

## **Broads Authority**

### **Planning Committee**

Minutes of the meeting held on 10 October 2014

Present:

Dr J M Gray – in the Chair

Mr M Barnard  
Miss S Blane  
Mr N Dixon  
Mr C Gould

Mrs L Hemsall  
Dr J S Johnson  
Mr P Ollier  
Mr P Warner

In Attendance:

Ms N Beal – Planning Policy Officer  
Mrs S A Beckett – Administrative Officer (Governance)  
Mr S Bell – for the Solicitor  
Mr F Bootman – Planning Officer  
Mr A Clarke – Senior Waterways and Recreation Officer  
Mr B Hogg – Historic Environment Manager  
Ms A Long – Director of Planning and Resources  
Ms C Smith – Head of Planning

Members of the Public in attendance who spoke:

#### **BA/2014/0205/FUL St Olaves Marina, Beccles Road, St Olaves**

Mr A Mendum	Chairman St Olaves Parish Council
Mr J Crowder	On behalf of Objectors – St Olaves Residents
Mr D Riddell	Objector – St Olaves Resident
Mr Geere	Objector – St Olaves Resident

#### **BA/2014/0254/FUL Ivy House Country Hotel, Ivy Lane, Oulton Broad**

Dr Adrian Parton	Applicant
------------------	-----------

#### **4/1 Apologies for Absence and Welcome**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting particularly members of the public, including Clara Robson – trainee Solicitor, Nplaw, as an observer.

Apologies were received from: Prof Jacquie Burgess, Mrs J Brociek-Coulton, Mr G W Jermay, Mr R Stevens and Mr John Timewell.

#### **4/2 Declarations of Interest**

Members indicated that they had no declarations of pecuniary interests other than those already registered and those set out in Appendix 1.

#### **4/3 Minutes: 12 September 2014**

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 September 2014 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman subject to an amendment to spelling in Minute 3/8(1) para 5 “foolproof”.

#### **4/4 Points of Information Arising from the Minutes**

There were no points of information to report.

#### **4/5 To note whether any items have been proposed as matters of urgent business**

No items had been proposed as matters of urgent business.

#### **4/6 Chairman’s Announcements and Introduction to Public Speaking**

##### **(1) Training/Briefing for Members:**

The Chairman reminded members that training would be provided on material and non-material considerations and the tests for conditions following this meeting.

##### **(2) Dates for Members to note:**

- **Broads Authority 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Celebrations: David Matless Lecture** – The Chairman reminded members that David Matless would be giving a lecture on 3 November 2014 at UEA starting at 6.30pm followed by a reception at 7.45pm. This would follow and supplement the publication of his book on the Nature of the Broads Landscape at the end of July. The event was part of Broads Authority 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary celebrations. Invitations were being sent out.
- **BA Planning Policy – Shaping the Broads Local Plan – 5 December 2014** The Chairman reported that there would be a workshop for all members of the Authority on Friday 5 December 2014 following the Planning Committee meeting. The aim was to give members the opportunity to help shape the Broads Local Plan in its early stages. All members had received an email and asked to respond as to their intention to attend by 31 October.

##### **(3) Advance Notice: Neighbourhood Plan for Oulton Broad**

The Chairman reported that residents of Oulton Broad were in the process of applying to be a Neighbourhood Area to produce a Neighbourhood Plan. A report would be brought to a future Planning Committee meeting.

##### **(5) 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. The Chairman also asked if any member of the public intended to record or film the proceedings and if so whether there was any member of public who did not wish to be filmed.

#### **4/7 Requests to Defer Applications and /or Vary the Order of the Agenda**

The Chairman stated that he intended to vary the order of the applications to be dealt with in view of the number of members of the public with an interest in the item and to enable the relevant Authority officer to provide potential answers to questions. He therefore proposed to take application BA/2014/0205/FUL St Olaves first.

No requests for deferral had been received.

#### **4/8 Applications for Planning Permission**

The Committee considered the following application 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 decision.

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/2014/ 0205/FUL St Olaves Marina, Beccles Road, St Olaves**  
Proposed Mooring Pontoons along the River Waveney frontage to St Olaves Marina Ltd.  
Applicant: Mr David Bromley

The Planning Officer provided a detailed presentation of the application for the installation of 164m of floating pontoons and installation of three fishing platforms along the river frontage of a large existing marina at the confluence of the River Waveney and the Haddiscoe Cut. He pointed out that a planning permission issued in 1997 was still in the process of being implemented. The marina could accommodate in excess of 150 boats in the water with space for considerably more in dry storage on land. There were no moorings along the river frontage at present and it was estimated that the pontoons could accommodate 16 new moorings but the actual number would be dependent on boat size. The application was to be considered in the context of Policy DP16 Moorings and in accordance with the Authority's Mooring Strategy.

Since the writing of the report, and in light of comments received the applicant had amended the application to provide the two short stay visitor moorings at the southern end of the proposed pontoons, rather than at the northern end where they had originally been intended to be for used for demasting. In officers' views this was regrettable as the Mooring Strategy was seeking to provide demasting mooring in this area by the bridge and there were already a number of visitor moorings in the vicinity. However, it was acceptable in terms of criterion (a) of Policy DP16 and criterion (h). This would require an alternative condition 5 to that stated within the report to include signage. In addition, on the advice of the Authority's Senior Waterways and Recreation Officer, the deflectors were removed as they would not fulfil the intended function of protecting the banks from the worst effects of the strong tide in order to aid natural reed bank regeneration. The Senior Waterways and Recreation Officer also advised that the pontoons could be moved in closer to the bank, though this option was not pursued by the applicant. The Planning Officer provided a diagram showing the width of the river from the narrower southern end to the wider northern (downstream) end of the marina based on GIS data. He referred to the Byelaws guidance which indicated that navigation intrusions in the river should not occupy in excess of twenty-five percent of the channel and the applicant had agreed to restrict the beam width of craft to be moored at specific locations on the pontoons. Should the Committee be minded to grant permission this would be conditioned. No information had been received on the fishing platforms as yet.

A considerable number of objections had been received from the residents on the opposite side of the river particularly relating to the impact on navigation but also ecology and landscape. Since the writing of the report further representations had been received from Mr William Kemp, the District Member for Haddiscoe and Mr Crowder on behalf of the residents of St Olaves, details of which had been circulated. In addition comments had also been received from St Olaves with Fritton Parish Council and Haddiscoe Parish Council similarly objecting to the impact on navigation relating to safety concerns particularly given the reduced area of the river and the fast flow of ebb tides at this location, as well as lack of consultation. There had also been a large number of emails from the St Olaves residents.

Having assessed the main issues for consideration concerning the criteria within Policy DP16 of the development plan namely the impact on navigation, impact on the ecology and impact on protected landscape of the Broads as well as the NPPF, the Planning Officer concluded that the application as amended was acceptable and would not have a negative impact on the navigation subject to conditions. In addition it was also considered that the location, extent and nature of the development would not adversely impact on the landscape or ecology of the Broads. There were no material considerations to justify

refusal of consent and therefore the recommendation was for approval with conditions.

The Senior Waterways and Recreation Officer provided clarification on the Mooring Strategy and the Authority's aim to provide demasting facilities at the four quarters of the bridge at St Olaves to cover both upstream and downstream. The applicant was of the view that there were demasting facilities available at the Bell Inn and that such facilities were infrequently used. However, this facility was reliant on the moorings being available as they were not designated as demasting only areas. Although the northern/downstream location would be preferable the application still accorded with the Policy criteria for moorings.

Mr Mendum on behalf of Fritton and St Olaves Parish Council, supported the concerns of the St Olaves residents who lived opposite the marina explaining that the proposals would make it very difficult for sailing boats to navigate in this narrow stretch of the river particularly with holiday visitors. He stressed that consideration should be given to those residents.

Mr Crowder on behalf of St Olaves residents was given the opportunity to provide a presentation to the Committee to support their concerns. He referred to the Authority's Core Strategy Policies CS1, CS2 and CS3 relating to the protection of the Authority's landscape, special qualities and navigation and claimed that neither the residents of St Olaves nor Haddiscoe, Fritton and St Olaves Parish Councils and the Environment Agency had been consulted. He had contacted the Environment Agency in Ipswich directly following which they had provided comments. He considered that the application was completely unnecessary as there were appropriate and sufficient private moorings available in the vicinity and facilities for demasting at the Bell public house nearer to the other village amenities. He considered that the river width was severely restricted and additional mooring to be provided by the pontoons would cause navigational safety problems. He also stated that there were discrepancies over the river width measurements as provided by the Authority and others, which would definitely compromise safety and any byelaw guidelines. He also questioned the impact of the proposal on the landscape and the residents' amenity. Mr Crowder, Mr Geere and Mr Riddell indicated the location of their properties and Mr Geere and Mr Riddell stated that they had used the riverbank to moor on especially when taking account of the tides prior to mooring safely within their own mooring cuts.

Members considered that if the St Olaves residents did moor boats on the riverbank and had mooring rights to do so, the navigable width of the river would be compromised. However, Officers explained that the Authority did not have any specific evidence to indicate that this was the case, especially when based on the aerial photographs for 1945, 1999, 2004, 2006, 2007 and 2010 or from consultation with the Area

Ranger and Head of Ranger services as well as other officers. Members commented that this could be a material consideration and evidence should be acquired before the application was determined. The Authority would be able to investigate any rights and planning history relating to express permission for mooring rights of those residents on the river bank but the onus would be on the residents to provide evidence that they had mooring rights and/or established use rights. This was made clear to the objectors.

On the issue of consultation, the Planning Officer stated that he carried out the statutory consultation required. A site notice had been placed on the Marina site in July and Haddiscoe Parish Council sent notice of the application in that month since the application fell within that parish. The Planning Officer commented that he had personally delivered letters to those in Priory Road, St Olaves on 8 July 2014 and apologised if he had missed anyone. Representations had been received from a number of those residents with riverside properties as a result. In addition a Site Notice had been placed at the entrance to the dinghy park on 24 August and St Olaves Parish Council provided with the plans on 11 September 2014, their comments being received on 3 October 2014. Comments had been taken right up until 9 October. The Environment Agency would have automatically been consulted but no response had been received as it was not usual for them to respond to water compatible development in relation to flood risk. Comments had since been received following Mr Crowder's approach, confirming this stating that the proposed pontoons and fishing platforms would fall within a "Water Compatible" use classification and were therefore appropriate in this location and due to their nature would not take up flood storage capacity. In addition they had no comments on the navigation or landscape aspects as these came within the Broads Authority's remit. There were comments on the ecology as there was evidence of water voles in the vicinity being present and this would require mitigation measures, advice on which was provided.

Given that a number of issues required clarification and there was lack of information on the rights to moor on the bank of the other side of the river to the application, Members considered that the application should be deferred. It was also considered important that the application should be referred to the Navigation Committee for their advice on the extent of the proposed moorings and their contribution to the network of mooring facilities in the Broads with reference to Policy DP16. Members also considered that deferment should provide opportunity for consultees to respond to any changes made to the application. Members considered whether to put a time restriction for the proposals to return to Committee. However, they considered that some of the information required could take some time but there should be sufficient information for members to determine the application. It was agreed that once further investigations had been made the decision on

whether there was reasonable information available within the next few months for a report to the Committee, should be left to the Chairman.

RESOLVED unanimously

- (1) that the amended application be deferred in order to:
  - (i) Seek clarification on the issue of mooring rights particularly relating to the St Olaves' residents on the northern side of the river;
  - (ii) Clarify the discrepancies on the measurements of the river width; and
  - (iii) Seek advice from the Navigation Committee on the following:
    - The extent to which the proposed mooring pontoons would contribute to the network of facilities within the Broads;
    - The Location, Quality and Type of moorings ; and
    - The impact on Navigationin the context of Policy DP16 especially criteria (a).
- (2) that it be delegated to the Chairman's discretion as to when the application is brought back to the Committee.

- (2) **BA/2014/0254/FUL Ivy House Country Hotel, Ivy Lane, Oulton Broad, Lowestoft** Replace existing marquee with building  
Applicant: Ivy House Country Hotel Ltd.

The Head of Planning provided a detailed presentation on the proposal for the replacement of the marquee in the grounds of Ivy House Country Hotel, granted a three year temporary planning permission in March 2014, with a permanent purpose-built building to hold functions such as weddings. The marquee had proved very successful and provided suitable evidence of the business need and viability indicating that investment in such a proposal would be a reasonable progression. It was proposed to construct the building in timber with timber boarding and a pantile roof to match the existing buildings of the main site and being positioned within sufficient natural tree screening was considered would not have a significant visual impact, and would be more recessive than the existing marquee. The building would sit in the same location , would be 2 metres longer , 0.5metres wider and 1.6metres taller than the marquee, which would provide 17% extra volume. The Head of Planning explained that the existing entrance marquee and pergola which provided a covered walk and link with the main Hotel building would remain and was now included as part of this application.

The Head of Planning drew members' attention to the consultation responses received and particularly those relating to the proposed conditions on noise as set out in Appendix 3 of the report. This being one of the key concerns, the Environmental Health Officer was satisfied that with such conditions the application was acceptable.

Since the writing of the report further consultation responses had been received from:

- Suffolk Wildlife Trust –no objections subject to conditions to cover noise similar to those imposed on application BA/2013/0410/FUL for the marquee
- Environment Agency – Having received a revised Flood Risk Assessment, no objections subject to conditions relating to flood risk
- Natural England – no objections. Confirmed that there were no issues which had not been satisfactorily addressed.

Having provided a detailed assessment of the proposals, taking account of the main issues in relation to principle (now established), visual impact, impact on the Conservation Area, neighbourhood amenity, Highway safety, trees, flood risk and ecology, the Head of Planning concluded that the application was acceptable and an appropriate type of development of a high quality which would be well screened and complement the existing use of the site. There would be no adverse impact on the Conservation Area and the development was considered to be in accordance with the relevant policies of the Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Dr Adrian Parton, the applicant, clarified that the windows within the new building would be sealed and would be laminated to provide additional sound reduction and the building would be fully air conditioned (using the existing air conditioning units). The opening times and timings for functions were intended to be similar to those for the marquee and the license applied for accordingly. ie up to 12.00 midnight and 12.30am on New Year. The sound report and proposed installations were based on the data and advice provided and prepared in consultation with the Environmental Health Officers with similar limitations but within a more robust structure. He explained that the experience gained over the last few months together with future demand had provided sufficient business justification to invest in a permanent building. An open day had been held to explain the plans and the applicant had worked with the objectors to allay any fears. He referred to the response received from the neighbouring business (Broadland Holiday Village) where they had no objections subject to the proposed conditions.

Members gave careful consideration to the application and in general accepted that the proposal involved a high quality designed building which linked in well with the existing premises, would be appropriate to the setting and well screened. The proposed conditions would allay any concerns over the issue of noise and on balance the proposals were a welcome addition to the facilities being offered in the area.

A member expressed concern about the application in that the marquee had only recently been granted temporary permission and the



three years had not yet expired. In particular there was concern about the retention of the marquee/covered walkway structure which was only a temporary structure and therefore would deteriorate. The applicant confirmed that it was in the best interests of the business to keep this in a good condition and therefore this would be taken down for cleaning annually. He was prepared for members to impose a condition on the application. However, members considered that such a condition should be left to officers' discretion.

Mrs Hemsall proposed, seconded by Mr Barnard and

It was RESOLVED by 8 votes to 1

- (i) that the application be approved subject to the conditions as set out within the report particularly those in Appendix 2 relating to noise, those of the Environment Agency concerning flood risk, and subject to officer's consideration and discretion relating to the covered walkway.
- (ii) that the proposal is considered to be acceptable in accordance with Planning Policy and in particular policies DP1, DP2, DP4, DP5, DP11, DP27, DP28 and DP29 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2011)

**(3) BA/2014/0272/FUL The Staithe Car Park and Public Conveniences, Bridge Street, Loddon**

Change of use of part of public conveniences to B1 Office.

Replacement door and new security gate. External alterations to front wall for insertion of prefabricated WC and shower units. New timber bollards. Removal of one car parking space.

Applicant: South Norfolk Council

The Planning Officer provided a detailed presentation of the proposal to reconfigure the existing toilet block facilities at Loddon Staithe to provide one unisex disabled toilet cubical, one standard unisex toilet cubical and single unisex shower cubicle. The remainder of the building would be used as B1 office space.

Having assessed the application against the main issues relating to the application such as principle, Impact on the character the Conservation Area, Design and Use and impact on neighbour amenity, the Planning Officer considered that the development proposed would improve the quality and standard of the facilities which was to be welcomed, although recognising that it would reduce the number available to the public. The proposed alterations to the building with the structure having some architectural interest due to provenance, were considered to be sympathetic and therefore acceptable on design grounds. It was not considered to have unacceptable impacts on any neighbouring occupier's amenity and therefore approval was recommended subject to conditions.

Mr Gould as the local member spoke in support of the proposal. He left the room and did not take part in the debate or voting on the application.

Members concurred with the Officer's assessment and were satisfied that the concerns of the Broads Society could be allayed. As some of the bricks were to be removed to allow for doors, it was considered that where possible these be used in the rebuilding of the premises.

RESOLVED unanimously

that the application be approved subject to conditions as outlined within the Committee report to include the reuse of the existing brick for the rebuild where possible.as the development is considered to be in accordance with Policies DP4, DP5, DP27 and DP28 of the Adopted Broads Development Management DPD (2011).

#### **4/9 Enforcement of Planning Control: Enforcement Items for Consideration**

**(i) Wherry Hotel, Bridge Road, Oulton Broad – unauthorised installation of refrigeration unit.**

The Committee considered a report concerning the construction and installation of a refrigeration unit at the rear of the Wherry Hotel, Bridge Road, Oulton Broad without planning permission. The refrigeration unit located to the rear of the building was not visible from the Broad but was prominent from the road. It had originally been intended as a temporary structure to provide additional refrigeration space until the new kitchen and refrigeration provision was constructed as part of the planning approval granted in 2011 (BA/2011/0135/FUL). However, this had not been implemented and planning permission had now expired.

The refrigeration unit was considered to be inappropriate for a permanent use in such a prominent location as the design style and structure was visually unacceptable in such a prominent location within the Oulton Broad area and Conservation Area. It was therefore considered contrary to both national and local planning policy particularly Policy CS5 of the adopted Core Strategy and Policy DP4 of the adopted Development Management Policies DPD. A member commented that there may be two refrigeration units on the site and that prior to commencing enforcement action this would need to be investigated.

Members also noted that as part of the application BA/2011/0135/FUL the sycamore tree protected by a TPO was to be removed with mitigating landscaping. The tree had been removed despite the planning permission having not been implemented; the mitigating landscaping had not been provided.. Officers were still investigating this matter as this came under separate legislation and would consider

whether it would best be resolved through an alternative scheme of planting, or whether prosecution was appropriate.

RESOLVED

- (i) that authorisation is granted for the serving of an Enforcement Notice seeking removal of the refrigeration unit(s), in consultation with the Solicitor, with a compliance period of three months; and
- (ii) that authority be given for prosecution to proceed should the enforcement notice not be complied with.

**(ii) Land at Newlands Caravan Park Geldeston – unauthorised structures BA/2013/0038/UNAUP4**

The Authority received a report concerning the erection of structures comprising toilet/shower unit, open fronted storage building and small shed without the benefit of planning permission on Land at Newlands Caravan Park, Geldeston Road, Geldeston.

Members noted that there was no planning permission for the use of the site as a caravan park and therefore it operated under the exemption and was limited to five caravans only. Officers considered that the level of facilities provided was excessive for five caravans and there was existing storage for an appropriate level of equipment in the form of the pre-existing shed.

The structures were considered to be contrary and also inappropriate to the adopted policies within the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD notably CS1, DP4 and DP14 and the National Planning Policy Framework and unlikely to obtain retrospective planning permission given the character of the area. Officers had attempted to engage with the landowner but had had limited success.

Some members considered that providing such facilities was not totally out of keeping for sites for a small number of caravans, although there was concern about the disposal of waste. It was clarified that the Environment Agency was investigating this matter. They considered that the landowner should be invited to submit a planning application prior to enforcement action being taken and that he be given 3 months in which to do so.

RESOLVED unanimously:

- (i) that officers be delegated to invite the landowner to submit a planning application for the unauthorised structures and that this be submitted with a period of three months.

- (ii) that if no planning application is submitted within three months, authority be granted to serve an Enforcement Notice in consultation with the Solicitor requiring the removal of the unauthorised structures with a compliance period of three months; and
- (iii) that authority be given to proceed with prosecution of the owner should the enforcement notice not be complied with.

**(iii) Land at North End Thurlton**

The Committee received an updated report on the longstanding issues around the enforcement of planning control in order to remove the unauthorised non-agricultural items together with unauthorised fencing on land at North End, Thurlton and restore the site to a condition suitable for agricultural use and of rural character and appearance of the area. Members were reminded that following the issuing of enforcement notice, and the subsequent appeal that had been dismissed, some compliance had been achieved and the site mostly cleared. However, the landowner had given a specific indication that he was unwilling to remove the fence (which formed part of the enforcement notice).

Members carefully considered the review and assessment of the advantages and disadvantages of the options to achieve compliance on the site, first considered in February 2014, including negotiations, prosecution and direct action. They were mindful that achievement of compliance through negotiations specifically relating to the clearance of the fence had not been successful. They gave careful consideration to each of the options taking account of the potential costs, noting that the compliance period imposed by the Inspector had expired as well as the additional time given by the Authority.

Members received clarification on the procedures for taking direct action, noting that this would be carried out by an experienced contractor. They considered that the landowner had been given more than enough time to comply and the decision to do so was a last resort. Members considered that direct action represented the option with the greatest prospect of success and that there were sufficient provisions within the Town and Country Planning Act to proceed on this basis, although it was recognised that there were financial risks. Prior to doing so the landowner would be informed of the Authority's intentions. Members noted that the action related to the land. Members would be informed of progress.

**RESOLVED**

that direct action by removal of the fence from Land at North End, Thurlton be instigated.

#### **4/10 Broads Local Plan –**

##### **(i) Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)**

The Committee received a report from the Planning Policy Officer on the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) , which was required by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). This set out the Authority's formal policy which sought to identify how and when local communities and stakeholders would be involved in the preparation of the Broads Local Plan. Members noted that since the first SCI was adopted in 2006 and revised in 2008, there had been changes in planning regulations and therefore it was necessary to amend the SCI to account for these well as new policy documents to be produced in the future and to take advantage of the increase in social media.

Although it was not a statutory requirement, Members agreed that it would be useful to invite comments to help improve the SCI and therefore endorsed the proposal to have a four week consultation commencing on 13 October and concluding on 7 November 2014. Following consultation and consideration of the responses a report would be submitted to the full Authority for adoption.

**RESOLVED**

that the Statement of Community Involvement be noted and endorsed for a four week public consultation period and that a report be submitted to the full Authority following that consultation.

##### **(ii) Broads Local Plan: Duty to Cooperate**

Members received a report from the Planning Policy Officer outlining some of the details of the requirements of the Duty to Co-operate as set out in the Localism Act 2011. Members noted that Local Planning Authorities needed to demonstrate how they had complied with the duty to cooperate at the independent examination of their Local Plans in order to proceed further. They noted the various ways in which the Authority was undertaking cooperation particularly through member and officer working groups, commissioning of joint work and the important and unique role of the Planning Committee itself with members appointed by the constituent District and County Councils. Where issues were raised by members at either the Authority's meetings or their own constituent District meetings, these could be logged and would provide further evidence of cooperation.

Members noted that the Authority had a proven track record in cooperation and endorsed the continuation of this approach.

**RESOLVED**

that the approach being taken in the Duty to Cooperate be endorsed.

**4/11 Consultation Documents Update and Proposed Responses  
South Norfolk Council: Gypsies and Travellers Local Plan (GLTP) Issues  
and Options Consultation**

The Committee received a report from the Planning Policy Officer on the publication of the Gypsies and Travellers Local Plan (GLTP) Issues and Options consultation from South Norfolk Council, the purpose of which was to enable and coordinate development of land in accordance with the requirements of the Joint Core Strategy.

Members endorsed the proposed comments.

RESOLVED

that the proposed consultation response together with the comments made be endorsed.

**4/12 Enforcement Update**

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

RESOLVED

that the report be noted.

**4/13 Appeals to the Secretary of State: Update**

The Committee received a schedule showing the position regarding appeals against the Authority since May 2013 as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

RESOLVED

that the report be noted.

**4/14 Decisions Made by Officers under Delegated Powers**

The Committee received a schedule of decisions made by officers under delegated powers from 2 September 2014 to 29 September 2014.

RESOLVED

that the report be noted.

**4/15 Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Planning Committee would be held on Friday 7 November 2014 at 10.00am at Yare House, 62- 64 Thorpe Road, Norwich. This would be followed by a meeting of the member Working Group the Heritage Asset Review Group.

This session would be followed by a training session for Members of the Committee on material and non-material considerations and guidance on imposition of conditions.

The meeting concluded at 13.45pm

CHAIRMAN

## Code of Conduct for Members

## Declaration of Interests

Committee: **Planning** 10 October 2014

<b>Name</b>	Agenda/ Minute No(s)	<b>Nature of Interest (Please describe the nature of the interest)</b>
Mike Barnard	4/8 (2)	Application BA/2014/0254/FUL Ivy House Country Hotel – lobbied by residents both for and against proposal.
Colin Gould	Item 4/8 (3)  Item 4/11	Application BA/2014/0272/FUL Predetermined will speak as local member and leave the meeting for the debate and vote. Member of South Norfolk Council: Consultation on South Norfolk Gypsies and Travelers Local Plan Issues and Options document
Murray Gray	Item 4/8(3) and Item 4/11	Member of South Norfolk Council: