

Unconfirmed



Minutes of a Meeting of the **Strategic Planning Committee** held in the Deben Conference Room, East Suffolk House, Melton, on **Monday, 9 December 2019 at 10:30 am**

Members of the Committee present:

Councillor Melissa Allen, Councillor Paul Ashdown, Councillor Stuart Bird, Councillor Chris Blundell, Councillor Jocelyn Bond, Councillor Norman Brooks, Councillor Jenny Ceresa, Councillor Tony Cooper, Councillor Linda Coulam, Councillor Mike Deacon, Councillor Graham Elliott, Councillor Tony Fryatt, Councillor Andree Gee, Councillor Colin Hedgley, Councillor Debbie McCallum, Councillor Malcolm Pitchers, Councillor Craig Rivett

Other Members present:

Councillor TJ Haworth-Culf

Officers present:

Liz Beighton (Planning Development Manager), Lisa Chandler (Energy Projects Manager), Caroline Clamp (Assistant Planning Officer), Mark Edgerley (Principal Planner Planning Policy), Naomi Goold (Senior Energy Projects Officer), Mark Kemp (Environmental Protection Officer), Matt Makin (Democratic Services Officer), Bethany Rance (Graduate Town Planner (Energy Projects)), Desi Reed (Planning Policy & Delivery Manager), Philip Ridley (Head of Planning & Coastal Management)

1 Election of a Chairman

On the proposition of Councillor McCallum, seconded by Councillor Ceresa, it was

RESOLVED

That Councillor Paul Ashdown be elected Chairman of the Committee for the 2019/20 Municipal Year.

2 Election of a Vice-Chairman

On the proposition of Councillor Ashdown, seconded by Councillor Ceresa, it was

RESOLVED

That Councillor Debbie McCallum be elected Vice-Chairman of the Committee for the 2019/20 Municipal Year.

3 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ritchie.

4 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Bond declared a Local Non-Pecuniary Interest in item 11 as it related to her Ward.

Councillor Cooper declared a Local Non-Pecuniary Interest in item 11 as it related to his Ward.

Councillor Ashdown declared that he had received significant correspondence via email in respect of item 11. He invited any other Members present to declare receiving any correspondence, if they so wished to.

Councillors Allen, Bird, Bond, Ceresa, Cooper, Coulam, Deacon, Elliott, Hedgley, Pitchers, and Rivett all declared that they had received significant correspondence via email in respect of item 11.

Councillor Haworth-Culf, who was visiting the Committee in her capacity as Ward Member for Aldeburgh and Leiston, also declared that she had received significant correspondence via email in respect of item 11.

5 Minutes

RESOLVED

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 9 September 2019 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendments:

Agenda Item 11, page 19, paragraph 1 to be deleted and replaced with

"That **AUTHORITY TO APPROVE** be granted subject to:

- receipt of additional bat survey information including impacts and mitigation measures;
- receipt of a Shadow Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) report providing sufficient detail for this Authority to undertake the necessary assessment in accordance with the habitats regulations;
- the signing of a section 106 legal agreement requiring a payment in relation to residual impacts on the AONB; and
- the inclusion of appropriate conditions including those detailed below."

Agenda Item 11, page 24, condition 15, to add the following text to the end of the first sentence "and Suffolk County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority."

Agenda Item 11, page 26, condition 20, to delete the following text from the first sentence "[...] (other than the Permitted Preparatory Works as defined in Informative 1) [...]"

Following the confirmation of the Minutes, the Chairman advised that the agenda would be reordered so that item 11 was heard next.

11 East Suffolk Council Engagement During the Development Consent Order Process for ScottishPower Renewables East Anglia One North and East Anglia Two Offshore Windfarm Proposals

The Committee received report **ES/0210** of the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member with responsibility for Economic Development.

ScottishPower Renewables had submitted two separate nationally significant applications for offshore windfarm developments off the East Suffolk coast with onshore infrastructure from the coast at Thorpeness via a cable route to the grid connection location to the north of Friston. The applications, East Anglia One North (EA1N) and East Anglia Two (EA2) were submitted to the National Infrastructure Unit of the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) on the 25 October 2019 and accepted on 22 November 2019.

The proposals had been the subject of pre-application consultation with the local authority and four formal rounds of public consultation, the last ending in March 2019. The Council was a statutory consultee in the decision-making process and the Secretary of State for Business, Energy, and Industrial Strategy would be making the final decision on the proposals based on the recommendation of the Examining Authority (appointed by the PINS) following an examination process.

The report provided background to both of the projects, a summary of the current position of the Council in relation to the projects, and sought advice and support from the Committee in relation to future consideration and process through the Development Consent Order (DCO) procedure of the proposals by the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Councillor Craig Rivett, and his advice to Cabinet on these matters.

Following a query raised by a Member of the Committee in relation to these proposals and other pending proposals Councillor Rivett assured the Committee that the Council had been working closely with the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy and others regarding the cumulative impacts of these proposed developments and that meetings had been held with the Minister of State for Business, Energy and Clean Growth to express the Council's concerns and seek the Government's assistance. He noted that the two new windfarms would bring jobs to the District, citing up to 100 jobs that EA1 would create. East Coast College had also opened its Energy Skills Centre and had entered into a partnership with Maersk to deliver training there.

Councillor Rivett said that the Council, as a statutory consultee and not the determining authority, needed to consider the proposals with its usual rigour, highlighting that 80% of planning decisions that had been reviewed on appeal by the PINS in the last three months had been upheld.

It was highlighted that the Council had sought further information from ScottishPower Renewables on both projects in relation to a number of matters, detailed at paragraph

3.7 of the report. Councillor Rivett considered that it was important that the scale of the proposals was not underestimated and noted the significant area that the onshore elements of the proposals would occupy.

Councillor Rivett invited the Senior Energy Projects Officer to make a presentation to the Committee on the proposals submitted to the PINS.

The Committee was advised of the consultation timeline for the EA1N and EA2 projects and that the Phase 4 consultation period had been completed in March 2019; applications to the PINS for DCOs had been made in October 2019 and accepted in November 2019. The applications were now at the pre-examination stage and ScottishPower Renewables (the applicant) had advertised that the proposals had been submitted.

The deadline for relevant representations to be submitted to the PINS was 27 January 2020. The Council as host Authority had pre-registered as an “interested party”, the relevant representation detailed a summary of the Council’s issues / response to the project.

The Senior Energy Projects Officer explained that the examination was expected to start between March and May 2020; once started the examination process would follow a strict six-month timetable and a decision was expected in the Spring of 2021.

The Senior Energy Projects Officer highlighted the key revisions to the proposals since the Phase 4 consultation relating to seascape, highways, substations, National Grid Electricity Transmission works, flood risk, the cable route, and working hours.

The Committee was shown a map which demonstrated the proximity of the proposed locations of EA1N and EA2 to other consented or proposed windfarms within the East Anglia Zone. The Senior Energy Projects Officer highlighted that the applicant had slightly increased the distance between the two developments by reducing the area at the northern end of the EA2 zone and that they would be nearer to the coast than any of the other windfarms in the zone.

The Senior Energy Projects Officer gave statistics on EA1N and EA2 relating to their operational capacity, the number of households they could power, their distance from shore at its closest point, the number of turbines, the turbine tip heights, and the number and type of offshore platforms that would be required. The Committee was also shown images of the types of platforms that could be used.

A map outlining where cabling would come ashore at Thorpeness and its route to the proposed substation site immediately north of Friston was displayed. It was confirmed that cabling would be underground, and its shore exit would be 85 metres back from the cliff edge to compensate for potential future coastal erosion.

The Senior Energy Projects Officer noted the proximity of the Special Protection Area (SPA) and Site of Specific Scientific Interest (SSSI) to the cable route and detailed where the cable would run alongside the areas before crossing at the narrowest point. The Committee was also made aware that a gap would be created in protected woodland in Aldringham for the cabling route and that it would not be possible to plant new trees

above the installed cables. Some works to the overhead lines would be required at the substation site in order to connect the infrastructure to the National Grid network.

The indicative positions for the onshore substations were demonstrated. There would be one substation per offshore windfarm, along with a National Grid substation which would be shared by both projects. The Senior Energy Projects Officer highlighted the concerns raised about the impact of these substations on the settings of nearby listed buildings, particularly how the relationship between the historic buildings and their settings would be disrupted. The construction of the substations would also require the diversion of a public right of way which was along a historic parish boundary.

Officers also had significant concerns regarding the impact of operational noise from the substations and considered that this was not fully addressed by the applicant's submissions. Officers had noted that it was not clear within the submissions what impact the noise from the substations would have on both the local ecology and the character of the area and that this would need to be explored further.

The Committee received an example layout for the substations; each substation would measure 190 metres by 190 metres. The Committee was also shown a picture of the existing substation for East Anglia One (EA1). The maximum height of substation equipment would be 18 metres and the maximum building height would be 15 metres.

An illustrative masterplan for the site was displayed. The Senior Energy Projects Officer highlighted the additional planting proposed around the substation site. The site drainage was also discussed. It was noted that the surface water flow paths, which were observed during recent flood events in and around Friston, did not correspond with the flow paths recorded on published maps and that further work was required with the applicant in this regard.

An example photograph of a cable sealing end compound was shown. The maximum height would be 16 metres and the individual sealing end compounds would be 50 metres by 50 metres, with a sealing end compound including a circuit breaker measuring 50 metres by 100 metres.

The presentation also included several visualisations provided by the applicant within their submissions of the proposed substation site, looking from various viewpoints. The visualisations included computer-generated imagery of the substation developments superimposed on to the site and gave examples of what the applicant considered the view would be both at the first year of operation and 15th year of operation, demonstrating the proposed planting to screen the site.

The Senior Energy Projects Officer said that there was concern that the proposed planting would not have reached the levels of maturity suggested by the applicant within 15 years and that the sites would not be screened from view as much as the applicant had suggested.

The Senior Energy Projects Officer outlined the issue of the cumulative impact of future projects including Sizewell C, National Grid ventures (interconnectors Eurolink and Nautilus), the Galloper extension, and the Greater Gabbard extension. Concerns had

also been raised about the substation site / Friston area becoming an area for future connections should these developments occur.

Officers were said to be reviewing the significant number of documents submitted by the applicant, in order to draft the Relevant Representations and Local Impact Reports that needed to be submitted to the PINS. It was the intention that these draft documents be reviewed by the Cabinet at its meeting on 7 January 2020 before their submission. The Senior Energy Projects Officer said that the Council continued to work with the applicant to identify the means by which the impacts of the proposals could be mitigated and/or compensated.

The recommendations set out in the report were outlined to the Committee.

The Chairman invited questions to Councillor Rivett and the Planning officers.

Councillor Rivett and the Head of Planning and Coastal Management confirmed that the Council had been active in liaising with the Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy and the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, on the proposals and would continue to do so. It was noted that the dialogue had been delayed by the impending General Election and that the Council would be contacting the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy following the conclusion of the election to progress all outstanding work.

A member of the Committee sought clarification that cabling would come ashore at Thorpeness and be underground on its route to Friston. He asked where the proposed Sizewell C Nuclear Power Station would connect if approved and was advised by the Head of Planning and Coastal Management that this would connect at the Sizewell nuclear site. He was also asked whether ScottishPower had sought grid connection at Sizewell.

It was confirmed that it had been indicated in an earlier consultation that an option to connect at Sizewell had been considered but it was understood this proposal had been dismissed due to the impact it would have on the AONB (The ScottishPower proposals would still have resulted in an additional National Grid substation at Sizewell).

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management advised that the Secretary of State for Business, Energy, and Industrial Strategy would determine the DCO application based on the information contained in the submission and will not have regard as to whether there may be better / more preferable options for the scheme.

Councillor Bird left the Conference Room at 11.05 am and returned at 11.07 am.

The Senior Energy Projects Officer confirmed that the proposed Galloper and Greater Gabbard wind farm extensions, which were yet to be determined would also require their own substations but that the proposed National Grid substation may be expected to be extended if the DCO was consented. Councillor Rivett highlighted that the Council had raised with the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy that the piecemeal approach to energy projects in the area was not appropriate.

A member of the Committee asked what the connection arrangements were for EA1 and if they could be used for the proposed developments. The Head of Planning and Coastal Management advised that the cabling for EA1 came ashore at Bawdsey and travelled underground via the Deben Peninsula to the north-west of Ipswich to connect at Bramford. He also noted that the permission granted for East Anglia Three (EA3) included utilisation of the same cable run.

The Senior Energy Projects Officer added that, following the Government funding process, EA1 received funding for a smaller capacity scheme and therefore sought a non-material amendment to the project which permitted a reduction in its generation capacity and a change to its transmission from Direct Current to Alternating Current. As a result of the amendments, the ability for the Bawdsey to Bramford cable corridor to accommodate future projects was removed. The onshore cables due to the nature of their transmission and installation required more space within the cable corridor.

Councillor Rivett confirmed that the recommendations to the Committee, ahead of the recommendations that would be given to the Cabinet in January 2020, would ensure that the Council was able to respond within the set timescales.

A member of the Committee, who was Ward Member for Aldeburgh and Leiston, acknowledged the agility required for the Council to participate in the examination process, and suggested that the recommendations could be amended to include Councillor Cooper, the Assistant Cabinet Member for Planning and Coastal Management. She suggested that this would be an improvement as more than one Member would be involved, and that Councillor Cooper was also Ward Member for Aldeburgh and Leiston.

Councillor Rivett explained that the issue was not being concentrated with himself entirely and noted that updates would be given to JLAG in addition to the report before the Committee and the report that would be presented to the Cabinet. Councillor Rivett invited Councillor Cooper to attend his energy briefings.

The Chairman invited the Committee to debate the recommendation that was before it. Councillor Rivett opened debate by proposing the recommendation set out in the report.

Several members of the Committee noted that members of the public had wished to speak and ask questions of the Committee on this item but had been unable to do so.

Reference was made to the Committee's previous meeting, where there had been public speaking regarding the planning application for Sizewell B Nuclear Power Station relocated facilities; several Members queried why public speaking had not been allowed on this item as they considered it important that residents views were heard.

Officers advised the Committee that in the case of the Sizewell B application, the Council had been the determining authority and as such the Council's Constitution allowed public speaking on the item. With regards to the DCO submissions for EA1N and EA2, the Council was a statutory consultee and the applications would be determined by the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy and no provision was available to enable the public to address the committee.

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management noted that the recommendations in the report before the Committee sought its views before being presented to the Cabinet at its meeting in January 2020, who would formulate the Council's response to the submissions. He advised the Committee that other interested parties were also able to submit their representations directly to the PINS to become involved in the examination process.

Councillor Rivett assured the Committee that the Council had and would continue to seek the views of residents regarding the proposals as it would be remiss of the Council not to do so.

Several members of the Committee expressed their support for wind power in the District. One Member was of the view that no site would be perfect and suggested that the Committee take the advice from technical experts and support Councillor Rivett and his role within the process.

The Committee discussed what weight would be given to the Council's representations to the PINS. Councillor Rivett stated that the Council's representations would be given significant weight as it was a statutory consultee and the Senior Energy Projects Officer advised that the Local Impact Report was a requirement of the decision-making process and had to be taken into account when the submissions were determined.

The Chairman invited Councillor Haworth-Culf, visiting as Ward Member for Aldeburgh and Leiston, to speak.

Councillor Haworth-Culf suggested that the Council held a public meeting to seek the views of residents on the proposals. She acknowledged Councillor Rivett's statements and expressed concern about the impact the proposals would have on residents' mental health as well as on the local area. She suggested that local employment would be lost, traffic issues would arise, and that there would be a negative impact on local ecology and noise levels. She was pleased to hear that officers shared concerns regarding noise levels and that both JLAG and Councillor Cooper would be kept apprised of the situation.

Councillor Rivett assured the Chairman that the Committee would also be kept up to date regarding the proposals.

The Chairman moved to the recommendations, which had been proposed by Councillor Rivett. Councillor Rivett acknowledged the suggestion from a member of the Committee regarding a possible amendment but did not feel it was required and reiterated that Councillor Cooper was welcome to attend the energy briefings.

It was confirmed that should the recommendations not be accepted by the Committee, its comments regarding Relevant Representations and the Local Impact Report would not be forwarded to the Cabinet when it considered the report in January 2020.

On the proposition of Councillor Rivett, seconded by Councillor McCallum it was by a majority vote

RESOLVED

That Strategic Planning Committee endorses and supports the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Economic Development in seeking delegated authority, in conjunction with the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, from Cabinet in order to:

1. Be agile in responding to requests for information and documents during the Development Consent Order process for the East Anglia One North proposal including representing the Council/authorising technical officers to represent the Council at Hearings; and
2. Be agile in responding to requests for information and documents during the Development Consent Order process for the East Anglia Two proposal including representing the Council/authorising technical officers to represent the Council at Hearings.

Following the conclusion of this item, the Chairman announced that the agenda was being further re-ordered and that item 9 would be heard next.

9 Authority Monitoring Report 2018/19

The Committee received report **ES/0211** of the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Planning and Coastal Management.

The Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) was produced annually to provide information on the progress of producing and implementing the Council's Local Plans. The Council monitors planning applications and decisions each year to provide a basis on which to judge the implementation and effectiveness of policies contained within Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans. Monitoring data collected by the Council was used alongside information collected from other sources such as Suffolk Observatory, Office of National Statistics and Natural England.

The 2019 AMR covered the monitoring period 1st April 2018 to 31st March 2019; Previous AMRs had been produced individually by Suffolk Coastal District Council and Waveney District Council since 2005, but this was the first report covering the East Suffolk area.

The Principal Planner made a presentation on the report, summarising the information that it contained. He spoke about the Council's progress against its Local Plans and the development of new Local Plans, supporting communities to formulate Neighbourhood Plans, the collection of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the projects these funds had been directed towards, the Council's active co-operation with neighbouring Local Planning Authorities, monitoring of significant effects identified in Local Plan sustainability appraisals.

Councillor Gee left the Conference Room at 11.35 am and returned at 11.39 am.

It was noted that the new Waveney Local Plan had been adopted by Waveney District Council in March 2019 and that this AMR provided baseline information that would evolve from the performance of that Local Plan. The Principal Planner advised that this

would also be the case for the emerging Suffolk Coastal Local Plan following its adoption.

The Committee was advised that the Council's Constitution specified that the AMR was to be received by the Strategic Planning Committee. The Principal Planner noted the significant information within the AMR which it was hoped presented a positive approach from the Council.

The Chairman invited questions to the Principal Planner.

It was confirmed that the AMR would be published on the Council's website and would be used by officers in various different ways, such as to monitor business plan targets and implementation of the Local Plan. He added that it could also be used in Appeals Decisions and examinations by the PINS either in favour of or against the Council. The document was described as being a powerful one for showing performance against indicators.

A member of the Committee noted the disparity between neighbourhood CIL collection in the former Suffolk Coastal and Waveney areas and sought further clarification on this. The Principal Planner said that the tables in the AMR related to the 2018-19 monitoring period and that collection was dependent on a number of factors such as completion of development, which would affect the monitoring period the collection appeared in. The Principal Planner agreed to check these figures before the publication of the document.

Another member of the Committee noted the comments regarding Neighbourhood Plans and said that he had experienced times where their policies had been ignored and wanted to see this change. The Head of Planning and Coastal Management assured the Committee that Neighbourhood Plans were given due regard and weight and were not ignored when determining planning applications, as this would be unlawful.

The Chairman moved to the recommendations set out in the report.

On the proposition of Councillor Brooks, seconded by Councillor Cooper it was by unanimous vote

RESOLVED

1. That the East Suffolk Authority Monitoring Report covering the period 1st April 2018 to 31st March 2019 be published.
2. That the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Planning and Coastal Management in conjunction with the Head of Planning and Coastal Management Service be given delegated authority to make minor typographical or presentational changes to the document following Strategic Planning Committee.

The Committee received report **ES/0214** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management. The report provided quarterly statistics on Planning enforcement between July and September 2019.

The report was presented by the Planning Development Manager, who noted that there had been a large number of enforcement cases during the period. She said the vast majority of cases had been closed as there had been no breach of planning permission but had required investigation to resolve as such. In the last period, only one enforcement notice had been served.

The Chairman invited questions to the Planning Development Manager.

A member of the Committee noted that the headline figures in the report showed that more cases were coming in month on month than could be cleared and sought assurances around how the backlog building up would be cleared, asking if the Enforcement Team was adequately resourced.

The Planning Development Manager noted that there was one vacant post in the Enforcement Team, and this would be advertised in January 2020. She considered that the team was adequately resourced and noted that Planning officers all dealt with enforcement cases, with the Enforcement Team dealing with the more complex cases.

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management was not of the view that the Enforcement Team was under-resourced. He suggested that further analysis of the backlog could be considered at the Committee's next meeting on 9 March 2020. He was not aware of any issues raised by town and parish councils and advised the Committee that he and his team liaised regularly with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Coastal Management on the matter.

The Vice-Chairman considered that the Enforcement Team was in the best position it had been for some time. The Chairman concurred with this assessment.

RESOLVED

That the report concerning Enforcement Team statistics be received and noted.

7 Planning Appeals Report

The Committee received report **ES/0207** of the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Planning and Coastal Management. The report provided an update on all appeal decisions received from the Planning Inspectorate between 22 August 2019 and 25 November 2019.

The report was presented by the Planning Development Manager, who noted that 80% of the appeals had been successfully defended. She considered that this demonstrated that the Council was making the right planning decisions at both delegated and Committee levels and that the success rate was higher than many neighbouring authorities.

The Committee gave its thanks to the Planning officers.

RESOLVED

That the contents of the report be received and noted.

8 Development Management Performance Report

The Committee received report **ES/0208** of the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Planning and Coastal Management. The report provided an update on the planning performance of the Development Management Team in terms of the timescales for determining planning applications.

The report was presented by the Planning Development Manager. It was noted that there had been an upward trend in performance with the exception of determining major applications but that this still exceeded both national targets and the stretched local targets set by the Council. The Planning Development Manager said that this report, in concert with the Planning Appeals report, highlighted that correct decisions were being made in good time.

The Chairman invited questions to the Planning Development Manager.

The Planning Development Manager advised that although the Development Management Team was always under pressure to deliver, it was a diligent and hardworking team containing officers that went above and beyond to achieve. She stated that she was proud of what the team had accomplished.

A member of the Committee reiterated concerns he had raised at the previous meeting of the Committee regarding the number of applications not being referred to Planning Committees for a decision, citing issues in his Ward. He suggested that a more robust referral system was necessary and that any application where both the parish or town council and the Ward Member's views were contrary to the officer's recommendation should be determined by Members, considering that this would have only a small impact on the Planning Committees North and South.

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management stated that the Planning service would review the referral system after one year of operation. He asked Members to direct any concerns from town and parish councils to officers and said that changes could be made to the Constitution, through the Audit and Governance Committee and Full Council, should any issues be picked up after review.

A member of the Committee, who was also a member of Felixstowe Town Council and was Vice-Chairman of its Planning Committee, stated that of late there had been mostly concurrence between that Committee's recommendations and the decisions issued by the Council.

The Vice-Chairman noted that a similar referral system had been operated at Suffolk Coastal District Council. She said that it was important to continually review the decisions made by the referral panel and amend the process as required. She stated concerns about a lack of valid planning reasons being given when consultees recommend refusal, suggesting that a requirement for these to be included could be added to the process in the future.

The Vice-Chairman confirmed that those applications with a significant public interest can be referred to Committee for a decision and that this had happened in the past.

In regard to a question on Neighbourhood Plans a member of the Committee, who was also Vice-Chairman of Planning Committee South, noted that Neighbourhood Plan policies were being given weight by the referral panel but needed to be considered against other local and national planning policies. He reminded the Committee that all Members were welcome to observe referral panel meetings, which took place at 9.30 am on Tuesdays (12 pm on a day where Planning Committee North or South meets).

RESOLVED

That the contents of the report be received and noted.

10 Suggested Amendments to the Code of Good Practice for Members – Planning and Rights of Way

The Committee received report **ES/0212** of both the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Planning and Coastal Management.

A review of the Code of Good Practice for Members – Planning and Rights of Way (The Code), conducted in October 2019, had highlighted a number of amendments required to reflect the current practice and arrangements for site visits undertaken by the Council's Planning Committees. The report asked the Committee to review the proposed amendments and recommend that they be approved by both the Audit and Governance Committee and Full Council.

The report was presented by the Head of Planning and Coastal Management who summarised that the Code in its present format suggested that Site Visits were public meetings, when in fact they should be fact-finding meetings.

The Committee was advised that the proposed changes were at Appendix B of the report and that approval would be sought from the Audit and Governance Committee and Full Council, as the Code was part of the Council's Constitution.

There being no questions, the Chairman moved the recommendations as set out in the report.

On the proposition of Councillor Deacon, seconded by Councillor Ceresa it was by unanimous vote

RESOLVED

That the proposed amendments to the Code of Good Practice for Members – Planning and Rights of Way be considered and recommended for approval to the Audit and Governance Committee and Full Council.

12 Strategic Planning Committee's Forward Work Programme

The Committee received and reviewed its current forward work programme.

The Vice-Chairman sought the Committee's views on visiting a company called Utopia to research modular housing. The Committee agreed to this in principle.

The meeting concluded at 12.16 pm

.....
Chairman