

# DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

**Minutes of the meeting of the Development Committee held on Thursday, 6 February 2025 in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 9.30 am**

**Committee Members Present:**

Cllr P Heinrich (Chairman)	Cllr M Batey
Cllr A Brown	Cllr M Hankins
Cllr G Mancini-Boyle	Cllr P Neatherway
Cllr J Toye	Cllr K Toye
Cllr A Varley	Cllr L Vickers

**Substitutes** Cllr K Boyes

**Members also attending:**

**Officers in Attendance:**

- Development Manager (DM)
- Planning Officer (PO)
- Principle Lawyer (PL)
- Housing Strategy Manager (HSM)
- Community Housing Enabler (CHE)
- Democratic Services Officer (DSO)

## **1 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor R Macdonald, Councillor P Fisher, Councillor A Fitch-Tillet and Councillor V Holliday.

## **2 SUBSTITUTES**

Councillor K Boyes was present as a substitute for Councillor V Holliday.

## **3 MINUTES**

The minutes of the Development Committee meeting held on Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> January will be presented at the next Development Committee meeting.

## **4 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

## **5 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor G Mancini-Boyle declared an interest in Item 8, PF/24/1634 and confirmed he previously employed by the applicant, Broadland Housing Association.

## **6 LITTLE SNORING - PF/24/1634 - CONSTRUCTION OF 19 DWELLINGS (CLASS C3) WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING, INFRASTRUCTURE, OPEN SPACE AND LANDSCAPING AT LAND NORTH OF KETTLESTONE ROAD, LITTLE SNORING**

Officer's Report

The PO-RS introduced the application and outline permission was requested for 10 affordable dwellings cross subsidised by 9 market dwelling as a part of a rural exception scheme in Little Snoring. He explained to the Committee the proposed application was acceptable in line with the policy H03 which was the rural exception policy. The PO-RS highlighted there was a conflict with policy H01 in relation to the market homes as the policy seeks to provide a mix of dwellings in regards to the dwelling size and number of beds.

The PO-RS highlighted to the Committee the application included open space of 3470 metres square and the applicant agreed to pay a contribution of £9004 to Little Snoring recreation ground. There was a conflict with policy CT6 in relation to lack of cycle storage but this was considered waived under the planning considerations.

The PO-RS advised that this application was recommend for approval and that the conflicts with policies mentioned would not significantly outweigh the benefits of the development.

### Public Speakers

Sophie Sadler- Broadland Housing Association- Supporting

*Councillor M Hankins joined the meeting at 9:41am. The Chair reminded Councillor M Hankins that he was unable to speak or vote on this application.*

### Local Members

The Local Member- Councillor T FitzPatrick- expressed the concerns of residents of Walsingham which included the plot was too small for the number of proposed dwellings. He highlight residents felt the village was being expanded in a way the infrastructure would not cope. He outlined there would be a loss of green space and hedgerow. Councillor T FitzPatrick added the development would cause additional concerns and add disturbance to existing highway safety and parking. He highlighted there was no additional pavement for pedestrians proposed as part of the application.

Cllr Fitzpatrick noted the proposal included 10 affordable dwellings and asked the committee to consider appropriate conditions to reflect the concerns of the residents.

### Member's Debate

- a. Councillor P Netherway sought clarification on the location of the School in relation to development site.
- b. The PO-RS highlighted to the Committee the School was located south west to the site.
- c. Councillor G Mancini- Boyle referred page 25 of the report and sought clarification on further information on EV charging points.
- d. The PO-RS confirmed those details of the EV charging point were to be conditioned. He explained it was in relation to the appearance of the EV charging points and provisions to be secured.
- e. Councillor J Toye commented some of the concerns and objections from residents had been mitigated already with adjustments made to the

application.

- f. The PO-RS added the applicant had addressed some residents comments in terms of the scheme and principal of the application.
- g. Cllr Toye proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation.
- h. Councillor A Varley commented this was a finely balanced decision but acknowledged the local need for both affordable and market dwellings. He was encouraged to see PV, air source heat pumps which contributed towards 2045 net zero position and ensure the tenants and occupiers of these dwellings benefitted from lower energy bills. Cllr Varley seconded the acceptance of the officer's recommendation.
- i. Councillor A Brown acknowledged the understandable nervousness in the community over such a development and reflected that the conditions were important to address those concerns of local residents. He highlighted the need and lack of affordable housing in the district. He noted that there was little objection or comment from any of the consultees and he confirmed his support for the proposal.
- j. Councillor G Mancini-Boyle asked further if capacity of internet connection was relevant for inclusion in the reports for future.
- k. The PO-RS In response to Councillor G Mancini- Boyle's further question, the Local Plan reference the capacity of internet connection.

**UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED** by 10 votes.

**That Planning Application PF/24/1634 be APPROVED in accordance with the Officers recommendation.**

*Councillor T Adams joined the meeting at 9:55am.*

**7 CROMER - PF/24/2341 - ERECTION OF 5 COMMERCIAL UNITS FOR USES WITHIN USE CLASSES E(C)(I) - FINANCIAL SERVICES, E(G)(I) - OFFICES, E(D) - INDOOR SPORT, RECREATION OR FITNESS, B8 - STORAGE OR DISTRIBUTION AT HOME FARM ENTERPRISE ZONE, HALL ROAD, CROMER, NORFOLK**

Officer's Report

The PO-RS introduced the report and highlighted to the Committee the recommendation was for refusal. The proposal was for 2 buildings containing 5 units with associated hard standing for parking. The PO-RS brought to the Committee's attention the site plans, existing and proposed elevations, photographs and the location of the site which was next to existing agricultural and commercial units. He highlighted the objections which included the impact on the town centre, highways, heritage, drainage, ecological and trees.

The PO-RS outlined the benefits of the application together with the issues raised in the report considered the harm outweighs the benefits of the application at this stage.

Public Speakers

Councillor David Roberts- Town/Parish

#### Local Member

Local Member- Councillor J Boyle expressed her support for this application as it complied with both policies EC3 and EC5 allowing additional units alongside the existing use. She highlighted the local community would benefit from the additional units which would not otherwise be available within the town therefore allowing existing business to continue. Councillor J Boyle explained there would be minimal impact on traffic and road structure as existing infrastructure would be used. She believed the site could be suitably concealed, that the area was already used for parking and storage of agricultural vehicles and was not the most attractive use currently and the new building would not be majorly visible.

Local Member- Councillor T Adams expressed support for this application stating one of the units already had permission and his belief that it met the policy criteria and aligned with appropriate economic objective of the national planning policy framework. He commented the development was needed as homes for existing longstanding Cromer businesses which would otherwise not have suitable units available to them. Councillor Adams believed there was unlikely to be detrimental traffic impact given the traffic was already on the local roads and noted the reduction in speed limit on Hall Road to 30mph. He brought to the Committee's attention the site was heavily concealed and was barely visible in the area and in his view would not negatively impact on the listed building. He concluded that the existing use and appearance was relevant and needed to be weighed up in the consideration of benefits given that Cromer in his view needed this development and that there had been no objections from local residents.

#### Member's Debate

- a. Councillor J Toye, commented as the Portfolio Holder for sustainable growth, small businesses need the opportunity to expand, as the most of them are rurally located and therefore needed to be sited accordingly. He commented further he did not believe the roads in the area were an issue and suggested that appropriate conditions would enable the development to be approved. He added he did not support the Officer's recommendation as he believed the issues could be resolved by conditions.
- b. Councillor A Varley echoed and agreed with Councillor J Toye comments and felt as a Council businesses and economic development should be encouraged. He believed with suitable conditions the proposal could be acceptable. He did not support the Officer's recommendation.
- c. Councillor P Netherway echoed the comments of Councillor A Varley and Councillor J Toye. He added he did not agree with the recommendation.
- a. The DM provided the committee with further information as to the reasons for the recommendation, stating that the application came before the committee at a relatively early stage because there were many issues including ecology, trees, highways and heritage. He commented if there was a need for units in Cromer there needs to be consideration as to where best to locate those units. He advised, Members could reject the recommendation, or they could defer the matter asking for further information from the applicant to allow a decision to be made.
- d. Councillor A Brown commented the committee were legally required to make decisions in accordance with planning policy unless there were material considerations that dictated otherwise. He commented that with the lack of

information on ecology, bio diversity net gain, and policy EC3 sequential test to determine the need. He was in support of the recommendation of refusal to then defer the decision to a following meeting. Councillor A Brown sought clarification on the reference to a planning application in 2003 and the associated Section 106 agreement included in the report.

- e. The PO-RS confirmed the referred 2003 application and associated permission was relating to what you can currently see on site and explained this was contrary to the policies at the time. He outlined as part of the 2003 application there was a financial contribution which was a material consideration and therefore justified the contradiction to the policies.
- f. The DM commented the Section 106 agreement for that application would be checked to ensure it was fulfilled.
- g. Councillor G Mancini-Boyle commented appendices 3,5,6,7,10 all stated insufficient information was provided and therefore agreed with deferment to allow for more information.
- h. Councillor P Heinrich questioned if there were alternative developments sites in Cromer which could be used.
- i. Councillor T Adams, confirmed there were no other sites available and commented a sequential test could be carried out. He added further he had no concerns on landscape, trees or biodiversity net gain. He added the Highway issues were being mitigated.

Councillor P Heinrich, as Chair proposed and seconded the Officer recommendation.

**The Officer Recommendation was refused.**

Cllr J Toye proposed a deferral of the matter on grounds of insufficient information to make a decision and the matter be brought back with more information to allow a proper decision to be made.

Cllr L Vickers seconded the proposal.

**UNANIMIOUSLY RESOLVED**

**That Planning Application PF/24/2341 be DEFERED.**

*Councillor T Adams left the meeting at 10:24am.*

**8 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE**

The DM presented the report which referred to the performance for December 2024. He highlighted to the Committee there was 100% for major applications and 97% for non-majors. He commented the authority were below both government and NNDC targets relating to the number of appeals.

Cllr A Brown thanked the Planning team for their efforts.

**9 APPEALS SECTION**

The DM referred the committee to the report and commented on recent decisions from the Planning Inspectorate supporting the NNDC decisions.

Cllr A Brown asked for information about the resourcing of the Planning Inspectorate.

The DM commented on the lack of experienced Planning Officers which the Inspectorate will also be suffering from and there would be recruitment issues.

*Councillor T Adams joined the meeting at 10:34am.*

## **10 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

The agenda circulated contained no exempt/confidential business and there was therefore no requirement to exclude the press and public to allow for its consideration.

The meeting ended at 10.35 am.

---

Chairman