

# Development Committee



**Please contact:** Democratic Services

**Please email:** [democraticservices@north-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:democraticservices@north-norfolk.gov.uk) Direct Dial: 01263 516108

**TO REGISTER TO SPEAK PLEASE SEE BOX BELOW**

Wednesday, 11 February 2026

A meeting of the **Development Committee** will be held in the **Council Chamber - Council Offices** on **Thursday, 19 February 2026** at **9.30 am**.

At the discretion of the Chairman, a short break will be taken after the meeting has been running for approximately one and a half hours

**Please note that members of the public should not speak to Committee Members prior to or during the meeting.**

## **PUBLIC SPEAKING :**

Members of the public who wish to speak on applications must register **by 9 am on the Tuesday before the meeting** by telephoning **Reception on 01263 513811** or by emailing [reception@north-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:reception@north-norfolk.gov.uk) Please read the information on the procedure for public speaking at Development Committee on our website or request a copy of "Have Your Say" from Customer Services.

Anyone may take photographs, film or audio-record the proceedings and report on the meeting. If you are a member of the public and you wish to speak, please be aware that you may be filmed or photographed. Please note that this meeting is livestreamed:

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCsShJeAVZMS0kSWcz-WyEzg>

*Presentations:* If you wish to view the Officers' presentations for the applications being considered by the Committee please follow the following link:

<https://modgov.north-norfolk.gov.uk/ecCatDisplayClassic.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13644&path=0>

**Emma Denny**  
**Democratic Services Manager**

**To:** Cllr P Heinrich, Cllr R Macdonald, Cllr M Batey, Cllr A Brown, Cllr P Fisher, Cllr A Fitch-Tillett, Cllr M Hankins, Cllr V Holliday, Cllr P Neatherway, Cllr L Paterson, Cllr J Toye, Cllr K Toye, Cllr A Varley and Cllr L Vickers

**Substitutes:** Cllr T Adams, Cllr P Bailey, Cllr K Bayes, Cllr J Boyle, Cllr S Bütikofer, Cllr N Dixon, Cllr T FitzPatrick, Cllr W Fredericks, Cllr J Punchard, Cllr C Ringer, Cllr M Taylor, Cllr E Tooke and Cllr L Withington

All other Members of the Council for information.

Members of the Management Team, appropriate Officers, Press and Public



**If you have any special requirements in order to attend this meeting, please let us know in advance**

If you would like any document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact us

**Chief Executive:** Steve Blatch

**Tel** 01263 513811 **Fax** 01263 515042 **Minicom** 01263 516005

**Email** [districtcouncil@north-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:districtcouncil@north-norfolk.gov.uk) **Web site** [www.north-norfolk.gov.uk](http://www.north-norfolk.gov.uk)

## **A G E N D A**

<b>PLEASE NOTE: THE ORDER OF BUSINESS MAY BE CHANGED AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIRMAN</b>
--

### **PUBLIC BUSINESS**

**1. CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTIONS**

**2. TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

**3. SUBSTITUTES**

**4. MINUTES**

(Pages 1 - 6)

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of a meeting of the Committee held on Thursday, 11<sup>th</sup> December 2025.

**5. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

(a) To determine any other items of business which the Chairman decides should be considered as a matter of urgency pursuant to Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972.

(b) To consider any objections received to applications which the Head of Planning was authorised to determine at a previous meeting.

**6. ORDER OF BUSINESS**

(a) To consider any requests to defer determination of an application included in this agenda, so as to save any unnecessary waiting by members of the public attending for such applications.

(b) To determine the order of business for the meeting.

**7. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

(Pages 7 - 12)

Members are asked at this stage to declare any interests that they may have in any of the following items on the agenda. The Code of Conduct for Members requires that declarations include the nature of the interest and whether it is a disclosable pecuniary interest. Members are requested to refer to the attached guidance and flowchart.

### **OFFICERS' REPORTS**

**8. HOLT - PF/24/2530 - ERECTION OF 23 DWELLINGS (INCLUDING 7 NO. AFFORDABLE DWELLINGS) WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING, LANDSCAPING AND CREATION OF PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AT LAND NORTH OF VALLEY LANE, HOLT, NORFOLK** (Pages 13 - 40)

**9. CLEY-NEXT-THE-SEA - PF/25/1571 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING NON-TRADITIONAL CONSTRUCTION DWELLING AND CONSTRUCTION OF REPLACEMENT DWELLING WITH** (Pages 41 - 52)

**ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING AND WIDENING OF ACCESS (SELF-BUILD) AT THORNHILL FARM, BRIDGEFOOT LANE, CLEY-NEXT-THE-SEA, HOLT, NORFOLK NR25 7BB**

10. **HOLT - PF/25/2133 (APPLICATION 1) - REPLACEMENT WINDOWS (RETROSPECTIVE) AT 2 THE BEECHES, STATION ROAD, HOLT, NORFOLK, NR25 6AU & HOLT - LA/25/2134 (APPLICATION 2) - REPLACEMENT WINDOWS (RETROSPECTIVE) AT 2 THE BEECHES, STATION ROAD, HOLT, NORFOLK, NR25 6AU** (Pages 53 - 64)
11. **THURSFORD - PF/25/2102 - CHANGE OF USE FROM AGRICULTURAL LAND TO A DOG WALKING FIELD WITH ASSOCIATED SECURE CAR PARKING, SHED FOR USE BY DOG WALKERS, ASSOCIATED VEHICULAR ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS TO SERVE DOG WALKING FIELD AND A CAR PARK FOR THURSFORD CEMETERY AS USERS CURRENTLY HAVE TO PARK ON THE HIGHWAY AT LAND TO THE NORTH OF THURSFORD CEMETERY, GUNTORPE ROAD, THURSFORD, NR21 0BP** (Pages 65 - 72)
12. **WALCOTT - PF/25/2618 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING ATTACHED OUTBUILDING AND ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AT CHURCH COTTAGE, COAST ROAD, WALCOTT.** (Pages 73 - 78)
13. **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE** (Pages 79 - 82)
14. **APPEALS SECTION** (Pages 83 - 88)
15. **EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

To pass the following resolution, if necessary:-

“That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A (as amended) to the Act.”

**PRIVATE BUSINESS**

This page is intentionally left blank

## DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

**Minutes of the meeting of the Development Committee held on Thursday, 11 December 2025 in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 9.30 am**

<b>Committee Members Present:</b>	Cllr P Heinrich (Chairman)	Cllr R Macdonald (Vice-Chairman)
	Cllr M Batey	Cllr A Brown
	Cllr P Fisher	Cllr A Fitch-Tillett
	Cllr M Hankins	Cllr V Holliday
	Cllr P Neatherway	Cllr L Paterson
	Cllr J Toye	Cllr K Toye
	Cllr L Vickers	

### **Substitute Members:**

<b>Officers in Attendance:</b>	Democratic Services & Governance Officer, Development Management and Major Projects Manager, Lawyer and Claire Shopland Committees
	Senior Planning Officer (SPO – JB)
	Senior Planning Officer (SPO – JS)
	Senior Planning Officer (SPO – MB)

### **78 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr A Varley.

### **79 SUBSTITUTES**

Cllr T Adams was present as a substitute for Cllr A Varley.

### **80 MINUTES**

The minutes of the Development Committee meeting held Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> October 2025 were approved as a correct record subject to typographical corrections on p.3 with the spelling of Cllr A Fitch Tillett's and Cllr L Paterson's names.

### **81 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None

### **82 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr A Brown declared a non-pecuniary interest with respect to planning application PF.24.2057 (Brinton). He stated that he was pre-determined and so would abstain from voting on the application.

Cllr A Fitch Tillett declared a non-pecuniary interest with respect to planning application RV.25.2056 (Happisburgh). As former portfolio holder for the Coast she was a staunch advocate for the scheme and as such considered herself to be pre-determined and would abstain from voting.

Cllr T Adams declared a non-pecuniary interest with respect to planning application PF.25.0961 (Hempton). He stated that he was pre-determined and so would abstain from voting on the application.

- 83 **HAPPISBURGH - RV/25/2056 - ACCESS TRACK TO LIGHTHOUSE LANE TO SERVE EXISTING PUBLIC CAR PARK AND NEW CAR PARK TO ALLOW FOR ROLLBACK OF EXISTING CAR PARK; ANCILLARY WORKS, WITHOUT COMPLYING WITH CONDITIONS 2 (APPROVED PLANS), 3 (LANDSCAPING), 14 (ACCESS TRACK FROM LIGHTHOUSE LANE), 15 (GATES/BOLLARD/CHAIN/OTHER MEANS OF OBSTRUCTION) AND 21 (OFF-SITE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS) OF PLANNING PERMISSION PF/22/2510 TO ALLOW NEW ACCESS POSITION OFF LIGHTHOUSE LANE TO ALIGN WITH OPPOSITE NEIGHBOURS GARAGE AND PREVENT CAR HEADLIGHTS SHINING INTO THE DWELLING FROM THE SITE EGRESS CARRIAGEWAY.**

#### Officers Report

The Case Officer (SPO-JB) introduced the officers report and provided details regarding the site's location, aerial views, photographs in and around the site, and technical drawings of the proposed variations.

It was noted that the proposed EV charging provision fell short of the requirements under the emerging Local Plan (CT6), which should be afforded significant weight due to its advanced stage. Officers considered the fall-back provision of no EV charging and concluded this was a significant material consideration which justified departure from the emerging plan.

An issue regarding land ownership had been identified, and a new 21-day consultation notice period had been issued.

#### Public Speakers

None.

#### Local Member

The Local Member, Cllr L Paterson, expressed his support for the scheme and endorsed improvements to signage and passing places.

#### Committee Debate

- a. In response to Cllr A Brown, the Development Manager advised that he was unaware of any financial implications.
- b. Cllr P Fisher proposed, and Cllr L Paterson seconded, acceptance of the officer's recommendation.

#### **IT WAS RESOLVED**

That Application RV/25/2056 be **APPROVED** subject to the expiration of the revised land ownership certificate notice period (December 30th) expiring without raising any new material planning considerations, as well as conditions listed below:

Imposition of conditions as per the previous approval (minus the time limit condition) together with two new conditions added to control / deliver the following:

- The use of land within the blue line for visibility splays for traffic leaving the site.
- The submission and approval of electric vehicle charging scheme.

Final wording of conditions to be delegated to the Assistant Director – Planning

**84 BRINTON - PF/24/2057 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND ERECTION OF REPLACEMENT DWELLING WITH GARAGE AT HOMESTEAD, SHARRINGTON ROAD, BRINTON, MELTON CONSTABLE, NORFOLK, NR24 2QG.**

Case Officer

The Case Officer (SPO-JS) introduced the officer report and recommendation for approval subject to conditions. She provided details of the site's location, existing and proposed site plan and elevations, technical drawings of the approved 2014 application (which had lapsed), images in and around the site showing the dilapidated existing dwelling, and images of the dwelling in 2009.

Public Speakers

Sarah Hayden – Brinton and Sharrington Parish Council  
Keith Parks – Objecting  
Anthony Hudson – Supporting

Local Member

The Local Member, Cllr A Brown, objected to the application. He expressed his concern that the site would be prone to flooding, which would be further exacerbated by surface water runoff, as well as through the loss of trees. He supplied images of the road servicing the property, noting it was prone to flooding. The Local Member stated that a more detailed flood analysis was required.

Cllr A Brown considered the application contrary to policies EN4, EN2 and HO 8 of the Core Strategy, and argued that the design, scale and mass of the proposed dwelling was disproportionally large for the setting within two designated conservation areas. The Local Member was critical of the calculation used to determine floor space, noting that it failed to account for the proposed 1<sup>st</sup> floor.

Committee Debate

- a. The Chairman sought clarity how much weight should be afforded the 2014 application, and whether flooding was a material consideration. The Case Officer and Development Manager confirmed the approved 2014 application was a material consideration, noting it had been approved under the existing core strategy. The Development Manager stated that flooding was also a material consideration and noted that if the proposal was for a new build dwelling in the countryside, as opposed a replacement dwelling, it would be assessed differently under policy.
- b. With respect to matters of flooding, Cllr T Adams, Cllr J Toye, and Cllr V Holliday expressed concern that the application may exacerbate issues. Cllr T Adams asked what consideration had been given to foul drainage matters and sought clarity if the Local Flood Authority (LFA) had been consulted on

the application.

- c. The Case Officer advised that the existing septic tank would be replaced with an acceptable Package Treatment Plant. The SPO-JS confirmed that although the LFA had not been formally consulted, as the proposal fell below the relevant thresholds for requiring a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment, she was mindful residents' comments and so sought guidance from the LFA who informally advised that the site lay in Flood Zone 1, and was therefore not at risk of fluvial flooding, and that they had no record of flooding to the dwelling. This was supported by NNDC's own records.
- d. The Chairman and Cllr Fitch-Tillett noted the images provided to the Committee by Cllr A Brown and considered that it was difficult to conclude if the flooding was as a result of water running from the site. Cllr Fitch-Tillett was content that matters pertaining to flooding could be appropriately addressed by condition.
- e. Cllr T Adams and Cllr V Holliday asked how the loss of trees may be mitigated. The Case Officer affirmed the Landscape Officer was content with the application and that the application was supported by a Landscape Management Plan. Cllr L Vickers disagreed with inferences that the Landscape Officer was critical of the scheme, as she felt their comments had been favourable.
- f. Cllr V Holliday endorsed concerns raised by Cllr A Brown with respect to NNDC Core Strategy Policies EN4 and HO8 and affirmed that consideration should be given to light pollution and the use of reduced VLT glazing. The Development Manager advised that Officers were satisfied that the proposed application complied with policy HO 8.
- g. Cllr A Brown stated that although the proposed dwelling maybe sit below Brook House, it was markedly larger than the existing dwelling. The Development Manager suggested, following discussion with the Principal Lawyer, that a condition be applied with respect to ground levels, ensuring the proposed dwelling continued to sit below neighbouring Brook House.
- h. Cllr L Paterson proposed, and Cllr M Hankins seconded, acceptance of the officer's recommendation with the suggested ground level condition included. Cllr L Paterson considered the 2014 approval granted under the existing core strategy, to be a key consideration which should be afforded significant weight.

#### **IT WAS RESOLVED**

That Planning Application PF/24/2057 be APPROVED subject to conditions outlined in the officer's report, as well as a condition pertaining to Ground Levels.

Final wording of conditions and any other considered necessary to be delegated to the Assistant Director – Planning

**85 HEMPTON - PF/25/0961 - SELF-STORAGE FACILITY WITH 212 CONTAINERS, PERIMETER FENCING, LANDSCAPING, AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT LAND SOUTH OF HEMPTON POULTRY FARM, HELHOUGHTON ROAD, HEMPTON, NORFOLK**



### Case Officer

The Case Officer (SPO-MB) introduced the officers report and recommendation for refusal. He provided details of the site's location plan, aerial views, proposed block plan and landscaping, an artist's impression of the street scene, images in and around the site, dimensions of the containers, and made references to an alternate site located with Fakenham – application PF/21/0065.

### Public Speakers

Charles Judson – supporting

### Local Member

A written statement from the Local Member, Cllr N Housden in support of the application was relayed to the Committee. The Local Member placed significant weight on the economic benefits of the proposal, and the need for farm diversification. He considered the site acceptable as it would pragmatically take vehicle movements away from the Town Centre and would have a reduced highway and environmental impact.

### Committee Debate

- a. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett expressed her surprise and concern to have received an email from the leader of the Council, Cllr T Adams, lobbying Members to support the application. Cllr T Adams stated he was within his rights to write to Members and expressed his support for the application, as the Raynham Estate Plan was of strategic consideration to the district.
- b. The Principal Lawyer confirmed Officers were aware of the correspondence and provided guidance to the Committee on the matter. The Principal Lawyer advised that Members of the Council could be lobbied by fellow Members. The Leader, Cllr T Adams, would not be voting on the application (and had earlier advised he would abstain from voting). She instructed the Committee to maintain an open mind when considering the application, and not to place undue weight on the representation made by the Leader, just because he is the Leader.
- c. Cllr A Brown recognised the economic benefits the proposal would bring if granted and sought assurances that the business would remain part of the Raynham Estate and not sold separately.
- d. Cllr T Adams noted the significant scale of the adjacent business which was already well serviced by HGV vehicles. He argued the proposal would result in employment generation, which he argued would benefit both the local economy and the district as a whole. He noted there were no statutory consultee objections to the proposal, and he considered that it complied with policies relating to farm diversification under the emerging Local Plan.
- e. The Chairman reminded the Committee that they must consider the planning application as presented and not broader matters.
- f. The Development Manager advised that the Planning Service had not been in receipt of the level of detail which Officers considered would justify a departure from policy, including financial information and details regarding

farm diversification. This information had been requested but not received.

- g. Cllr L Paterson proposed, and Cllr P Fisher seconded, deferral of the application due to a lack of information regarding farm diversification, and how the application would support the estate. Cllr V Holliday added that she would like to see greater detail on the wider economic benefits to the district, specifically employment, when the proposal is next presented to committee.
- h. Cllr R Macdonald expressed his concern regarding the location of the site in relation to the adjacent poultry farm and the impact of Avian Flu issues.

**IT WAS RESOLVED**

That Planning Application PF/25/0961 be DEFFERED.

**86 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE**

The report was noted.

**87 APPEALS SECTION**

The report was noted.

**88 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

The meeting ended at 10.58 am.

---

Chairman

## Registering interests

Within 28 days of becoming a member or your re-election or re-appointment to office you must register with the Monitoring Officer the interests which fall within the categories set out in **Table 1 (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests)** which are as described in "The Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012". You should also register details of your other personal interests which fall within the categories set out in **Table 2 (Other Registerable Interests)**.

**"Disclosable Pecuniary Interest"** means an interest of yourself, or of your partner if you are aware of your partner's interest, within the descriptions set out in Table 1 below.

**"Partner"** means a spouse or civil partner, or a person with whom you are living as husband or wife, or a person with whom you are living as if you are civil partners.

1. You must ensure that your register of interests is kept up-to-date and within 28 days of becoming aware of any new interest, or of any change to a registered interest, notify the Monitoring Officer.
2. A 'sensitive interest' is as an interest which, if disclosed, could lead to the councillor, or a person connected with the councillor, being subject to violence or intimidation.
3. Where you have a 'sensitive interest' you must notify the Monitoring Officer with the reasons why you believe it is a sensitive interest. If the Monitoring Officer agrees they will withhold the interest from the public register.

## Non participation in case of disclosable pecuniary interest

4. Where a matter arises at a meeting which directly relates to one of your Disclosable Pecuniary Interests as set out in **Table 1**, you must disclose the interest, not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation. If it is a 'sensitive interest', you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest, just that you have an interest. Dispensation may be granted in limited circumstances, to enable you to participate and vote on a matter in which you have a disclosable pecuniary interest.
5. Where you have a disclosable pecuniary interest on a matter to be considered or is being considered by you as a Cabinet member in exercise of your executive function, you must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest and must not take any steps or further steps in the matter apart from arranging for someone else to deal with it

## Disclosure of Other Registerable Interests

6. Where a matter arises at a meeting which **directly relates** to one of your Other Registerable Interests (as set out in **Table 2**), you must disclose the interest. You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting but otherwise must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation. If it is a 'sensitive interest', you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

## Disclosure of Non-Registerable Interests

7. Where a matter arises at a meeting which **directly relates** to your financial interest or well-being (and is not a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest set out in Table 1) or a financial interest or well-being of a relative or close associate, you must disclose the interest. You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting. Otherwise you must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation. If it is a 'sensitive interest', you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.
8. Where a matter arises at a meeting which **affects** –
  - a. your own financial interest or well-being;
  - b. a financial interest or well-being of a relative, close associate; or
  - c. a body included in those you need to disclose under Other Registrable Interests as set out in **Table 2**

you must disclose the interest. In order to determine whether you can remain in the meeting after disclosing your interest the following test should be applied

9. Where a matter **affects** your financial interest or well-being:
  - a. to a greater extent than it affects the financial interests of the majority of inhabitants of the ward affected by the decision and;
  - b. a reasonable member of the public knowing all the facts would believe that it would affect your view of the wider public interest

You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting. Otherwise you must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation.

If it is a 'sensitive interest', you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

10. Where you have a personal interest in any business of your authority and you have made an executive decision in relation to that business, you must make sure that any written statement of that decision records the existence and nature of your interest.

**Table 1: Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

This table sets out the explanation of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests as set out in the [Relevant Authorities \(Disclosable Pecuniary Interests\) Regulations 2012](#).

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Employment, office, trade, profession or vocation</b>	Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain. [Any unpaid directorship.]
<b>Sponsorship</b>	Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from the council) made to the councillor during the previous 12-month period for expenses incurred by him/her in carrying out his/her duties as a councillor, or towards his/her election expenses. This includes any payment or financial benefit from a trade union within the meaning of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992.
<b>Contracts</b>	Any contract made between the councillor or his/her spouse or civil partner or the person with whom the

	<p>councillor is living as if they were spouses/civil partners (or a firm in which such person is a partner, or an incorporated body of which such person is a director* or a body that such person has a beneficial interest in the securities of*) and the council —</p> <p>(a) under which goods or services are to be provided or works are to be executed; and</p> <p>(b) which has not been fully discharged.</p>
<b>Land and Property</b>	<p>Any beneficial interest in land which is within the area of the council.</p> <p>‘Land’ excludes an easement, servitude, interest or right in or over land which does not give the councillor or his/her spouse or civil partner or the person with whom the councillor is living as if they were spouses/civil partners (alone or jointly with another) a right to occupy or to receive income.</p>
<b>Licenses</b>	<p>Any licence (alone or jointly with others) to occupy land in the area of the council for a month or longer</p>
<b>Corporate tenancies</b>	<p>Any tenancy where (to the councillor’s knowledge)—</p> <p>(a) the landlord is the council; and</p> <p>(b) the tenant is a body that the councillor, or his/her spouse or civil partner or the person with whom the councillor is living as if they were spouses/civil partners is a partner of or a director* of or has a beneficial interest in the securities* of.</p>
<b>Securities</b>	<p>Any beneficial interest in securities* of a body where—</p> <p>(a) that body (to the councillor’s knowledge) has a place of business or land in the area of the council; and</p> <p>(b) either—</p> <p>(i) the total nominal value of the securities* exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body; or</p> <p>(ii) if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which the councillor, or his/her spouse or civil partner or the person with whom the councillor is living as if they were</p>

	spouses/civil partners has a beneficial interest exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.
--	---

\* 'director' includes a member of the committee of management of an industrial and provident society.

\* 'securities' means shares, debentures, debenture stock, loan stock, bonds, units of a collective investment scheme within the meaning of the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000 and other securities of any description, other than money deposited with a building society.

**Table 2: Other Registrable Interests**

You have a personal interest in any business of your authority where it relates to or is likely to affect:

- a) any body of which you are in general control or management and to which you are nominated or appointed by your authority
- b) any body
  - (i) exercising functions of a public nature
  - (ii) any body directed to charitable purposes or
  - (iii) one of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union)





**HOLT – PF/24/2530 – Erection of 23 dwellings (including 7 no. affordable dwellings) with associated parking, landscaping and creation of public open space at Land north of Valley Lane, Holt, Norfolk**

**Major Development**

**Target Date: 28 February 2025**

**Extension of Time: 28 February 2025**

**Case Officer: Mark Brands**

**Full Planning Permission**

## **RELEVANT CONSTRAINTS**

Agricultural Land Classification: Grade 2

Archaeological Notification Areas

Conservation Areas – Holt and Glaven Valley

Landscape Character Assessment - River Valleys and Wooded Glacial Ridge

Listed Buildings in vicinity

Principal Routes

Within Holt settlement boundary

Holt Neighbourhood Plan Area

Mineral Safeguarding Area

GIRAMS Zones of Influence (various)

## **THE APPLICATION**

Seeks planning permission for the erection of 23 dwellings, comprising four x 1 bed, one 2 bed, thirteen x 3 bed and five x 4 bed. The development comprises 7 affordable (units 17-23) and 16 market dwellings (units 1-16). The units are mostly two storeys in a mix of detached, link and semi-detached terrace and apartment block, and 1-unit single storey dwelling.

The main area of open space is on the western boundary of the site, with pockets of open space and landscaping also in the centre of the site east to west axis, and buffer strips to the south and north and northeast of the site.

The site is accessed via Pound Close (comprising a small housing “Close” to either side) this in turn joins Norwich Road (A148). The site is adjacent to predominantly detached residential properties to the east and south; a property and garden abutting the site to the north. To the west and northwest is countryside and Spouts Hill County Wildlife Site. The site area is 0.94 hectares, with 1,492sqm of public open space proposed predominantly on the western side of the site.

An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening Opinion was completed by the Council, dated 23 January 2025, this concluded that the proposal would not likely have significant effects on the environment in EIA terms. The decision concluded that an Environmental Statement was not required to be submitted with the application.

### Further details / amendments received during the course of the application

- 7, 9 and 19 January 2026 Following the adoption of the new Local Plan, updated plans and reports have been provided to reflect new policy considerations and requirements, levels details and BNG calcs.

- 9 December 2025 details on private footpath and land transfer and shadow castings
- 18 November 2025 Updated site plan received to address highway comments
- 14 November 2025 Shadow Casting neighbouring view plans, plot plans, indicative sketch plans and frontage site sections
- 17 October 2025 planning statement and indicative sketch drawings
- 25 September 2025 Full package of revised plans received for plots, covering letter, reports and supporting details received

Since the submission of the original plans, the proposals have been subject to a significant redesign and full set of new plans submitted. The summary of consultee comments reflects the revised proposals. The public comments summary is based on the representations received during the course of the application, noting the similarities and references made to the earlier comments submitted in the public comments.

## RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Reference	PF/23/0537
Description	Hybrid application comprising a Full Planning Application for 15 dwellings along with vehicular and pedestrian access, services/utilities infrastructure through the site, and an Outline Application (all matters reserved apart from access) for seven 'self-build' dwellings
Outcome	Withdrawn

## REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

Local member: the application has been referred to committee at the request of Councillor Rouse for the following reasons:

I have serious concerns along with several local residents about the displacement of local wildlife and ecology related to this proposal, I feel this contradicts commons law to strictly prohibit building on Conservation Land and feel approval of this proposal would in such be extremely controversial, as well as this there are concerns of the local residents that would feel overlooked by this development and the infringement upon their own properties, increased influx of traffic we feel would also be a significant issue as the junction around Valley Lane is already very busy with any potential development risking further congestion and traffic issues.

I do really feel that this development would not be wise and that the committee should be made fully aware of the objections.

## CONSULTATIONS

**Holt Town Council – Support** (summarised – full comments on public site)

- Developer has offered the lower field as an extension to Spout Hills and seek its inclusion in the S106 with HTC provided money with the intention to open up some of this land for public access.
- Its an allocated site
- Maximum amount of affordable housing should be delivered and preference to increasing the amount currently offered
- Recognise the efforts made in the revised plans to address concerns raised by nearby residents

- Maintenance of buffer zones to be maintained by a maintenance company
- Note the additional parcel of open space being offered to the community and provided this is included in the S106 HTC support application.

**Anglian Water – Comments** – (subject to informatives, local infrastructure has sufficient capacity to accommodate the development)

**Landscape (NNDC) – Comments**

- Revised plans present a more appropriate orientation of units that satisfactorily addresses previous concerns in relation to landscape and visual impact.
- Views through the site to Spout Hills and the countryside beyond are retained.
- Landscape buffers at site boundaries are improved and there is pedestrian linkage from the site to Spout Hills.
- Site lies east of Spout Common County Wildlife Site.
- A financial contribution to Norfolk Wildlife Trust appropriate
- Support revised layout to include wildlife corridors on northern, western and partially on southern boundary and reduction of height and associated light spill
- Bats use western and southern boundary for foraging and commuting between roosts and feeding sites
- Proposed BNG / slow worm translocation site managed as rough grassland would provide alternative foraging for barn owl following loss of grassland site
- GIRAMS contribution required
- Translocation site required to be enhanced prior to translocation of slow worms
- BNG – further information required

**Environmental Health – No objections** – (subject to conditions including contamination in the event this is encountered, details of plant/machinery/ventilation/air con/heating equipment)

**Natural England – Comments**

- Further information required regarding impacts on designated sites (GIRAMS)
- Impacts on landscape do not necessitate Natural England involvement

**Climate and Environmental Policy – Comments**

- No energy statement setting out how its meeting sustainable construction and energy efficiency
- Recommend building the houses to be net zero

**Norfolk County Council Flood & Water Management (LLFA) – No objection** (subject to conditions) –

- Objected to original details based on insufficient information and details expected at the full application stage
- a sensitivity check is required to ensure strategy and calculations continue to comply with latest version of all relevant policies and guidance
- Details incorporate rain garden features for 8 plots
- No Construction Water Management Plan has been provided that clearly assesses and demonstrates safe management of local flood risk and surface water runoff drainage throughout the proposed construction phase. However, due to this application being submitted prior to this requirement being included in the Norfolk LLFA's Guidance for Developers document, in this instance the LLFA are willing to provide a condition for this information
- Proposals include individual soakaways and permeable paving where the maintenance and management responsibilities will be the responsibility of future occupants and this needs to be ensured.

**Norfolk County Council - Planning Obligations Co-Ordinator – Comments** (outlining contribution requirements)

**Norfolk County Council Highways – No objections** (subject to conditions)

**Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service – No objections** (subject to provision of 1 fire hydrant)

**Planning Policy (NNDC) – Comments** – Outlines the background to the allocation of the site and associated consultations, context of the site and policy positions and expectation of adherence to allocation policy

**Strategic Housing NNDC – Support – On balance, broad** policy compliance level of affordable homes (with the inclusion of a commuted sum).

**Norfolk Minerals and Waste - No objections** – site is underlain by a Mineral Safeguarding Area (Sand and Gravel), it is considered that as a result of the site area it would be exempt from the requirements of the adopted Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy

**Norfolk Wildlife Trust – Comments**

- Site is adjacent to Spout Common County Wildlife Site (CWS), noted for 'lowland fen' habitat (priority habitat). Concerned about negative impacts on this CWS, particularly from visitor pressure and light spill
- concerns about the cumulative negative impacts on Spout Common CWS as a result of increased footfall on the site from coded boundary gate.
- recommend a contribution is provided from the developer towards the management of Spout Common CWS, in order to mitigate against the cumulative impacts of visitor pressure (including through the provision of signage, interpretation panels or infrastructure etc)
- welcome revised site plan reducing number of floors and all buildings would be lower, which would reduce light spill
- Mitigation and enhancement measures outlined in report should be conditioned

**Norfolk Constabulary – Designing Out Crime Officer – Comments**

- Information on role in relation to providing advice in relation to layout, environmental design and physical security of buildings, based upon principles of crime prevention through environmental design.
- Concerns over blank elevations in between homes 3 and 4 and a common bungalow design which places the active elevations into the private rear garden space
- Boundary treatment suggestions
- Unobserved parts of the site
- Suggested changes include all homes having private footpaths to their entrance doors and clearly define private spaces rather than public/communal approach
- Vulnerability to rear gardens due to slightly low boundary treatment is removed
- Network of alleyways to provide access to terraced homes and flats is appropriately controlled

**Internal Drainage Board – Comments**

- Testing shows a drainage strategy reliant on infiltration to be achievable

**Norfolk Historic Environment Service – No comments** (no recommendation for archaeological works)

**Historic England – No objections** (subject to conditions)

- Site is within Holt and adjacent to Glaven Conservation Areas and two grade II listed properties to the north of the site (Hill House and Methodist Church)
- Conservation Area Character Appraisal identifies the site as contributing to Holt Conservation Area's significance, with positive views looking west from Norwich Road. The proposed site forms a buffer between the urban settlement of Holt and the countryside.
- changes represent an improvement in how the development responds to its sensitive landscape and heritage context. The reduced building heights and enhanced green infrastructure would better preserve the visual transition between the built-up edge of Holt and the open landscape of the Glaven Valley. The additional planting and open space provision would assist in filtering views from Spout Hills and the Glaven Valley Conservation Area.
- amended proposals represent a constructive and generally successful response to our earlier concerns. The revised layout, reduced building heights and strengthened landscape framework deliver the allocation in what now appears to be the least harmful form, achieving a more sensitive relationship with the Holt and Glaven Valley Conservation Areas and the wider landscape setting.

#### **Conservation and Design (NNDC) – No objections**

- The alterations to the layout and house type designs have addressed the primary concerns that previously led to a Conservation and Design objection
- As with the previous iteration, the plots are arranged around the central open space, and for the most part there is a sufficient amount of variation in building lines and plot orientation to provide some interest, in addition to varying the detailing across the house types. The hard line of development at rear of the site has been addressed through the new layout which has allowed the long-range views into the open countryside to be retained giving a sense of the built form tapering away from the town.
- The applicant has provided a site section as requested, which has provided a better understanding of how the new buildings will sit amongst the existing topography without becoming overbearing on the surrounding dwellings.
- As previously, the proposed designs and materials across the different plots are largely compatible with the general form and character of Holt
- Following revisions and reduction of first floor glazing on plots 10 and 11 consider the proposals policy compliant with the design, landscape and heritage policies

#### **Local Member Councillor Connor Rouse**

**Objects** – see comments above in “REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE”

#### **REPRESENTATIONS**

60 representations have been received during the course of the application, 60 **objections** and 1 **Supporting** comment. The main concerns are summarised (full public comments can be viewed on the public website):

##### Objections:

- Insufficient consultation process / delays in putting up site notices
- No public consultation engagement from applicants
- Prematurity of the proposals / not an allocated site at the time
- Detriment to Conservation Area and designated heritage assets and landscape

- Does not preserve nor enhance designated heritage assets
- Land should remain undeveloped / loss of green space
- Loss of biodiversity, detriment to local wildlife and protected species
- Detriment to Spout Hills from developing site and increased visitors etc
- Inadequate drainage strategy, surface water run off / flooding concerns
- Similar objections to those cited under PF/23/0537
- Concerns over design of proposals
- Insufficient infrastructure, services and amenities to support additional housing (concerns over water pressure and sewage capacity, no capacity at local schools, GP, dental, lack of job availability)
- Detriment to neighbouring residential amenities through additional disturbances, noise, loss of light, light pollution, disruption, overbearing and loss of views
- Site acts as an important ecological and landscape buffer between the town and Spout Hills and wider countryside
- Significant developments have already been built in Holt, insufficient demand for more housing
- Highway safety concerns, Pound Close narrow road, traffic hazard, pedestrian safety, congestion on Norwich Road
- Insufficient plans showing relationship with surroundings / ecological details
- Overdevelopment of the site
- Overdevelopment of the town
- Housing does not reflect local need / unaffordable / used as second homes / holiday lets
- Insufficient provision of affordable housing
- Development too close to existing properties / insufficient separation distances
- Dominating scale – should be mostly single storey given levels differences
- Inappropriate density
- Inappropriate housing mix and tenure
- Inconsistencies / insufficient BNG details
- Public open space insufficient
- No paths from Pounds Close to safely walk to open space
- Inappropriate levels of proposed development, should be lowered to reduce impacts
- Impact on heritage assets inadequately assessed
- Contrary to Neighbourhood and Local Plans and NPPF (regarding loss of green space and impact on designated assets)
- Insufficient viability details
- Path to Spout Hills should be available to all not private gated entrance for private use by residents of the development only
- Conflict of interest with the Town Council with the proposed land transfer
- Concerns translocation site not viable

#### Support

- Positive contribution towards local housing need
- Proposals would preserve Holt's character

#### **HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS:**

Art. 8: The right to respect for private and family life.

Art. 1 of the First Protocol: The right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions

Having considered the above matters, APPROVAL of this application as recommended is considered to be justified, proportionate and in accordance with planning law.

## **CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998 - SECTION 17**

The application raises no significant crime and disorder issues.

## **LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS**

Under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the council is required when determining planning applications to have regard to any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application. Local finance considerations are not considered to be material to this case.

## **RELEVANT POLICIES:**

### **North Norfolk Local Plan 2024-2040 (December 2025):**

CC1- Delivering Climate Resilient Sustainable Growth  
CC3 - Sustainable Construction, Energy Efficiency & Carbon Reduction  
CC4 - Water Efficiency  
CC7 – Flood Risk & Surface Water Drainage  
CC8 - Electric Vehicle Charging  
CC9 - Sustainable Transport  
CC10 - BNG  
CC11 - Green Infrastructure  
CC12 – Trees, Hedgerows & Woodland  
CC13 - Protecting Environmental Quality  
SS1 – Spatial Strategy  
HC1 - Health & Wellbeing  
HC2 - Provision & Retention of Open Spaces  
HC4 Infrastructure Provision, Developer Contributions & Viability  
HC5 - Fibre to the Premises (FTTP)  
HC7 - Parking Provision  
ENV2 - Protection & Enhancement of Landscape & Settlement Character  
ENV3 - Heritage & Undeveloped Coast  
ENV4 - Biodiversity & Geodiversity  
ENV5 - Impacts on international & European sites, Recreational Impact Avoidance Mitigation Strategy  
ENV 6 - Protection of Amenity  
ENV7 - Protecting & Enhancing the Historic Environment  
ENV8 - High Quality Design  
HOU1 - Delivering Sufficient Homes  
HOU2 - Delivering the Right Mix of Homes  
HOU8 - Accessible & Adaptable Homes  
HOU9 - Minimum Space Standards  
DS1 - Development Site Allocations  
H17 - Holt - Land North of Valley Lane

### **Holt Neighbourhood Plan (August 2023)**

Policy Holt1 – Design Guidance  
Policy Holt2 – Housing Type & Standards  
Policy Holt3 – Green Infrastructure  
Policy Holt6 – Connectivity in and Around Holt

## **Minerals and Waste Development Framework - Core Strategy and Minerals and Waste Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2010-2026**

### Material Considerations:

**National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024):**

Chapter 2 Achieving sustainable development  
Chapter 4 Decision-making  
Chapter 5 Delivering a sufficient supply of homes  
Chapter 6 Building a strong, competitive economy  
Chapter 8 Promoting healthy and safe communities  
Chapter 9 Promoting sustainable transport  
Chapter 10 Supporting high quality communications  
Chapter 11 Making effective use of land  
Chapter 12 Achieving well-designed places  
Chapter 14 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
Chapter 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
Chapter 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment  
Chapter 17 Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals

**Supplementary Planning Documents:**

North Norfolk Design Guidance (2011)  
North Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment (2021)  
North Norfolk Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (2021)  
North Norfolk Open Space Assessment (2019)

**Other relevant documents**

Norfolk Green Infrastructure and Recreational Impact Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy -  
Habitats Regulations Assessment Strategy Document (2021)

**OFFICER ASSESSMENT:****MAIN ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION:**

1. Principle of development
2. Housing Mix
3. Design and amenity
4. Impact on Landscape
5. Ecological impacts, BNG and GIRAMS
6. Developer contributions
7. Highways and Parking
8. Heritage
9. Flooding and Drainage
10. Conclusion and Planning Balance

**1. Principle of Development**

The spatial strategy for North Norfolk is set out within Local Plan Policy SS 1. This states that the majority of new development within the district will take place in the larger towns and villages having regard to their role as employment, retail and service centres, identified need and capacity to accommodate sustainable growth. The policy lists Large Growth Towns, Small Growth Towns, Large Growth Villages and Small Growth Villages. The rest of North Norfolk is designated as 'Countryside' and development will be restricted to particular types of development to support the rural economy, meet affordable housing needs and provide renewable energy. Holt is designated as a Small Growth Town in the settlement hierarchy (where a lesser quantity of development will be located), the site is an adopted allocation within the settlement boundary.



The site subject of this application is allocated in the new Local Plan for housing growth under Local Plan Policy H17 - Land North of Valley Lane. Proposals for the site should be in accordance with and compatible with the site-specific Policy H17. This policy sets out proposals should include the provision of approximately 27 dwellings, public open space, and associated on and off-site infrastructure including 10 supporting criteria for the allocation set out below.

1. *Carefully and sensitively designed development incorporating suitable open space and landscaping will be required to preserve, and where opportunities arise, to enhance, the setting of the Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings to the north;*
2. *Site layout, scale and massing which incorporates suitable landscaping and buildings that retain a soft edge to the settlement from Spout Hills County Wildlife Site;*
3. *Retention and enhancement of mature hedgerows and trees around the site;*
4. *Access to be provided from Pounds Close with an acceptable junction with the A148;*
5. *Improved pedestrian access across site into the Spout Hills from the town;*
6. *The submission, approval and implementation of a Surface Water Management Plan ensuring that there is no increase off site and safe access and egress;*
7. *The submission, approval and implementation of a Foul Drainage Strategy, including any enhancements and setting out how additional foul flows will be accommodated within the foul sewerage network;*
8. *Enhancement to sewerage infrastructure should be undertaken prior to the first occupation of any dwelling to prevent detriment to the environment and comply with the Water Framework Directive;*
9. *On site delivery of not less than 0.07 hectares of public open space or the agreed payment of an equivalent financial contribution for the extension or improvement of local open space provision; and,*
10. *Appropriate contributions towards mitigation measures identified in the Norfolk Green Infrastructure and Recreational Impact Avoidance & Mitigation Strategy (GIRAMS).*

The proposals are not fully policy compliant, the number of dwellings proposed for the site is 23 rather than the allocated 27. Furthermore, there is conflict with criterion 5 relating to an improved pedestrian access across the site into Spout Hills from the town. The site will be restricted to a gated pedestrian access for residents of the new development rather than promoting connectivity across the site for the wider public. However, there are alternative routes to Spout Hills in the vicinity and the parcel of land to the west showing the access is promoted as Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) land where it would be disadvantageous for this to be a more formal route widely accessible to the public as this would be detrimental to habitat. The translocation site for the Slow Worms is proposed to be transferred to Holt Town Council and to include some public accessibility (subject to appropriate management).

As such while criteria 5 is not met, reasonable justification has been offered to depart, and other public benefits are offered as part of the proposals that weigh favourably in the planning balance.

In summary, the principle of residential development on this site is acceptable subject to compliance with Local Plan Policy H17 and other relevant Development Plan policies as set out within this report.

## **2. Housing Mix**

Policy HOU 2 states that all new housing developments shall provide for a mix of house sizes and tenures in accordance with the prescribed criteria in the policy.

The proposals would be considered under the 10-25 dwellings or sites larger than 0.2 hectares criteria within Affordable Zone 2, whereby such scale of development would be expected to deliver at least 35% of affordable homes on site.

Regarding market dwellings, Policy HOU2 expects a housing mix where at least half the units shall comprise 2-3 bed properties of which 20% shall be two-bed and 80% three bed. Regarding the affordable housing mix requirements 25% shall be intermediate housing and the remainder rented in a mix comprising one, two and three bed with the majority two bed.

With a site allocation of 27 dwellings, it is recognised that the Policy HOU2 (in relation to schemes comprising 26 to 150 dwellings) requires at least one "serviced" plot on the site. However, the number of dwellings in the proposals is for 23, and this is below the policy threshold to include a serviced plot for self and custom house building purposes.

Officers note that the plans have evolved for this scheme in seeking to address matters raised by representations. This is in order to provide an appropriate design and landscaping layout and officers consider the proposals appropriately reflect the site context, constraints and sensitivities of the site and its surroundings rather than being a deliberate attempt to avoid policy requirements. This will be set out further in the report.

Policy HOU8 requires that all new homes must be designed and constructed in a way that enables them to be adapted to meet the changing needs of their occupants over their lifetime. Accordingly, all new dwellings shall meet the Buildings Regulations M4(2) Category 2 Standard. This requirement is also set out within Policy HOLT2 of the Holt Neighbourhood Plan. Also, under Policy HOU8 a minimum of 5% of dwellings shall be provided as wheelchair user dwellings in accordance with the Building Regulations M4 (3) standard Category 3 (this would be plot 23). Policy HOU 9 sets out that all new dwellings shall comply with or exceed the minimum Nationally Described Space Standards.

The proposed housing mix comprises four x 1 bed dwellings, one x 2 bed dwelling, thirteen x 3 bed dwellings and five x 4 bed dwellings,

The proposal is for 16 market dwellings and 7 affordable houses (plots 17-23). With an offsite contribution for a single affordable home.

The market housing mix consists of eleven x 3 bed and five x 4 bed houses. The provision of 2-3 bed properties amounts to 11 dwellings, exceeding the 50% requirement (which would have expected around 8 such units), however within this mix there are no 2 bed properties, and so this will not fulfil the requirement for 20% of the smaller units in the housing mix. However, it should be noted that the overall quantum of smaller units being provided exceeds the minimum requirement, and the affordable housing mix includes four x 1 bed flats and one x 2 bed dwelling.

Regarding affordable housing this would comprise four x 1 bed units, one x 2 bed unit and two x 3 bed units which would be transferred to a Registered Social Housing Provider, as such these units will be available in perpetuity at rents that meet Homes England Rent Standard (up to 80% of market rents). The proportion of affordable units would equate to approximately 30.4%. A commuted sum has been offered in lieu of an additional on-site unit, this balances the affordable housing offer. It is recognised that off-site financial contributions are not an option specified for larger schemes (10 or more dwellings) in the policy, as such there is a departure with these proposals in terms of achieving full policy compliance.

### Housing Need

Housing need changes gradually over time, the latest information on housing need in Holt is set out below and clearly supports the need for affordable homes in Holt, including those for intermediate rent which will be let to local households:

As of 11 February 2025, there were 988 households on the Council's housing list who want to live in Holt. Of these 171 are in the highest priority bands 1\*, 1 and 2. The largest need amongst these households is for smaller 1 and 2 bedroom homes but there is also a need for family homes in particular, larger 4-bed homes.

In terms of tenure the highest need is for rented homes. Of the 7 affordable units, 5 would be affordable rent and 2 shared ownership ensuing an appropriate tenure split according with policy HOU 2

### Summary

There is some policy conflict regarding the housing mix with insufficient smaller units in the market housing mix, and only a commuted sum for the 8<sup>th</sup> affordable dwelling rather than 100% of affordable units on site. As the scheme falls short of the allocated 27 units there will be no self or custom build homes as part of the proposals.

On balance the broader mix of the scheme includes an appropriate mix of units, including smaller units as part of the affordable housing provision. The proposals will broadly satisfy local housing need and include an appropriate tenure mix. As such, the proposal would broadly accord with the aspirations of the Development Plan to create mixed and balanced communities.

The proposed affordable dwellings are of a compatible style to the market dwellings to ensure these are indistinguishable from other buildings on site. The housing mix is considered broadly appropriate but noting that there is an under provision of smaller two bed units. All proposed units would accord with the National Minimum Space Standards by meeting or exceeding these internal space requirements.

Officers note the limited policy conflict with Policy HOU2 but consider there to be broad compliance with main aspects and aspirations of the policy, we conclude that on balance the benefits listed above would outweigh that limited policy conflict. Further considerations is given in the Planning Balance section.

### **3. Design and amenity**

Local Plan Policy ENV8 requires all development to be of high-quality design, that reflects the characteristics of the site and respects local character in terms of layout, landscaping, density, mix, scale, massing materials, finish and architectural details and delivers an energy efficient and low carbon development. All proposals should take account of the North Norfolk Design Guide SPD and proposals will be expected to demonstrate the proposals contribute positively to the public realm, retains important landscaping and natural features, includes appropriate landscape and ecological enhancements.

Policy HOLT1 of the Holt Neighbourhood Plan additionally sets out that design should have regard to the special interest and character of the Neighbourhood Area as relevant to the location, nature and scale of the proposals. This would fall under section 2 '*Elsewhere within the designated Holt Settlement Boundary*' whereby development should have regard to the importance of a combination of long and revealed views into the Conservation Area from public vantage points on its outskirts and the scale and grain of development in the vicinity of the site. The site is within the settlement boundary but is on its western edge, with open countryside to the west. As such the position on the edge of the town, and topography gives

prominence. Consequently, appearance and topography and key characteristics of town edge sites such as this have an intrinsic relationship to the wider Glaven Valley Conservation Area which lays to the south and west of the site.

The NPPF states that the creation of high-quality buildings and places is fundamental to the planning and development process. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Paragraph 135 goes on to state that development should establish or maintain a strong sense of place, be sympathetic to local character and history, landscape setting and be visually attractive. Permission should be refused for development of poor design which fails to take opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area, considering local design standards or guidance contained with SPDs.

### Layout

The scheme layout seeks to respond to the edge of town location and maintain important visual connections through the site towards the green expanse of Spout Hills beyond and a soft boundary between the site and Spout Hills and surrounding countryside. This is achieved through location of the open space on the western boundary of the site and an east west axis estate road going through the site and incorporated landscaping along the estate road. The land falls to the west, with the proposals reflect the topography of the site with the development ridgelines undulating accordingly. The landscaping proposals, in addition, to the main open space to the western part of the site includes small green spaces and landscaping through the centre of the site and landscaping buffer to the northern boundary and southwestern boundary. The layout is considered appropriate and relates well with the setting and isn't overly regimented regarding the building line or road layout and the layout more informal with varied siting, orientation and ridge heights.

### Scale and massing

The buildings would be predominantly two-storey, reflecting the predominant scale of built form in the area (with the exception being a single bungalow). The proposed density is not regarded as overdeveloped. The general density considerations per hectare is 30 for villages and 40 for towns as a starting point, with allowances made in allocated sites to ensure delivery of a range of uses and taking into account local density, character and site contexts. As noted above the allocated number of dwellings on allocation was 27, the proposals are for 23 dwellings. Some of the dwellings are large scale but Officers consider that the overall quantum and mix appropriately takes into account the local context of the site, ensuring a viable scheme and appropriate incorporation of landscaping and open space. The extent of built form and configuration is also considered acceptable given the semi-rural setting. There is articulation of the built form and roofscape reflecting the levels differences in the site and a varied roofscape.

### Appearance

Design and materials have been chosen to reflect the traditional vernacular of the locality to reinforce local distinctiveness. The materials include flintwork, red and painted brick and clay roof tiles. The detailing is also appropriate with features including sash-style windows, bay projections, porches and decorative brick courses. The design and materials are reflective of vernacular local materials, scale and proportions. The visual design and appearance of the development is considered to be of a high standard sympathetic to the local character and site context.

There is appropriate variation of the building line and scales reflecting the topography of the site and opening up towards the open space and countryside to the west. Plots 10 and 11 flank the west of the site by the open space and tapers towards the countryside.

The design of the proposed dwellings is considered to result in a good mixed visual appearance, reflecting local vernacular characteristics / detailing and accords with local design considerations in the Local and Neighbourhood Plans and Design Guides.

#### Amenity

Policy ENV6 sets out that all new development will provide for a high standard of amenity including adequate living conditions. Development will not be permitted which causes unacceptable impacts on the amenity of neighbouring occupants or does not provide for adequate levels of amenity for future occupants. In assessing the impact of development on existing occupants, proposals should take account of the North Norfolk Design Guide or justify any departure from these standards must have regard to the following considerations:

- provision of appropriate private amenity space;
- loss of privacy and outlook and prevention of overlooking;
- loss of daylight and/or sunlight and prevention of overshadowing;
- prevention of disturbance from odour, noise, vibration, dust, air and artificial light pollution.

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that developments should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

The North Norfolk Design Guide sets out minimum distances between dwellings looking at different types of elevation based on the living accommodation views that may be affected. Additionally, it states that residents should have the right to adequate privacy levels and that new development should not lead to any overbearing impacts upon existing dwellings. Existing residents should also be free from excessive noise and unwanted social contact. Additionally, private garden areas should be of adequate size and shape to serve their intended purpose. They should be substantially free from shading and are recommended to be of an area equal or greater than the footprint of the dwelling they serve.

The design guide includes guidance for spacing and distancing between properties to mitigate the impact on neighbouring amenity, as follows:

Primary to	Primary	21.0m
	Secondary	18.0m
	Tertiary	12.0m
	Blank	11.0m
Secondary to	Secondary	15.0m
	Tertiary	9.0m
	Blank	8.5m
Tertiary to	Tertiary	3.0m
	Blank	2.5m

The majority of the gardens within the proposed development are comparable in size or greater than the footprint of the dwelling they would serve. However, there are exceptions to

this including plots 6 and 7, and plots 13 and 14, the latter is also in close proximity to neighbouring trees and the size and depth of rear gardens vis a vis the large footprints comprise around half the requirement. As such these properties have smaller proportioned gardens to their dwelling's footprint and challenge those plot size standards.

The flats would be served by communal outdoor amenity areas. Given the configuration of the site the flats are located in close proximity to plots 21 and 22. The distance between the flats (units 17-20) and these properties at the rear is 2.5m. The windows on the rear elevations serve the bathrooms and open plan kitchen / living areas, the latter of which are served by other windows and sources of light with windows on three elevations. However, the windows on the rear either face the blank elevation of plot 21 or alternatively the first-floor window overlooks gardens serving plots 21 and 22. This can be mitigated with the imposition of a condition for the first-floor kitchen window to be obscure glazed to reduce this impact to the affected plots. There is some amenity conflict with the proposed units on the development, but suitable mitigation will be provided to ameliorate impacts.

Regarding the impact on neighbouring amenity from the proposed development this is considered below.

Plot 10 to the southwest corner of the site is close to the converted barns 14A and 14B (distance to the boundary 5m) which is on the boundary of the site and is on lower ground with rooflights on the northern roof slope. The closest first floor window serves an ensuite and would be obscure glazed on the south elevation at the rear around 14m to the neighbouring boundary. There is a French door on the ground floor on this elevation serving the lounge. The other first floor window at the rear is set back as this is an L shaped property fronting the green. This serves bedroom 3 but this would be around 23m from the neighbouring property. Further details have been provided to show distance from the rooflights of the neighbouring property and windows of unit 10 with the distance to the first-floor front (west) window being between 16.5m and 20m. The first floor window on the west facing elevation faces due west, rather than directly overlooking the southerly direction towards the neighbouring property westwards as such given the orientation of the property, and intervening boundary treatment and landscape buffer, while not fully in accordance with the suggested separation distances of 18 - 21m the proposals are considered not to create unacceptable impacts on the amenity of neighbouring occupants through undue dominance or overlooking.

Concerns have been raised over the proximity of unit 5 with No. 4 to the southeast of the site. Unit 5 has been revised and now features a hipped roof to reduce the impact and dominance on the neighbouring property. The side elevations on the southern elevation have no fenestration and the boundary at this point includes a boundary wall between the two properties. The separation distance between the proposed dwelling and existing property varies between 8.89m and 12.53m. The separation guidance sets out 11m being appropriate distances between primary windows (on rear elevation of no. 4) blank elevations (side elevation of unit 5). The separation does not fully accord with the guidance set out in the design guide as the rear half of the unit would be within this separation distance. The unit is located to the north of the existing neighbouring property, as such would not significantly adversely affect daylight to the property, as set out the roof is hipped and there are no windows on this elevation and an intervening garden wall.

Units 4 and 5 form a semi-detached property, to the east of the site is a converted garage that was approved for conversion to a dwelling under application ref: PF/21/0917. There is no fenestration on the first-floor westward wall flanking the application site with the main outlook northwards and southwards parallel to the site. There is a window on this elevation at the ground floor level. A 1.8m fence will be erected along the boundary where there is currently no boundary treatment. There are other sources of light for the main living area within this property, equally there are permitted development allowances for enclosing fences walls and

gates as such the impact of the development is not considered to adversely affect this property from the status quo. There may be oblique views from the converted garage over the boundary westwards to the new properties but given the orientation this would not result in direct overlooking. On balance the proposals are not considered to result in an overbearing impact on the neighbouring properties regarding the impact from units 4 and 5.

Concerns have also been raised over the impact of unit no. 23 (comprising single storey dwelling with hipped roof) to The Stable Flat (formerly associated with Hill House) due to loss of natural day light, overlooking and overbearing impacts, and loss of privacy given the proximity to the neighbouring property (sitting on the boundary of the site). The Stable Flat has a first-floor window serving a bedroom that looks into the site, and the property and private garden is on lower ground than the application site extending along the northern boundary.

Unit 23 would be on a diagonal from the affected dwelling to the boundary, as such the separation distances to the built form wouldn't be affected given the configuration and orientation of the elevation and fenestration. Given the proximity, this unit was amended to form a single storey dwelling with hipped roof to mitigate the impacts on the existing property to the north. The fenestration on the side of unit 23 on the northern elevation would be obscure glazed and there would also be an intervening boundary fence around 1m from the unit and a landscaping buffer between this property and the existing dwelling of some 3m (around 4m separation between the boundary with The Stable flat). This landscape planting buffer extends across the whole of the northern boundary.

The distance of the boundary from the northern property from first floor windows across plots 11-16 (serving habitable rooms) varies between 14m – 18m). The degree of separation is considered acceptable and obscure glazing to provide suitable mitigation against overlooking concerns.

Concerns have also been raised over loss of light and shading to the property as this is to the north of the application site. Shading analysis has been undertaken and shows limited impact of overshadowing on the neighbouring property. For example, limited shadowing from unit 23 would be experienced in the winter season where the sun is lower. The private amenity space is to the west of the dwelling, as such there would be shading from the dwelling and existing boundary wall and outbuilding as the sun moves round to the west. The nearest ground floor are wooden doors, with windows on the centre of the property. The shadow casting indicates part of unit 23 would cause additional overshadowing but this would be for a limited period, and only a limited part of the ground floor windows. As such the proposals are not considered to adversely impact neighbouring amenity through loss of light, overshadowing, overbearing impact, overlooking given the relationship of the development with the property to the north.

### Conclusion

Whilst noting the concerns raised by neighbours, Officers consider that the proposals are acceptable in terms of design and amenity and where there is conflict within the site this can be mitigated with appropriate obscure glazing to minimise amenity impacts.

### Environmental sustainability and fibre connectivity

Policy CC1 sets out development shall be delivered with the highest regard to sustainable development and climate change principles including positively contributing to mitigating and adapting to climate change, minimising greenhouse gas emissions, focusing larger scale development into the most sustainable areas where services are available, facilities can be supported and more sustainable modes of transport are viable.

Policy CC 3 sets out that new development is required to achieve progressively higher standards of environmental sustainability. This includes reductions in CO2 emissions of a minimum of 31% below the Target Emission Rate.

Policy CC 4 sets out all new development must be designed and constructed in a way that minimises its impact on water resources, with all new dwellings designed and constructed in such a way that enables them to meet or exceed Building Regulations Part G water efficiency higher optimal standard. Policy HC 5 requires all dwellings to be provided with fibre connections.

The proposals adopt a fabric first approach to exceed the minimum requirements of Building Regulations Part L for thermal performance and through appropriate measures achieve reductions in CO2 emissions of 56% below the Target Emission Rate. Regarding water efficiency, development would use low water consuming fittings to achieve a minimum water efficiency of 110 l/p/d (estimations indicating 108.8 l/p/d). BT Openreach have confirmed that a supply is available and they can provide the site with fibre, extending the existing fibre network from Norwich Road.

The proposals would accord with the new policy considerations concerning environmental sustainability and fibre connectivity.

#### **4. Impact on Landscape**

Policy CC 12 sets out proposals should retain existing trees and hedgerows and include the provision of new trees and hedgerows including street trees and woodland. Regard shall be taken of the North Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment and encouraged to mitigate against the impacts of climate change, enhance the character and appearance of the district and improve green infrastructure. Harm or loss of landscape features will only be permitted where a landscape strategy would compensate for the loss or where the overriding benefits arising from the proposals outweighs the harm. Where development could affect existing and retained trees and hedgerows details shall be provided for their care and protection with mitigation measures in place to ensure works do not have a harmful impact on existing trees.

The site lies on the western edge of Holt within Holt Conservation Area and directly adjacent to the Glaven Valley Conservation Area and Spout Common County Wildlife Site (CWS). The site is currently a small paddock that links with other fields, woodland and green space forming the setting to Holt. The site slopes away to the west towards a tributary of the River Glaven within Spout Common.

The site lies on the cusp of two classified Landscape Types, Wooded Glacial Ridge and River Valley (RV5 River Glaven), as defined in the North Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment (2021 SPD). Minimal light pollution and dark night skies are noted valued features of the Wooded Glacial Ridge Type, and the wealth of biodiversity is a key feature of the River Valley Type, along with the overall character of a wooded, enclosed and pastoral landscape with small field sizes on the valley floor

The landscape character does have capacity to accommodate development subject to the scale and design assimilating into the into the surroundings.

The application is not accompanied by a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). However, officers have visited the site and surrounding viewpoints towards the application site to be able to make an appropriate assessment on the impacts on the Conservation Area and landscape character.



The revised layout presents a more appropriate orientation of units that satisfactorily addresses previous concerns in relation to landscape and visual impact. Views through the site to Spout Hills and the countryside beyond are retained. Landscape buffers at site boundaries are improved and there is a better relationship with the countryside with the open space on the western side of the site to ensure a soft edge to the settlement and mitigating the impacts to the west from extensive built form or light spill with the amended proposals and reduced glazing extents.

The layout appears rather parking dominated with a number of parking courts and accesses; this is partially mitigated with wrapping soft landscape planting around the parking areas to reduce the impact of parked vehicles

The design, variation of scale, materials and landscaping go a significant way to mitigate the landscape impacts. Subject to the imposition of conditions, the proposals are considered broadly acceptable from a landscape perspective in accordance with Local Plan Policy ENV2.

## **5. Ecological impacts, BNG and GIRAMS**

Policy CC10 sets out that qualifying development must achieve a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The accompanying biodiversity net gain strategy should set out the pre-development biodiversity value of the development site, demonstrate application of the mitigation hierarchy, clarifies and explains the predicted biodiversity outcomes, compliance with the BNG Hierarchy and details of how it will be maintained for at least 30 years after the development is completed.

Policy ENV4 sets out all policy proposals will be expected to provide suitable ecological surveys, retain, protect and buffer ecological and geological features and provide for the appropriate management of those features, deliver BNG, incorporate biodiversity enhancement measures and avoid net loss or fragmentation of habitats. Adverse impacts must be addressed, be in accordance with the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and any adverse effects on nationally and locally designated sites only permitted where it can be demonstrated that the needs outweigh the adverse impacts.

Policy HOLT3 of the Holt Neighbourhood Plan identifies the green infrastructure network, this includes Spout Hills County Wildlife Site. Development proposals that adjoin the network are required to not harm the habitat connectivity present in that part of the network and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity, including habitat connectivity, proportionate to their scale and impact.

Paragraph 187 of the NPPF sets out that development should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing sites of biodiversity value, minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity.

### **Ecology**

The application is accompanied by an appropriate ecological assessment. The site lies immediately east of Spout Common County Wildlife Site, a lowland fen and a UK priority Section 41 habitat.

The Ecological Impact Assessment (2024) has highlighted that increased recreational pressure onto Spout Common is likely if the proposed development is granted planning permission. The comments provided by Norfolk Wildlife Trust highlight that the increase in

recreational pressure upon the lowland fen habitat would further degrade its condition, and that a financial contribution towards the management of the County Wildlife Site is recommended. This has been recommended at £2,000 for the next 30 years (totalling £60,000). A financial contribution to the Norfolk Wildlife Trust is considered appropriate in this case given the increase in management requirements to offset the increase in recreational impacts.

The revised layout includes wildlife corridors on the northern, western and partially on the southern boundary. The revised layout also includes a reduction in height of the corner properties from three to two storey which will reduce light spill onto the wildlife corridors and the neighbouring Spout Hills County Wildlife Site. Bats use the western and southern boundary of the site for foraging and for commuting between roosts and feeding sites.

The site is also used by a barn owl with a roost adjacent to the site. The loss of rough grassland on the site will remove important local foraging habitat for this Schedule 1 protected species. The proposed BNG / slow worm translocation site will be managed as rough grassland and will provide alternative foraging habitat for the barn owl, although it will have to forage further from its roost. This is land proposed to be transferred and made publicly accessible under an ecology management plan. The land is under the applicant's ownership. Any translocation would need to be supported by an appropriate management plan. The translocation land would be need to secured through a S106 obligation.

Following the 2024 reptile surveys a population of slow worms was found on the proposed development site. The Ecological Impact Assessment identified an intermediate negative effect if mitigation is not carried out. Mitigation is proposed as capture and translocation of the slow worm population to a site 80m west of the development site. The proposed slowworm translocation site has boundary scrub/ trees on the western, and partially on the eastern side. The southern boundary scrub abuts the old railway line (now a footpath) with the site having access for wildlife to commute to the wider countryside. The site would not have public access reducing disturbance to wildlife on the site and will form part of the Biodiversity Net Gain requirements for the application.

Subject to the translocation site for the slow worms being enhanced prior to translocation, with details to be secured through a Reptile Mitigation Strategy reverting the site to rough grassland with appropriate mowing regimes and include basking areas, hibernacula etc the ecological mitigation and enhancement measures are considered appropriate, other such measures include.

- Enhancement of agreed translocation site
- Any works impacting eastern boundary close to outbuilding to be carried outside of the barn owl nesting season (February -October)
- Wildlife buffer strip on western, northern and southern boundary to retain and protect foraging and commuting habitat for bats and other wildlife and protect Spout Hills County Wildlife Site (CWS).
- Native hedgerow planting along the site boundaries
- Wildflower planting in the public green
- Installation of 1 bat tube within each house
- Installation of swift bricks / boxes
- Installation of 1 integrated bird box within at least 7 of the new houses

#### GIRAMS:

The cumulative recreational impacts from new overnight accommodation in Norfolk is considered to have a significant adverse impact upon the integrity of European Sites. The Norfolk Authorities adopted the Green Infrastructure and Recreational impact Avoidance

Mitigation Strategy (GIRAMS), a strategic mitigation measure, on 1st April 2022. GIRAMS requires a tariff payment of £304.17 per dwelling to be made by the developer to fund mitigation measures to be implemented across Norfolk. Subject to securing this payment there would be no other potential pathways of impacts upon any other designated sites.

#### Biodiversity Net Gain

The application is subject to mandatory 10% BNG enhancement requirements. Accurate baseline values must be agreed prior to determination to allow both the council and applicant to be fully informed of the unit requirements to deliver 10% BNG across all relevant unit types.

Trees and boundary features have been excluded from the baseline calculations; these should be included in the baseline figures and the inclusion of these could increase the BNG requirements accordingly.

On site habitat creation would comprise modified grassland along western, northern and southern boundaries (0.1887 ha), 39 trees would be planted along the roads and accessways (0.1588ha). Gardens would take up 0.2676ha, urban surfaces including roads and buildings 0.4503ha. The report considers this would result in a net unit loss of -0.86 habitat units (36.82% net loss). However, concerns have been raised over the suitability of the location of some of the tree planting, and omitting existing features etc as such the net loss is likely to be higher. Offsite net gains are therefore required; mitigation would be on the land to the west (adjacent to the application site). This land comprises neutral grassland, bramble scrub and gorse scrub with a small area of broadleaved woodland and two small ponds. Proposals include creation of a small area of hawthorn scrub in the southwest corner and enhancement of the neutral grassland to moderate condition and bramble scrub to mixed scrub and 5 trees to be planted. The figures suggest an overall creation and net gain of habitat units of 20.5%.

An agreed baseline habitat in the metric calculations, and suitability of the location of trees on site will be achieved through the BNG baseline map and metric. Officers consider these can be agreed accordingly with sufficient offsite BNG land to deliver the statutorily required minimum of 10% net gains.

The site is also identified in the Local Nature Recovery Strategy, whereby habitats of strategic significance receive higher values on the metric, an uplift of 15% to the value of habitats being created on the metric to promote enhancement of such areas. Scrub, trees and hedgerows would fall into this uplift.

The delivery of the proposed mitigation and enhancement measures and BNG with contribution to the CWT would ensure appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures are achievable and delivered. As such the proposals do not adversely affect protected sites and species. This is subject to revisions to the BNG metric to ensure the habit baseline is accurate and the enhancements are achievable and meet or exceed the required BNG 10% net gain.

Subject to this and the other mitigation and enhancement measures (and contributions) the proposals are considered to satisfy policies CC 10, ENV 4 of the Local Plan, HOLT1 of the Holt Neighbourhood Plan and Section 15 of the NPPF.

## **6. Developer contributions**

Policy HC4 requires the delivery of necessary infrastructure and secure sustainable development. The Council will secure infrastructure through specific developer contributions in order to service, manage and mitigate the impact of development which meets the tests of the NPPF. Development will be expected to contribute towards the provision of infrastructure, affordable homes, community infrastructure, deliver and maintenance of open space,

sustainable transport, environmental infrastructure, visitor impact mitigation, other requirements in Neighbourhood Plans and monitoring purposes.

The recently published National Model Design Code sets out that new development should contribute towards the creation of a network of green spaces and facilitate access to natural green space where possible.

The North Norfolk Open Space Assessment provides the most up to date evidence of local need. It provides the justified evidence to support the requirement for open space contributions.

Based on the mix of housing tenures, sizes and types shown within the submission, there would be an on-site requirement for amenity green space, play space for children and off-site contributions where required for allotments, parks and recreation, play space (youth) and natural green space.

### **Assessment of Requirements**

#### Allotments:

The requirement is 340.80 sqm (£9,427) for the proposed development. There is an existing overprovision of 0.99ha in Holt, as such a contribution towards allotments would not be necessary.

#### Parks and Recreation Grounds:

The requirement is for 624.80sqm (£71,883) for the proposed development. The definition provided of Parks and Recreation Grounds states that they are “*defined as an open space that: Has at least two facilities e.g. a children’s play area and tennis courts, or; Has provision for formal sports pitches e.g. football or cricket pitch (informal football would be excluded); and Is owned/managed by the Council (or Town/Parish Council), for general public access.*” The proposed on-site open space would not provide two facilities or sports pitches and therefore would not meet the definition of Parks and Recreation Grounds. A contribution of £71,883 is therefore required.

#### Play Space (Children and Youth):

There is a requirement for 56.8 sqm of children play space for the proposed development, and 34.08 sqm of youth play space (combined total requirement is for 90.88sqm. A dedicated area has not been shown in the public open space area, contributions of £16,890 would therefore be required.

#### Amenity Green Space and Natural Green Space:

The requirement is for 568 sqm of Amenity Green Space for the proposed development.

Criteria 9 of the allocation policy sets out that not less than 0.07 ha of public open space should be included or agreed payment of equivalent financial contribution for the extension or improvement of open space provision.

The open space to the western part of the site would be 1,492sqm more than double the requirement, in addition to smaller parcels of green space and landscape buffers included in the site as well.

The requirement for natural green space is 852 sqm. The translocation site being transferred could be considered to fall under the Natural Green Space consideration whereby such land “*Covers a variety of spaces including meadows, woodland, copses, river valleys and lakes all of which share a trait of having natural characteristics and biodiversity value and are also partly*

or wholly accessible for informal recreation". The translocation site would exceed the requirements for the natural and green space contributions.

There is an overprovision of green and natural green space land being provided as part of the proposed development exceeding the open space metric and policy allocation requirements.

There is an overprovision of allotments in Holt, as such contributions for this isn't required, but off-site contributions of £88,573 towards parks and recreation grounds and children's play area would be required to satisfy local requirements to be included in a S106 Obligation.

Contributions would also be required for other services and facilities including areas such as primary education, libraries and fire hydrant requested by Norfolk County Council. The Local Planning Authority also received a request from the Norfolk Wildlife Trust to mitigate against additional recreational disturbances on the site.

A table of S106 financial and non-financial contributions expected from the development is set out below.

Contribution Description	Amount (index linked)	Cost Per Dwelling (approx.)	Agreed to be paid by the applicant?
Affordable Housing (7 units – 5 social rent, 2 shared ownership)	On-Site Provision	-	Yes
Commuted sum	£100,000		Yes
NCC Education contribution – Special Education Needs and Disabilities (SEND)	£96,806	£2,059.70	Yes
Norfolk Wildlife Trust	£60,000		Yes
GIRAMS Tariff*	£6,995.91	£304.17	Yes
Library Contribution	£4,255	£185	Yes
Fire Hydrant (one)	On-site provision	-	Yes
NNDC and NCC S106 Monitoring Fee	£500 per obligation	-	Yes
Open space contributions	£88,573		Yes

*\*This contribution is mandatory in order to satisfy Habitats Regulations*

Subject to securing the required contributions through S106 obligation (or condition(s) as may be the case with the Fire Hydrant), the proposals would accord with the requirements of Core Strategy Policy HC 4.

## 7. Highways and parking

Policy CC 9 sets out that development shall be well located and designed to minimise the need to travel and maximise use of sustainable forms of transport

Policy HC 7 (Parking Provision) states that adequate vehicle parking facilities will be provided by the developer to serve the needs of the proposed development and in order to avoid inappropriate on-street parking, highway safety problems and protect living and working conditions locally. Development proposals should make provision for vehicle and cycle parking

in accordance with the Norfolk County Council Parking Guidelines and take into account the requirements of the North Norfolk Design Guide.

Policy CC 8 sets out appropriate provision for electric vehicle charging points shall be incorporated into proposals appropriate to its context and location and precise details of this provision (including number, layout and charge points) how this will be allocated and managed including mechanism / procedure for taking payments.

The internal access road would be a private permeable shared surface extending east to west linking the open space with the rest of the town. There is sufficient manoeuvrability and parking provision within the site to accommodate the proposed development. There would be policy compliant parking provision commensurate for the sizes of properties in accordance with local policy comprising 55 parking spaces, more details are required regarding cycle storage provision however to demonstrate appropriate provision. For vehicular parking provision the 1 bed flats would have 1 space each, 2 and 3 beds would have 2 spaces each and the 4 bed units would have a minimum of 3 parking spaces and there would be 5 visitor parking spaces on the site. Further details of cycle storage are required but will be secured by condition. Electric vehicle charging points would be incorporated into the proposals and similarly secured by condition.

The highway authority has raised no objections to the proposals on highway safety grounds including additional vehicular movements to and from the site and joining onto Norwich Road etc noting the concerns raised by the public in the public consultation. There is considered appropriate capacity in the local highway network to accommodate the proposed development. A Traffic Regulation Order would however be required for waiting restrictions on Pound Close to ensure appropriate free flow of traffic at the junction to be secured by suitably worded condition. The proposals would accord with Development Plan policy requirements and complies with criteria 4 providing the access from Pounds Close

## **8. Heritage**

Policy ENV7 requires that development proposals will conserve and, where possible, enhance the historic environment. This includes conserving historic landscapes and built form and settings and protection for designated and non-designated heritage assets and Conservation Areas.

Criterion 1 and 2 of the allocation policy are most pertinent to the consideration of the impacts on heritage assets (requiring the proposals to be carefully and sensitively designed to preserve and enhance setting of the Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings and ensuring the suitable retention of a soft edge to the settlement).

The application site is situated within the Holt Conservation Area, on the western edge of the town, and falls into the Glaven Valley Conservation Area, in addition to bordering the Spout Common County Wildlife Site. New development in a conservation area should seek to preserve or enhance the prevailing character and appearance, and in line with para 196 of the NPPF plans should take into account the 'desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness'. Also near the application site are two Grade II listed buildings: Hill House and Holt Methodist Church.

The site itself acts as a buffer between the urban development of Holt and the surrounding countryside, as highlighted in the Holt Conservation Area (2022) it also allows views over the open countryside from Pound Close off the west side of Norwich Road, and provides the conservation area with a green setting overlooking Spout Hills and the wider Glaven Valley.

The immediate context of the site along Norwich Road is varied, with some modern properties interspersed with older ones, there is a mixture of vernacular, Georgian and neo-Georgian character. On the west side of the road, properties are generally set back from the road and there are lots of trees lining the road with a number of grass verges also.

Concerns were raised with the design and layout of the original proposals submitted with the application, with reservations given over the lack of variation in the building line and scale of the properties and design in particular of the properties at the western part of the site. The western part is particularly sensitive given the proximity of Spout Hills and buffer between the countryside and town of Holt on this edge of settlement location. The design of the rear plots 10-13 raised concerns including the incongruous rear elevations given the disconnect with the architectural style of the site, large extent of glazing and balconies on the rear and associated visual impact on views towards the town and Conservation Areas.

The revised proposals including alterations to the layout and design have sought to address concerns raised with the original proposals.

As with the previous iteration, the plots are arranged around the central open space, and for the most part there is now an appropriate variation in building lines and plot orientation to provide more interest, in addition to varying the detailing across all house types. The “hard line” of development at rear of the site has been addressed through the new layout which has allowed the long-range views into the open countryside to be retained giving a sense of the built form tapering away from the town.

A site section is now provided, which has shown a more sympathetic understanding of how the new buildings will sit amongst the existing topography without becoming overbearing on the surrounding dwellings.

The proposed designs and materials across the different plots are now more compatible with the general form and character of Holt. The revisions have addressed the primary issues with plots 10-13 over the quantity of glazing, this has successfully addressed a concern at the first-floor level to plots 10 and 11 where the large wrap around openings were considered out of scale with the rest of development.

Overall, Officers consider that the proposals are acceptable from a heritage and conservation perspective. They would not result in detrimental impacts on the significance of the designated and non-designated heritage assets, and their character and appearance would predominantly be preserved. The proposals would accord the Development Plan policy considerations.

## **9. Flooding and drainage**

Policy CC 7 sets out development will be located where this minimises the risk of flooding, and mitigating such risk through avoidance, design and implementation of sustainable drainage (SuDS) principles. Development should not materially increase flood risk to other areas and will incorporate appropriate surface water drainage mitigation measures to minimise its own risk of flooding. Proposals will have regard to climate change and flood extents from all sources identified in the NNDC Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, and subsequent updates.

Additionally, developers will be required to demonstrate compliance with national policy, by showing the development:

- does not increase greenfield run off rates and vulnerability of the site,
- has a positive impact on the risk of surface water flooding,

- addresses potential impact of infiltration upon groundwater,
- provides adequate foul water treatment and disposal,
- has suitable access is safeguarded and does not compromise existing drainage schemes of a larger site.

Open areas within new development must be designed to optimise drainage and reduce run-off. Where SuDS are proposed development proposals should be an integral part of the green infrastructure framework and provide multi-functional benefits. Adherence to LLFA Guidance which includes appropriate Flood Risk Assessment / Drainage Strategy and follows the drainage hierarchy. Drainage requirements including detailed maintenance and management arrangements for the lifetime of the development will be secured by way of planning conditions and / or obligations.

The application is accompanied by a flood risk assessment and drainage strategy. The site falls towards the west, the highest part of the site is at the entrance from Pounds Close at 62.96m AOD, falling to 56.24m in the northwest corner, with average gradient levels across the site of 1:15. The site lies at the head of a valley. A spring arises approximately 70m from the western corner of the site at a level of 44m AOD (12m below the lowest part of the site) and flows north along the valley.

The site is situated within flood zone 1 (the lowest probability of flooding). The geology is suitable for infiltration. Drainage infiltration testing on the site has provided favourable results, and groundwater was not encountered. The site is located within a groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ). There is no formal provisions for drainage on the existing site, rainfall is assumed to naturally soak into the ground when infiltration capacity is reached would be directed towards River Glaven catchment. Estimated groundwater level is at least 16m below site ground levels, the risk of groundwater flooding occurring is therefore considered to be very low. The SPZ is an area of protection placed around abstraction.

The site is considered at low risk of flooding from all sources other than surface water flooding. The drainage strategy for the site includes the use of soakaways, permeable paving and rain gardens, reducing flood risk by attenuating the rate and quantity of surface water run-off for and promoting groundwater recharge via infiltration.

Surface water run-off from roof areas will be directed to individual shallow soakaways located in back gardens, or communal soakaways would be placed to the front including in the open spaces. Finished floor levels would be set at a minimum of 150mm above ground levels. Private roads, soakaways and parking spaces would have permeable surfaces for natural infiltration.

The surface water drainage strategy is considered acceptable.

Regarding foul drainage, there is a foul sewer available in the existing access off Norwich Road and Anglian Water has confirmed the foul sewer system has available capacity at the site. Given the ground levels the connection to the public sewer would be a pumped connection. There is capacity at the Holt Main Road Water Recycling Centre for foul water from this development.

The proposals are considered to accord with policy CC7. As set out in the response from Anglian Water, there is capacity in the local infrastructure to accommodate the proposed development and no request has been put forward to enhance the sewage infrastructure, in the absence of an identified need to enhance this infrastructure it is considered that criteria 8 of the allocation policy requiring foul water upgrading may be departed from in such circumstances.



## **10. Allocation criteria, Conclusion and Planning Balance**

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 sets out that decisions must be taken in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Proposals for the site should be in accordance with and compatible with the site-specific policy H17. This policy sets out proposals should include the provision of approximately 27 dwellings, public open space, and associated on and off-site infrastructure including 10 supporting criteria for the allocation set out in section 1 above.

As set out the proposals are to be considered against the site allocation policy H17. Officers consider the revised proposals have carefully and sensitively designed the development to incorporate open space which preserves / enhances the setting of designated heritage assets and incorporates appropriate landscaping to retain a soft edge of the settlement from Spout Hills CWT.

The layout retains views of the countryside from the town along the east west axis and incorporates landscape buffers / open space on the western boundary to ensure a soft edge is retained with views towards the development. The effect is to assimilate well with the existing edge of the settlement; this is enhanced by good levels of mature hedgerow and trees.

The proposals are considered compatible with criterion 1-3 (landscaping and heritage assets, design and retention of hedgerows and trees).

Appropriate access to the site can be achieved as demonstrated in the revised layout proposals (subject to a TRO), according with criterion 4 (access via Pound Close).

There is conflict with criterion 5 (improved pedestrian access across the site to Spout Hills) as the access to Spout Hills through the BNG land would be gated with coded access only available for maintenance and proposed residents. Officers note that there are already alternative routes to Spout Hills to the north and south. Further that wider public access through the proposed BNG land may impact delivery of other enhancements. Finally, that there are also levels differences between the application site and desired footpath link that may prejudice delivery of an accessible for all path. On this basis departure from criterion 5 relating to full public access is considered to be reasonably justified.

Criterion 6, the drainage strategy proposed demonstrates how surface water would be dealt with, according with the SuDS hierarchy. This would be dealt with through infiltration through the ground, the land is suitable for such techniques without creating undue run off from the site to adjacent land. Noting the comments from the LLFA a sensitivity check was required, further details around this confirming the details in the drainage strategy remain accurate and reflect the most up to date guidance. No objections to this have been received from any statutory consultee. On this basis and noting the onus is on the Local Authority to be satisfied. Officers consider the calculations modelling remain appropriate and consistent with guidance and policy.

Criterion 7 & 8, there is capacity in the local sewage network to accommodate the proposed development, as such enhancements to local infrastructure has not been set out or requested by Anglia Water to accommodate the proposed development, as such further details are not considered necessary for both criteria 7 and 8. (foul drainage strategy and sewerage infrastructure)

Criterion 9, there is an overprovision of public open space being provided. Where open space is not being provided on site the off-site contributions are to be secured for improvement to local parks and children play spaces. This is accepted given the site topography and proximity for offsite provision. Additionally, there would also be the transfer of the “translocation site” to Holt Town Council with managed public access. Subject to an appropriate scheme of management this is considered acceptable and would exceed the requirements of criteria 9 (Open Space).

GIRAMS contribution would be secured through the S106 agreement to satisfy criteria 10 (Visitor Mitigation).

There is broad compliance with the allocation policy with the benefits outweighing the conflict regarding lower number of dwellings being delivered, Self Build and Custom Housing shortfall and lack of a publicly accessible connection to Spout Hills through the site.

In addition to the above assessment of the allocation criteria officers note that there is a limited departure from design guide guidance around privacy and amenity, further that housing mix is not compliant with policy. These factors attract negative weight.

In addition to the criterion assessment above, the benefits include delivery of an allocated North Norfolk Local Plan site which addresses the districts affordable housing need. There would be the provision of 7 affordable homes and commuted sum of £100,000 for an additional unit to be provided off site. The proposals are well designed and includes appropriate landscaping and open space. Delivery of new open space and contributions of £88,573 for off site open space improvements to address local requirements. Ecological enhancements through delivery of BNG. Benefits s which supports Holt’s services, facilities, businesses and employment during the construction phase of the development.

Mitigation contributions would be provided regarding GIRAMS, impact of additional recreational impacts on Spout Hills, and education and library contributions to support these local services and able to accommodate the proposed development.

Officers are clear that the substantive benefits listed above will more than outweigh any harm arising from the policy departure and those other factors detailed in this report. As such officers consider that there is a positive planning balance and that the application should be approved.

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

**Delegate authority to the Assistant Director of Planning to APPROVE subject to:**

- 1. Satisfactory resolution of new sustainability policies.**
- 2. Satisfactory resolution ecological matters including addressing the BNG baseline calculations and further details around the translocation site.**
- 3. Securing of S106 Obligations as set out at Section 6 of the report including Affordable housing and other financial contributions.**

<b>Contribution Description</b>	<b>Amount (index linked)</b>	<b>Cost Per Dwelling (approx.)</b>	<b>Agreed to be paid by the applicant?</b>
Affordable Housing (7 units – 5 social rent, 2shared ownership)	On-Site Provision	-	Yes

Commuted sum	£100,000		Yes
NCC Education contribution – Special Education Needs and Disabilities (SEND)	£96,806	£2,059.70	Yes
Norfolk Wildlife Trust	£60,000		Yes
GIRAMS Tariff*	£6,995.91	£304.17	Yes
Library Contribution	£4,255	£185	Yes
Fire Hydrant (one)	On-site provision	-	Yes
NCC S106 Monitoring Fee	£500 per obligation	-	Yes
Open space contributions	£88,573		Yes

**4. Imposition of conditions including any considered necessary by the Assistant Director - Planning including matters relating to:**

- Time Limit for implementation
- In accordance with approved plans
- Materials
- Landscaping details, implementation and management
- Mitigation and enhancement measures set out in Ecological Assessment
- Construction Management Plan (CEMP)
- Highway access
- Provision of parking and retention
- Cycle parking provision
- Implementation and retention of refuse and recycling
- Drainage strategy and mitigations
- Permitted Development Right restrictions
- BNG Delivery
- Traffic Regulations Order

**Final wording of conditions to be delegated to the Assistant Director – Planning.**

**That the application be refused if a suitable section 106 agreement is not completed within 4 months of the date of resolution to approve, and in the opinion of the Assistant Director - Planning, there is no realistic prospect of a suitable section 106 agreement being completed within a reasonable timescale.**

This page is intentionally left blank

**CLEY-NEXT-THE-SEA – PF/25/1571 – Demolition of existing non-traditional construction dwelling and construction of replacement dwelling with associated landscaping and widening of access (self-build) at Thornhill Farm, Bridgefoot Lane, Cley-next-the-sea, Holt, Norfolk NR25 7BB.**

**Minor Development**  
**Target Date: 7 October 2025**  
**Extension of Time: None**  
**Case Officer: Mark Brands**  
**Full Planning Permission**

## **RELEVANT SITE CONSTRAINTS**

Located within the countryside  
Located within Glaven Valley Conservation Area  
Landscape Character Assessment – Rolling Heath and Arable / river valleys  
Norfolk Coast National Landscape (formerly AONB)  
Tourism Asset Zone  
GIRAMS Zones of Influence (various)

## **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

Reference	PF/07/1703
Description	Erection of single-storey rear extension
Outcome	Approved 18.12.2007
Reference	PF/03/0522
Description	Erection of replacement double garage
Outcome	Approved 09.05.2003
Reference	PF/02/1547
Description	Erection of single-storey rear extension
Outcome	Approved 25.11.2002
Reference	PF/88/1060
Description	Lifting of agricultural occupancy condition
Outcome	Approved 09.06.1988

## **REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE**

The application has been referred to committee at the request of Councillor Holliday for the following reasons:

Despite a welcome decrease in extent, there is still a considerable increase in glazing over the existing dwelling in this revision, together with a significant increase in footprint, height and mass. I concur with Landscape regarding the glazing on the north and west elevations. The proposed landscaping is welcomed but questions remain if the planned intermediate level screening adequately infills the central gap on the northern boundary, and the time it will take to establish the proposed hedge. I feel this application still does not conform to new Local Plan policies ENV1, 2, 3 and HOU6.

## THE APPLICATION

Seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing single storey dwelling and construction of replacement contemporary two storey dwelling.

The proposal is located in the countryside on the north side of Bridgefoot Lane in a relatively isolated position, with mature and hedgerows around the borders of the site with the adjacent land comprising an arable field. There is a detached curtilage outbuilding proposed to be retained as part of the proposals. The dwelling is relatively well screened from Bridgefoot Lane, a narrow countryside lane by the mature hedgerows. The site is within the National Landscape, and Glaven Valley Conservation Area

### Further details / amendments received during the course of the application

Design and access statement planning addendum, received 22 January 2026

Proposed site and roof plan PP.500 Rev. E, received 22 January 2026

Proposed floor plans PP.1000 Rev. A, received 3 October 2025

Proposed elevations PP.2000 Rev. A, received 3 October 2025

Amended 3D views, received 3 October 2025

## CONSULTATIONS

Conservation and Design (NNDC) – **No objections** (to revisions subject to conditions)

Norfolk Coast Partnership – No responses received

County Council Highways (Cromer) – **No objections** (subject to conditions)

Landscape (NNDC) – **No objections** (to revisions subject to conditions)

Cley Parish Council - **Objects**

### Plans as originally submitted

Concerns were raised by Cllrs that the access road is narrow. Sewage lorries and sugar beet lorries regularly use the route. The visibility splay is poor and requires the hedgerow to be cut back. Cllrs asked that the developer is made aware of the Cley Code of Construction Practice. The building will be twice as big as the existing. Concerns were raised with the glazing, which is a 3- fold increase. Residents on Glanford Road have a direct line of sight. Less glazing would be preferred. Due to the significant size and glazing Cllrs all voted to OBJECT

### Revised plans

Cllrs wish to OBJECT to the planning proposals due to the amount of glazing and additional light spill, especially in the North West corner of the property. Cllrs request that the windows here are reduced in size.

Cllrs also requested more screening. On plan 2419.PP.500 at point G7C there is a large gap which Cllrs would like to see filled with additional screening.

Ward Councillor – **Objects**

### Plans as originally submitted

This proposes an extensive new build on the site of a modest bungalow. The proposed dwelling is taller, has a larger footprint and the mass is significantly greater. I struggle

to see how this conforms to Local Plan Policy H08 in terms of the scale of the replacement of the existing building.

The area of glazing is increased very significantly. Even with reduced visible light transmission glass, this will be a large increase in light emissions with the subsequent adverse impact on the National Landscape's Dark Skies. I cannot find any details of a compatible lighting plan. I question the compliance with Local Plan Policy EN2.

The natural screening from the most sensitive aspects, the north and north west, where this dwelling comes into sight from the village, is patchy and not dense. 11 healthy trees are to be felled. Highways request a significant extent of mature hedging be removed or thinned for access. These changes have landscape and biodiversity consequences. Do these comply with LPP EN2 or 9"

#### Revised plans:

"Whilst welcoming the reduction in glazing, there is still a considerable increase in this revision over the existing dwelling, especially to the north and west; together with a significant increase in footprint, height and mass. The proposed landscaping is welcomed but questions remain if it is sufficient on the northern boundary, and the time it will take to establish. I feel this application still does not conform to new Local Plan policies ENV1, 2, 3 and HOU6. Should this application be approved, I agree with all Landscape's requested conditions"

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

2 representations have been received during the processing of the application, 1 **supporting** and 1 **objecting**. The main issues are summarised (full public comments can be viewed in full on the planning portal website):

#### Objections

Highway safety concerns

Size and scale of replacement dwelling

Increase in glazing

Concerns over loss of planting, detriment to landscape, ecology and biodiversity

Detrimental design

Impact on views

#### Support

Site is well screened

New dwelling would sit comfortably in its surroundings

## **HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS**

It is considered that the proposed development may raise issues relevant to Article 8: The Right to respect for private and family life. Article 1 of the First Protocol: The right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions.

Having considered the likely impact on an individual's Human Rights, and the general interest of the public, approval of this application as recommended is considered to be justified, proportionate and in accordance with planning law.

## **CRIME AND DISORDER**

The application raises no significant crime and disorder issues.

## **EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES**

The application raises no significant equality and diversity issues.

## **LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS**

Under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the council is required when determining planning applications to have regard to any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application.

Local finance considerations are not considered to be material.

## **RELEVANT POLICIES**

### **North Norfolk Local Plan 2024-2040 (December 2025):**

CC 1 - Delivering Climate Resilient Sustainable Growth  
CC 3 - Sustainable Construction, Energy Efficiency & Carbon Reduction  
CC4 - Water Efficiency  
CC7 - Flood Risk & Surface Water Drainage  
CC 8 - Electric Vehicle Charging  
CC 9 - Sustainable Transport  
CC 10 - BNG  
CC 12 - Trees, Hedgerows & woodland  
CC 13 - Protecting Environmental Quality  
SS 1 - Spatial Strategy (Except Small Growth Villages which is apportioned no weight  
SS 2 - Development in the Countryside  
HC5 - Fibre to the Premises (FTTP)  
HC 7 - Parking Provision  
HOU 6 - Replacement Dwellings, Extensions, Domestic Outbuildings & Annexed Accommodation  
ENV 1 - Norfolk Coast National Landscape & The Broads  
ENV 2 - Norfolk Coast National Landscape & The Broads  
ENV 2 - Protection & Enhancement of Landscape & Settlement Character  
ENV 3 - Heritage and Undeveloped Coast  
ENV 4 - Biodiversity & Geodiversity  
ENV 6 - Protection of Amenity  
ENV 7 - Protecting & Enhancing the Historic Environment  
ENV 8 - High Quality Design

Material Considerations:

### **Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance:**

Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (December 2008)  
North Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment SPD (2021)

### **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):**

Chapter 2 - Achieving sustainable development  
Chapter 4 - Decision-making  
Chapter 12 - Achieving well-designed places  
Chapter 14 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
Chapter 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
Chapter 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment



## **OFFICER ASSESSMENT**

### **Main issues for consideration:**

- 1. Principle of Development**
- 2. Design and Conservation**
- 3. Landscape and ecology**
- 4. Environmental**
- 5. Highways**
- 6. Planning Balance and Conclusion**

### **1. Principle of Development**

Policy SS 1 states that the majority of new development in North Norfolk will take place in the towns and designated villages proportionate to their size. Policy SS 2 states that within the countryside development will be restricted to set criteria including replacement of dwellings. Furthermore, the site is within the National Landscape (ENV 1) and Glaven Valley Conservation Area (ENV 7). The principle of replacement dwellings within this area is acceptable subject to compliance with all relevant Core Strategy Policies principally the guidance on replacement dwellings under policy HOU 6 This policy permits replacement dwellings provided that the development would not materially increase the impact of the dwelling on the appearance of the surrounding area and comply with the high quality design policy taking into account the design guide. When determining what constitutes a 'material increase in impact' account will be taken of the size of the exiting property, prominence, plot coverage, and impact of the proposal on the landscape of the area. Subject to compliance with this and the other policies in the Local Plan, the principle for the development for a replacement dwelling could be supported.

### **2. Design and Conservation**

Policy ENV 8 requires all development to be of high-quality design, that reflects the characteristics of the site and respects local character in terms of layout, landscaping, density, mix, scale, massing materials, finish and architectural details and delivers an energy efficient and low carbon development. All proposals should take account of the North Norfolk Design Guide SPD and applications will be expected to demonstrate the proposals contribute positively to the public realm, retains important landscaping and natural features, includes appropriate landscape and ecological enhancements. Development is expected to provide and enhance the green infrastructure network, the special character of the historic environment, reduce opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour, create safe, secure and accessible environments. Application should provide appropriate private amenity space and appropriate facilities for refuse and recycling, ensure development is designed in accordance with minimum space standards, accessible and adaptable homes policies and finally it should maximise opportunities for the provision of Sustainable Drainage Systems.

Paragraph 131 of the NPPF highlights that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

Paragraph 135 advises amongst others matters, that developments should function well and add to the overall quality of the area; be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; be sympathetic to local character and history while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change; establish or maintain

a strong sense of place creating attractive, welcoming and distinctive places; create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible.

The application site lies within Glaven Valley Conservation Area, which is a designated heritage asset. Any new development within this area must aim to at least preserve its established character and appearance. In accordance with paragraph 203 of the NPPF, proposals should also consider the desirability of making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness and comply with policy ENV 7.

The existing modest bungalow is of negligible aesthetic value, as such its demolition and replacement is considered acceptable subject to design of the replacement dwelling. The site benefits from a large curtilage, capable of accommodating a larger replacement dwelling. The existing outbuilding to the east of the site is to be retained.

The proposed replacement is considerably larger both in terms of footprint and its three-dimensional presence on the site. The replacement dwelling would be of a larger massing and scale than the modest existing bungalow. The replacement would include a second floor with flat roof.

The topography of the site rises to the northeast and as such the proposed dwelling appears partly sunken into the contours from certain views. The built form has been split into a series of angular elements which step in and out at various points of the elevations, this helps to breaking up the overall massing, bulk, and volume as well as creating some architectural interest

The flint facing at ground floor level would help to set the buildings within its site whilst the larch cladding would weather up over time and respond well to its soft rural environs. The siting and layout of the building also responds well to its site context and takes account of a range of environmental factors. This assists in mitigating some of the increase in scale.

The site is generally sylvan in character; however, the perimeter tends towards being “gappy” on the northern and western periphery. From these aspects the increased scale could be more apparent within the wider landscape, particularly during the winter months when deciduous screening is less effective. The larger quantum of glazing could lead to unwanted light spillage within the countryside; the remoteness of the location makes heightens this sensitivity.

Officer concerns were raised over the “boxy” quality of the original design, with eaves lines to the fore and, where unbroken, these would have created strong horizontal desire lines. This would increase the impact of the massing and counteracts the intended layering and articulation. The design has since been amended to supplement the boundary planting, reduce the glazed areas and amend the design of the dwelling to express more of a vertical emphasis and articulation. The overall result of the amendments is a better overall form and breaks up the roofline creating a cascade down through the elements. The creation of the higher block adds an additional 0.6m to the height on this raised section. Vertical projecting batten details to the upper flood has also been added to further add to the vertical emphasis with this dentil course detail.

Given the context of the site, the proposals are now considered to comply with local policy considerations and provisions within the NPPF. While the replacement dwelling is of a more notable size, massing and height than the existing, this is effectively mitigated by the landscaping around the site and its undulating topography. Officers do consider the proposals would not adversely and materially increase the impact of the replacement dwelling in terms of its appearance of the surrounding area. The site is well contained with the mature trees and landscaping on the boundaries. The large undulating plot offers scope to accommodate a

larger replacement dwelling without the proposals imposing themselves on the wider landscape. The proposals are considered to comply with Local Plan Policies HOU6 and ENV8.

### **3. Landscape and ecology**

Policy ENV1 sets out the highest degree of protection will be given to the designated landscapes and settings including the Norfolk Coast National Landscape. Development in such areas should seek to further the purposes of designation and contribute positively to the conservation and enhancement of the defined key qualities through appropriate siting, scale, massing, materials and design. Wildlife and cultural heritage should be conserved and enhanced, negative impacts on key qualities minimised. Where development proposals are considered to have potential adverse impacts on the local landscape character, these would need to be informed by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.

Policy ENV 2 sets out proposals should demonstrate that their location, scale, design and materials will protect, conserve and enhance the defining qualities and local distinctiveness of the Landscape Character Type; landscape features; visually sensitive areas; important views; nocturnal character. Proposals should demonstrate measures that enable a scheme to be well integrated into the landscape. The site is located within the Undeveloped Coast whereby policy ENV 3 only permits development where policies in the plan permit such schemes or can be demonstrated to require a coastal location which would not be significantly detrimental to the open coastal character.

Policy ENV 4 sets out all policy proposals will be expected to provide suitable ecological surveys, retain, protect and buffer ecological and geological features and provide for the appropriate management of those features, deliver BNG, incorporate biodiversity enhancement measures and avoid net loss or fragmentation of habitats. Adverse impacts must be addressed, be in accordance with the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and any adverse effects on nationally and locally designated sites only permitted where it can be demonstrated that the needs outweigh the adverse impacts.

In response to concerns raised by the officers concerning adverse impact on the nocturnal character of the National Landscape, glazing has been reduced by 18.7m<sup>2</sup> from that originally proposed to now total of 76.4m<sup>2</sup>. The Committee should note the replacement dwelling will see an overall increase in openings compared with that of the existing dwelling (27.2m<sup>2</sup>). Timber slats have been introduced to 6m<sup>2</sup> of openings. Whilst Officers have some disappointment that there has been no agreement to reduce the size of the large windows on both floors of the corner of the north and west elevations, the applicant confirms they would be willing to include external blinds on the north-west elevations to limit light spill. The use of blinds will need consideration in terms of enforceable / reasonable conditions tests - Officer view is that such conditions may not be enforceable.

The GIA (Gross Internal Area) of the proposed dwelling is 269.2m<sup>2</sup>. This is nearly twice the area of the existing dwelling which is 135.3m<sup>2</sup>. The proposed dwelling is set into the sloping site which will reduce its presence and impact. The roof level will be slightly higher (0.8m compared to the existing dwelling) with an increase of 1.3m on the northern block. The resulting building will be significantly larger than the existing dwelling.

Soft landscape mitigation has been increased on the north site boundary and to the west of the dwelling within the existing garden. This is in the form of mixed native hedgerow planting to supplement weak sections along the north boundary and strategically placed groups of trees and shrubs within the garden area to the north and west to assist in filtering the impact of the large replacement building.

The site lies within the Glaven Valley Conservation Area, the applicant offers control over the management of the garden vegetation which plays a vital function in making this proposal acceptable. The proposals would result in the loss of 7 category C trees and 4 category C groups to facilitate the demolition and construction of the replacement dwelling. Additionally, the mixed species hedgerows at the site entrance would be cut back to allow for improved visibility (*likely required in any case if overgrown over NCC highway land*). The trees proposed for removal are internal with little wider visibility, as such are not considered to result in significant adverse residual effects. Officers accept the arboricultural details. The supplementary planning is in the form of new hedgerow and supplementary planting groups to filter views comprising Hawthorn, Hazel and Holly, Yew, Guelder, rose, dogwood and holly. An extended hedgerow to the northern boundary is also provided. Officers consider that this compensation off sets the loss of the trees and is considered acceptable.

The ecology details set out that no bats were seen to emerge or enter the existing house. It was noted that two trees to the southwest were identified as having bat roost potential, but these are well away from the proposed works area. All existing vegetation on site provides habitat for nesting and foraging birds. Reptiles are most likely to be in wooded areas and dense vegetation and could be impacted during the construction works, reptile checks of potential basking/hibernation areas are proposed. Traditional orchard and native hedgerows are priority habitat; these habitats are largely unaffected by the proposed construction works. Appropriate mitigation measures have been set out and enhancements, including bird, swift and bat boxes/ bricks, to be integrated in the proposals and installed on suitable trees on the site. The site is considered exempt from Biodiversity Net Gain requirements as the proposals are for a self-build dwelling.

When weighing up the changes to the building and the landscape, Officers consider that the proposal would not have a significantly detrimental material impact on the surrounding area. Appropriate ecological mitigation and enhancement have been proposed. The development would comply with the requirements of the replacement dwelling policy HOU 6 and would not conflict with Policies ENV 1, ENV 2, ENV 3, ENV 4.

#### **4. Environmental**

Policy CC 1 sets out that development shall be delivered with the highest regard to sustainable development and climate change principles including positively contributing to mitigating and adapting to climate change, minimising greenhouse gas emissions.

Policy CC 3 sets out new development is required to achieve progressively higher standards of environmental sustainability. This includes reductions in CO2 emissions of a minimum of 31% below the Target Emission Rate to be achieved through the implementation of the energy hierarchy through use of design and energy efficient measures and by provision of appropriate renewable and low carbon energy technologies and incorporation of measures to maximise solar gain, natural ventilation, use of green roofs, natural shading and other appropriate measures.

Policy CC 4 sets out all new development must be designed and constructed in a way that minimises its impact on water resources, with all new dwellings designed and constructed in such a way that enables them to meet or exceed Building Regulations Part G water efficiency higher optimal standard.

The replacement dwelling seeks to achieve high standards of thermal efficiency and use of renewable energy including Air Source Heat Pump, Mechanical Ventilation Heat Recovery System and Photovoltaic panels. These measures are a positive change from the traditional

dwelling that currently sits on site. Whilst further details would be required from the applicant to demonstrate full compliance with the new Local Plan Policies (CC1, 3 and 4), the Committee will note that the retention of the existing inefficient traditional dwelling on site is a material consideration as a fallback potential should permission not be granted.

With this in mind, Officers consider that some matters can be secured through imposition of conditions including water efficiency measures required under Policy CC 4.

On balance, whilst not in full accordance with Local Plan Policies CC1, 3 and 4) Officers find a broad accordance with the environmental policy aspirations and this can be weighed in the planning balance.

## **5. Highways**

Policy CC 9 requires development to provide safe and convenient access for all modes of transport, including access to the highway network.

Policy HC 7 requires new development to have sufficient parking facilities including provision of EV charging points (Policy CC 8).

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

The site would utilise the existing access onto Bridgefoot Lane, with this to be widened to improve visibility in both directions with a larger parking area to ensure appropriate parking provision and manoeuvrability on site to accommodate the larger dwelling and could be viewed as an improvement to the existing arrangement with improved visibility.

No objections have been raised by the highway officer on the amended access arrangement. Regarding the comments on maximising the visibility, the boundary hedgerows are overgrown, and the comments encourage this to be cleared back to the boundary of the site and not over the highway verge, which the highway authority would have some powers to enforce this already. There isn't considered to be a conflict between the visibility and retention of the hedgerow.

The updated plan includes provision of an EV charging point, the level of provision of electric vehicle charging points is appropriate to the development size and type, the level of new parking provision together with local context and site location. In any event the fallback position is noted whereby the existing dwelling may be retained on site with no EV charging point. As such this change represents betterment above the fallback position.

The proposals are considered to accord with the aforementioned Local Plan Policy considerations.

## **6. Other material considerations**

Local Plan policy HC5 – Fibre to Premises requires applicants provide evidence demonstrating that fibre (FTTP) connections in accordance with the National Building Regulations will be provided. Where this cannot be demonstrated to be practical or viable then the policy allows alternatives such as superfast fibre to be delivered.

The applicant confirms that fibre broadband will be provided to the dwelling in accordance with the Building Regulations, or should the connection be not viable under the terms set out within the Regulations, alternative provision will be provided in accordance with the Regulations.

The submission fails to provide clear evidence of engagement with the relevant network operators. There is no clear, non-technical statement confirming that FTTP can be delivered as part of the development. The applicants have supplied an aspiration that if granted planning permission that the proposals will then comply with building regulations requirements. This fails to demonstrate full compliance at the point of granting planning permission. The proposals therefore fail to meet the full technical requirements of Policy HC 5, although Officers recognise that this matter could be secured via imposition of planning condition.

As above officers are aware of the potential fallback position, i.e. whereby the current traditional dwelling remains occupied on site with no fibre connection. The aspiration to connect and where necessary seek alternatives to full fibre connections would represent small positive weight in favour of the proposals.

Self-Build and Custom Housing (SBCH) – policy HOU 2 “housing mix” does not require any element of SBCH on sites where less than 5 dwellings are provided. As such the applicant’s intention to create a new unit of SBCH will exceed policy requirements.

Members attention is also drawn to the recent appeal decision APP/Y2620/W/25/3368039 at Edgefield, in this decision the inspector found that up to five SBCH units should be afforded substantial positive weight in terms of meeting an observed unmet demand for SBCH in the district. Here the proposals are for a single dwelling consequently the ability to significantly boost SBCH is therefore proportionate.

## **7. Planning balance and Conclusion**

Section 38(6) of the Town and Country Planning Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 sets out that planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The proposal seeks permission for the demolition of the existing bungalow and the construction of a larger replacement dwelling. The revised scheme has been designed to respond successfully to the site’s context, and landscape. The proposals now ensure an appropriate high-quality design and scale is delivered. The site is well screened, with filtered planting both existing and proposed. The design makes good use of the undulating topography and assimilates well into that context. Further that the use of VLT glazing will mitigate, to a significant degree, the impacts of introducing the larger dwelling and greater glazing in this sensitive location. The proposed design and mitigation will effectively minimise impacts on the surrounding landscape. For the reasons outlined in the report the proposals are not considered to materially increase the detrimental impact of the proposals on the appearance of the surrounding area.

In addition the proposals will provide a single unit of SBCH which will attract positive weight in terms of meeting the observed under supply within the district.

The report notes areas where compliance with policy has not been achieved. Officers note the negative weight that would normally be applied in these circumstances. However, the proposals should be considered within the fallback position, i.e. that the original dwelling in its traditional form would otherwise remain. In such circumstances the negative weight applied is balanced out by the fallback position, i.e. there will be building regulations compliance to achieve carbon efficiency and fibre connectivity.

Officers find that there that the negative weight associated with those considerations above is addressed by carefully amended plans, mitigation or is otherwise balanced out by the fallback position. As such reasonable positive weight can be applied to this high-quality contemporary design for a replacement dwelling.

It is therefore concluded that, subject to conditions, the proposed development is acceptable and compliant with the relevant Development Plan policies as outlined above.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**APPROVAL subject to conditions relating to the following matters:**

- Time limit
- Development in accordance with approved plans
- Materials (inc flint sample panel)
- Accordance with ecological mitigation and enhancement measures
- Hard and soft Landscaping details
- Implementation of landscape proposals
- Accordance with Arboricultural Method Statement
- Replacement of tree failures (10 years)
- External Lighting
- Specification for glass of a VLT value less than .65
- Removal of Permitted Development rights
- Access accordance with NCC specifications
- Visibility splays
- Levels
- Water efficiency
- EV parking
- Self-build standard conditions
- Securing Fibre to the premises (or alternative if Fibre not available).

**Final wording of conditions and any others considered necessary to be delegated to the Assistant Director – Planning**

This page is intentionally left blank



**HOLT - PF/25/2133 (Application 1) - Replacement windows (retrospective) at 2 The Beeches, Station Road, Holt, Norfolk, NR25 6AU**

**HOLT - LA/25/2134 (Application 2) - Replacement windows (retrospective) at 2 The Beeches, Station Road, Holt, Norfolk, NR25 6AU**

---

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Development Committee are being asked to determine two separate planning and listed building applications which relate to replacement windows at 2 The Beeches, Station Road Holt.

Given that there are similar matters affecting both applications, a combined report has been produced so as to reduce duplication. Nonetheless, separate decisions will be required for Application 1 and Application 2.

This report sets out:

- the development proposed;
- identifies the responses received from consultees and public representations;
- Runs through the main planning considerations; and
- Provides an officer recommendation

It should be noted that, although these applications only relate to Flat 2, there are numerous upvc windows already installed within the listed building across multiple flats, seemingly without appropriate permissions or consents first being in place and which are subject to ongoing enforcement considerations. Given the retrospective nature of these applications, there are clearly wider implications in terms of planning enforcement beyond Flat 2 (which is the subject of these applications) and which is why these applications are before the Committee for determination.

The planning and listed building considerations within this report apply to both applications (unless stated otherwise)

---

<b>Application 1: PF/25/2133</b>	<b>Application 2: LA/25/2134</b>
<b>Householder Planning Application</b>	<b>Listed Building Consent Application</b>
<b>Target Date:</b> 19 <sup>th</sup> December 2025	<b>Target Date:</b> 19 <sup>th</sup> December 2025
<b>Extension:</b> 30 <sup>th</sup> January 2026	<b>Extension:</b> 30 <sup>th</sup> January 2026
<b>Case Officer:</b> Harry Gray	<b>Case Officer:</b> Harry Gray

## **RELEVANT PLANNING CONSTRAINTS**

Residential Area  
Grade II Listed Building  
Within a settlement boundary  
Within a Conservation Area  
Landscape Character Type - Wooded Glacial Ridge.

## RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None – other than the applications subject to these reports

## THE APPLICATION(S)

Seek retrospective planning permission and listed building consent to retain six replacement windows at 2 The Beeches, a first-floor flat within a Grade II listed building and located within the settlement boundary and conservation area of Holt. The first floor of the building is split into two flats. The windows for both flats have been replaced and are subject to live enforcement cases, however, only No.2 has submitted applications for their retention.

## REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

At the request of the Development Manager on the basis that decisions made in respect of these planning and listed building applications will have a direct bearing on the direction on-going enforcement cases affecting not only the property subject of these applications but also on the wider building (where many other windows have been replaced without either listed building consent or planning permission). Given the range of comments, both in support and objection, it is considered important that the Development Committee makes the final decision in the wider public interest.

## PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL

Holt Town Council - Support

## CONSULTATIONS

**Conservation & Design (NNDC) – Object** – a copy of the response is attached in full at Appendix 1.

## REPRESENTATIONS

To date, **six** representations have been received following publicity via site notice and advertisement in the local press in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

**Five** representations **support** the applications and raise the following matters (summarised):

- In keeping design.
- Energy efficiency and environmentally/eco friendly.

**One** representation **objects** to application PF/25/2133 and raises the following matter (summarised):

- See no reason to change the existing windows.

## **HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS**

It is considered that the proposed development may raise issues relevant to:

Article 8: The Right to respect for private and family life.

Article 1 of the First Protocol: The right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions.

Having considered the likely impact on an individual's Human Rights, and the general interest of the public, refusal of this application as recommended is considered to be justified, proportionate and in accordance with planning law.

## **CRIME AND DISORDER**

The application raises no significant crime and disorder issues.

## **EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES**

The application raises no significant equality and diversity issues.

## **LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS**

Under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the council is required when determining planning applications to have regard to any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application. Local finance considerations are not considered to be material to this case.

## **RELEVANT POLICIES**

### **North Norfolk Local Plan (adopted December 2025)**

CC1 - Delivering Climate Resilient Sustainable Growth

CC3 - Sustainable Construction, Energy Efficiency & Carbon Reduction

CC13 - Protecting Environmental Quality

SS1 - Spatial Strategy

HC7 - Parking Provision

ENV6 - Protection of Amenity

ENV7 - Protecting & Enhancing the Historic Environment

ENV8 - High Quality Design

HOU6 - Replacement Dwellings, Extensions, Domestic Outbuildings & Annexed Accommodation

### **Holt Neighbourhood Plan (August 2023)**

Following a public referendum on Thursday 29 June 2023, the Holt Neighbourhood Plan has been brought into legal force. It now forms part of the statutory Development Plan for North Norfolk.

HOLT1 - Design Guidance

## Material Considerations

### **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):**

Chapter 2 - Achieving sustainable development

Chapter 4 - Decision-making

Chapter 12 - Achieving well-designed places

Chapter 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Chapter 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

### **Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance:**

North Norfolk Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (December 2008)

Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Planning Document (January 2021)

s16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act, 1990

## **OFFICER ASSESSMENT**

### **Main issues for consideration:**

- 1. Principle**
- 2. Design and impact on the Grade II Listed Building and surrounding Conservation Area**
- 3. Amenity**
- 4. Highways (parking)**
- 5. Other matters**

#### **1. Principle (Applicable to PF/25/2133 only)**

The dwelling is located within the settlement boundary of Holt identified under Policy SS 1 of the adopted Local Plan where the principle of extensions to existing dwellings is considered acceptable subject to compliance with other relevant Core Strategy policies. Whilst not strictly an extension, but rather an alteration, this policy would remain relevant.

#### **2. Design and impact on the Grade II Listed Building and surrounding Conservation Area**

Section 16 (2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out that "In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority...shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out that "In considering whether to grant planning permission...for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority...shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out that "In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area...special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area."

The Beeches is a Grade II listed building (formerly known as The Shrublands) and occupies a relatively prominent position within the Holt Conservation Area. The building currently comprises of 4 flats, two at first floor and two at ground floor.

Conservation & Design Officer input into assessing the applications has been provided. In the first instance, it is noted that the application fails to describe the significance of the heritage assets affected; namely the grade II listed host building and the wider Holt Conservation Area. There is no assessment of the age and value of the windows that have been removed and no meaningful appraisal of their condition or ability to be repaired and upgraded rather than replaced. As a result, the alterations that have been undertaken cannot be considered compliant with paragraph 207 of the NPPF.

The Conservation & Design Officers notes that the limited photograph evidence available of the windows that have been removed would suggest that the windows were the original c19 windows, rather than modern replicas, and would therefore have held intrinsic historic and evidential value, with their loss having a detrimental impact upon the overall significance of the listed building.

Furthermore, the Conservation Officer observes that, by reason of the replacement plastic windows having a more standardised form, with an artificial, uniform texture, and having thicker framing, relatively flat sections of plastic, modern glass and more prominent and conspicuous position in the reveal, the replacement windows are considered to be at odds with the classical, symmetrical fenestration of the early-19<sup>th</sup>-century building, from which it draws part of its significance. It has been concluded that the proposal would result in harm to the heritage assets.

The only exception to this is window 2, which as it is a casement and located on a less prominent side elevation with no other windows immediately around it, is less stark, despite its inappropriate trickle vents.

The level of harm to the significance of the heritage assets has been quantified as 'less than substantial' to the significance of the Grade II listed building and the character and appearance of the surrounding conservation area. However, as paragraph 212 of the NPPF reminds us, great weight should be given to the assets' conservation, irrespective of the level of harm. As per paragraph 215, where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

The Committee will note the applicant's case in support of the application (as set out in Section 5 below).

Whilst the Local Planning Authority (LPA) recognises the motivation of replacing single-glazed windows with double glazing in terms of improved energy and thermal efficiency and to aid fully functioning windows, the weight to be attributed to these benefits would be a matter for the decision maker to decide whilst also acknowledging that alternative timber options may be available, which would better reflect the form and character of the original windows.

The applicant has provided examples of modern/coloured windows that have been installed within other Listed Buildings and Conservation Area of Holt. This is noted, and it is unclear whether or not the examples provided have benefitted from planning permission (or listed building consent). However, each individual planning application must be considered upon its own merits and accordingly, the current application has been assessed based upon the particular merits of this Listed Building and its position within the Conservation Area.

In this particular case, harm to the listed building has been identified through the insertion of modern upvc window frames and glazing. Absent sufficient public benefits to outweigh the harm identified, the proposal would be considered unacceptable and would therefore be contrary to Policies ENV7 and ENV8 of the adopted North Norfolk Local Plan, Paragraphs 207, 212 and 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework, s16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 and the North Norfolk Design Guide.

**3. Amenity** (Applicable to PF/25/2133 only)

As the proposal is for the retention of the replacement of the existing windows and not for the introduction of new windows, it is considered that an increase in residential amenity impacts would not occur. The proposal would therefore be compliant with the aims of Policy ENV8 of the adopted Local Plan.

**4. Highways (parking)** (Applicable to PF/25/2133 only)

The proposal would accord with the requirements of Policy HC 7 of the adopted Local Plan.

**5. Other Matters**

The applicants case in support of their proposal is based primarily on three aspects:

- i. The applicants state that they were not aware that they had purchased the lease on a Listed building and they say neither were their estate agents, solicitors or landlords. The applicant notes that if you search for listed buildings in Holt, The Beeches is not Listed and is referred to as Shrublands which they say has not existed for 35 years. The applicant considers that all of this could have been avoided if the name change had been updated in 1990 when the Beeches was developed and certainly there should be a plaque placed on the building declaring its listed status. That in itself would have avoided any confusion, according to the applicant.
- ii. The applicant sets out that all of the windows installed are A Rated. The applicant reminds the Council that it claimed to be the first Council in the county to recognise the Climate emergency and launched a Net Zero Action Plan reducing emissions at every opportunity. Yet the same people are asking a retirement complex where the average age of the residents is over 80 to ignore their advice and tolerate draughty ill-fitting windows and ignoring completely the health and safety of their residents. The applicant says that by replacing their rotten, draughty and frankly dangerous timber windows with A rated Upvc they improved the efficiency by more than 80% and seriously reduced their fuel bills to an affordable level.
- iii. The applicant sets out that they replaced their own windows in woodgrain white Upvc to improve their quality of life and reduce their outgoings. The applicant says that their service charge has increased by more than 50% in three years and many are deeply concerned about increasing cost and striding to live within their pensions. The new windows are as close to matching the old as can be achieved with modern materials, even with timber glazing you cannot upgrade the old ones as the only ways you can improve them to anything like the level of UPVC is with secondary glazing with all of the obvious disadvantages they display, resulting in

unsightly extra glazing bars and difficult access for both ventilation and in case of fire.

In response to the applicants comments above, firstly it is important for the Committee to understand that not knowing that a building is Grade II listed is not a valid legal defence if you carry out unauthorised works, as this offence is one of strict liability. The only legal defence is showing that the works were urgently needed in the interest of health and safety or for the preservation of the building, and that this was the absolute minimum work required. Officers understand that this is not the case here.

The applicant refers to the Council's website as the source of inaccurate listing data. The Council does not maintain the National Heritage List for England, that task falls to Historic England who compile the list and NNDC signpost from their website to the Historic England maintained website. However, the applicant is correct that, on the National Heritage List for England, The Beeches is not listed and instead the property is recorded as Shrublands, 28 Station Road, presumably reflecting the name of the property at the time of first listing in 1983. Whilst Officers do recognise the frustration with the property changing names adding to confusion when seeking to establish listed status, it is nonetheless the responsibility of the purchaser (and their solicitor where applicable) to do the necessary due diligence when purchasing a freehold or leasehold property - Caveat emptor "let the buyer beware".

In respect of the windows that have been installed, Officers recognise the energy performance benefits from double glazed windows compared with rotten or draughty single-glazed windows. The energy performance benefits are matters that are capable of attracting positive weight in the planning balance. In addition, Officers note the comments from the applicant that the upvc windows they installed are as close a match as possible and that they could only have achieved the energy performance improvements if they had installed secondary glazing, which would have added to emergency escape difficulties for the elderly people living in the building. It is very difficult for Officers to provide any meaningful commentary as to whether the original timber windows were beyond repair and/or that secondary glazing could have been installed to improve thermal performance. The original windows had been removed before any opportunity for Conservation & Design Officers to explore alternative solutions had been considered (including replacements using timber).

Finally, it should be noted that there are numerous upvc windows already installed within the listed building, seemingly without appropriate permissions or consents. It must also be noted that this application only pertains to the six windows associated with Flat no.2 and not no.1, the other first-floor flat or the other flats within the building. Other flats are subject to enforcement cases, and it is considered that the breaches are considered likely to harm the significance of the Grade II listed building and wider conservation area.

### **Planning Balance and Conclusion**

The proposal would result in 'less than substantial' harm to the host Grade II Listed Building and wider conservation area, and without sufficient material considerations if favour to outweigh the harm, the replacement windows would be considered unacceptable. As a result, this application is contrary to Policies ENV7 and ENV8 of the adopted North Norfolk Local Plan, Paragraphs 207, 212 and 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework, s16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 and the North Norfolk Design Guide.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

### **HOLT - PF/25/2133 (Application 1) - Replacement windows (retrospective) at 2 The Beeches, Station Road, Holt, Norfolk, NR25 6AU**

#### **REFUSAL for the following reason:**

1. By reason of their standardised artificial texture, uniform sheen, thicker and flatter framing, modern glazing, and because they will not age and weather in the same way as the original timber windows, it is considered that the installed plastic windows constitute inauthentic contemporary additions which appear unduly conspicuous within the host grade II listed building, failing to preserve or enhance its refined and elegant character and appearance. With the building also lying within the Holt Conservation Area, which is characterised by its classical Georgian architecture, it is considered that the removal of the former windows and their replacement with inauthentic equivalents, has resulted in less than substantial harm being caused to existing designated heritage assets. With there being insufficient public benefits to outweigh the identified harm, and with the submission failing to properly describe the significance of the assets involved, the proposed development is therefore considered contrary to Local Plan Policies ENV7 and ENV8 of the adopted North Norfolk Local Plan, Paragraphs 207, 212 and 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework, s66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 and the North Norfolk Design Guide.

**Final wording of reason(s) for refusal to be delegated to the Assistant Director – Planning**

### **HOLT - LA/25/2134 (Application 2) - Replacement windows (retrospective) at 2 The Beeches, Station Road, Holt, Norfolk, NR25 6AU**

#### **REFUSAL for the following reason:**

1. By reason of their standardised artificial texture, uniform sheen, thicker and flatter framing, modern glazing, and because they will not age and weather in the same way as the original timber windows, it is considered that the installed plastic windows constitute inauthentic contemporary additions which appear unduly conspicuous within the host grade II listed building, failing to preserve or enhance its refined and elegant character and appearance. With the building also lying within the Holt Conservation Area, which is characterised by its classical Georgian architecture, it is considered that the removal of the former windows and their replacement with inauthentic equivalents, has resulted in less than substantial harm being caused to existing designated heritage assets. With there being insufficient public benefits to outweigh the identified harm, and with the submission failing to properly describe the significance of the assets involved, the proposed development is therefore considered contrary to Local Plan Policies ENV7 and ENV8 of the adopted North Norfolk Local Plan, Paragraphs 207, 212 and 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework, s16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 and the North Norfolk Design Guide.

**Final wording of reason(s) for refusal to be delegated to the Assistant Director – Planning**



In the event of refusal of these applications, further consideration will be required in relation enforcement matters, to be delegated to the Assistant Director - Planning.

This page is intentionally left blank

Please return completed forms to [planning.consultation@north-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:planning.consultation@north-norfolk.gov.uk)

**Application Details:**

Reference: PF/25/2133 & LA/25/2134 Officer: Mr Harry Gray

Location: 2 The Beeches, Station Road, Holt, Norfolk, NR25 6AU

Proposal: Replacement windows (retrospective)

**Consultee Details:**

Name: Alannah Hogarth

Dept: Conservation and Design (NNDC)

Reason: **The site is within a conservation area.**

**The application is for or could affect a listed building**

Advice ☐

No Comment\* ☐

Support ☐

Object ☒

The Beeches is a Grade II listed building (formerly known as The Shrublands at the time of listing in 1983) that occupies a relatively prominent position within the Holt Conservation Area, both of which are considered designated heritage assets for the purposes of the NPPF. Having previously been a single dwelling, consent was granted in the late 1980s for the building to be subdivided into several flats. The current application relates to unauthorised works that have been carried out that affect the first-floor properties and seeks to regularise those at Flat 2 only.

Conservation & Design (C&D) are unable to support this application to retain the replacement windows for three primary reasons: -

1. In the first instance, the application fails to describe the significance of the heritage assets affected; namely the grade II listed host building and the wider Holt Conservation Area. Beyond this, there is no assessment of the age and value of the windows that have been removed and no meaningful appraisal of their condition or ability to be repaired and upgraded rather than replaced. As a result, the alterations that have been undertaken cannot be considered compliant with para 207 of the NPPF.
2. The limited photographic evidence available gives no reason to suggest the windows that have been removed were modern replicas, there is a strong likelihood they were the original C19 windows that had intrinsic historic and evidential value, and as such their loss has had a detrimental impact upon the overall significance of the listed building.
3. By virtue of the limitations of plastic as a material, the replacement windows are more standardised in form, with an artificial, uniform texture. The thicker framing, relatively flat sections of plastic, modern glass and position in the reveal make them more prominent and conspicuous within the traditional context. Part of the significance of the building is derived from its classical, symmetrical, fenestration, thus the incongruous nature of the replacement windows is exacerbated by the fact that the original windows remain on the ground floor. The only exception to this is window 2, which as it is a casement and located on a less prominent side elevation with no other windows immediately around it, is less stark, despite its

inappropriate trickle vents.

The replacement of historic windows with uPVC is a significant threat to individual historic buildings and to the Conservation Area as a whole, as highlighted in the Holt Conservation Area Appraisal (2021). Changes to traditional fenestration causes the loss of historic fabric, alters the appearance and aesthetic value of a building and can also affect the historic fabric of the remainder of the building by changing its breathability. New windows can be obtrusive if set too close to the front of the wall, losing the play of light and shadow which adds interest to historic facades. It is, therefore, preferable to repair damaged windows and to undertake regular maintenance to ensure their enduring longevity.

Whilst it is understood that the rationale behind replacement hinged partly on improving thermal performance and occupant comfort, it is worth noting that there are many simple thermal improvement options available for timber windows such as draught-proofing, shuttering or secondary-glazing. In fact, there are a number of studies that suggest timber windows have a better overall thermal performance than uPVC. It is also possible to use double glazed timber sash windows, before resorting to plastic, which has a limited life span and cannot be re-used or recycled. Therefore, only limited weight can be given to these arguments.

C&D are, therefore, unable to support the application as it is considered to result in 'less than substantial' harm to both the listed building and the character and appearance of the conservation area. Any harm to a designated heritage asset must be supported by sufficient justification in addition to being outweighed by any public benefit to be derived from the scheme. In this case, there are no obvious public benefits to be had and so there is nothing to outweigh the identified harm. The application is, therefore, contrary to Local Plan policy EN8, paras 207, 212 & 215 of the NPPF, and s16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act, 1990.

Date: 21/11/2025

\*Determine in accordance with the Development Plan, other material planning considerations and statutory duties

**THURSFORD - PF/25/2102 - Change of use from agricultural land to a dog walking field with associated secure car parking, shed for use by dog walkers, associated vehicular access improvements to serve dog walking field and a car park for Thursford Cemetery as users currently have to park on the highway at Land To The North Of Thursford Cemetery, Gunthorpe Road, Thursford, NR21 0BP**

**Minor Development**

**Target Date: 19<sup>th</sup> February 2026**

**Extension of Time: 27<sup>th</sup> February 2026**

**Case Officer: Olivia Luckhurst**

**Full Planning Permission**

**RELEVANT PLANNING CONSTRAINTS**

Countryside

Landscape Character Assessment - Tributary Farmland

**RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

None.

**THE APPLICATION**

Seeks the change of use from agricultural land to a dog walking field with associated secure car parking, shed for use by dog walkers, associated vehicular access improvements to serve dog walking field and a car park for Thursford Cemetery.

**REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE**

The application has been referred to committee at the request of Councillor Sarah Butikofer due to considering that there are grounds under SS1 and HC7 of the new Local Plan to ask for this application to be discussed at committee. The benefits to the local community from this scheme are recognised by the Parish Council who are extremely supportive. The application is made by a local farmer trying to diversify their land usage.

**PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL**

**Thursford Parish Council – Support.**

**CONSULTATIONS**

**Norfolk County Council Highways - Object** - Appreciate that Gunthorpe Road is very lightly trafficked presently and the cemetery would benefit from the use of a car parking facility for visitors what would otherwise park on the verge. However, conscious that the dog walking element of the application will generate new traffic with vehicles visiting on an hourly basis and therefore do not consider the network suitable for that purpose.

The carriageway width of Gunthorpe Road measures just 2.8m and is only capable of allowing one vehicle to pass. It has no formal passing places along its length. It is unlit and away from centres of population and therefore a car dependant site. Grass was observed to be growing in the centre of the road in some parts and it's of a fragile construction.

At the junction of Gunthorpe Road with North Lane, towards its southern end, visibility to the trafficked direction was observed to be only 2.4m x 42m. For the speed of traffic experienced along North Lane, minimum visibility splays of 2.4m x 120m should be provided to accord with the adopted national guidance as set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).

At the highway junction of Gunthorpe Road with Hindringham Road, towards the north, visibility to the trafficked direction was also obstructed by hedging to approximately 17m and to the non-trafficked at just 10m. It is observed from our records that there is a recorded accident at this junction.

Ultimately, it is the view of the Highway Authority that an approval of this application in its present form would lead to an intensification of use on Gunthorpe Road resulting in conditions detrimental to highway safety.

**Landscape (NNDC) - No objection** - Clarification requested of the type of fencing to be used around the site boundaries. The Block Plan states '1.8m high wooden fencing with wooden posts 1m off boundary'.

Confirmation is required as to whether this is deer fencing with wire mesh infill which would be appropriate, or close board fencing which would not be suitable. The site is part of a larger arable field. New native hedge planting with trees is proposed on the west and north site boundaries. This is appropriate, given that these are new artificial boundaries in the middle of a cropped field. Trees such as oak, field maple, hawthorn would be appropriate. The Planning Statement states that the hedge will be hawthorn. A mixed species hedge would be preferable to provide a richer habitat. This should be amended on the Block Plan.

The Planning Statement also sets out that there will be a tree shelter belt north of the site to protect a group of holiday homes. This is shown notionally on the Block Plan, but there are no details.

The parking area is acceptable in terms of location and surface materials, as is the proposed timber field shelter. Subject to clarification of the fencing and satisfactory amendment of the Block Plan, there are no further substantive issues relating to landscape and visual impact.

Planting details can either be included prior to consent (i.e. species, size, % mix, planting densities, protection measures) or can be secured by way of condition.

**Economic Development (NNDC) - No objection.**

**Environmental Health (NNDC)** - Note that this site has been relocated from that in previous applications - to be at distance from residential boundaries. Recommend that use is in accordance with the submitted details. Groups should not be permitted. The field is only to be available to private individuals, and their dogs sessions are of fifty-minute session with a ten-minute change over period.

In addition, suggest that the sessions are time limited and would suggest 07.00 hrs to 19.00 hours for this site. Waste disposal measures should be in place.

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

No representations received.

## **HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS**

It is considered that the proposed development may raise issues relevant to Article 8: The Right to respect for private and family life. Article 1 of the First Protocol: The right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions.

Having considered the likely impact on an individual's Human Rights, and the general interest of the public, refusal of this application as recommended is considered to be justified, proportionate and in accordance with planning law.

## **CRIME AND DISORDER**

The application raises no significant crime and disorder issues.

## **EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES**

The application raises no significant equality and diversity issues.

## **LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS**

Under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the council is required when determining planning applications to have regard to any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application. Local finance considerations are not considered to be material.

## **RELEVANT POLICIES**

### **North Norfolk Local Plan (adopted December 2025)**

SS1 - Spatial Strategy

SS2 - Development in the Countryside

CC7 - Flood Risk & Surface Water Drainage

CC8 - Electric Vehicle Charging

CC 9 - Sustainable Transport

CC10 - BNG

CC12 - Trees, Hedgerows & Woodland

CC13 - Protecting Environmental Quality

HC7 - Parking Provision

ENV2 - Protection & Enhancement of Landscape & Settlement Character

ENV4 - Biodiversity & Geodiversity

ENV5 - Impacts on international & European sites, Recreational Impact Avoidance Mitigation Strategy

ENV6 - Protection of Amenity

ENV8 - High Quality Design

### **Material Considerations**

#### **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):**

Chapter 2 - Achieving sustainable development

Chapter 4 - Decision-making

Chapter 12 - Achieving well-designed places

Chapter 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

## **OFFICER ASSESSMENT**

### **Main issues for consideration:**

- 1. Site and Application**
- 2. Principle of Development**
- 3. Design and Impact on Landscape and Character of the Area**
- 4. Amenity**
- 5. Highways**
- 6. Biodiversity**
- 7. Conclusion**

#### **1. Site and Application**

The application site is located within the village of Thursford fronting Gunthorpe Road. The site is host to undeveloped agricultural land enclosed by mature trees and hedging. Planning permission is sought for the change of use to a dog walking field with associated secure car parking, shed for use by dog walkers, associated vehicular access improvements to serve dog walking field and a car park for Thursford Cemetery.

#### **2. Principle of Development**

Policy SS 1 sets out that most of the new development in North Norfolk will take place in the Large Growth and a small amount of new development will be focused on several designated Small Growth Villages. The rest of North Norfolk, including all settlements that do not fall under the above criteria, will be designated as Countryside. Policy SS 2 limits development in areas designated as Countryside to that, which requires a rural location and accords with a list of particular uses, which includes recreational uses.

Thursford has no designated settlement boundary meaning that the site is considered as countryside under policies SS 1 and SS 2 of the Local Plan. The proposal seeks to change the use of an undeveloped agricultural field to a dog walking field with associated structures. Such a proposal falls under the category of recreation and tourism, which is one of the types of development that is acceptable in principle in this location under Policies SS 1 and SS 2, subject to assessment against other relevant policy considerations.

#### **3. Design and Impact on Landscape and Character of the Area**

The application is designated as Tributary Farmland within the North Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment and is characterised by generally open and rolling/undulating rural farmland with some elevated plateau areas and a rich diversity of minor settlement, woodland and historic estates. As the name suggests, it forms the catchment area for a number of watercourses feeding into the main river valleys of the Stiffkey, Glaven and Bure.

The site is presently undeveloped and is well shielded by mature trees and hedges along the boundary. The application proposes the construction of a shed intended for use by dog walkers. This shed would be made of timber, standing 2.4m tall, 3.6m wide, and 3.6m deep, and it would be located near the eastern boundary.

In addition to the field shelter, two new wooden gates, each 1.8m high, would be installed to the south of the site, creating a division between the car park and the field. Additionally, a new parking area is set to be established to the south of the site.



The proposed site plan shows that a new wooden fence, standing 1.8m high, would be erected to the east and west, with a native hedge also planned for planting along the western boundary.

The proposed field shelter is viewed as a minor addition to the site and is not expected to negatively affect the character or appearance of the area. Furthermore, the structure would be effectively concealed by the existing boundary vegetation, thus limiting visibility.

In summary, it is considered that the proposed development would not adversely impact the character or appearance of the surrounding area and as such, complies with policies ENV 1 and ENV 8 of the adopted North Norfolk Local Plan.

#### **4. Amenity**

Policy ENV 6 states 'All new development will provide for a high standard of amenity including adequate living and working conditions. This standard should be achieved and maintained without preventing or unreasonably restricting the continued operation of established authorised uses and activities on adjacent sites.'

The site is physically separated from nearby dwellings by existing boundaries, intervening land, and established vegetation, which together provide effective visual and acoustic screening. The site provides a sufficient separation distance to the north of 81m and a 134m to the west. The use is low-intensity and recreational in nature, with no permanent buildings or activities that would generate significant noise, or disturbance beyond typical countryside levels. In addition, boundary treatments and landscaping further reduce the potential for overlooking or loss of privacy.

The planning statement provided with the application confirms that group bookings would not be allowed and the field would only be available to individuals. In addition, no lighting is proposed and sessions would be limited to 50 minutes with a ten-minute handover period.

A condition would also be added limiting the use of the site between the hours of 07:00-19:00 to prevent any disturbance to neighbouring properties.

Given the restricted use of the site and separation from neighbouring properties, the proposal is considered not to have a detrimental impact on residential amenity and complies with policy ENV 6 of the adopted North Norfolk Local Plan.

#### **5. Highways and Parking**

The site has an existing access point off Gunthorpe Road, which is regarded as a road with very light traffic. The proposed development aims to establish a new parking area for Thursford Cemetery, which is seen as a benefit since visitors currently park on the roadside. However, the dog walking aspect of the application is expected to increase traffic, with vehicles arriving on an hourly basis, and the road network is currently deemed unsuitable for this increase by the Highway Authority.

Gunthorpe Road has a carriageway width of only 2.8 metres, allowing just one vehicle to pass at a time. There are no designated passing areas along its length. The road is unlit and situated away from populated areas, making the proposal heavily reliant on car access. In some sections, grass has begun to grow in the centre, indicating its fragile construction.

At the junction of Gunthorpe Road and North Lane, visibility towards the direction of traffic at the southern end was noted to be only 2.4m x 42m. Given the speed of traffic on North Lane, the Highway Authority suggest that the minimum visibility splays of 2.4m x 120m should be

provided to comply with the national guidelines outlined in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).

At the highway junction of Gunthorpe Road and Hindringham Road to the north, visibility towards the direction of traffic was also hindered by hedging, extending only about 17m, while visibility to the non-trafficked direction was limited to just 10m. The Highway Authority has confirmed that their records indicate a documented accident at this junction and has advised that the application be refused, as the proposed development would intensify use on Gunthorpe Road, leading to conditions that would compromise highway safety.

In summary, the unclassified road serving the site is considered inadequate for the proposed development due to its restricted width, lack of passing opportunities, substandard construction, and limited visibility at nearby road junctions. If approved, the proposal is likely to create conditions that would be harmful to highway safety and is therefore contrary to policies ENV 8 and CC 9 of the adopted North Norfolk Local Plan.

## **6. Biodiversity**

Policy ENV 4 states 'Development proposals where the principal objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity or geodiversity interests of European, international, national and local nature conservation designations will be supported in principle'.

Development proposals will be expected to:

- a) provide a suitable ecological survey to establish the extent of potential impact where there are grounds to believe that ancient woodland, veteran trees, protected species, priority species or priority habitat may be affected during and after development;
- b) retain, protect and buffer ecological and geological features and provide for the appropriate management of those features;
- c) deliver a measurable biodiversity net gain, in accordance with Policy CC 10 'Biodiversity Net Gain';
- d) incorporate biodiversity enhancement features, by designing-in provisions for wildlife, including the provision of nests and roosts; and
- e) avoid the net loss or fragmentation of habitats and support the creation of coherent ecological networks in urban and rural areas and through Nature Recovery Networks.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is a mandatory planning approach in England, effective from February 2024, requiring developers to leave the natural environment in a better state than before, with a minimum 10% increase in biodiversity value. It ensures habitats are enhanced or created, aiming for a net positive impact on wildlife.

The proposal constitutes a material change of use from arable land to recreational dog walking which would be classified as grassland, resulting in the loss of an existing arable habitat as defined by the Defra Biodiversity Metric. As Biodiversity Net Gain applies to development involving habitat change, the proposal is liable for BNG requirements to ensure that any loss of baseline biodiversity value is compensated, and a minimum 10% net gain is achieved and secured in the long term.

If the application is to be approved, prior to determination a completed Biodiversity Metric will need to be provided and approved. Subject to the baseline being agreed, a condition will be added to ensure that Biodiversity Net Gain plan is provided before commencement.

### **Planning Balance and Conclusion**

The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in principle and complies with policies SS 1 and SS 2. The development is set within an appropriate rural location for its use and is of an appropriate scale that is not considered to have a detrimental impact on residential amenity.

However, the dog walking aspect of the application is expected to increase traffic, with vehicles arriving on an hourly basis, and the road network is deemed unsuitable for this increase. The road is unlit and situated away from populated areas, making it reliant on car access. In some sections, grass has begun to grow in the centre, indicating its fragile construction. the unclassified road serving the site is considered inadequate for the proposed development due to its restricted width, lack of passing opportunities, substandard construction, and limited visibility at nearby road junctions. If approved, the proposal is likely to create conditions that would be harmful to highway safety and is contrary to policy ENV 8 and CC 9 of the adopted North Norfolk Local Plan.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

#### **REFUSAL for the following reason:**

1. The unclassified road that provides access to the site is deemed insufficient for the proposed development due to its narrow width, absence of passing opportunities, subpar construction quality, and limited visibility at nearby road junctions. If the proposal is approved, it is expected to create conditions that could negatively impact highway safety. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed development is contrary to policies ENV 8 and CC 9 of the adopted North Norfolk Local Plan.

This page is intentionally left blank

**WALCOTT - PF/25/2618 – Demolition of existing attached outbuilding and erection of single storey extension at Church Cottage, Coast Road, Walcott.**

## **Householder Planning Application**

**Target Date:** 19.02.2026

**Extension of time:** 26.02.2026

**Case Officer:** Nicola Wray

## **RELEVANT SITE CONSTRAINTS:**

- Countryside Policy Area
- North Norfolk Designated Rural Area
- Undeveloped Coast - The site lies within an area designated as Undeveloped Coast.
- Contaminated Land - The site lies within an area identified as potentially containing Contaminated Land.
- Landscape Character Type - The site lies within an area defined by the Landscape Character Assessment (Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)) as Coastal Plain
- Mineral Safeguard Area - The site lies within a Mineral Safeguard Area as defined by Norfolk County Council (NCC).

## **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:**

No relevant planning history

## **THE APPLICATION**

Seeks permission for the demolition of the existing attached outbuilding and erection of single storey extension.

## **REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE:**

At the request of the Development Manager. The Local Member had indicated support for the proposal on 23 Dec 2025 but had not called the application to Committee strictly in accordance with the revised constitution. The Development Manager has therefore exercised call-in powers in the interest of allowing democratic consideration of the material planning merits of this application.

## **REPRESENTATIONS:**

No (zero) public representation has been made in relation to this application.

**Local Member Contact** - Cllr Porter has submitted a representation of support for the application on 23.12.2026

## **CONSULTATIONS:**

**Parish/Town Council - No Reply**

**Conservation and Design (NNDC) - Objection** - The application site is situated within the immediate setting of the Grade I Listed All Saints Church, which for the purposes of the NPPF is considered a designated heritage asset. There is some concern relating to the scale and form of the proposed extension, which by virtue of its position adjacent to the main road and within the immediate setting of the Church is inevitably more sensitive to change.

**Historic England - *No comment***

## **HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS**

It is considered that the proposed development may raise issues relevant to

Article 8: The Right to respect for private and family life.

Article 1 of the First Protocol: The right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions.

Having considered the likely impact on an individual's Human Rights, and the general interest of the public, approval of this application as recommended is considered to be justified, proportionate and in accordance with planning law.

## **CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998 - SECTION 17**

The application raises no significant crime and disorder issues.

## **LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS**

Under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the council is required when determining planning applications to have regard to any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application. Local finance considerations are not considered to be material to this case.

## **RELEVANT POLICIES:**

### **North Norfolk Local Plan**

Policy CC1: Delivering Climate Resilient Sustainable Growth

Policy CC13: Protecting Environmental Quality

Policy ENV2: Protection & Enhancement of Landscape & Settlement Character

Policy ENV3: Heritage & Undeveloped Coast

Policy ENV6: Protection of Amenity

Policy ENV7: Protecting & Enhancing the Historic Environment

Policy ENV8: High Quality Design

Policy HC7: Parking Provision

Policy HOU6: Replacement Dwellings, Extensions, Domestic Outbuildings & Annexed Accommodation

Policy SS1: Spatial Strategy

Policy SS2: Development in the Countryside

## **Material Considerations**

**National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):**

Chapter 2: Achieving sustainable development

Chapter 4: Decision-making

Chapter 9: Promoting sustainable transport

Chapter 12: Achieving well-designed places

Chapter 15: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Chapter 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

**Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance:**

North Norfolk Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (December 2008)

Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Planning Document (January 2021)

**OFFICER ASSESSMENT:****Main issues for consideration:**

1. Principle of development
2. Scale and impact on surrounding countryside
3. Design and Impact on heritage assets
4. Amenity
5. Parking
6. Climate Change

**1. Principle**

The dwelling is located outside the defined settlement boundaries identified under Policy SS1 and is therefore located within the designated countryside where Policy SS2 allows the extension of existing dwellings subject to compliance with other relevant Local Plan policies.

**2. Scale and Impact on the surrounding Countryside**

Policy HOU6 : “Replacement Dwellings, Extensions, Domestic Outbuildings & Annexed Accommodation” of the adopted local plan confirms that proposals will be permitted provided that they:

- a) *Would not materially increase the impact of the dwelling on the appearance of the surrounding area; and*
- b) *Would comply with the provisions of Policy ENV8 ‘High Quality Design’ and take account of the North Norfolk Design Guide.*

Policy HOU6 goes on to set out that “In determining what constitutes a ‘material increase in impact’ account will be taken of the size of the proposal in relation to the prevailing character of the area, the size of the existing property, the prominence of the site, plot coverage, and impact of the proposal on the landscape and townscape of the area”.

The North Norfolk Design Guide provides that the scale of extensions should ensure that the architectural character of the original building remains dominant.

Church Cottage is located in the open countryside between Walcott and Happisburgh it is adjacent to the Grade I Listed All Saints Church.

The existing property is considered to be relatively modest in scale with a two-storey element comprising lounge, kitchen and lobby at ground floor with two bedrooms and a bathroom at first floor. A single storey range extends from the rear of the property housing storage areas and a boiler.

The proposal seeks to replace the single-story elements to the rear with a new and larger single storey element approximately 7.5m long and approximately 8m wide comprising of a lounge, third bedroom, wc, utility room and re-configured lobby. The footprint of the extension would be wider and larger than the existing two-storey element and also includes a new chimney along the north elevation serving the lounge.

In terms of context to aid assessment of whether or not the proposal would constitute a 'material increase in impact', Officers note that, as the coast road bends round when moving from Walcott towards Happisburgh, the rear elevation of the property occupies a visually prominent position. From here, the proposed extension would appear as a large and dominant addition (exacerbated by the width of the extension which has the appearance of a single storey bungalow attached to a small two-storey dwelling).

Whilst there are aspects of the proposal that would appear compliant with the North Norfolk Design Guide; the Conservation and Design Officer notes that it is the awkward relationship to the main house together with the scale, width, large feature inglenook chimney stack and roof alignment that remain non-compliant with design guidance.

Officers note that the isolated nature of the building and its close proximity to the road both mean that the site is quite prominent. The proposal would be significantly larger than the original property and the scale of the extension coupled with its visibility would materially increase the impact of the dwelling on the appearance of the surrounding area and as such the proposal would be considered to fail to comply with Policy HOU6 in this regard.

Overall, the proposal is contrary to the aims of adopted local plan policies HOU6 and ENV8.

### **3. Design and Impact on heritage assets**

Church Cottage, despite its proximity to the designated heritage asset Grade I Listed Church of All Saints, is not in itself a designated heritage asset, and does not lie within a Conservation Area.

Policy ENV 7 requires that consideration is given to proposals as to their impact on designated heritage assets, as such, the proposal should be considered as to its impact upon the Grade I Listed Church of All Saints.

Policy ENV8 provides that development proposals will *"seek to achieve an integrated design approach that reflects the characteristics of the site, respects the local character in terms of, scale, massing, material, finish and architectural details."*

Proposals are also expected to respect or improve the existing local character. As currently designed, the proposal lacks subservience to the host dwelling, it would not be considered to improve the existing character of the building.

Historic England have not provided a comment on the proposal and overall, the proposal reads relatively separately to the Church and is within its wider setting. Conservation and Design are of the view that the application raises concerns relating to scale and form of the proposed extension, which by virtue of its position adjacent to the main road and within the immediate setting of the Church is inevitably more sensitive to change.



In trying to achieve a significantly larger footprint than the existing extensions provide, the resulting form of the new extension is compromised and has a rather stretched quality. The squat proportions are exacerbated by the large chimney stack which dominates the north elevation, and results in an addition that bears little connection to the host dwelling. The host dwelling appears to have at one stage been a very modest dwelling, which whilst it has been added to over the years, does retain its humble proportions

In addition, Officers are of the view that, without addressing the above concerns, the application is considered to result in a degree of 'less than substantial' harm to the setting of the Grade I listed Church, although this is likely at the lower end of the scale. However, any level of harm to a designated heritage asset, which includes its setting, must be supported by sufficient justification in addition to being outweighed by any public benefit to be derived from the scheme.

The application is, therefore, contrary to Local Plan policies ENV7 and ENV8, in addition to paras 212 & 215 of the NPPF.

#### **4. Residential Amenity (Effect on living conditions)**

The proposed extension would not result in any significant detrimental effect on the residential amenity of adjoining neighbours and would comply with the aims of Local Plan Policy ENV6 and Policy ENV8.

#### **5. Parking**

Officers consider note that the existing parking arrangements are somewhat awkward, as they currently stand, due to the triangular shape. However, planning policy requires that the parking threshold remains at two vehicles for the size of dwelling as proposed and, as such, with two parking spaces proposed, the proposal would accord with the requirements of Local Plan Policy HC7 and Policy ENV8.

#### **6. Climate Change**

A Climate Emergency statement has been submitted confirming that consideration has been given as to the reduction of emission as part of the proposal, as such the proposal would be considered to comply with Policy CC1.

#### **Other material considerations**

The proposal is also sited on an area of contaminated land; a Contaminated Land Assessment has been submitted confirming that there are "no significant concerns identified as a result of contaminated land searches". Additionally, as the property is already within a residential use class, the proposal is considered to comply with Policy CC13.

#### **Planning Balance and Conclusion:**

Whilst the proposal does not give rise to concerns in relation to the principle of extension, amenity and parking, the scale and form of the proposed extension coupled with its visibility would materially increase the impact of the dwelling on the appearance of the surrounding area and as such the proposal would be considered to fail to comply with Policy HOU6 in this regard. The proposal would also result in some, albeit very limited, harm to the setting of the Grade I listed Church of All Saints.

There are no material considerations in support that indicate the application should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan.

Officers have sought to discuss revisions to the proposal with the applicant but at this stage an acceptable alternative cannot be achieved and the applicant is therefore entitled to have their application determined as submitted.

On balance, the recommendation is therefore one of refusal.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**REFUSAL for the following reasons:**




1. The proposal would be significantly larger than the original property and the scale of the extension coupled with its visibility would materially increase the impact of the dwelling on the appearance of the surrounding area and as such the proposal would be considered to fail to comply with Local Plan Policies HOU6 and ENV8.
2. The proposal is also considered to be contrary to Local Plan Policy ENV 7 by reason of the increased visual impact of the proposal on the setting of the Grade I listed All Saints Church.


**Final wording of reason(s) for refusal to be delegated to the Assistant Director – Planning**

## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE – 19 FEB 2026

### 1. INTRODUCTION:

- 1.1 This report briefly sets out performance in relation to the determination of planning applications in Development Management the period **November 2025**.
- 1.2 This report sets out the figures for the number of cases decided and percentage within time set against the relevant target and summary of 24-month average performance.
- 1.3 The tables also set out the percentage of the total number of decisions made that are subsequently overturned at appeal as 24-month average performance.
- 1.4 In addition, the tables set out the number of cases registered and validated within the specified months.

Performance Measure	Actual Performance	Target	Comments
<b>(Speed)</b> <b>Decisions Made</b> (Period Nov 2025)	<b>Major</b> 4 decisions issued  <i>100% within time period</i>	60%  (80% NNDC)	24 month average to 30 Nov 2025 is  <b>97.00%*</b>   *this figure will be upgraded as it includes a now quashed decision.
	<b>Non-Major</b> 49 decisions issued  <i>92% within time period (4 cases over time)</i>	70%  (90% NNDC)	24 month average to 30 Nov 2025 is  <b>95.00%</b> 
<b>(Quality)</b> <b>% of total number of decisions made that are then subsequently overturned at appeal</b>	<b>Major</b>	10%  (5% NNDC)	24 month average to 30 Nov 2025 is  <b>1.56% (one case RV/22/1661)</b> 
	<b>Non-Major</b>	10%  (5% NNDC)	24 month average to 30 Nov 2025 is  <b>0.90%</b>

Performance Measure	Actual Performance	Target	Comments
			
<b>Validation</b> (Period Nov 2025)	Information not currently available for this period	3 days for Non- Major from date of receipt  5 days for Majors from date of receipt	Datasets do not currently breakdown validated apps by Major / Minor or those on PS2 returns, but performance data retrieval being reviewed.

## 2. S106 OBLIGATIONS

- 2.1 A copy of the list of latest S106 Obligations is attached. There are currently three S106 Obligations being progressed, one of which has been completed and can be removed from the list.

## 3. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 3.1 Members are asked to note the content of this report.

**SCHEDULE OF S106 AGREEMENTS**

**UPDATE FOR DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE:**

**19 February 2026**

Application reference	Site Address	Development Proposal	Parish	Planning Case Officer	Committee or Delegated Decision	Date of Resolution to Approve	Eastlaw Officer	Eastlaw Ref:	Current Position	RAG Rating
PF/24/2434	Area Of Woodland North Of Fulmodeston Road Swanton Novers Wood	Erection of additional four, one bedroom self-contained tree houses for use as short-term holiday let accommodation with external works and servicing (to include solar panels, ponds and car parking provi	CP100 - Swanton Novers	Jamie Smith	Committee	24/07/2025	Fiona Croxon	TBC	Applicant has requested a temporary suspension of matters so file being temporarily closed	
PF/21/1990	Land Off Norwich Road Corpusty Norfolk	Construction of 38 residential dwellings with associated infrastructure and landscaping	CP021 - Corpusty and Saxthorpe	Jamie Smith	Committee	27/07/2025	Fiona Croxon	25830	COMPLETED	
PF/25/1280	Land To The East Of Langham Road Blakeney NR25 7PJ	Full planning application for 8 no. residential dwellings with associated access, parking and landscaping.	CP012 - Blakeney	Olivia Luckhurst	Delegated	TBC	Fiona Croxon	TBC	S106 signed	

This page is intentionally left blank

## **OFFICERS' REPORTS TO DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE 19-February-2026**

*Appeals Information for Committee between  
02/12/2025 and 10/02/2026*

### **APPEALS SECTION**

#### **NEW APPEALS**

**ALBY WITH THWAITE - PF/25/0473 - Construction of dwelling and garage (self-build) with associated landscaping and installation of solar array**

Field View, Alby Hill, Alby, Norwich, Norfolk, NR11 7PJ

**For Mr. Karl Barrett**

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

**Appeal Start Date:** 30/01/2026

**Appeal Decision:**

**Appeal Decision Date:**

**BLAKENEY - PF/25/0522 - Demolition of two-storey dwelling and erection of replacement two-storey dwelling (part-retrospective)**

8 Langham Road, Blakeney, Holt, Norfolk, NR25 7PG

**For Mr Ingham**

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

**Appeal Start Date:** 05/01/2026

**Appeal Decision:**

**Appeal Decision Date:**

**CATFIELD - CD/25/1379 - Discharge of conditions 5 (French drain details) & 14 (Secure Access Scheme) of planning permission PF/23/2004 (Part change of use of existing agricultural machinery workshop/store and haulage depot to incorporate a containerised self-storage facility (B8 storage) (retrospective))**

Store Galore , Ludham Road, Catfield, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, NR29 5PY

**For Mr S Hill**

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

**Appeal Start Date:** 22/01/2026

**Appeal Decision:** Turned away by the Planning Inspector

**Appeal Decision Date:** 31/10/2025

**HOLT - PO/25/0642 - Outline application for demolition of existing building and construction of 14no. new residential dwellings with associated external works. (Outline application-with Landscaping to be dealt with under reserved matters)**

Former Police Station, Norwich Road, Holt, Norfolk, NR25 6SH

**For Mr J. Pointer**

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

**Appeal Start Date:** 19/01/2026

**Appeal Decision:**

**Appeal Decision Date:**

**MUNDESLEY - PF/25/1808 - Removal of existing conservatory and construction of rear and side single storey extension**

29 High Street, Mundesley, Norwich, Norfolk, NR11 8LH

**For Mrs Lynne Cottrell**  
FAST TRACK - HOUSEHOLDER

**Appeal Start Date:** 18/12/2025

**Appeal Decision:**

**Appeal Decision Date:**

**SUTTON - PF/24/2338 - Change of use from dwellinghouse (Class C3) to holiday let (no specified use class) including upgrade of an existing access surface and installation of a tennis court (retrospective)**

Sutton Hall, Hall Road, Sutton, Norwich, Norfolk, NR12 9RX

**For Mr Haizel**  
WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

**Appeal Start Date:** 18/12/2025

**Appeal Decision:**

**Appeal Decision Date:**

**THORPE MARKET - PF/25/1375 - Proposed dwelling with detached garage (self-build) on site of demolished farm house**

The Farm House, Hall Farm Barns, Station Road, Thorpe Market, Norwich, Norfolk, NR11 8UD

**For Mayes Properties Ltd**  
WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

**Appeal Start Date:** 02/12/2025

**Appeal Decision:**

**Appeal Decision Date:**

**INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS - IN PROGRESS**

**LUDHAM - TW/25/0472 - T1 - Large Sycamore, Remove along with the mound as causing drainage issues and replace with a smaller tree**

2 Malthouse Lane, Ludham, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, NR29 5QL

**For Mrs Rebecca Studd**  
INFORMAL HEARING

**Appeal Start Date:** 13/10/2025

**Appeal Decision:**

**Appeal Decision Date:**

**WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS APPEALS - IN HAND**

**CATFIELD - CL/24/1249 - Lawful Development Certificate for existing use of land as residential garden**

Fenview, 3 Fenside Cottages, Fenside, Catfield, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, NR29 5DD

**For Mr J Amos**  
WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

**Appeal Start Date:** 12/12/2024

**Appeal Decision:**

**Appeal Decision Date:**



**CROMER - PF/24/1536 - Replacement of 2 No. first floor windows with Upvc double glazed windows on rear elevation (retrospective)**

Flat 2, Shipden House, High Street, Cromer, Norfolk, NR27 9HG

**For Mr Stuart Parry**

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

**Appeal Start Date:** 12/12/2024

**Appeal Decision:**

**Appeal Decision Date:**

**CROMER - LA/24/1384 - Replacement of 2 No. first floor windows with Upvc double glazed windows on rear elevation (retention of works already carried out)**

Flat 2, Shipden House, High Street, Cromer, Norfolk, NR27 9HG

**For Mr Stuart Parry**

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

**Appeal Start Date:** 12/12/2024

**Appeal Decision:**

**Appeal Decision Date:**

**MELTON CONSTABLE - EF/23/2472 - Lawful Development Certificate for proposed conversion of loft to bedroom and installation of rooflights**

Sloley House, 27 Briston Road, Melton Constable, Norfolk, NR24 2DG

**For Mr & Mrs Dean & Sonia James**

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

**Appeal Start Date:** 18/11/2024

**Appeal Decision:**

**Appeal Decision Date:**

**WICKMERE - LA/25/0741 - Works to install solar panels to south-facing pitch of the tiled cart barn roof**

5 Park Farm Barns, Wolterton Park, Wolterton, Norwich, Norfolk, NR11 7LX

**For Mr Christopher Lawrence**

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

**Appeal Start Date:** 10/10/2025

**Appeal Decision:**

**Appeal Decision Date:**

**APPEAL DECISIONS - RESULTS AND SUMMARIES**

**BRINTON AND SHARRINGTON - PF/24/1479 - Change of use agricultural building to shop/cafe (Class E), with associated external alterations; alterations to car park layout**

Sharrington Strawberries, Holt Road, Sharrington, Melton Constable, Norfolk, NR24 2PH

**For Mr Simon Turner**

INFORMAL HEARING

**Appeal Start Date:** 14/08/2025

**Appeal Decision:** Appeal Dismissed

**Appeal Decision Date:** 29/01/2026

**EDGEFIELD - PP/24/2388 - Permission in principle for development of up to 5 custom and self-build dwellings (as a phased development)**

Land North Of Plumstead Road, Edgefield, Norfolk, NR24 2RN

**For Mr Charlie De Bono**  
WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

**Appeal Start Date:** 09/07/2025  
**Appeal Decision:** Appeal Allowed  
**Appeal Decision Date:** 16/12/2025

**FAKENHAM - PO/24/0808 - Erection of single storey dwelling - outline with all matters reserved**

77 Norwich Road, Fakenham, Norfolk, NR21 8HH

**For Mr Chris Almond**  
WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

**Appeal Start Date:** 24/09/2025  
**Appeal Decision:** Appeal Dismissed  
**Appeal Decision Date:** 04/12/2025

**HAPPISBURGH - PF/25/0962 - Erection of 4 no. dwellings with associated garden / amenity areas and garages as well as new car passing places proposed**

Land East Of Short Lane , Happisburgh Common, Happisburgh, NR12 0RH

**For Mr Tarachand Dass**  
WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

**Appeal Start Date:** 06/10/2025  
**Appeal Decision:** Appeal Dismissed  
**Appeal Decision Date:** 15/12/2025

**HOLT - PF/25/0593 - Installation of 4no. dormer windows to facilitate loft conversion**

Shire House , Shirehall Plain, Holt, Norfolk, NR25 6HT

**For Ms. Susannah Sherriff**  
FAST TRACK - HOUSEHOLDER

**Appeal Start Date:** 05/09/2025  
**Appeal Decision:** Appeal Dismissed  
**Appeal Decision Date:** 11/12/2025

**RUNTON - PF/25/0773 - Change of use of land from grazing/storage to dog training exercise facility and erection of associated store and shelter building, formation of vehicular access from Mill Lane**

The Field, Mill Lane, East Runton, Cromer, Norfolk, NR27 9PH

**For Mr & Mrs A & C Hyam & Cluley**  
WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

**Appeal Start Date:** 11/11/2025  
**Appeal Decision:** Appeal Dismissed  
**Appeal Decision Date:** 03/02/2026

**Total Number of Appeals listed: 19**

**OFFICERS' REPORTS TO  
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (ENFORCEMENTS)**

*Appeals Information for Committee between  
02/12/2025 and 10/02/2026*

**19-February-2026**

**APPEALS SECTION**

**WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS APPEALS - IN HAND**

**ALDBOROUGH - ENF/21/0234 - Siting of pig bungalows**

Land Adjacent Rectory Farm House, Rectory Farm, Doctors Corner, Aldborough, Norfolk, NR11 7NT

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

**Appeal Start Date:** 17/09/2025

**Appeal Decision:**

**Appeal Decision Date:**

**BLAKENEY - ENF/24/0158 - Change of use of the land for the siting of a static caravan**

Villeroche, Langham Road, Blakeney, Holt, Norfolk, NR25 7PW

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

**Appeal Start Date:** 26/02/2025

**Appeal Decision:**

**Appeal Decision Date:**

**CROMER - ENF/24/0079 - Two twelve-light windows have been replaced with uPVC windows in Grade II listed building**

Flat 2, Shipden House, High Street, Cromer, Norfolk

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

**Appeal Start Date:** 19/02/2025

**Appeal Decision:**

**Appeal Decision Date:**

**HOLT - ENF/24/0026 - Material change of use of the land for the siting of shipping containers.**

Oakhill House, Thornage Road, Holt, Norfolk, NR25 6SZ

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

**Appeal Start Date:** 06/02/2025

**Appeal Decision:**

**Appeal Decision Date:**

**WEYBOURNE - ENF/23/0278 - Change of use of barn to a pilates studio**

Weybourne House, The Street, Weybourne, Holt, Norfolk, NR25 7SY

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

**Appeal Start Date:** 29/04/2024

**Appeal Decision:**

**Appeal Decision Date:**

This page is intentionally left blank