speaking

- (1) RTPI Planning Summer School 6 - 9 September 2013 University of Leeds 80th Anniversary.**
Theme: Planning for Prosperity to include practitioners and councillors

The Chairman reminded Members of the annual RTPI conference to be opened by Lord Taylor of Goss Moor. This was especially useful for new members on the Committee. If anyone was interested in attending they were requested to inform the Administrative Officer.

- (2) Broads Authority Policies**

The Chairman drew attention to the Clear folders of the Authority's Core Strategy and Development Management Policies together with the NPPF that were available for all members. The list of policies compatible with the NPPF was also included. The file was for use during the meetings and could be handed in at the end.

(3) **Public Speaking**

The Chairman reminded everyone that the scheme for public speaking was in operation for consideration of planning applications, details of which were contained in the revised 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.

13/7 Requests to Defer Applications and /or Vary the Order of the Agenda

No requests had been received to defer items.

13/8 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/2013/0072/FUL Cantley Sugar Factory, Station Road, Cantley**
Proposed extension in height of two existing sugar syrup storage tanks along with an additional storage tank and associated landscaping
Applicant: Mr Mark Tolley British Sugar (Cantley) Ltd.

The Planning Officer reminded members that the application had been deferred from two previous meetings Minute 11/8(1) for further consultation and Minute 12/8(1) in order to provide members with the opportunity to visit the site to examine the concerns relating to residential amenity expressed by the community and to view the nature of the site. The site visit had taken place on Friday 7 June 2013, a note of which was attached to the report before members today.

The Planning Officer provided a detailed presentation and comprehensive assessment of the proposal that comprised two main elements namely increasing the height of the two existing syrup tanks from 15metres to 19.37 metres and the construction of a new silo of 28.2m in height to the west of the existing two silos. He explained the reasons for assessing the application against the criteria in the emerging Policy PP/CAN1 of the Broads Site Specific Policy DPD as well as the NPPF and that this was also in the context of all of the Authority's Development Management Policies, particularly Policy DP28. In assessing the application the Planning Officer focused on the key areas of concern namely the impact on landscape, the impact on

amenity particularly the loss of an area of amenity space and the impact of the proposed new tank in terms of overshadowing and overbearing impact, the requirements of the NPPF and ecology.

He provided photographs showing the site from various vantage points including neighbouring sites Grange Road and Station Road from where most of the concerns had been expressed, and from within the site, also providing a reminder to those members who had been on the site visit. In particular he explained the landscaping scheme including the areas where trees would be retained and the areas of new planting together with photomontages of the site after one year from construction and following maturity as seen from opposite the lorry entrance to the site. The Planning Officer also explained a plan illustrating cross sections of the proposals on the application site and the distances between proposed silos, bunds and the houses.

Since the site visit and the writing of the report further consultations had been received from the Environment Agency which had no objections relating to flood risk or pollution, and three representations in support of the application; two from farmers and one from the NFU emphasising the importance of the Cantley site to the economy of the area. Copies of the latter had been sent to most Members of the Committee and were available to all those present.

The Planning Officer particularly drew attention to the main issues arising as a result of the site visit relating to alternative sites, the design of the new bund, colour of silos and planting. He explained that following the site visit British Sugar had provided a map together with detailed assessment of the 10 different locations that had been investigated for the new silo within the 60 ha complex, the vast majority of which were used for a specific purpose and would require rearrangement of the whole operation of the site (details of which were provided on the Authority's website and were explained later in the meeting).

British Sugar had also provided detailed documentation explaining the engineering requirements for the design of the bunds which were also now available on the Authority's website. He explained that officers were satisfied that it would not be possible to retain the existing planting and mound and retain the 110% containment capacity as required by the Environment Agency. Therefore, it was considered that the increase in height and re-profiling of the new bund was an appropriate design and was fully justified to meet the necessary regulations.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the new silo would be painted in the same off-white colour as the other silos on site. With regards to the landscape scheme, subject to approval of the application, specific details would be dealt with by officers and it would be reasonable to include evergreen species, although this would be subject to taking

advice from the Authority's Landscape Officer and Arboricultural Consultant. Although it was recognised that there would be a significant impact on the landscape and on the outlook of a number of residential properties, it was considered that the proposals would be seen within the context of a large industrial site and therefore ultimately the impact would be neutral. The distances from the silos were also considered to protect the amenity of the neighbouring residents.

With regard to ecology, the substantial loss of trees initially could potentially result in a loss of habitat and in accordance with requirements the applicant had submitted additional ecological surveys prior to this meeting. Although there did not appear to be any ecological concerns, this would require detailed examination and officers would need to be assured that any mitigating measures were included and appropriate.

The Planning Officer commented that the guidance from the NPPF was unequivocal with regard to sustainable economic development. The Cantley factory was a significant employer within the Broads providing 200 to 300 jobs on site and supporting 1,000s in the wider community including about 500 sugar beet growers thus contributing to the economic benefits of the region and nationally. Therefore, refusal would be contrary to the guidance from the NPPF.

The Planning Officer therefore recommended that the application be delegated to officers for approval subject to assessment of the ecological surveys and subject to conditions.

Mr Tuck the Vice-Chairman of Cantley Parish Council thanked the Planning Committee Members for attending the site visit. He drew attention to and reiterated the concerns expressed at the previous meeting particularly relating to amenity and questioned the interpretation of the policy with regard to protection of that amenity.

Representatives from British Sugar, the Project Manager and Factory Manager provided details of the ten different locations within the site that had been considered as options for the siting of the new silo and the reasons for discounting nine of them and proposing the current application. All the sites currently had a use for either storage of soil, coal or limex and therefore using any one of these would require the existing use to be displaced and relocated on the site. The site within the application was considered to be the one that would cause least disruption and have least impact on the village. In answer to questions, it was confirmed that the material for the new bund would be sourced from within the site and from beet wash. With regard to overlooking, it was clarified that access to the top of the silos for maintenance was required but on an infrequent basis and was restricted and secured. There was a carefully orientated and detailed CCTV system for within the site which did not extend to overlooking neighbouring properties.

Mr Proctor one of the two District Council members for Cantley commented that the Cantley Factory and the residents of Cantley needed to co-exist. It was important that the factory, the Authority and the community worked together and it was encouraging to note that there had been dialogue and he hoped that this would continue.

He quoted the planning Policy PP/CAN1 particularly criteria (b) and (d) and considered that the report and the assessment had not judged the application against these sufficiently. He considered that the development would not be seen in the context of the main body of the site, would dominate the skyline, have an overbearing effect and would have an adverse impact on the character and amenity of the area. He considered that the application did not meet the policy requirements and therefore did not meet the tests of the emerging policy. He considered that the assessment was fundamentally flawed and the application should be refused.

Members considered that it had been particularly useful to have had the site visit and have many of the issues raised at that visit clarified. It was particularly helpful that the concerns expressed had been addressed including an explanation of the alternative locations and justification for the proposed site for the new silo being clustered with the two existing tanks and appropriately distanced from the residential properties. When seen from the river the proposals would be behind the larger silos within a massive site which would help to mitigate their impact. They considered that the issue of the bunding had also been satisfactorily resolved.

Members appreciated the reservations of the residents and were mindful that the site visit took place when trees were in full leaf and that there should be sufficient screening in the winter months. It was considered that provided a detailed landscaping scheme including evergreens and mature trees was devised, this could help to mitigate the impact on amenity. It was necessary to consider the business needs of the factory and take into account the national importance of the site to the economy in accordance with the NPPF. Members considered that overall it was important for the factory and the residents to co-exist; the sugar factory had business requirements but it had been demonstrated that the interests of residents had been taken into account. Therefore, on balance members considered that the officers' recommendation could be accepted. Although it was recognised that there could be an alleged potential impact on property values, it was confirmed that this was not a material planning consideration.

Dr Johnson proposed, seconded by Mrs Hempsall and it was

RESOLVED unanimously (Mr Stevens abstaining having arrived during the debate and therefore not being party to the full presentation and discussion)

that the application be delegated to officers for approval subject to the ecological reports that had been submitted being satisfactory to the Authority as well as Natural England as well as the appropriate mitigation measures being included and conditions as outlined in the report particularly relating to condition (iii) concerning landscaping to ensure that there are sufficient mitigation measures and screening within the planting scheme including evergreen and if appropriate some mature specimens in accordance with arboricultural advice.

Subject to these conditions, the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with criteria 'a' – 'h' of emerging Policy PP/CAN1 and with guidance within the NPPF. There are not considered to be any material considerations which would justify the refusal of this application.

(2) **BA/2013 BA/2013/0089/CU Church Farm, Church Road, Burgh Castle**

Norfolk Change of use from public house and restaurant to domestic residence

Applicant: Dr and Mrs P Swallow

The Planning Officer provided a comprehensive presentation and detailed assessment of the application for change of use of the site from its currently defined mix of Class A4, A3 and C1 providing visitor facilities to domestic residence (Class C3) at Church Farm Burgh Castle that contained a Grade II listed farmhouse together with outbuildings.

Having assessed the proposal against the Authority's policies, particularly DP27, including the emerging Site Specific Policies and the consistency with the NPPF taking into account the assessment provided by the applicant to demonstrate that the current use was economically unviable, and that there were equivalent facilities in the area serving the same needs, the Planning officer considered that the criteria (a) and (b) of policy DP 27 had been robustly proven and therefore the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Mr Paige on behalf of the applicant explained that three previous owners of the site had been declared bankrupt and the applicants as current owners had also suffered financially following their purchase in 2009. The property had been marketed and a case for removal of the condition made. It was recognised that for the property to be successful it required sound management with financial backing and a good location with an element of through custom. Unfortunately, being located in a cul de sac and the proximity of other businesses providing similar services on the route towards this, casual visits were not sufficient to sustain the business.

Although concerned that this would mean a reduction in visitor facilities in the area, Members recognised the difficulties the location posed for the applicants relating to access but acknowledged that there were sufficient facilities available in the vicinity. They were satisfied that a robust case had been made for the change of use and the issue of lack of viability had been proven. Members also considered that for the building to return to its origins as a Grade II Listed property could be beneficial.

RESOLVED by 9 votes with one abstention

that the application be approved subject to conditions as outlined in the report as in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the development is acceptable in respect of Planning Policy and in particular in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework and Policies CS1 and CS22 of the Core Strategy (2007) and DP5, DP27 and DP28 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2011).

- (3) **BA/2013/ 0105/COND Greenacres, Marsh Road, Burgh Castle**
Removal of condition 3 of pp 06/94/1051/BF (BA/1994/0303/HISTAP) to allow the property to be sold without limiting it to agricultural or forestry workers.
Applicant: Mr and Mrs Friend

The Planning Officer provided a detailed presentation and assessment of the proposal which involved the removal of an agricultural occupancy condition on a property originally granted permission in 1995. The applicant had provided a valuation and marketing statement to address criteria in the Authority's DM Policy DP26 and this was taken into account. The Planning Officer concluded that the applicants had demonstrated that the agricultural use of the site no longer required on site residential accommodation and that strong evidence had been provided that despite determined attempts to sell or rent the property with the agricultural restriction these had been unsuccessful. It was clarified that the applicants were not in breach of their planning permission as their last occupation was in agriculture. The Planning Officer recommended approval.

Members acknowledged and recognised the concerns of the Parish Council regarding the potential development of the site in future but having addressed these concerns and been assured that any proposals would require planning permission themselves, concurred with the officer's assessment and

RESOLVED by 9 votes with one abstention

that the application be approved as the proposal is considered to accord with Development Plan Policies CS22 of the Core Strategy (2007) and DP11, DP26 and DP28 of the Development Management

Polices DPD (2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework which is a material planning consideration.

(4) **BA/2013/0126/FUL 6 Broadland Court, Maltsters Way, Oulton Broad, Lowestoft, Suffolk**

Creation of new dormer window in roof space with provision of two new openings and balcony

Applicant: Mr Simon Goodbrand

In providing the presentation and assessment, the Planning Officer explained that the application was before Committee due to objections from a neighbour. Letters from the objector were circulated to Members. The proposal included the installation of a dormer window on the western roof slope of the flat and the installation of a first floor balcony on the eastern side of a flat in Broadlands Court, Maltsters Way at Oulton Broad. The proposed dormer window first submitted was considered to be inappropriate in form and scale. Following negotiations with the applicant, amended plans had since been submitted which were considered to achieve a design more appropriate and in keeping with the development of Broadland Court and the Conservation Area. The proposed balcony was located on a recessed part of the host building above a shared laundry area and it was considered that it would not adversely impact on the building or the character of the Conservation Area.

Since the report had been written and the amended plans sent out for further consultations, three responses had been received. The two District Council Ward members had requested that the application be referred to the Committee. The original plans relating to the dormer window had been considered to be out of scale with the other properties. There were concerns about precedence in relation to the balcony and ownership issues. The neighbour who had originally objected was satisfied with the revised plans for the dormer window but still had concerns over the balcony relating to amenity and precedence.

The Planning Officer concluded that the revised plans satisfied the concerns relating to design, would not adversely impact on amenity and would not set a precedent as all applications were required to be considered on their merits. The Planning Officer recommended that officers be given delegated authority to approve the application subject to no further adverse comments of a significant nature being received.

Members views were divided. Although all members considered that the amended plans in relation to the dormer window were now acceptable, some members considered that the addition of a balcony, albeit in a recessed area could upset the symmetry of the entire complex, the design of which had been very successful, and therefore the proposal would destroy that heritage asset and therefore be contrary to Policy DP4 (b). Other members had the contrary view; they considered that the proposed siting was a unique situation and that the

design of the balcony was acceptable, and it would not have an adverse impact particularly within the recessed area.

The Chairman put the Officer's recommendation to the vote which was divided 5 in favour and 5 against. The Chairman therefore used his casting vote and it was

RESOLVED

that authority be delegated to officers to approve the amended application subject to no additional adverse comments or objections being received and subject to conditions as outlined within the report with an additional condition requiring the use of roof lights and details of materials. Subject to these, the proposals are considered to accord with Development Plan Policies CS5 of the Core Strategy (2007) and DP4, DP5 and DP28 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework which is a material planning consideration.

- (5) **BA/2013/0100/FUL White Lodge, Kingfisher Lane, South Walsham**
Remove and replace 78.6 metres of existing quayheading and associated boardwalk and raise quayheading level by 0.3m and 0.45m. Works partially implemented.
Applicant: Mr Matthew Thwaites.

The Planning Assistant explained that the application was in part retrospective and was associated with a recently replaced dwelling nearing completion. The proposal involved the replacement of existing quayheading and associated boardwalk and raising some quay heading. Having assessed the application in terms of the Authority's policies the Planning Assistant recommended approval as the form and materials would be seen in the context of the dwelling on site and other ancillary buildings and would not have a detrimental landscape or amenity impact and private navigation of the dyke would not be impeded.

A Statement from the Applicant's agent in support of the application had been circulated.

Although expressing disappointment at the retrospective nature of the application, in principle Members considered that the proposal was acceptable and that for practical purposes it would be appropriate for the new piling to be placed in front of the old. They were also pleased that the height of the quayheading would coincide with that of the neighbours and that it would not impede navigation. However, Members were concerned about the accuracy of the plans and concerned that clarification was required as to the exact line of the quayheading and what they were being asked to approve.

Prof Burgess proposed, seconded by Mr Ollier and it was

RESOLVED by 6 votes to 4

that authority be delegated to officers to approve the application subject to the submission of more accurate plans and subject to conditions as outlined in the report (without condition (iii) relating to extension no further than 300mm from existing) as the proposal is considered to be acceptable in accordance with Policies DP2, DP4, DP13 and DP28 of the adopted Development Management Policies DPD (2011), Policy CS1 of the adopted Core Strategy (2007) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

13/9 Broads Local Plan: Broads Site Specifics Development Planning Document

The Committee received a report reminding members of the progress on the Site Specifics DPD and outlining the proposed detailed way forward to progress the document to submission to the Planning Inspectorate. Although originally intended for submission in February 2013, members noted the reasons for the delay particularly the departure of the previous planning Policy Officer and the delay in recruitment as well as the ongoing enforcement issues at Thorpe Island that had been the subject of an appeal, and which would have a bearing on the Site Specific Policy TSA2 for Thorpe Island. Due to the challenge to the Inspector's decision, the Authority had been awaiting the outcome before submitting the policy in order that it could reflect that decision. Given that the original decision of the Planning Inspectorate had now been quashed, and the Enforcement Notice reverted back to a pending appeal and the soundness of the Site Specifics Policy could be questioned, it was therefore proposed to retain the original TSA2 from the Broads Plan 1997, delete the TSA2 Site Specifics Policy from the DPD but progress the remainder of the Site Specifics Policies DPD. As the deletion was a main modification it was considered necessary to go out to Pre-Submission Consultation again and the opportunity taken to make other minor and factual amendments to correct inconsistencies and update the text to reflect other changes over the last year, improve clarity and improve the presentation of the policy maps.

Members noted the proposed changes to the text with those sections to be removed struck through and highlighted in yellow and the text to be added being in red and highlighted in yellow as set out in the enclosed Appendix A to the report. In particular attention was drawn to WES1 (West Somerton) where no changes were recommended, but scored negative on the Sustainability Appraisal. It was noted that this allocation was a local desire and had undergone specific consultation and further that the approach had not received any comments as part of the previous round of consultation. It was also noted that Church Farm Inn, Burgh Castle would need to be deleted from Policy XN6 Waterside Pubs Network under the Waveney in light of the decision earlier in the meeting. It was explained that there would be a new Policy SN9 on settlement boundaries which would list all those settlements with Development Boundaries and help provide clarity. The Committee also

noted that some discussions were ongoing with the Environment Agency regarding some of their comments on water quality monitoring.

It was noted that during the consultation period, the following supporting documents would also be in the public domain for comment:

- Sustainability Appraisal
- TSA2 Topic Paper including the NPPF assessment
- Habitats Regulation Assessment
- Maps updated.

RESOLVED unanimously

- (i) that the Draft Site Specific Policies DPD is amended to delete Draft TSA2 (Thorpe Island);
- (ii) that minor modifications as highlighted in Appendix A of the report be accepted and approved;
- (iii) that Church Farm Inn, Burgh Castle be deleted from Policy XN6;
- (iv) that a Policy relating to Development Boundaries be included as SN9; and
- (v) that the report on Site Specifics DPD as amended be presented to the full Authority.

That the Planning Committee

RECOMMENDS to the full Authority

- (i) that the second publication of the Draft Site Specifics Policy DPD as amended be approved for consultation from between 9.00am on Monday 15 July 2013 to 4.00pm on Friday 13 September 2013;
- (ii) that the Chief Executive be delegated to approve the Draft Site Specifics Policy DPD for submission to the Planning Inspectorate following the consultation period, assessment of that consultation and subject to there being no significant issues being raised not previously considered by the Authority.

13/10 Acle Neighbourhood Plan – Designating Acle as a Neighbourhood Area

The Committee received a report setting out the procedures for undertaking and designating Neighbourhood Plans and summarising the comments received during the six week consultation period on Acle becoming a Neighbourhood Area in order to produce an Neighbourhood Plan.

Members noted that the lead for the Neighbourhood area was Broadland District Council, with the Authority's officers having been involved in the

consultation of the designation jointly with the District. A consultation event was organised for 29 June and Broadland District Council was due to consider it at a meeting on 16 July. Mrs Hempsall, the member appointed by Broadland District Council thanked the Planning Policy Officer for her valuable contribution to the Steering Group.

RESOLVED

- (i) that the report and comments received be noted; and
- (ii) that the Acle Neighbourhood Area be designated.

**13/11 Neighbouring Consultation and Proposed Responses:
Waveney District Council: Renewable Energy and Sustainable
Construction Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)**

The Committee received a report that summarised the Waveney District Draft Supplementary Planning Document on Renewable Energy and Sustainable Construction to assist with the implementation of planning policies.

On the general comments members were pleased to note that reference was made to the Broads own landscape sensitivity study but disappointed that the Authority's executive boundary was unclear. Members endorsed the comments on the requirement for clarification on the Biodiversity Action Plan and that reference should be made to the Authority's Biodiversity Action Plan.

Comments on the main issues relevant to the Broads Executive Area such as landscape setting, opportunities for use of reed beds and biodiversity were endorsed. Although the Undergrounding of cables was implicit in the comments on energy transmission and ancillary infrastructure and the sensitivity of the Broads landscape, Members considered that this should be strengthened by making reference to the recent successful undergrounding schemes which had taken place in the area and that this should be built upon.

RESOLVED

that the report be noted and the proposed responses be endorsed for forwarding to Waveney District Council.

13/12 Proposed Langley Conservation Area Public Consultation

The Committee received a report on the Proposed Langley Conservation Area following reappraisal and were invited to provide comments noting that this was part of the Authority's continuing programme of reappraisals. It was noted that the majority of the Langley Conservation Area was centred round Langley Abbey and fell within the Broads Authority area and partly within South Norfolk Council's area, and therefore the initial appraisal was carried out by the Authority in consultation with South Norfolk. Members noted that the proposed public consultation exercise would be organised and funded by the Authority. The consultation exercise would include the production of a

summary leaflet setting out the effects of designation which would be distributed to all those residents within the proposed Conservation Area as well as the Parish Council. There would be a public open day in the village in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement. The responses from the consultation would be brought back to the committee for consideration.

Members considered that the draft boundary map and the area described in the draft appraisal in the parish of Langley with Hardley was worthy of Conservation Area designation following a detailed assessment and that public and stakeholder consultation was required. It was suggested that reference should be made to the Wherryman's Way.

RESOLVED

the Langley Conservation Area Draft Re-Appraisal be endorsed for public consultation subject to minor editorial amendments.

13/13 Training for Planning Committee Members

The Committee received a report proposing a Draft Training Programme for Members for 2013/14. This would be in addition to and complimentary to the Member Development Programme already compiled by the Authority and would include the Annual Design Quality Tour due to take place in the Autumn. It was proposed that in addition to the Design Tour, to introduce two formal training sessions per annum in April and November and for attendance at one to be mandatory. Members agreed that the subject matter of the sessions should be initially suggested by themselves and arranged by the Director of Planning and Resources with the agreement of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee and a record of attendance taken.

Members supported the concept particularly given some of the complex matters with which they were required to deal. The Chairman commented that one idea was to have an outside consultant to attend a Planning Committee meeting to observe deliberations and provide Members with critical feedback following the meeting. It was noted that the neighbouring planning authorities and the National Parks had a variety of ways of dealing with training. A member commented that although it was appreciated that training was essential and was much appreciated, to make this mandatory on an annual basis particularly for those local government appointees could be onerous. However, it was generally considered that attendance at one session should be mandatory. The timings of the sessions were discussed and it was agreed that this could be following a committee meeting or in an evening.

RESOLVED

that a more formal structure and programme of Training for Members with the potential to make this mandatory be introduced.

13/14 Enforcement Update

The Committee received an updated report on enforcement matters already referred to Committee.

RESOLVED

that the report be noted.

13/15 Appeals to the Secretary of State: Update

The Committee received a schedule showing the position regarding appeals against the Authority since October 2012 as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

RESOLVED

that the report be noted.

13/16 Decisions Made by Officers under Delegated Powers

The Committee received a schedule of decisions made by officers under delegated powers from 13 May 2013 to 11 June 2013.

RESOLVED

that the report be noted.

13/17 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Planning Committee would be held on Friday 19 July 2013 at 10.00am at Yare House, 62- 64 Thorpe Road, Norwich.

The meeting concluded at 13.50 pm

CHAIRMAN

Code of Conduct for Members

Declaration of Interests

Committee: Planning Committee

Date: 21 June 2013

Name	Agenda Item/Minute No(s)	Nature of Interest (Please describe the nature of the interest)
All Members	13/8(1) 13/8(4)	Applications: BA2013/0072/FUL Cantley. Lobbied by Cantley Parish Council and objectors and supporters. BA/2013/0126/FUL 6 Broadland Court, Maltsters Way, Oulton Broad. Lobbied by Objectors
L Hemsall	13/10	Acle Neighbourhood Plan – On Steering Group
P Ollier	13/8 (1) and (4)	As above
M Barnard	13/8 (1) and (4) 13/11	As above and Neighbouring Authority Consultation: Waveney DC Renewable Energy and Sustainable Construction Draft SPD District Councillor for Waveney