

## DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Development Committee held on Thursday, 9 November 2023 in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 9.30 am

**Committee Members Present:** Cllr P Heinrich (Chairman) Cllr R Macdonald (Vice-Chairman)  
Cllr M Batey  
Cllr P Fisher  
Cllr V Holliday  
Cllr P Neatherway  
Cllr A Brown  
Cllr M Hankins  
Cllr G Mancini-Boyle  
Cllr L Vickers

**Substitute Members Present** Cllr L Paterson  
Cllr J Punchard

**Officers in Attendance:** Assistant Director for Planning (ADP)  
Development Manager (DM)  
Principal Lawyer (PL)  
Development Management Team Leader (DMTL)  
Senior Planning Officer (SPO)  
Planning Officer (PO)  
Household Planning Advisor (HPA)  
Senior Landscape Officer – Arboriculture (SLOA)  
Deputy Monitoring Officer  
Democratic Services Advisor - Regulatory

**Members also in attendance:** Cllr W Fredericks

### 67 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr A Fitch-Tillett, Cllr J Toye, Cllr K Toye and Cllr A Varley.

### 68 SUBSTITUTES

Cllr J Punchard was present as a substitute for Cllr A Fitch-Tillett. Cllr L Paterson was present as a substitute for Cllr J Toye.

### 69 MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Committee meeting held on Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2023 were approved as a correct record subject to minor typographical amendments.

### 70 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

### 71 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- i. Cllr V Holliday declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda items 12 and 13 (PF/23/0999 and PF/22/1530 respectively). She advised that she intended to

speak as the Local Member for each item but would not participate in any discussion or vote on the applications as she was pre-determined.

- ii. Cllr P Neatherway declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 11 (PF/23/1531). He advised he was well known by the relevant parties and would therefore abstain from speaking or voting on the application.

**72 MUNDLESLEY - PF/23/0843 - REMODELLING OF BUNGALOW TO FORM TWO AND A HALF STORY DWELLING WITH ATTIC ROOMS AT 2 BECKMEADOW WAY, MUNDLESLEY, NORFOLK**

Officers Report

The PO introduced the officer's report and recommendation for approval. She confirmed the site's location, relationship within the local context, existing and proposed elevations and floor plans, and provided images of the site.

With respect to key concerns, the PO advised several representations had been received which raised concerns regarding amenity issues, the key concern being that the development would have an overbearing impact on No.4. Whilst the proposal would increase the property from a one and a half storey dwelling to a two and a half storey dwelling, the property was set away from the boundary to the east, with the increase in height also stepped from the property at No.4. Given the orientation of the properties, the stepped height increase with the single storey garage closest to the boundary, and the existing boundary treatments of mature trees and hedging, officers did not consider there to be a significant adverse impact in terms of overbearing or overshadowing. The PO advised that a condition requiring the retention and replacement of the trees and hedging along the boundary would also be included, subject to approval, to soften the visual impacts of the proposal from the highway. Further, the bathroom windows on the first and second floor would be conditioned to be obscure glazing.

Concerns were also raised from neighbours regarding the proposed roof dormers resulting in a loss of privacy, however the PO confirmed that the application conformed with the North Norfolk Design Guide. Furthermore, concerns were raised regarding potential noise pollution as a result of the proposal and potential for the dwelling to be a holiday let. Whilst the development would increase the number of bedrooms, officers did not consider this would have a significant adverse impact in terms of noise pollution. The proposal was for a residential dwelling and no change of use had been submitted, the applicant had further stated that the property would continue to be used as a residential dwelling.

The PO stated that whilst the proposal would result in No.2 becoming one of the larger properties in Beckmeadow Way, the dwelling was not considered to be out of character for the area given the other large, detached properties in the street.

Public Speakers

Simon Quilter – Objecting  
Christian Keen -Supporting

Members Questions and Debate

- i. The Local Member – Cllr W Fredericks – stated that planning should be about community and about housing need, she reflected on the demographic

composition of Mundesley and stressed the need for bungalows to facilitate the requirements of North Norfolk's aging population. She commented that the design of the property was not in keeping with the street scene and would have an overbearing impact given the height of the roofline, despite efforts to lower the roof height from earlier designs. She was further concerned about the potential loss of trees to make way for additional parking, and the overall impact of the development on neighbouring properties. The Local Member reiterated the vital importance of bungalows in the local housing stock at a time of a chronic housing crisis.

- ii. Cllr L Paterson proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation, provided the retention of the trees would be conditioned.
- iii. Cllr L Vickers seconded the recommendation. She contended that whilst there was a theoretical need for bungalows in the housing stock, this needed to be balanced against the real life needs of the resident.
- iv. Cllr P Fisher welcomed the proposed conditions listed.
- v. Cllr V Holliday noted the proposed alterations and considered the roof height an No.2 would be higher than the roofline at No.6.
- vi. The PO advised, because of the elevations, No.2 would sit higher than No.6 but was actually the same height.

**RESOLVED** by 11 votes for and 1 against.

**That planning application PF/23/0843 be APPROVED in accordance with the officer's recommendation.**

**73 SHARINGTON - PF/23/1352- ERECTION OF SINGLE-STOREY DETACHED AGRICULTURAL WORKERS DWELLING AND DETACHED AGRICULTURAL STORAGE BARN.LAND WEST OF MICHAEL HOUSE, BALE ROAD, SHARRINGTON.**

Officer's Report

The PO introduced the officer's report and recommendation for approval subject to conditions. She advised that amended plans had been received after the publication of the agenda, which addressed the Landscape, and Conservation and Design Officer's comments. These amendments related to proposed material changes, omission of a window and increased boundary tree planting. The PO outlined the site's location, relationship with its local setting including Sharrington Conservation Area, proposed elevation and floor plans, and provided images of the site.

The key issues for consideration related to principle of development, landscaping, and heritage harm.

Officers considered the application to comply with NNDC Core Strategy Policy HO5. The PO confirmed that the independent agricultural assessor (Acorus) had undertaken a site visit, observed all the tenanted and privately owned land, as well as the farm's profit and loss records, and was satisfied there was suitable need for a new dwelling. Further, the farm was considered to be financially viable.

Landscaping concerns had been largely addressed by the application, with a reduction in use of glazing and an increase in the volume of trees on the southern boundary. However, it was noted that the domestication of the current agricultural field remained a concern for consultees.

Heritage concerns had been identified by the Conservation and Design Officer, who objected to the proposal. These concerns related to the infilling of the currently open site, the gap between the hedges was considered to positively contribute to the village setting and the wider landscape. The views across the field were considered the principal contributor to Sharrington's setting on the edge of the Glaven Valley and part of the settlement's defining characteristics. The PO advised that the heritage harm identified was deemed to be less than substantial, therefore the public benefits arising from the scheme must be weighed against this harm.

It was acknowledged that the Local Planning Authority was currently unable to demonstrate a 5-year Housing Land Supply. The PO advised the proposal would provide a benefit in contributing a new dwelling to the local housing land supply, however as this is only one dwelling the benefit was limited.

The PO noted that the proposal would provide a rural worker's dwelling to meet an identified need, supporting the local economy and vitality of the rural community as well as a well-established rural farming business. Given the mitigating factors of the development proposed, on balance and in this instance, the harm to the affected heritage asset was considered to be outweighed by the limited public benefit of the scheme, officers therefore recommended approval of the application subject to conditions.

### Public Speakers

Deborah Hyslop – Brinton and Sharrington Parish Council  
Keith Parks – Objecting  
Jerry Stone – Supporting

### Members' Debate and Questions

- i. The Local Member – Cllr A Brown – reflected that this was a difficult application to determine at this time, given the Glaven Valley Conservation Area Appraisal (GVCAA) was due to be considered the following week by the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party (the agenda having already been published). The appraisal had been subject to extensive discussions and consultations over the last 18 months and would likely be adopted at Cabinet on 4<sup>th</sup> December. The Local Member noted that once the GVCAA was approved, the whole of the proposed site would fall within the Conservation Area and felt it would be dangerous to consider the application ahead of the consideration and adoption of the GVCAA, as the adoption of the appraisal would have implications on the weight of harm attributed to the application. The Local Member was critical of the public benefits identified by officers as contributing positively to the scheme. Cllr A Brown proposed deferral of the application until the GVCAA, affecting 80% or more of the site, was adopted.
- ii. Cllr M Batey seconded the motion for deferral.
- iii. Cllr L Vickers spoke against deferral. She considered that a delay on a technicality may result in changes to the officer's current recommendation for

approval.

- iv. The Chairman noted the GVCAA was in an advanced stage, it was therefore a relevant document to Members considerations. He stated it was a matter for Members to determine whether the minor boundary changes provided sufficient reason to defer or refuse the application.
- v. The DM reflected that this was an unusual situation. He confirmed that adoption of GVCAA would result in the entirety of the site falling within the Conservation Area. In determining the application Members were asked to consider and weigh up the harm arising from the proposal, which was considered to be less than substantial, against the public benefit. He recognised that whilst the GVCAA had not yet been adopted, it was far advanced and noted that Members may wish to defer consideration of the application to obtain a view Conservation and Design Officer as to the weight of heritage harm they would attribute to the GVCA from the proposal.
- vi. The Chairman reiterated that Member's should form a determination on the evidence provided, officer's guidance and the independent advice received.
- vii. Cllr L Vickers stated that she did not consider there to be justification for a delay and was not persuaded by the arguments for deferral. Farming was not a 9-5 job and there was a demonstrable need for an agricultural worker's dwelling.
- viii. Cllr J Punchard echoed Cllr L Vickers comments and spoke against deferral. He reflected that planning applications continued to be determined even though the new Local Plan had yet to be adopted and did not consider the situation with the GVCA should be treated differently.
- ix. Cllr L Paterson considered their sufficient information to form a determination at the meeting.
- x. Cllr V Holliday noted a resolution had been passed by Cabinet (following recommendation from Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party) that weight should be attributed to several policies within the emerging Local Plan. She argued that the GVCAA was in its final stages, having been in discussion for an extended period of time, and agreed with Cllr A Brown that this should carry weight.
- xi. Cllr P Fisher stated he was nervous to form a determination when the GVCAA was due to be determined and (likely) adopted in the very near future. He welcomed deferral of the application.
- xii. Cllr A Brown agreed with Cllr V Holliday that there were parallels with the weight attributed with the emerging Local Plan, and that the same principle should apply with the GVCAA. He considered this appropriate given the GVCAA was a supplementary planning document which informed the Local Plan. He reiterated his concerns about the soundness of process in determining the application at this time and considered there would be a risk of judicial review should a determination be formed. Cllr A Brown acknowledged if the application were to be deferred this would only result in a delay of around 4 weeks.
- xiii. The PL stated she was concerned about the lack of mention of the GVCAA

and its imminency of adoption within the officer's report. She considered that due weight should be given to the GVCAA.

- xiv. The ADP determined that the risk of judicial review was light, though acknowledged the comments made by the PL.
- xv. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle asked, should the application be deferred, whether this would be detrimental to the application. He considered that applications should not be delayed for emerging policies.
- xvi. The DM advised that the introduction of the whole of the site into the GVCA may have an additional heritage impact, which may be detrimental to the application.
- xvii. The ADP reflected that within the next 12 months there would be an array of additional planning considerations including changes to the NPPF and adoption of the new Local Plan. He asserted that Cllr A Brown was correct in his comments that the GVCAA was well advanced and detailed on a published agenda. The ADP advised that the inclusion of the whole of the site within the GVCA may not automatically result in officers taking a different view, though it may change the weight given to certain policies. If Members were to defer the application, it would be in the knowledge that the GVCAA was likely to be adopted. However, the ADP considered Members had enough information to consider the application at the meeting and commented that there wouldn't be a significant risk in relation to that decision.

**THE VOTE WAS LOST** by 6 votes for and 6 votes against deferment. The Chairman used his casting vote against deferment.

- xviii. Cllr L Paterson proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation for approval. He stated that the application was for an agricultural worker's dwelling, to which there was a known need, it was sensitively designed and would be well screened.
- xix. Cllr J Punchard seconded the motion.
- xx. Cllr A Brown contended that the agricultural workers dwelling was actually a disguise for a retirement property for the applicant. He considered the history of the site and earlier applications which cited the applicant was of ill health and soon to retire. The application was removed from the principal farmhouse, which he understood conflicted with the Agricultural Tenancy Act. Cllr A Brown argued that the application was not policy compliant, and it was unnecessary for the dwelling to be built when other properties in the community could be purchased by the applicant to serve as their residence. Considering the applicant's health, he argued that there was instead a need for a temporary dwelling, but that he would not be supportive of such a structure. With respect of benefits attributed to the scheme, Cllr A Brown commented that one dwelling would not tip the balance with regards the Local Planning Authority's 5-year Housing Land Supply position. Further, he noted that the barn did not meet the test for permitted development and so had been added to the scheme, contributing to additional heritage harm.
- xxi. Cllr V Holliday acknowledged the significant number of objections from the community, and from various officers, which she contented should be given

weight. Based on her observations, she questioned whether pigs needed farmers to live in such close proximity.

- xxii. Cllr L Paterson asked if it would be permissible for the dwelling to be used by an agricultural worker who subsequently retires.
- xxiii. The DM advised it would be permissible depending on the wording of the occupancy restriction.
- xxiv. Cllr P Neatherway noted that Environmental Health hadn't responded to the consultation.
- xxv. The PO confirmed that Environmental Health hadn't responded at the time of writing but had since made no objection.

**IT WAS RESOLVED** by 7 votes for 5 against.

**That planning application PF/23/1352 be APPROVED in accordance with the officer's recommendation.**

**74 BALE - PF/23/1027 - ERECTION OF DETACHED AGRICULTURAL STORAGE BUILDING AT LAND AT OAK FARM, SHARRINGTON ROAD, BALE, FAKENHAM, NORFOLK**

Officer's report

The SPO introduced the officer's report and recommendation for approval subject to conditions. He outlined the site's location, relationship in its local context (just outside of the Conservation Area boundary), proposed elevations and floor plan, aerial views, and photographs of the site. It was noted that the proposed barn was to be constructed of similar materials to the nearby village hall.

The key issues for consideration were highways concerns, though it was acknowledged there were no formal objections from the Highway Authority; scale of development; and the impact to the local character and environment.

Public Speakers

Simon Pegg – Supporting

Members' Debate and Questions

- i. Cllr A Brown recited a pre-prepared statement on behalf of the Local Member – Cllr S Butikofer, who was unable to attend the meeting. The Local Member placed weight on the objection made by the parish council and considered that whilst the application was compliant with policy SS2, it failed to engage with developing the site. Further, the orchard had been poorly maintained.

Local Member noted the limitations with accessing the site given the access road was narrow, further the site situated on a blind bend in a densely occupied residential street, making it especially difficult for large agricultural vehicles to navigate. If the unit was let out to an agricultural tenant there was the potential for increased use. The Local Member welcomed the reduction in scale of the development but remained unconvinced by its long-term future. She requested that, should the application be approved, a condition be

applied that the unit could not be sublet.

- ii. The Chairman asked officers if such a condition were possible.
- iii. The PL confirmed this would be acceptable.
- iv. Cllr A Brown proposed this condition be added.
- v. Cllr P Fisher seconded the substantive motion for the condition to be added.  
*The Amendment was approved.*
- vi. Cllr L Paterson asked about the wider site and if this was the entire holding.
- vii. The SPO confirmed the site boundary.
- viii. The Chairman confirmed Members were asked to comment on the planning merits of the application before them. Members were only provided the site plan relevant to the application.
- ix. Cllr L Paterson asked if plans needed to be submitted and approved to convert an arable field into an orchard.
- x. The SPO advised that the planting was for agricultural produce. The proposal was for the building to be used in association with the proposed orchard.
- xi. Cllr M Hankins referenced the crime and disorder detailed in the officer's report and stated that it was well known that there was an increase in theft on agricultural sites. As such, he was surprised with objections, given the proposal would seek to secure valuable agricultural equipment. Cllr M Hankins proposed acceptance of the officer's report for approval subject to conditions.
- xii. Cllr R Macdonald seconded the motion.

**IT WAS RESOLVED** by 10 votes for and 2 against.

**That planning application PF/23/1027 be APPROVED in accordance with the officer's recommendation.**

**75 TRUNCH - PF/23/1531 - ERECTION OF SINGLE-STOREY EXTENSION; RAISING OF ROOF AND INSERTION OF REAR DORMER WINDOW WITH BALCONY TO CREATE HABITABLE ROOF SPACE. MAYFIELD, TRUNCH ROAD, MUNDESLEY.**

Officer's report

The HPA introduced the officer's report and recommendation for approval subject to conditions. He advised that the application had been returned to committee following a site visit. The HPA reiterated the site's location, relationship with neighbouring dwellings, proposed and existing elevations and floor plans, and provided photos of the site.

The key issues for consideration were the principle of development, impact on the character of the area, residential amenity, highways and parking, and impact on



protected species.

### Public Speakers

David Houton – Objecting  
Howard Little – Supporting

### Members' Debate and Questions

- i. Cllr A Brown considered the right of neighbours to their privacy was critical in determining the application. He noted NNDC Core Strategy Policy EN4 that applications should not have a significant detrimental effect on residential amenity of nearby occupiers and was unconvinced that the application wouldn't have an adverse impact to neighbours.
- ii. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation. He concluded that the neighbouring properties either side of the dwelling were large and stated that it was refreshing for an application to be received which didn't intend to double the footprint of the principal dwelling.
- iii. Cllr V Holliday reflected on the site visit and stated that she considered the scale and massing of the proposal would be intrusive.
- iv. Cllr M Hankins commended officers and the applicant for their efforts to minimise the impact of the proposal. He was satisfied with the scheme following the site visit and so seconded the officer's recommendation.
- v. Cllr P Fisher commented, having attended the site visit, that he didn't consider the development would overlook neighbouring properties, rather it would look down the applicant's own garden. He further reflected that noise disturbances emanating from the balcony would be limited given the balcony led off from the bedroom.
- vi. Cllr R Macdonald expressed his support for the scheme and agreed that the two adjacent properties were far larger.

**RESOLVED** by 9 votes for, 2 against and 1 abstention.

**That planning application PF/23/1531 be APPROVED in accordance with the officer's recommendation.**

*The meeting was adjourned at 11.06am and reconvened at 11.22am.*

## **76 WEYBOURNE - PF/23/0999 - DEMOLITION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND ERECTION OF NEW TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION WITH CONNECTING SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AT 3 BARNFIELD COTTAGES, STATION ROAD, WEYBOURNE**

### Officer's report

The DMTL introduced the officer's report and recommendation for approval subject to conditions. He outlined the site's location, relationship with neighbouring dwellings, existing and proposed elevations and floor plans, and provided photos of the site.

The DMTL stated that the main issues for consideration were matters of principle of development, design and heritage impact, amenity, landscape, biodiversity, and highways.

With respect of design and heritage impact, the DMTL confirmed that the revised scheme was considered acceptable, and better aligned with the existing dwelling when compared to earlier proposals. Whilst officers acknowledged that the proposed development would alter the symmetry of the existing cottages, this had already been altered to an extent by the existing first floor extension and by the sizable rear extension to No.1 Barnfield cottages, which had been approved earlier in the year. The extension was noteworthy in its size; however, it was not considered to have a significant detrimental impact on the appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding area, nor conflict with the character and appearance of the Weybourne Conservation Area. The application was therefore compliant with policies EN4 and EN8 of the NNDC Core Strategy.

The DMTL advised that the fenestration proposed was policy compliant, and the relatively small rooflights detailed would not result in any significant overlooking. Officers concluded that there would not be a significant loss of light or overshadowing by consequence of the proposal.

The Landscape Officer took no issue with the scheme and did not consider that the proposal would introduce a negative visual impact to the AONB, noting that the property was positioned in the built-up part of the village.

Any concerns relating to light spill from the development had been satisfactorily addressed through a significant reduction in glazing from 7 to 3 rooflights. It was further noted that the proposal would replace the existing first floor extension which was almost fully glazed. Accordingly, the proposal accorded with policies EN1 and EN2.

The DMTL concluded by affirming that the application was considered, on balance, to be acceptable and compliant with the relevant development policies.

### Public Speakers

Martin Brown – Weybourne Parish Council  
James Stanbrook – Objecting  
Jonathan Smith – Supporting

### Members' Debate and Questions

- i. The Local Member – Cllr V Holliday – noted the large number of objections to the application and argued public comments were material a consideration in determining planning applications. The objections to the proposal related to matters including loss of privacy, loss of light or overshadowing, parking, and effect on the Conservation Area. She relayed a sample of objections submitted and stated there was no space capacity on Station Road to accommodate additional vehicles, it was therefore difficult to understand how the three parking spaces could be accessed. The Local Member considered the application would be contrary to the NNDC Design Guide, NNDC Conservation Area guidelines and NNDC Core Strategy policies EN2, EN4, EN8, HO8 and CT6.

- ii. Cllr P Fisher asked if the 52% increase in the size of the dwelling reflected the removal of the first-floor structure.
- iii. The DMTL advised he didn't believe it did, therefore the current first floor floorplan figure could be discounted from the 52%.
- iv. Cllr R Macdonald noted the proposed first floor windows on the side elevation of the dwelling, he did not consider this would have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties given the angle.
- v. The DMTL advised the lights were at head height, officers did not consider the degree of overlooking to be significantly detrimental.
- vi. Cllr L Paterson stated that he was struggling to accept the scale of the proposed extension.
- vii. The Chairman noted policies EN2, EN4 and EN8, and asked how officers applied weight to these policies when considering the application.
- viii. The DMTL confirmed that in assessing the application, officers considered that the property was located in a built-up area of Weybourne. Officers were content that there wouldn't be a significantly detrimental impact upon the wider landscape and the AONB, with the extension sitting relatively comfortably against the existing residential property. In terms of policy EN8, the Conservation and Design Officer was satisfied the revised proposal would not cause additional heritage harm.
- ix. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle considered this a challenging application to determine and sought confirmation whether there was a calculation or metric which could be applied to determine the maximum size of an extension.
- x. The DM advised each application was considered on its merits, there was no formula or algorithm to determine maximum extension sizes. He affirmed that the application accorded with the development plan.
- xi. Cllr M Hankins acknowledged that this was a significant extension but welcomed the proposal in converting an existing holiday home into a principal residence. He considered this change would bring benefits to the community and argued weight should be given to this consideration.
- xii. Cllr L Vickers asked about the situation at No.1 Barnfield Cottages, and the relationship of this property with the proposal.

*Images were relayed at the meeting of the road scene.*

- xiii. The Chairman asked how big of an extension would be acceptable under permitted development.
- xiv. The DMTL advised that this was difficult to determine given the site was located within a Conservation Area.
- xv. Cllr M Hankins proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation.
- xvi. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle seconded the officers recommendation.

**RESOLVED** by 8 votes for, 1 against, and 3 abstentions.

**That Planning Application PF/23/0999 be APPROVED in accordance with the officer's recommendation.**

*Cllr J Punchard left the meeting at 11.50am.*

**77 WEYBOURNE - PF/22/1530 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SINGLE-STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND ERECTION OF TWO-STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AT GABLE END, THE STREET, WEYBOURNE**

Officer's report

The DMTL introduced the officer's report and recommendation for approval subject to conditions. Since the publication of the agenda, additional representations had been received objecting to the proposal which had been uploaded to the planning portal. He outlined the site's location, relationship with the neighbouring dwelling, existing and proposed floor plans and elevations, and provided images of the site.

The DMTL advised the key issues for consideration related to design and heritage, and amenity issues. It was noted that the scheme was for a sizeable extension, however officers considered the revised proposal plans would result in less than substantial harm and would ensure that the extension remained subservient to the host dwelling. The Conservation and Design Officer had lifted their objection, and now considered the application policy compliant. The DMTL confirmed that it would be conditioned that the Holly tree be retained, irrespective, had the Holly tree not been protected by condition, the potential removal of the Holly tree did not provide justification for refusal of the whole application.

With respect to amenity matters, the DMTL confirmed that the neighbour had raised objections to the proposal which they considered would result in unacceptable overlooking of their property. Subsequently, revised plans had been submitted which removed the initially proposed balcony. Officers did not consider there would be significant overlooking and noted that the neighbour also had a first-floor window facing the gardens. The impact of any loss of light to the first-floor window on the neighbouring property facing the extension, would be limited by consequence of the window serving a stairwell and not a primary room.

The proposal was not considered to have a significant detrimental impact on the AONB or Conservation Area, with the extension being located to the rear of the dwelling and only visible from the east.

The existing parking arrangement was not altered through the proposal and remained unchanged; therefore, this did not substantiate grounds for refusal.

Public Speakers

Wayne Shields – Weybourne Parish Council  
Marie Fraser - Objecting

Members' Debate and Questions

- i. The Local Member – Cllr V Holliday – reflected on objections raised from the community, that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on dark skies, loss of biodiversity, lack of parking and impact to the Conservation Area. She

affirmed that the Local Authority had a responsibility to consider any material considerations raised by local people. Cllr V Holliday considered the application would block out light to the first-floor windows of the neighbouring property and would cause additional overshadowing of the neighbouring garden which would be most notable in the spring. She further argued that the first-floor windows would overlook the neighbouring garden, as had been identified in the officer's report. The Local Member stated the sizable extension would result in a lack of amenity space, with much of the remaining garden expected to be paved, contributing to the loss of biodiversity. She expressed her concerns about the parking arrangements which was unsuited to the area. Cllr V Holliday stated that the application was in conflict with EN2, EN4, EN8, EN9, HO8, CT6 and emerging Local Plan policy CT10 in addition to the Conservation Management Guidelines and the NNDC Design Guide.

- ii. Cllr L Paterson expressed his concerns about the loss of light and privacy to neighbours. He stated the parking arrangements were inappropriate.
- iii. The Chairman reiterated the proposal did not seek to alter the existing parking arrangements.
- iv. Cllr P Fisher considered this was a finely balanced application and proposed the application be deferred pending a site visit.
- v. Cllr M Hankins seconded the motion for a site visit.

**RESOLVED** by 10 votes for and 1 abstention.

**That Planning Application PF/22/1530 be DEFERRED to enable a site visit.**

**78 CROMER - RV/23/1131 - VARIATION OF CONDITION 1 OF PLANNING PERMISSION REF. RV/21/2628 [VARIATION OF CONDITION 1 (PLANS) OF PLANNING PERMISSION PF/19/1073 (VARIATION OF CONDITION 1 (PLANS) OF PLANNING PERMISSION PO/18/1779 TO ALLOW CHANGES TO GARAGING & PARKING, WITH UNDERGROUND PARKING CHANGING THE DESIGN OF THE DAY ROOM, A SMALL REAR EXTENSION TO LARKWOOD APARTMENTS FOR SERVICES & BALCONIES ADDED AT FIRST FLOOR LEVEL TO LARCHWOOD COURT AND OAKWOOD HOUSE), TO ALLOW ADDITION OF A SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION TO UNIT 4 OF OAKWOOD HOUSE, AND THE ADDITION OF 2 NO. REPLACEMENT PARKING SPACES (IN LIEU OF DOUBLE GARAGE)] TO ALLOW FOR CHANGES TO ELEVATION AND ROOF DESIGN OF MAPLEWOOD HOUSE, WOODLAND HOUSE AND ROSEWOOD HOUSE AND TO INCLUDE BASEMENT PARKING; NEW DAYROOM POSITION AND REMOVAL OF LAUREL HOUSE AT BARCLAY COURT GARDENS, OVERSTRAND ROAD, CROMER**

*Cllr A Brown left the meeting.*

*The PL left the meeting for this item and was replaced by the DMO.*

#### Officer's report

The ADP introduced the officer's report and recommendation to approval subject to conditions. He detailed the history of the site and confirmed that the relevant conditions detailed on prior planning approvals would still apply with this application.

With respect to public representations, the ADP confirmed that 15 representations had been received and noted that there had been some confusion about the proposal. He relayed the submission made by the Local Member, Cllr E Spagnola, who was unable to attend the meeting. Cllr Spagnola considered that clarification was needed for the benefit of neighbours who were unclear what the application intended to do.

The ADP summarised the proposed changes including: the introduction of further basement car parking (incorporating electric car charging points) and the alternative use (e.g., landscaping and the larger Woodland House) to some of the previously proposed external car parking areas (no longer proposed). Changed elevation designs, including to the roof design, to Maplewood, Woodland and Rosewood Blocks), it was noted that there would not be an increase to the overall roof height. Re-siting of the day room to the southern boundary, effectively replacing the former 2 and a half storey residential block ('Laurel House'), the 6 units lost from Laurel House were included within a larger footprint 'Woodland House'.

Many of the representations received related to the area between Maplewood and Oakwood, with residents expressing concern about the lack of landscaping, though it was noted there had been no changes proposed from the existing scheme in this area. Irrespective, the applicant had agreed to introduce a planting scheme consisting of hedgerows and trees to form a visual buffer between developments. Traffic calming measures would also be addressed by way of condition, as would a construction management plan.

### Public Speakers

None.

### Members' Debate and Questions

- i. Cllr P Fisher thanked the ADP for clarifying the proposed changes between this and earlier applications. He asked about the likelihood of scheme being built out given the extensive history of the site.
- ii. The ADP noted that it was the applicant's intention to start construction in the coming weeks subject to permission being granted. He acknowledged that the applicant had received approval for other historic applications and could decide to build out the earlier schemes, though remarked this was unlikely.
- iii. Cllr P Neatherway asked about the adequacy of surface water drainage.
- iv. The ADP advised that the Council had consulted with the lead local flood authority who were satisfied with the scheme. He confirmed that residents had not raised any issues regarding water drainage when they made their representations.
- v. Cllr V Holliday considered it sensible that the day room had been re-sited to a more central location. She reflected on parking arrangements with use of underground parking and the narrowing of the existing road, and asked if either of these arrangements were of concern.
- vi. The ADP confirmed that revised scheme removed visitor parking from

Mangrove, hence why the access road could be narrowed. Prospective residents would be well aware of the parking arrangements before purchasing, and it was unlikely the applicant would build out the scheme with underground parking unless he was satisfied there was a market for such arrangements.

- vii. The Chairman noted the underground enclosed parking arrangements included electric charging points, in light of the recent fire at Luton Airport Carpark, he proposed that suitable fire precautions be conditioned.
- viii. Cllr P Fisher seconded the Chairmans amendment.

*The Amendment was carried.*

- ix. Cllr L Paterson proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation.
- x. Cllr P Neatherway seconded the motion.

**RESOLVED** by 10 votes for and 1 abstention.

**That planning application RV/23/1131 be APPROVED in accordance with the officer's recommendation.**

## 79 FELMINGHAM - TPO/23/1014- LAND AT THE GRANGE

### Officer's report

The SLOA introduced the officer's report and recommendation that the TPO area order be confirmed. She outlined the history of the trees and surrounding area, provided images of the site, and identified the key issues for consideration. The SLOA advised that officers instigated the order following receipt of a planning application which proposed a tree removal plan. The area order sought to pause any further tree works till information was received including survey works and future planning application. The SLOA advised that, in the fullness of time, when detailed information was provided that the Landscape team would take a more detailed look at what needed to be protected as opposed to the blanket area order.

### Public Speakers

Mr Ward – Objecting.

### Members' Debate and Questions

- i. Local Member - Cllr P Neatherway advised that the TPO had not been raised as a concern by the parish council.

*Cllr M Batey left the room at 12.50pm*

- ii. Cllr A Brown proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation.
- iii. Cllr P Fisher seconded the officer's recommendation, he reflected the SLOA advised the confirming of the TPO would serve as a holding position till detailed information was provided.
- iv. The Chairman reflected that the area was well maintained, and protection of

the trees was important given the planning application.

- v. Cllr L Paterson asked if the order would apply to the whole area, and if it was usual for the TPO to be applied to conifers.
- vi. The SPOA confirmed the TPO was for an area order, she advised that each tree was evaluated on its own merit.

**RESOLVED** by 9 votes for and 2 abstentions.

**That TPO/23/1014 be CONFIRMED in accordance with the officer's recommendation.**

*Cllr M Batey returned to the meeting at 12.52pm.*

## **80 FAKENHAM - TPO/23/1016 - WELLS ROAD, FAKENHAM**

### Officer's report

The SPOA introduced the officer's report and recommendation that the TPO be confirmed. She outlined the history of the trees and surrounding area, provided images of the site, and confirmed the key issues for consideration. Officers considered the pine trees to form part of the older landscape and formed an important feature to the street scene, offering considerable visual amenity.

It was noted that some concerns had been raised about tree roots, however officers were content that this would not be an issue.

### Public Speakers

None.

### Members' Debate and Questions

- i. The Local Member – Cllr L Vickers – noted the trees were not a native species nor did she consider them particularly attractive. She expressed her sympathy with residents' concerns and questioned the safety of the tall pine trees given how top heavy they were.
- ii. The SPOA advised there was no indication that the trees would fail. With pruning, the trees were expected to last for another 10 years which would allow enough time for the next generation of trees to become established. The removal of the existing pine trees was considered to have a significant impact on visual amenity.
- iii. Cllr L Vickers placed emphasis of the objections received from the residents who had the trees located in their gardens. She asked, should the trees fall, whether the Council would be liable by consequence of imposing a TPO.
- iv. The SPOA advised it would be the owner of the tree who would be liable if reasonable precautions were not taken.
- v. Cllr P Neatherway asked if the tree roots, likely covering a large surface area due to the size of the trees, were causing damage to the public highway.



- vi. The SPOA agreed that the root coverage would be large, noting that the pine trees were estimated to have been planted in the 1960's or 1970's. She stated that there was no apparent damage to the road and pavement, nor had there been any damage to properties.
- vii. The Chairman enquired what the standard lifespan would be for a Corsican Pine.
- viii. The SPOA advised that the species could live up to 200 years.
- ix. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation.
- x. Cllr P Neatherway seconded the motion.

**RESOLVED** by 10 votes for and 1 against.

**That TPO/23/1016 be CONFIRMED in accordance with the officer's recommendation.**

## **81 SHERINGHAM - TPO/23/1017 - LAND AT 23 HOLT ROAD, SHERINGHAM**

### Officer's report

The SPOA introduced the officer's report and recommendation that the TPO be confirmed. She outlined the history of the area, provided images of the site, and outlined the key issues for consideration. The SLOA considered the trees contributed positively to the biodiversity and connectivity of the area and it was important they be retained.

### Public Speakers

None.

### Members' Debate and Questions

- i. Cllr A Brown asked about the prevalence of honey fungus, referenced in the officer's report.
- ii. The SPOA advised that honey fungus was an endemic fungus located everywhere. She offered technical details on the lifecycle stages of the parasitic fungi. The SLOA confirmed that there was no evidence the sycamore trees were infected with the fungi, though it was present elsewhere in the garden. She advised she was in communication with the residents about the situation and asked that they provide images should the sycamores show signs of infection.
- iii. Cllr A Brown proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation.
- iv. Cllr P Fisher seconded the motion.

**RESOLVED** by 10 votes for and 1 abstention.

**That TPO/23/1017 be CONFIRMED in accordance with the officer's recommendation.**

## **82 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE**

- i. The DM introduced the officers report and spoke positively of the planning service' performance both with respect of major and non-major applications, in addition the council's strong appeals record. He advised that the number of applications remained high unlike other Local Authorities whose workloads were slowing.
- ii. Cllr A Brown expressed his thanks to officers for their continued hard work and for the encouraging performance figures. He welcomed additional funding to aid with the application backlog.
- iii. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle stated that he had shared recent planning performance data with his parish councils. He commended the planning team and encouraged the promotion of the excellent work undertaken by the planning service whose work is often misunderstood by residents.
- iv. The ADP updated Members of the recent Town and Parish Forum and confirmed that briefing sessions would be held across the district over the next 2 years covering the generality of planning with the aim to give greater insight to Town and Parish Councils about the planning process.
- v. Cllr M Hankins commended officers for the introduction of the weekly list and asked if a weekly decision list could also be published.
- vi. The ADP advised he would consider Cllr M Hankin's suggestion and would discuss the practicalities of implementation with relevant officers.
- vii. The PL provided an update on the S106 appendix and advised that she was broadly waiting on applicants.

## **83 APPEALS SECTION**

- i. The DM provided an update to the growing list of appeals, he noted that many of the appeals decided were on advertising signage applications.

## **84 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

None.

The meeting ended at 1.20 pm.

---

Chairman