

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Development Committee held on Thursday, 14 November 2024 in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 9.30 am

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Committee | Cllr P Heinrich (Chairman) |
| Members Present: | Cllr R Macdonald (Vice-Chairman) Cllr A Brown Cllr P Fisher Cllr A Fitch-Tillett Cllr M Hankins Cllr V Holliday Cllr G Mancini-Boyle |
| Substitute | Cllr C Ringer |
| Members Present: | Cllr L Paterson |
| Members also attending: | Cllr T Adams Cllr W Fredericks |
| Officers in Attendance: | Development Manager (DM) Senior Planning Officer (SPO-AW) Senior Planning Officer (SPO-MB) Senior Landscape Officer (SLO-CB) Development Management Team Leader (DMTL-CR) Planning Officer (PO-IM) Trainee Planning Officer (TPO-NW) Solicitor Assistant Director for Planning (ADP) Community Housing Enabler (CHE) Democratic Services Officer |

77 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr M Batey, Cllr K Toye, Cllr J Toye, Cllr L Vickers, Cllr P Neatherway, Cllr A Varley.

78 SUBSTITUTES

Cllrs C Ringer and L Paterson were present as substitutes.

79 MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Committee meeting held Thursday 17th October 2024 were approved as a correct record.

80 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

81 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr L Paterson declared an interest with respect to the S106 appendix item to note

(Oak Farm) he is the landowner.

Cllr A Brown declared a non-pecuniary interest in items 10 and 11, he considered himself pre-determined with respect to the applications, and therefore advised he would abstain from voting on the applications but would speak.

Cllr P Fisher declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 9, he is the Local Ward Member for Wells-next-the-sea.

82 HANWORTH - PF/24/1364- ERECTION OF TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION, INFILL EXTENSION AND PORCH TO DWELLING; OTHER EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS INCLUDING TO SHAPE OF ROOF AND REPLACEMENT WINDOWS TO OWLETS, THE COMMON, HANWORTH.

Officers report

The SPO-AW introduced the Officers report and recommendation for approval subject to conditions.

She outlined the sites' location, located within the designated countryside under policy SS1 and SS2 of the Core Strategy, and set on the common itself. The site was located within the Hanworth Conservation area and open common land. It was understood that Hanworth is one of the largest fenced commons in England.

The SPO confirmed the existing and proposed floor plans and elevations. Officers concluded that the building as built was not representative of the majority of the conservation area and, therefore, there was scope for improvement. Further, Officers considered that the proposed dwelling would site comfortably within the plot.

Following advice from the Conservation and Design Team, revised plans had been received which amended the massing of the extension. Whilst there would be a visible increase in built form, this was considered to be fairly contained and was not considered to be disproportionately large in the context of Policy HO8. The footprint of the extension would remain fairly large, but Officers felt this was acceptable given the size of the plot and the revised height and mass of the extension. Conservation and Design Officers were satisfied that the scheme would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the Hanworth Conservation Area.

In terms of policies EN2 and EN4, Officers considered the proposal to be a contemporary design which makes good use of quality traditional materials including pantiles, brick and natural timber cladding, which would silver down over time and tie in with the grey flints seen on other buildings. The juxtaposition between the existing and proposed extension would help to read this as a modern addition to the dwelling.

Ecological mitigation and enhancements would be appropriately conditioned, and the proposed extension was not considered to have a negative impact on neighbours' amenity.

Concerns had been raised locally regarding the capacity of the septic tank on site, however as this was a householder application this was outside the scope of the application.

Public speakers

Gill Wilton – Hanworth Parish Council
Louise Rice – Objecting
Nick Payne – Supporting

Local Member

The Local Member – Cllr J Toye – outlined the unique history of Owlets, which had a special connection with the village, and which invoked the image of a small rural cottage and not a large four-bedroom house. He considered it important to understand the history which underpinned the significance of why local residents were so concerned about development, its scale and finish.

The Local Member stressed the special character of Hanworth Common, and argued the development would negatively change the views and site lines of the common.

Cllr J Toye was critical of the Conservation and Design teams' assessment, and felt due regard had not been given to local knowledge or to Hanworth Conservation area. He further disagreed with their comments that the existing dwelling was of 'limited architectural and historic merit'. The Local Member considered the proposed extension was not in keeping with the area and failed to be subservient to the host dwelling.

With respect of planning policy EN4, the Local Member considered the proposal would neither preserve nor enhance the character and quality of the area. Further he challenged whether the application complied with policy EN8, or chapter 16, paragraph 198 of the NPPF.

Cllr J Toye argued that permission would not be granted for a new dwelling on the common, and this scheme, effectively doubling the size of the existing dwelling and which ignores the historical context was unacceptable.

Cllr V Holiday arrived at 9.58am

Members debate

- a. Cllr R Macdonald expressed some concern whether the application would comply with policy HO8 given the size of the extension. He agreed with local residents' comments that if the applicant (who had recently purchased the dwelling) wanted a 4-bedroom house, should they not have purchased a 4-bedroom house.
- b. Cllr L Paterson considered the scale and mass of the extension to be significant and asked what the percentage increase would be to the dwelling's footprint.
- c. The DM advised that figures were unavailable for the percentage increase. With respect to policy HO8 there were two key policy tests for the Committee to consider – whether the proposal would result in a disproportionately large increase in the height and scale of the dwelling, and, if this would materially increase the impact of the dwelling on the appearance of the surrounding countryside. Officers were satisfied the proposal complied with policy HO8, though it was a matter for the Committee to consider the planning balance.

- d. Cllr L Paterson asked if there was a policy consideration in instances where the gentrification of an existing property would make it unaffordable.
- e. The DM advised there was no such policy test within the core strategy.
- f. Cllr A Brown shared in the Committee's concern that this was a disproportionately large extension which would have an overbearing impact on the highly sensitive landscape. He was surprised that the property was not locally listed given its history, nor that the site was afforded greater protection. Cllr A Brown was critical of the Conservation and Design Teams assessment of the scheme.
- g. The Chairman asked if the Conservation and Design Team were available to comment.
- h. The DM advised the Conservation and Design Team weren't available for the meeting. He affirmed that the Planning Authority had a statutory duty to preserve and protect the character and appearance of a Conservation Area. The Officer recommendation gave weight to the submission from the Conservation Officer. He argued that if the Committee were minded to refuse the application, policy reasons would need to be articulated for this decision.
- i. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett affirmed that an extension should be subservient to the host dwelling, she was unconvinced this rule had been applied.
- j. The SPO advised that Officers took a visual assessment of the height, scale and overall massing of an extension. In this instance the proposed ridgeline was stepped down from the host dwelling and would be set back from the front elevation.
- k. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle asked how many other properties had been extended locally.
- l. The SPO advised other properties had been extended locally, she noted the representation from the parish council that other extensions had been approved without concern.
- m. Cllr C Ringer held significant reservations whether the application was compliant with policy HO8, and felt the Officers report and assessment significantly understated the significance of Hanworth Common and the dwellings relationship with it. He argued the application was contrary to policy EN2 and endorsed refusal of the application.
- n. The Chairman recognised the Committee's concern regarding the scale and massing of the extension and advised that the Committee had the option to defer consideration. He invited the ADP to advise.
- o. The ADP confirmed the outcomes available to the Committee and stated that if Members considered the information presented to be lacking, this would be a valid reason to defer. He noted Members comments and the desire for additional information with respect to the scale and massing, and the attention of Conservation and Design officers to respond to Committee Comments. He noted that the Committee had previously deferred an application at Binham to allow a better proposal to come forward.

- p. Cllr A Brown considered there may be merit for a site visit.
- q. The Chairman stated a site visit at this time of year presented challenges and would be result in a speedy resolution.
- r. Cllr L Paterson did not consider deferral necessary as he felt the application unacceptable due to the scale and massing. He distinguished the differences between this and the Binham application.
- s. The Chairman noted the Committee were not against an extension to the dwelling in principle, but took issue with the design, scale and massing. He commented that deferral may allow for an improved scheme, and that that there was merit in discussing the application with a Conservation Officer present.
- t. Cllr C Ringer stated he was not against the application in principle, or deferral, but that there would need to be marked improvement to the scheme for him to consider it acceptable.
- u. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett proposed deferral of the application.
- v. Cllr C Ringer seconded.
- w. The DM sought clarity what the Committee would like to be re-negotiated with the applicant. He confirmed that the applicant was within their rights to have their application as submitted considered.
- x. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett detailed the Committees requests; that the extension should be more subservient to the hoist dwelling, and that materials used be more in keeping with the local vernacular.
- y. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle added that more should be done to blend the extension with the host dwelling in a sympathetic manor, as the proposed scheme looked like an entirely separate house.
- z. The SPO noted the proposal made use of clay pantiles and red brick and sought clarity which materials were at issue.
- aa. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett stated it was the cladding at issue. She stated the host dwelling was a traditional Norfolk cottage, and considered the proposals modern design was not in keeping.
- bb. The DM reflected it was a fine balance and commented that it was not unusual for a traditional building to get a modern extension in the district. He thanked Members for their clarity for the matters at issue.

RESOLVED by 9 votes for and 1 abstention.

That Planning Application PF/24/1364 be deferred.

WELLS-NEXT-THE-SEA - PF/24/1572 - ERECTION OF 47 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING, OPEN SPACE, DRAINAGE, VEHICULAR ACCESS AND PARKING PROVISION AT LAND OFF MILL ROAD, WELLS-NEXT-THE-SEA, NORFOLKOfficers report

The SPO-MB outlined the application and recommendation for approval subject to conditions. He detailed the sites' location, situated to the west of Wells-next-the-sea, and contained within the North Norfolk National Landscape (formerly known as the AONB).

The SPO-MB provided details of the proposed site plan, variation of roofscapes, Tenure Plan; including 26 Market dwellings, 21 affordable dwellings comprised of 8 social homes, 8 intermediate, and 5 shared accommodation, site sectionals, indicative visualisation spanning 1 – 5 years, floor plans and elevations for various types of dwelling, proposed landscaping including landscape buffering to the North and trees lining the main access road, and offered images in and around the site.

The Case Officer confirmed the key issues for consideration and advised that whilst the proposal was a departure from the existing Local Plan, Officers had given due regard to the Local Authorities lack of 4- & 5-Year housing land supply and the 'tilted balance' detailed in the NPPF. The proposal was seen to positively contribute to the housing shortfall and would deliver benefits through off-site developer contributions. Further, the confirmed that Officers considered the housing mix proposed to be acceptable, and that appropriate regard had been given to the impact of the scheme on the sensitive location.

The SPO-MP noted the Inspector did not consider the site should be contained in the emerging Local Plan, however the Council continued to support its retention in the Plan. The Inspector had not been provided with the full detail of the application at the examination stage, and therefore had not been provided with mitigation details.

Public Speakers

John Edwards – Objecting
Keith Glascoe – Objecting
Will Buck - Objecting
Geoff Armstrong – Supporting

Local Member

The Local Member - Cllr P Fisher – thanked officers for their comprehensive report for a complex and sensitive site. He reaffirmed the Council considered the site suitable for development and reflected on the increasing housing target and need to deliver additional homes. He spoke positively of the developer's engagement with the Town Council and for adapting plans accordingly. Further, he was pleased with the environmental and bio-diversity provisions outlined, and that due consideration had been given to dark skies. Cllr P Fisher stressed the need for affordable homes, both in Wells and across the district.

Members Debate

- a. The ADP confirmed the reasons why the application had been presented to Committee. He confirmed the scale of the development and relationship with

the emerging Local Plan merited consideration by the Committee. He advised against refusal of the application on the grounds that the Local Plan had not been adopted.

- b. Cllr L Paterson considered the right balance had been struck by officers and so proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation.
- c. Cllr G Mancini- Boyle asked for details regarding the landscape management plan to ensure that the planting scheme would thrive.
- d. The SPO-MB confirmed the standard clause would apply for a 10-year management plan; this could be monitored.
- e. In response to questions by the Chairman, the Landscape Officer confirmed the landscape character assessment guides to reflect the local planting pallet to filter in the development at all elements of the new build.
- f. Cllr V Holliday stated that this is a complex matter with a divided community, however there is a desperate need for housing. She asked if there is a principal residence policy in Wells-Next-The-Sea's neighbourhood plan.
- g. SPO-MB advised this site is excluded from the neighbourhood plan because it addresses specific local needs.
- h. Cllr V Holliday asked if it is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) site.
- i. SPO-MB explained that due to the site's previous allocation for a larger area that has been subsequently reduced, this is not within SSSI.
- j. Cllr V Holliday questioned the absence of principle residency exclusion on site resulting in a lot of second homes.
- k. The DM advised the site is meeting the policy requirement for housing and is at the maximum NNDC require.
- l. Cllr A Brown referenced concerns regarding the relationship of the planning inspector, advising they are appointed and per statutory processes, NNDC must engage with them. He expressed the prevalent need for affordable housing in Wells-Next-The-Sea and the advantage of having a responsible developer. Cllr A Brown seconded the proposal.
- m. Cllr M Hankins congratulated the Officer on an excellent report. He stated the overriding concern is that Wells-Next-The-Sea has a shortage of houses.
- n. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett echoed the desperate housing need for local people, particularly in Wells-Next-The-Sea with second homes and fully supports the recommendation.
- o. The ADP reflected on previous points raised, advising it is unusual for an Inspector to have a clear position in contrary to Officers recommendation. However, since the Inspectors initial letter, there has been more detailed and refined information which has shaped the Officers recommendation to the Committee.

He expressed the importance of establishing affordable housing with a view

to future Government requirements.

The ADP advised that SLO-CB is independent of mind and would make it clear if this was an unacceptable proposal. He has been to see the site and with the detail in mind, he is comfortable with the recommendation.

He also reiterated the caveat of the recommendation which includes a S106 package as well as the attention to local issues such as highways and flooding needs. Whilst he is confident these caveats can be addressed; they will need to be done before issuing any decision.

- p. Cllr R Macdonald asked for more information in relation to the Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFAs) comments.
- q. SPO-MB explained that the LLFAs had requested further calculations to reflect more recent guidance. These calculations have been provided with an updated technical note and discussed informally with the LLFAs Officer; they are satisfied with the new calculations but requested further clarification on the attenuation basin.
- r. Cllr V Holliday expressed concerns regarding the access road, querying whether this could be moved. She also asked if there would be a lighting condition appended to the houses.
- s. SPO-MB assured there would be inclusion of a lighting condition to protect the nocturnal element. In reference to the road access, SPO-MB explained the pre-application changes included more sweeping access and further landscaping to soften the impact on Mill Road. Addressing comments to connect to Holkham Road, this would have a more significant impact on the landscape with views from the North. The current plan is the only realistic prospect to accommodate the development.
- t. Cllr C Ringer asked for clarification of the allocations policy.
- u. The CHE advised that as it is an allocated site, it will be a general needs allocation. Homes for Wells will most likely take the intermediate units who have their own policy which meets local needs and key workers.
- v. Cllr W Fredericks thanked the Committee for their comments and consideration to homeless and local people reiterating the importance of affordable homes as a community.

RESOLVED with 10 votes for.

That Planning Application PF/24/1572 be approved in accordance with the Officers recommendation.

Cllr P Fisher and Cllr M Hankins left meeting at 11:16am.

The meeting was adjourned at 11.16am and reconvened at 11.32am

84 SHERINGHAM - PF/24/1827- CHANGE OF USE OF GROUND FLOOR FORMER SHOP (CLASS E) TO HOT FOOD TAKEAWAY (NO SPECIFIED USE CLASS), INSTALLATION OF EXTRACTION AND VENTILATION EQUIPMENT; EXTERNAL

ALTERATIONS TO 10 CHURCH STREET, SHERINGHAM.

Officers report

The SPO-AW outlined the application PF/24/1827 and ADV/24/1828 with recommendation for approval subject to conditions.

The SPO-AW provided details of the proposed change of use, specifically in relation to the ventilation equipment. A noise report was submitted to support this, and environmental health officers are happy there would be no significant negative amenity impact from the change of use subject to condition.

Conservation and Design Officers consider the existing shop front fails to make a positive contribution to the designated area as existing, it is also noted the proposal misses the opportunity to reinstate some character.

The SPO-AW detailed the proposed signage, advising that Officers considered the proposed signage accords with the aims of the design guide, policies EN4, EN13 and CT5 subject to condition.

The SPO-AW confirmed the key issues for consideration, including no current policy basis to reject and limited heritage harm. Public benefits of securing a viable use for an empty shop and the 16 local jobs which will be created. A litter management plan has been submitted which address litter concerns.

Public Speakers

Peter Ratcliffe – Sheringham Town Council
Andrew Hodgson (Agent) – Supporting

Local Member

The Local Member - Cllr L Withington was unable to attend but shared a document prior to the meeting with the Members. The DM read a summary of the issues within the document.

Cllr P Fisher joined meeting at 11:48 am.

Cllr L Withington raised concerns about the exceeding of levels within the EC5 policy and tipping the balance of the towns eateries and impacts the health and wellbeing targets for North Norfolk.

She referenced policies EN4, EN5, EN8 and section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework including paragraph 8. Advising it is not in the public interest here to say that that the less than substantial harm identified on the Sheringham Conservation Area is outweighed by the public interest.

With the concerns over these policies, going against public interest and environmental concerns, Cllr L Withington advised she seeks to refuse the application.

Members Debate

- a. Cllr A Brown reminded the Committee that he is pre-determined on the application and will be abstaining from voting. He referenced an error in the

consultants' Design and Planning Statement on the Planning Portal, advising the statement that the nearest hot food takeaway is 120 meters away which is inaccurate.

Cllr A Brown raised concerns in relation to the Health Protocol and detrimental effect to local residents, referencing late night noise from vehicles delivering. Would suggest imposing a condition that retail unit closes at 9:00 pm, to guarantee immunity to the residents above.

- b. Cllr L Paterson supported the concerns regarding noise and agreed with the need for a curfew. He raised various points relating to NNDC's Planning Policy, specifically the concern over littering.
- c. The SPO-AW advised the clearing of litter would be in the locality of the restaurant but could look at specifying a set area.
- d. Cllr V Holliday raised concerns over the introduction of another fast-food outlet increasing the likelihood of health risks in the area, adding to the already high demand on healthcare.
- e. Cllr C Ringer referred to policy EC5 and questioned the differing statistics surrounding the percentage of shop fronts on the High Street.
- f. The SPO-AW explained with the details around change of class being broad allowing for variation and interpretation, it impacts Officers overall assessment.
- g. Cllr C Ringer shared his reservations in approving this recommendation.
- h. The DM reiterated the difficulty in finding the right balance when referring to the policies and advised the Officers can make recommendations to the best of their judgment, but it is down to the Committee to make an overall decision.
- i. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett expressed benefit of getting rid of the ugly signage on the currently disused storefront. She echoed concerns of late-night noise from vehicles delivering but understands Environmental Health and the Safe Neighbourhood Team have been advised and happy. Proposed both PF/24/1827 and ADV/24/1828.
- j. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle raised a concern about the carbon footprint in relation to transportation of product.
- k. Cllr V Holliday advised Environmental Health have not addressed the issues of late-night vehicle noise. She advised the NPPF does state to make decisions based on the wellbeing of residents and quoted 96C of the NPPF.
- l. Cllr L Paterson does not feel the Committee can prevent traffic noise and should not allow this to affect the final decision.
- m. Cllr A Brown stated Public Health England have published guidance on how to use the planning system to promote healthy weight environments.

- n. The ADP referred to paragraph 96C of the NPPF, previously mentioned. The examples used are about being permissive, rather than constrain the negative.

He goes on to say that the policy refers to use class order, which is out of date. Reiterating the point that Officers must make a recommendation based on interpretation of an out-of-date policy not a modern set of use class circumstance.

The ADP guided the Committee there is the capacity refuse due to EC5 with the loss of retail frontage and the over concentration of hot food takeaway, as well as a residential immunity issue. The concerns surrounding waste could be addressed with a condition rather than be considered a reason for refusal.

The Chairman clarified that Cllr A Fitch-Tillett has proposed the Officers recommendation for approval, Cllr R Macdonald seconded.

VOTED

RESOLVED by 3 votes for, 4 against and 2 abstentions.

The vote is lost.

Cllr C Ringer proposed the refusal, Cllr L Paterson seconded.

VOTED

RESOLVED by 4 votes for, 3 against and 2 abstentions.

That Planning Application PF/24/1827 be REFUSED in accordance with EC5 and EN4.

- 85 SHERINGHAM - ADV/24/1828- DISPLAY OF ONE EXTERNALLY ILLUMINATED FASCIA SIGN AND ONE INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED HANGING SIGN AT 10 CHURCH STREET, SHERINGHAM.**

Please refer to point 84 regarding PF/24/1827.

The Chairman clarified that Cllr A Fitch-Tillett has proposed the recommendation, Cllr R Macdonald seconded.

RESOLVED by 4 votes for, 2 against and 3 abstentions.

That Planning Application ADV/24/1828 be approved in accordance with the Officers recommendation.

- 86 WEST RAYNHAM - PF/24/0901 - FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION OVER EXISTING SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO FORM ADDITIONAL BEDROOM; EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS INCLUDING RELOCATION OF THE ENTRANCE DOOR, CHANGES TO EXTERNAL WALL AND LAYOUT OF SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AND, REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING FIRST FLOOR WINDOW AND FRENCH WINDOW AT NORTH VIEW, 29 THE STREET, WEST RAYNHAM, FAKENHAM, NORFOLK, NR21 7EZ**

Officers report

The PO-IM outlined the application with recommendation for refusal. She advised the Applicant has provided 3 further supporting documents since the Application was published, these are available on the case file though are not considered to alter the Officers recommendation.

The PO-IM provided details of the proposed changes and reason for the Officers recommendation for refusal, specifically detailing that a pre-application was done with the Applicant, which resulted in guidance which has not been met in this Application.

Public Speakers

David Sidell – West Raynham Parish Council
Sarah Clears – Supporting

Local Member

The Local Member - Cllr N Housden was unable to attend but shared a statement, the DM read the statement to the Committee.

Cllr N Housden spoke about how the application would impact on the family and local community. He explains the applicant has worked with the Officers to come to a pragmatic consensus benefiting the visual aspects for fulfilment of the planning criteria and internal provision of accommodation needed.

The Local Member asks that the Committee considers applications not only based on planning policy grounds, but the social demographic benefit. He states approving this application will ensure that the property is extended to serve a stable working family who are an integral part of this local community.

Members Debate

- a. The Chairman advised there did not seem to be an issue with the principal of this development, just whether the style of roof is acceptable within the conservation area of West Raynham.
- b. Cllr L Paterson asked for clarification of the proposal.
- c. The PO-IM shared images of the proposal and confirmed the reasons for the recommendation for refusal.
- d. Cllr V Holliday asked for further information in terms of the room dimensions and usability of the duo-pitched perpendicular extension.
- e. The PO-IM advised the room would be capable room of practical habitation, particularly if the room were to be vaulted to the ridge or the floor level is lowered.
- f. Cllr V Holliday enquired if lowering the floor would be an issue, but PO-IM advised this had not been explored so could not answer the question.
- g. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle asked for clarity over the reason for the suggested recommendation due to other similar structures in the area.

- h. Cllr A Brown asked if there is the scope to not make a decision today and allow the applicant to go away and work with the Officers more.
- a. The ADP suggested if it was concluded to defer the decision it may be best to go back to basics with the plans.
- b. Cllr A Brown suggested the other properties in the village with similar aesthetics were prior to the Conservation Area status was invoked.
- c. The DM advised that some of the examples of similar builds pre-dated the planning system and would explain why a previous application was refused in 2023.
- d. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett requested clarification of the location of the extension in relation to the street view. She felt there was a great need for the extension and proposed the approval of the application.

The Chairman put the Officers recommendation to refuse the application to the vote

VOTED

RESOLVED by 1 vote for, 8 against.

The vote is lost.

- e. Cllr L Paterson proposed the application for approval due to not being able to see the roof from the road and disagreeing with the harm mentioned.
- f. The ADP concluded the approval would be based on the Officers proposal having been founded largely on the position of the extension in relation to the building and the road to the front, would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Cllr L Paterson proposed the approval, Cllr A Fitch-Tillett seconded.

VOTED

RESOLVED by 9 votes for.

That Planning Application PF/24/0901 be APPROVED.

The Chairman proposed to suspend standing orders to complete applications and that the Officers final reports shall be taken as they are with questions to Officers raised separately.

The meeting was adjourned at 12.48pm and reconvened at 12.53pm

87 BACONSTHORPE - PF/24/1919 - ALTERATIONS AND EXTENSION OF EXISTING SINGLE STOREY OUTBUILDING TO FACILITATE USE AS ANNEXE ACCOMMODATION AT NEWT COTTAGE 65 CASTLE ROAD, BACONSTHORPE, HOLT.

Officers report

The TPO-NW briefly outlined the application and the Officers recommendation for approval.

Public Speakers

Martin Stuart (Agent) – Supporting

Local Member

The Local Member - Cllr C Ringer - outlined his reasons for bringing this to the Committee was to decide whether the proposal complies with EN4.

He expressed the concern of the overlooking of the properties if the application is approved, referencing compelling documentation provided by the main objector.

The Local Member asked that if the application be approved, for conditions to be included in relation to the roof light and glass as well as the Officer proposed conditions specifically in relation to the prohibition of it being a standalone holiday let.

Members Debate

- a. The Chairman advised that if the roof light was a concern a condition could be agreed.
- b. The DM advised a condition could be included in relation to the glass if the applicant was accepting of it.
- c. Cllr L Paterson stated that on the basis that there is a condition of obscuring glass in the roof light he would propose the officer's recommendation for approval.

Cllr L Paterson proposed the approval, Cllr R Macdonald seconded.

RESOLVED with 9 votes for.

That Planning Application PF/24/1919 be approved in accordance with the Officers recommendation and the condition related to the roof light.

- 88 **SUFFIELD PARK - PF/24/1924 - DEMOLITION OF DETACHED GARAGE; SINGLE STOREY FRONT & REAR EXTENSIONS; ALTERATIONS TO FENESTRATION AND EXTERNAL MATERIALS, NEW PV PANELS, FORMATION OF RETAINING WALLS TO IMPROVE ON-SITE PARKING, REPLACEMENT OF BOUNDARY FENCE WITH RENDERED WALL, RELOCATION OF REAR PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND FORMATION OF TWO RAISED FLOWER BEDS AT 5 CLIFF DRIVE, CROMER**

Officers report

The DMTL-CR briefly outlined the application with images of the site and plans in relation to the application.

He outlined the Officers report and recommendation for approval. Highlighting key points in relation to impact on the character of the area and design, amenity, coastal considerations and concerns of the use of the property.

Public Speakers

Susan Taylor – Supporting

Local Member

The Local Member - Cllr E Spagnola was unable to attend but shared a statement, the DM read the statement to the Committee.

Cllr E Spagnola explained concerns regarding overdevelopment on the site, causing intrusion of the neighbours, affecting the vista from surrounding areas along the cliff line and potentially prompting coastal erosion issues. She also discussed the impact on parking year-round and noise pollution with it due to the increase in occupants.

With these key points in mind, Cllr E Spagnola urged the Committee to object to the planning application.

Members Debate

- a. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett supported the Officers recommendation and knowledge in relation to the Coastal Erosion. She proposed the Officers recommendation to approve the application.
- b. Cllr A Brown seconded the proposal stating the Local Members concerns have been addressed within the report.
- c. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle praised the applicant for being accommodating in relation to not overlooking neighbours and supported the application.
- d. Cllr V Holliday stated it is unfortunate that the runoff goes into the foul system but understands this is due to no other option due to cliff erosion.
- e. Cllr T Adams advised drainage options are very limited due to the location. He advised there have been concerns regarding cracks along the pavement and cliff top pass, but these are due to settlement and will continue to occur. He thanked the applicant for allaying concerns in terms of it being a holiday let.

Cllr A Fitch-Tillett proposed the approval, Cllr A Brown seconded.

RESOLVED with 9 votes for.

That Planning Application PF/24/1924 be approved in accordance with the Officers recommendation.

89 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE

The Chairman asked Members to raise any questions with the Officers directly.

90 APPEALS SECTION

The Chairman asked Members to raise any questions with the Officers directly.

91 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

The meeting ended at 1.22 pm.

Chairman