

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Development Committee held on Thursday, 30 May 2024
in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 9.30 am

Committee Members Present:

Cllr P Heinrich (Chairman)	Cllr A Brown
Cllr P Fisher	Cllr A Fitch-Tillett
Cllr M Hankins	Cllr V Holliday
Cllr P Neatherway	Cllr J Toye
Cllr K Toye	Cllr A Varley
Cllr L Vickers	

Substitute Members Present:

Cllr C Ringer

Officers in Attendance:

Development Manager (DM)
Principal Lawyer (PL)
Senior Planning Officer (SPO)
Senior Planning Officer – JB (SPO-JB)
Planning Officer (PO)
Household Planning Assistant (HPA)
Democratic Services Officer – Governance

6 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllr M Batey, Cllr G Mancini-Boyle, and Cllr R Macdonald.

7 SUBSTITUTES

Cllr C Ringer present as a substitute for Cllr M Batey.

8 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

9 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr V Holliday advised she would abstain from voting on application PF/24/0348.

10 HOLT - PF/24/0246 - ERECTION OF 3 NO. DETACHED DWELLINGS ON LAND ON THE EAST SIDE OF GARDEN HOUSE, PEACOCK LANE, HOLT, NR25 6HD

Officer's Report

The SPO introduced the Officer's reports and affirmed the recommendation for refusal, per Highways objections. The item was referred to committee by the local member, Cllr M Batey, who was critical of the Highways objection and considered there to be public interest in the item.

It was noted that the site was situated within the settlement boundary of Holt, located within the Conservation Area and subject to an area settlement TPO. An aerial of the

image of the site was shown as well as proposed floor plans and elevations and image in and around the site and peacock lane.

Public Speakers

Maggie Prior – Holt Town Council
William Dunne – Supporting

Local Member

Cllr C Ringer recited a statement prepared by the Local Member- Cllr M Batey who was unable to attend the meeting. Cllr M Batey considered the application was of public interest and would be best addressed by the Committee.

Highways

The Highway's Authority representative advised that Peacock Lane had been subject to some development in the form of replacement dwellings. He noted in the last 15 years there had been approximately 3 applications on Peacock Lane for new dwellings which had either been granted on appeal or by Development Committee. The Highways Authority did not consider Peacock Lane suitable for further development, the fundamental issue being around the access and the concentrated movements arising from additional dwellings. The Highways Officer advised that for each dwelling there would be approximately 6 daily movements, increasing the level of use by approximately 18 cars per day down the narrow junction. Further, the lack of pedestrian facilities would increase the risk of conflict between pedestrians and vehicles.

The Chairman enquired about accident record for Peacock Lane. The Highway's Officer advised that there were no recorded personal injury accidents on Peacock Lane that he was aware of.

Members Debate

- i. Cllr J Toye considered, with the exception of Highways concerns, the application was acceptable in all other respects. Councillor J Toye was critical of the vehicle movement database and the information used in the database to form the response. He reflected that Peacock Lane was estimated to serve between 70-80 dwellings, if each dwelling resulted in 6 vehicle movements per day, this would be around 3.75 – 4% of vehicle traffic, something he considered to be an insignificant number. Further Cllr J Toye noted the proximity of Peacock Lane to Holt Town centre and considered that residents would be able to utilise other means of transport to access the town including walking and or cycling.
- ii. Cllr C Ringer echoed comments made by Cllr J Toye that in almost all other respect the application was policy compliant. Whilst accepting the Highways Officers comments relating to replacement development, he considered there to be a marked difference in the traffic generated from the former businesses on peacock lane and that the proposed dwellings. He believed that the traffic generated would be lesser than that of the sites former use. Cllr C Ringer understood anecdotally that the relocation of the post office from the junction of Peacock Lane has improved road safety. He agreed with Cllr J Toye that the site was located within easy walking distance of the town and would be safe owing to the cut through path. Cllr C Ringer reflected on the historic

nature of the town and of its road network, he considered that the junction with Peacock Lane was typical for the Georgian town. He was reticent to see development pushed to the periphery of the town where there would be a reliance on cars.

- iii. Cllr K Toye enquired what pedestrian awareness signs were in situ on the road to remind road users of pedestrian safety, further she asked if the pathway to town was in good condition. Given the lack of personal accident reporting of the road, and its proximity to the town, Cllr K Toye expressed her support for the application.
- iv. Cllr V Holliday proposed acceptance of the Officer's recommendation and reflected on her experience as a GP driving around Holt. She considered the junction to be very dangerous and was critical of the personal injury accident recording, as she believed from personal experience that many accidents went unrecorded.
- v. Cllr P Fisher noted the historic businesses on Peacock Lane, which operated before the introduction of the Holt by-pass. The introduction of the by-pass subsequently re-directed traffic away from the junction with Peacock Lane. He asked if there was any data of the impact of the by-pass?
- vi. The Chairman seconded the Officer's recommendation.

THE VOTE WAS LOST by 2 votes for, and 10 votes against.

- vii. The DM noted Member's comments that they did not consider that the Highways impact would be as severe as presented by the Highway's Authority to the Committee, rather the Committee broadly placed greater weight on the benefits of the dwellings and of the sustainability of the location, which they considered outweighed Highway harm.
- viii. Cllr J Toye supported the summary provided by the DM, and further considered the traffic impact assessment was misleading and the volume of traffic generated from the proposal would be insignificant. He proposed acceptance of the application.
- ix. Cllr L Vickers seconded the motion.

IT WAS RESOLVED by 10 votes for and 2 against.

That Planning application PF/24/0246 be APPROVED. Final wording to be delegated to the Assistant Director – Planning.

- 11 **BRADFIELD - PF/23/1580 - STATIONING OF CARAVAN FOR A MIXED USE COMPRISING SHORT TERM RESIDENTIAL RETREAT / HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION FOR CARERS AND PEOPLE FROM A CARING PROFESSION (UP TO 84 DAYS PER ANNUM); HOSTED RETREATS FOR CARERS AND PEOPLE FROM A CARING PROFESSION (UP TO 18 DAYS PER ANNUM); FULL-DAY AND HALF-DAY THERAPEUTIC RETREATS FOR CARERS AND PEOPLE FROM A CARING PROFESSION INCLUDING OVERNIGHT ACCOMMODATION FOR THE SITE MANAGER / OPERATOR (UP TO 66 DAYS PER ANNUM) AT LAND EAST OF LINCOLN COTTAGE (KNOWN AS THE COTTAGE), COMMON ROAD, BRADFIELD COMMON, BRADFIELD, NORFOLK**

Officer's Report

The SPO-JB introduced the Officer's report and recommendation for refusal. He affirmed the site's rural location, proposed site plan, including extensive landscaping resulting to ecological enhancements, photos of the caravan (pre-enhancement) and surrounding landscape. Details were provided for the proposed breakdown of use of the caravan and anticipated number of vehicle movements.

The key issue for consideration was the principle of development. It was noted that the application proposed mixed use which would bring some wellbeing benefits, however Officer's considered the application would principally be classed as residential or tourism use. As such, Officer's did not consider the application site suitable for this form of development having regard to the strategic objectives of the development plan, or the aims of the NPPF with respect of sustainable development.

Public Speakers

Mark Watts – Objecting
Isobel Claire-Walters – Supporting

Local Member

Cllr P Neatherway stated that whilst the therapeutic offering would likely be welcomed by many, he expressed concern with the site's location for such a development, particularly with the narrowness of the roads in the local highway network. He was critical of how use of the site would be monitored given its triple use class and considered this unenforceable.

Members Discussion

- i. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett shared in Cllr P Neatherway's comments that the wellbeing service was welcomed, but not in this location. She agreed that additional traffic on the narrow Bradfield roads should be avoided. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett proposed acceptance of the Officer's recommendation, with a heavy heart.
- ii. Cllr P Neatherway seconded the motion.

RESOLVED by 9 votes for and 3 abstentions.

That the application be REFUSED in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

- 12 **WEST RAYNHAM - PF/23/2330 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE WORKSHOPS AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW SINGLE STOREY DWELLING AT WEST RAYNHAM AUTO CLINIC, MASSINGHAM ROAD, WEST RAYNHAM, FAKENHAM, NORFOLK, NR21 7AJ**

Officer's Report

The PO introduced the Officer's report and recommendation for approval. She noted the relevant planning history for the site including recent refusal in September 2023. Images of the site were provided, along with proposed and exiting elevations, proposed site plan including the biological treatment component which would serve

this and the neighbouring dwelling – and would make the development Nutrient Neutral.

The proposal for a new market dwelling in the countryside was considered contrary to NNDC core strategy policies SS1 and SS2, however prior issues with design had been resolved, GIRAM's payment received, and matter of Nutrient Neutrality resolved, and, as the local authority were unable to demonstrate a 5-year Housing Land supply, the tilted balance, as set out in the NPPF must be engaged. Officers considered their sufficient reasons to outweigh the policy conflict and therefore the application should be approved.

Public Speakers

Kevin Jolliff – Supporting

Members Discussion

- i. Cllr A Varley thanked the case officer for her thorough report. He did not consider there to be any detrimental harm arising from the scheme and stated it would be an improvement on land landscape and street scene. He proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation for approval.
- ii. Cllr C Ringer seconded the motion, and agreed it was an improvement on the existing.
- iii. Cllr C Vickers considered the proposal would be a significant improvement on the street scene and would result in a reduction in traffic movements.
- iv. Cllr M Hankins enquired about the condition for the removal if contamination from the site and risk assessment.
- v. The DM advised if contaminated materials were found on site, there would need to be remediation work undertaken. It would be for the owner to ensure remediation works, if required, were undertaken.
- vi. Cllr V Holliday expressed concern for the loss of the car repair facility, she asked where the nearest alternate venue would be. Additionally, she understood that there would be some monitoring of septic tank upgrades and asked how the nutrient effluence would be monitored, and if this could be conditioned.
- vii. The DM advised that a nutrient calculation had been submitted by the applicant, and confirmed the current nutrient output would be assessed and used as a comparative with the package treatment plant to be installed as part of the proposal. The legal agreement was proposed to ensure that the package treatment plant could be delivered.
- viii. Cllr V Holliday argued that effluent monitoring should occur, and with this being the first of perhaps many applications utilising package treatment works, it would be beneficial to ensure the process was in place.
- ix. The DM advised that monitoring responsibility would rest with the owners of the site, and not a matter for the district council to monitor individual package treatment plants, which would be resource intensive.

- x. Cllr J Toye advised he had a package treatment plant, and he was responsible in ensuring the Environment Agency would access to take samples, and the Environment Agency were responsible for monitoring. Cllr J Toye considered the proposal to be a sensible re-use of the site.

UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED by 12 votes for.

That Planning Application PF/23/2330 be APPORVED in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

13 BLAKENEY - PF/24/0348 - ERECTION OF TWO-STOREY FRONT EXTENSION, RAISING OF ROOF OF SINGLE-STOREY SIDE EXTENSIONS, INSERTION OF DORMER WINDOWS ON FRONT AND REAR AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS AT 29 THE PASTURES, BLAKENEY, HOLT, NORFOLK, NR25 7LY

Officer's Report

The PO introduced the Officer's report and recommendation for approval. She outlined the recent planning application for the site, detailed in the agenda pack. The Case Officer affirmed the sites' location, site plan, proposed and existing floor plans and elevations, and images of the site. It was noted that the first-floor bedroom window, overlooking neighbouring property on the western elevation would be removed as part of the proposal. The current proposal sought to address the reasons for refusal for the previous application (PF/23/2642) by a redesign and a reduction in size of the proposed rear dormer and the submission of Primary Roost Assessment. The scheme was considered to comply with NNDC core Strategy Policies SS3, EN1 , EN 2, EN4 and CT5. The prior scheme was also considered to be acceptable in principle and was not objected to by the Parish Council on residential amenity grounds.

Public Speakers

Rosemary Thew – Blakeny Parish Council
Jordan Cribb – Supporting

Local Member

The Local Member – Cllr V Holliday – affirmed the community's objection to the proposal, principally due to concerns of overlooking and loss of privacy for neighbours. She noted that the two new dormers would be higher and wider than that already existing which would contribute to further overlooking the neighbour's private outdoor space. The Local Member referenced The North Norfolk Design Guide which states that 'rooms and windows should not create significant overlooking of any other dwelling windows or private garden areas or should they lead to any overbearing impacts'. Further, the current local plan policy states that 'proposals should not have a significant detrimental effect on residential amenity of nearby occupiers' and the emerging local plan states that 'development will not be allowed which causes unacceptable impacts on the amenity of neighbouring occupants'

The Local Member took issue with the separation distance between proposed windows and the neighbours garden (16 meters) which she considered would have a significant detrimental impact. She noted that NNDC classified bedrooms

differently from other Local Authorities including Broadland and South Norfolk which class bedrooms as primary habitable space. Cllr V Holiday suggested outdoor living space be given the same status as indoor living space, which would make the 16m distance insufficient. The Local Member encouraged the Committee refuse the application.

Members Discussion

- i. Cllr P Neatherway asked images to be redisplayed of the view from the first-floor windows facing the neighbouring property and enquired about the height of the current window.
- ii. The PO advised the images were taken facing straight on and the height from which they were taken.
- iii. Cllr L Vickers sought confirmation that the window facing the neighbouring property patio and dining area would be removed.
- iv. The PO confirmed the first-floor window on the western elevation would be removed.
- v. Cllr A Varley thanked the Case Officer for her thorough report. Whilst respecting the views of the local member, he contended that the application would not have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties or the wider community and landscape. He was further encouraged by the ecology report and the conditions proposed. Cllr A Varley proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation for approval.
- vi. Cllr J Toye seconded the motion.

RESOLVED by 11 votes for and 1 abstention.

That Planning Application PF/24/0348 be APPROVED in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

14 NORTH WALSHAM - PF/24/0795 - TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION TO DWELLING AT 1 MILLFIELD ROAD NORTH WALSHAM NORFOLK

- i. The Chairman noted that the Local Member, Cllr L Shires, had sought delegated approval, however the report had been drafted prior to this communication due to scheduling.
- ii. The HPA introduced the Officers report and recommendation for approval, he outlined the site's location, existing and proposed floor plans and elevations, and images of the site.
- iii. The Chairman proposed acceptance of the Officers recommendation
- iv. Cllr A Varley seconded.

UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED by 12 votes for.

That Planning Application PF/24/0795 be APPROVED in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

15 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE

The DM confirmed 1 Major decision had been reached in the month in time, and 79 non-major decisions for the same period. The Local Planning Authority continued to perform well and was well within government thresholds for the quality of decision making.

The S106 appendix was noted.

16 APPEALS SECTION

- i. The DM offered an update to the appeals report and advised that a decision had been reached for the Thurning applications which both went in favour of the Council, and against it. He noted that the cost award sought by the appellant was refused by the Planning Inspector.
- ii. Cllr C Ringer enquired about the decision reached at East Beckham and whether the Norfolk County Council decision to allow the recycling facility would have an impact.
- iii. The DM considered there would likely be an impact and the Enforcement Manager would monitor the situation.

17 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

The meeting ended at 11.00am

Chairman