

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

**Minutes of the meeting of the Development Committee held on Thursday, 24 July 2025
in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 9.30 am**

Committee	Cllr P Heinrich (Chairman)	Cllr R Macdonald (Vice-Chair)
Members Present:	Cllr T Adams	Cllr S Bütikofer
	Cllr A Brown	Cllr P Fisher
	Cllr A Fitch-Tillett	Cllr M Hankins
	Cllr V Holliday	Cllr P Neatherway
	Cllr K Toye	Cllr A Varley

Members attending: also Cllr M Taylor

Officers in Attendance: Development Manager (DM)
Senior Planning Officer(s) SPO
Development Manager Team Leader(s) (DMTL)
Legal Advisor (LA)
Democratic Services Manager (DSM)
Democratic Services Officer (DSO)

1 CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTIONS

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained how he would manage the proceedings.

2 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies had been received from Cllr Batey, Cllr Paterson and Cllr J Toye.

3 SUBSTITUTES

Substitutes for the meeting were Cllr Adams (Cllr Batey), Cllr Bütikofer (For Cllr Toye)

4 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 27th of June 2025 were approved as a correct record.

5 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

7 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Fisher declared that in relation to item 8 a close family member lived close to the site and Cllr Brown noted that he contributed to the local neighbourhood plan but was not predetermined.

Cllr Fitch-Tillett noted that she had been lobbied on several matters but was not

predetermined.

Cllr Hankins declared that he was predetermined for item 10. He would therefore not vote.

8 CORPUSTY - PF/21/1990 - CONSTRUCTION OF 38 RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE AND LANDSCAPING AT LAND OFF NORWICH ROAD, CORPUSTY FOR BROADLAND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

SPO-JS presented the report and took the Committee through the Site Plan and layout together with photographs, details of house types and materials and the main issues. In terms of the principle of development Parcel A of the site was identified in the Neighbourhood Plan for residential development and Parcel B was located in an area designated as Countryside. The SPO explained that in terms of nutrient neutrality, 22 septic tank replacements (for householders off site) over a phased period were proposed and considered acceptable, secured by S.106 agreements or S106 Unilateral Undertakings. The Committee was referred to full details of the proposed S.106 contributions and obligations within the report. The recommendation was for approval with conditions and a S.106 agreements.

Public Speakers

Guy Hodgson- Corpusty Parish Council
Andrew Savage (Applicant)

Local Member

Cllr Brown welcomed that the Applicant had now been able to overcome nutrient neutrality issues and was pleased with the previous level of engagement with the Parish Council. There were still some concerns over the level of affordable housing, but overall the village welcomed the plan. He expressed frustration that Housing England could not confirm funding prior to a planning approval and that the market housing could not be designated as primary housing only. He expressed desire for more information regarding the Adams Lane upgrade.

Members Debate

- a. The Chair and Cllr Adams queried the capacity of the sewers and how surface water was to be dealt with. The DM clarified to the Committee that whilst he did not believe the local treatment works was on the Anglian Water list to upgrade, Anglian Water had a duty to connect and the proposal to improve septic tanks in the area would mean that the application mitigated the impact, with the surface water ultimately released back into the river at greenfield runoff rates
- b. Following a question from Cllr Varley, the Applicant confirmed that all properties would have PV panels.

Cllr Brown proposed and Cllr Macdonald seconded the recommendation and requested that the conditions included monitoring fees, a sediment bay, working EV points, Swift boxes and Hedgehog highways and lighting strategy (the request for overage/clawback for an affordable housing contribution was withdrawn after advice from Officers).

IT WAS RESOLVED unanimously to

Delegate authority to the Assistant Director of Planning to Approve the applications in accordance with the recommendation (including a satisfactory s.106 agreement and the S106 unilateral undertakings required for the septic tank upgrades) and including those matters identified by members in the debate.

9 WORSTEAD - PF/24/2474 - DEMOLITION OF PART EXISTING BUILDING AND ERECTION OF NEW COLD STORE TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED PLANT ROOM AT ALBERT BARTLETT WESTWICK, STATION ROAD, WORSTEAD, NORTH WALSHAM

SPO-AW presented the report to the Committee. She corrected the report to note that Cllr Penfold formally objected to the application (the report incorrectly stated he returned no comments). She informed the Committee that since publication of the agenda further correspondence has been received including raising issues connected with the time frame given for response for new documents.

The SPO detailed the location providing site plans photographs and visualisations, proposed elevations and floor plans. The Committee was taken through the key issues including the size and scale of the proposed building and its conflict with policy EC3. Further information was provided to the Committee including details of overshadowing of other properties, impact on heritage assets, together with the views from the Landscape Officer. The SPO referred the Committee to the economic considerations and provided information on the current number of employees within this business and the impact to the local economy. On balance, the recommendation was to approve the application.

Public Speakers

John Bacon -Worstead Parish Council
Jennifer Gubbins-objecting
Philip Madeley- Sloley Parish Council
(Additional individual local resident- objecting)
Alan Roberts (Applicant)

Local Members

Cllr Penfold spoke against the application and requested that his objection be formally noted. He noted the distress this application has caused his constituents, and what he believed to be a total lack of consultation with the local community by the applicant. He referred to at least 43 instances of local objection and representation and therefore doubted the suggestion of wider local benefits as suggested by the report. He suggested that a less high and visually intrusive building could have been capable of agreement with the community. He stated he was not against business growth but did object when it rode rough-shod over the local community. He noted the lack of engagement with Sloley Parish Council and objected to the application's lack of provision of a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment. He referred the Committee to the objections of the Senior Landscape Officer and the holding objection of Highways. He urged the Committee to defer the Application and attend a site visit.

Views of Cllr Dixon were read out by the DM. Cllr Dixon stated that in respect of the merit of the application the documents submitted in June and July have clarified concerns around landscape, light loss, noise wildlife, habitat and traffic movement.

He noted that a balanced recommendation had been reached by the Officer. He expressed concern as to whether mitigation measures had been properly explored to reduce impact and residents' objections. He raised further points relating to engagement with Sloley Parish Council and their ability to have their voice heard and the time given to respond and requested the Application be deferred.

Members Debate

- a. Members including the Chair, Cllr Brown, Cllr Hankins expressed concern over the lack of consultation by the applicant with the local community. The DM confirmed to the Committee that such consultation was not a legal requirement.
- b. Cllr Toye, Cllr Bütikofer and Cllr Holliday expressed concern at the height and scale of the building proposed and asked questions regarding alternative size and scale building (the applicant confirmed that the design reflected the need for 4000 pallets and other designs impacted on vehicular movements). Additional questions regarding the colour of the building were raised, the SPO confirmed that it was proposed the colour was controlled by condition.
- c. Cllr Brown noted that in terms of considering a foreseeability test, it would be quite likely that this business would expand, but he considered what was probably not foreseeable was that it would be a building of this height.
- d. Cllr Adams noted that this building would result in reduction in vehicular movements, noise and water usage, and he and Cllr Fitch-Tillett noted the economic benefits as material to the local farming community, substantial local employment and non-domestic rates and considered, with weight, the view of the economic growth team. Cllr Holliday noted that the economic argument lacked some substance in her view. The Chair, Cllr Fitch-Tillett and Cllr Adams also noted the long standing presence of this type of business on this site.
- e. Cllr Bütikofer asked questions concerning the response from Highways and the SPO confirmed that Highways had requested a transport statement, and the applicant had indicated this proposal would result in 8 less HGV movements a week and there would not be any intensity of use.
- f. Members including Cllr Bütikofer and Cllr Hankins noted the difficult balance between the impact on the local community and the impact to the established business. The DM confirmed to the Committee that as Officers they had come to a balanced decision, giving considerable weight to the existing business and its economic benefits whilst noting visual impact of the proposed building. He reminded the Committee that they could give a different weight to the issues and could come to a different view.
- g. Members considered a potential deferment for a site visit with Cllr Neatherway and Cllr Brown expressing support and the Chair doubting its usefulness.

Cllr Fitch-Tillett proposed and Cllr Adams seconded the recommendation

It **WAS RESOLVED** by 6 votes in favour and 6 votes against with the Chair exercising his casting vote in favour that the Application be Approved subject to the Conditions covering the matters detailed in the report.

The meeting adjourned at 11.10 and reconvened at 11.25

10 FULMODESTON - PF/24/2434 - ERECTION OF ADDITIONAL FOUR, ONE-BEDROOM SELF-CONTAINED TREE HOUSES FOR USE AS SHORT-TERM HOLIDAY LET ACCOMMODATION WITH EXTERNAL WORKS AND SERVICING (TO INCLUDE SOLAR PANELS, PONDS AND CAR PARKING PROVISION) AT LAND AT WOODLAND, BROWNS COVERT, HINDOLVESTON ROAD, FULMODESTON FOR MR D ASTLEY

SPO-JS presented the report. The Committee was provided with details of the site location, the existing approved treehouses, floor plans and visualisations and details of the main issues. The SPO explained to the Committee that whilst there was suggestion of additional units in the future, the application before them was for an additional 4 treehouses. Policy EC 7 was explained to the Committee and that the site was within the countryside as designated within policy SS1. In addition, the SPO detailed that the proposals failed to comply with policy CT 5. The recommendation was for refusal.

Public Speakers

Delaval Astley (Applicant)

Local Member

Cllr Hankins spoke in support of the application. He noted that this amounted to another farm and woodland diversification proposal and was an innovative one. He believed that it was essential to enable the woodland to be maintained and supported. He suggested that it was important to promote diverse tourist accommodation.

Members debate

- a. Members including Cllr Adams, Cllr Brown, Cllr Toye, Cllr Varly and Cllr Bütikofer noted the innovative and novel design of the treehouses.
- b. Cllr Adams and Cllr Varley applauded the sustainable design and approach of the application, Cllr Varley expressed disappointment that none of the proposed treehouses were accessible to wheelchair users. Cllr Bütikofer and Cllr Fitch-Tillet expressed concern at the inclusion of a cesspit in the design which would require tanking of waste. The SPO explained to the Committee that should they wish to approve the application, a S.106 could be included to ensure appropriate provisions regarding this tanking.
- c. Cllr Bütikofer expressed the view that adding additional treehouses to the woodland would inevitably alter the characteristics of the woodland and felt that no further treehouses after this application would be desirable, the DM confirmed to the Committee that this was not a restriction that could be placed on the applicant.
- d. Cllr Adams gave considerable weight to the support from the economic growth team and supported the provision of distinct and novel visitor accommodation.

- e. The DM provided the Committee with further information regarding the proposed Biodiversity Net Gain of 18%, being 8% above the minimum and that the previous net gain provided in association for the earlier application for 2 treehouses was not a consideration in relation to this application.
- f. Cllr Brown expressed concern that the application was contrary to policy and remained unconvinced that there were sufficient material considerations to support approval.

Cllr Brown proposed and Cllr Fitch-Tillett seconded the recommendation for refusal contained within the report.

It **WAS RESOLVED** by 5 votes in favour and 6 votes against to reject the recommendation.

- g. Cllr Adams proposed that the application be approved on the basis that the policy considerations were outweighed by the outstanding quality and design of the proposals and the ecological benefits together with economic benefits the proposals would deliver. He noted the need for conditions.
- h. The SPO and DM provided the Committee with details of the previous conditions and contents of S.106 and suggested that they form the basis of conditions and S.106 legal agreement, together with provisions conditioning a site investigation relating to the water level to assess the viability of the cesspit proposed and a lighting strategy. A S.106 agreement would cover similar issues as before with the addition of provisions relating to the tankering of waste to ensure nutrient neutrality issues were dealt with. They suggested the final wording of the Conditions and S.106 be delegated to the Assistant Director of Planning. The LA outlined that a s106 would need to cover a) restrictions at the site being no barbeques, chimerae or external heaters within the curtilage of the dwellings, b) that the dwellings and woodland need to stay in the same freehold/leasehold ownership c) that the dwellings are only to be used for holiday accommodation d) that the owner needs to keep a register setting out the dates and duration of the lets in relation to each dwelling e) a GIRAMS Contribution for each dwelling is required to be paid f) a Council Monitoring Fee is required to be paid and g) there would be a requirement that waste water is removed to outside of the catchment.

Cllr Adams proposed, and Cllr Varley seconded that the application be approved subject to conditions and a S.106 agreement, the final wording of which be delegated to the Assistant Director of Planning.

It **WAS RESOLVED** by 8 votes in favour and 3 votes against that

The application be approved subject to conditions and a S.106 agreement, the final wording of which be delegated to the Assistant Director of Planning.

Cllr Fisher left the meeting at 12.10.

- 12 **POTTER HEIGHAM - RV/24/2059 - CHANGE OF USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND AND PART OF BUILDING, INCLUDING EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS, TO FITNESS STUDIO AND CAR PARK (RETROSPECTIVE) WITHOUT COMPLYING WITH CONDITION 2 (OPENING HOURS) OF APPEAL DECISION APP/Y2620/W/19/3229508 (NNDC REF. PF/18/1298) IN ORDER TO EXTEND THE OPENING HOURS FROM 0615 - 1930 MONDAYS TO FRIDAYS TO 0600 - 2000 MONDAYS TO FRIDAYS AND 0800 - 1200 SATURDAYS AT GLEBE FARM, MARSH ROAD, POTTER HEIGHAM, GREAT YARMOUTH**

The Chair requested that item 12 be considered next to ensure local member availability.

DMTL-CR took the Committee through the report and presentation. The DMTL confirmed that all recently submitted information had been uploaded to the planning portal. The Committee was provided with information as to the site location, aerial view, site plan and elevations together with photographs of access and local roads. The DMTL provided the Committee with details of the main issues primarily being resident amenity and highway safety on the local Marsh Lane, a single track road and provided information on his early morning site visit. Details of the planning inspectorate's previous decision was provided to the Committee and the DMTL confirmed to the Committee that a finely balanced recommendation was for approval.

Public Speakers

Sheridan Turner- Potter Heigham Parish Council

Louisa Sharpless – objecting

Local Member

Cllr Blathwayt spoke for refusal of the application. He explained to the Committee that this site was not an agricultural site and that the main purpose of this site had been the storage of building materials. He expressed concern regarding compatibility with other users of March Lane, including dog walkers, horse riders and walkers of the local Weavers Way. He also expressed concern over the other local highways being Station Road and Church Road, the latter being populated by young families and older people. He expressed that he was not against entrepreneurial activities but felt this was the right business in the wrong location. He noted this was retrospective application, this meant that the effects of the changes were known and he urged the Committee to reject the application.

Member Debate

- a. Cllr Adams and Cllr Macdonald asked for information regarding alleged breaches of planning and the DMTL and DM provided information noting they were in relation to opening hours and that no planning enforcement action would be considered whilst there was a relevant planning application to be decided.

- b. Cllr Varley expressed concern at the lack of objection from Highways and that this meant that a decision to refuse based on highways concerns was open to being appealed. The DMTL confirmed that Highways had been asked to confirm that they had no objection-given that they had objected to the earlier application, and they had reiterated their position of no objection. Cllr Fitch-Tillett noted the difficult position that left the Committee in.
- c. Cllr Brown considered the impact on the previous decision of the Planning Inspector and how binding that decision was on the Committee. The LA noted that the focus for the Committee was not on the principle of development but on the acceptability or otherwise of the impact of the proposed increase in hours.

Cllr Fitch-Tillett proposed, and Cllr Toye seconded the recommendation for approval of the application subject to conditions the final wording of which to be delegated to the Assistant Director of Planning.

It **WAS RESOLVED** by 6 votes in favour and 4 votes against that

The application be approved subject to conditions, the final wording of which, to be delegated to the Assistant Director of Planning.

At 12.50 the Chair noted that to continue the Development Committee meeting, standing orders relating to the length of a meeting would need to be suspended.

Cllr Fitch-Tillet proposed and Cllr Toye seconded that the relevant standing order be suspended.

It **WAS RESOLVED** unanimously to suspend the standing order.

It **WAS ALSO RESOLVED** unanimously to continue the Development Committee meeting after a short break.

The meeting adjourned at 12.55 and reconvened at 13.02 with Cllr Bütikofer having left the meeting.

11 SUTTON- STALHAM - PF/24/2338 - CHANGE OF USE FROM DWELLINGHOUSE (CLASS C3) TO HOLIDAY LET (NO SPECIFIED USE CLASS) INCLUDING UPGRADE OF AN EXISTING ACCESS SURFACE AND INSTALLATION OF A TENNIS COURT (RETROSPECTIVE) AT SUTTON HALL, HALL ROAD, SUTTON

DMTL-PR presented the report to the Committee. He took the Committee through aerial photographs, proximity to local neighbours, floor plans, elevations, access and provided details of the main issues including the principle of development and noise and light pollution. The DMTL clarified to the Committee that the application before them related only to the change of use of the property to short term letting and not the wider site for weddings and events. The DMTL took the Committee through policies SS1 and SS2 and EN13, together with relevant considerations including sound limiters at the property and a proposed complaints procedure. The

recommendation as for approval.

Public Speakers

John Knowlden -Objecting

Jason Parker -agent

Local Member

Cllr Taylor spoke in favour of refusal of application. He was pleased that the views of local residents could be heard and noted real harm that the residents had already experienced since the start of the year. He referred the Committee to policy EN2 and believed that the proposed changes neither enhanced the special qualities of this historic building nor added to the distinctive nature of the settlement. He also referred to policy EN13 and did not believe that there was adequate mitigation in this regard. He noted that potential other uses would have an on-site presence and highlighted highways concerns.

A statement was read on behalf of Cllr Bayes who noted a lack of engagement with local residents, Parish and Ward Councillors. He suggested the applicant's stance indicated little concern for the feelings and wellbeing of local residents.

Members Debate

- a. The Chair clarified to the Committee that they were considering the application to the areas outlined in red on the plan and not the areas outlined in blue,.
- b. DMTL provided further information of the noise management plan as a tool to help manage noise. The DMTL provided clarification, following a question from Cllr Adams, as to the nearest noise receptors.
- c. Members including Cllr Adams, Cllr Brown, Cllr Holliday and Cllr Fitch-Tillett expressed concerns about the practicality of enforcing a noise management plan and the considerable burden this would place, with Cllr Fitch-Tillett referring to experience relating to a similar property. Cllr Adams also noted the impact in terms of highways use.
- d. The DMTL confirmed, following a question, that Officers were content with the ecological information provided by the applicant.
- e. The DM confirmed that the Committee was entitled to request conditions should they wish and that noise management plans were not impossible to enforce nor was a condition to limit guests to 12. The Committee was entitled to expect conditions to be enforced. The LA provided the Committee with advice regarding the permitted use of Fireworks in the grounds of private dwellings.

The Chair proposed and seconded the recommendation that the application be approved .

IT **WAS RESOLVED** by 1 vote in favour and 9 votes against to reject the recommendation for approval.

- f. Cllr Fitch-Tillet proposed that the application be rejected on the basis of the noise and disturbance to the local area. The DM clarified his understanding from what had been said was that members had no confidence that a noise management plan would be sufficient and therefore the noise impact would be contrary to policy EN13.

Cllr Fitch-Tillet Proposed and Cllr Neatherway seconded that the application be refused.

It **WAS RESOLVED** unanimously to refuse the application.

13 WALSINGHAM - PF/25/1120 - REMOVAL OF DEGRADED CONSERVATORY AND ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AT MILL HOUSE, 5 SCARBOROUGH ROAD, WALSINGHAM, NORFOLK, NR22 6AB

PO-IM presented the report to the Committee providing details of the location together with photographs of the site and planned development. The recommendation was for approval.

Members Debate

Cllr Adams proposed, and Cllr Holliday seconded the recommendation.

It **WAS RESOLVED** unanimously to approve the application.

14 WALSINGHAM - LA/25/1121 - REMOVAL OF DEGRADED CONSERVATORY AND ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AT MILL HOUSE, 5 SCARBOROUGH ROAD, WALSINGHAM, NORFOLK, NR22 6AB

PO-IM presented the report to the Committee providing details of the location together with photographs of the site and planned development. The recommendation was for approval.

Members Debate

Cllr Adams proposed, and Cllr Holliday seconded the recommendation.

It **WAS RESOLVED** unanimously to approve the application.

15 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE

The Committee noted the update.

16 APPEALS SECTION

The Committee noted the reports.

The meeting ended at 1.55 pm.

Chairman