

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Development Committee held on Thursday, 21 August 2025 in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 9.30 am

Committee Members Present:	Cllr R Macdonald (Chair)	Cllr M Batey
	Cllr A Brown	Cllr P Fisher
	Cllr A Fitch-Tillett	Cllr M Hankins
	Cllr V Holliday	Cllr P Neatherway
	Cllr L Vickers	Cllr L Paterson
Members attending:	also Cllr Boyle (item 8 only)	
	Cllr Adams (item 8 only)	
Officers in Attendance:	Assistant Director for Planning (ADP) Development Manager (DM) Legal Advisor (items1-9) Senior Planning Officer(s) (SPO) Planning Officer (PO) Democratic Services Officers	

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 Heinrich, Cllr J Toye, Cllr K Toye and Cllr Varley

3 SUBSTITUTES

There were no substitutes.

4 MINUTES

Subject to one amendment, on page 2 the reference to "Housing England" to be corrected to "Homes England", the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 24th July 2025 were approved as a correct record.

5 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

One item of urgent business was submitted, being a report on Authorisations from Committee and will be considered within item 12.

7 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Holliday noted that in respect of items 10 and 11 she would be abstaining.

Cllr Fisher declared that in respect of item 10 he knew the owner of a neighbouring property and would therefore be abstaining.

Cllr Fitch-Tillett declared that she had previously received hospitality from the applicant in respect of item 8 but was not pre-determined and would vote.

8 CROMER - PF/24/2341 - ERECTION OF 5 COMMERCIAL UNITS FOR USES WITHIN USE CLASSES E(G)(III) - INDUSTRIAL PROCESS SUITABLE FOR RESIDENTIAL AREA AND B8 - STORAGE OR DISTRIBUTION AT HOME FARM ENTERPRISE ZONE, HALL ROAD, CROMER, NORFOLK

The ADP presented the report and took the Committee through the history of this application and provided an update on matters since it was last before the Committee. He confirmed that issues relating to use class had been resolved and the only outstanding issue remained the objection by Norfolk County Council Highways. He provided the Committee with site plans, photographs, elevations and landscaping plans. He confirmed that Highways had objected but had provided suggested conditions that could be imposed if the Committee was minded to approve the application. These related to the shape and size of the access and visibility splays. The recommendation was refusal on the grounds of the Highways objection.

Public Speakers

Colin Robb -Cromer Town Council

Local Members

Cllr Boyle spoke in favour of the application. She noted the need for local business in the local area, the need for farms and estates to diversify and her belief that the economic benefits outweighed other policy concerns. She noted that in connection with highways matters the road in the area had recently been reduced to a 30mph zone and believed that the site access could be improved in a limited way to improve safety.

Cllr Adams also spoke in support of the application. He noted that the Committee had not previously raised issues regarding Highways concern and given the site's history as a coach depot, he did not believe the suggested use raised any safety concerns. He believed that the 30mph limit was important to ensure road safety. He urged the Committee to approve the application and impose conditions sparingly.

Members Debate

- a. Cllr Vickers and Cllr Hankins expressed support for the application, citing the economic benefits, farm diversification, the previous use of the site as a coach park and the ability to condition changes to the access as important factors. The ADP clarified the employment benefits detailed in the application following a question from Cllr Holliday, informing the Committee that 41 jobs may be secured or a further 11 jobs created.
- b. The DM confirmed, following a question from Cllr Brown, that policy EC3 did not apply as the policy applied to the expansion of individual existing businesses
- c. Cllr Paterson expressed a view that the local roads were sufficient, and Cllr Brown, Cllr Fisher and Cllr Holliday asked for details of appropriate conditions

that could be imposed to address the Highways concern. The ADP confirmed that should the Committee be minded to grant approval, he would recommend inclusions of conditions relating to use, Ecology, BNG, trees, delivery of land, drainage, materials uses, external lighting and boundary treatment. In respect of the highways issues further discussions with highways could be undertaken to agree conditions to improve the situation without the need to remove considerable trees and vegetation. The ADP also noted that this application was subject to a further consultation which would expire on the 9th September, therefore if the Committee approved the application it would be subject to further consideration of any new objections received.

The Chairman proposed and seconded the recommendation for refusal

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

Cllr Paterson proposed that the application be approved, with the range of conditions outlined by the ADP and specifically such conditions as to reasonably address the Highways concerns whilst limiting vegetation loss.

It **WAS RESOLVED** Unanimously to approve the application subject to the conditions referenced by the ADP and subject to any new objections raised during the ongoing consultation.

9 BODHAM - PF/24/2705 - DEMOLITION OF WORKSHOP BUILDING AND ERECTION OF BUILDING FOR USE AS A LIVE/WORK UNIT, RECLADDING OF RETAINED STORAGE BUILDING, DEMOLITION OF OTHER STORAGE BUILDINGS AND ERECTION OF CART SHED AT OLD SCARFE BROTHERS WORKSHOP, CHURCH ROAD, LOWER BODHAM

PO-IM presented the report and detailed the changes made since the matter was last before the Committee. She provided the Committee with photos, site plans and proposed elevations. She detailed the main issued being compliance with core strategies and the design of the building. The recommendation was refusal.

Public Speakers

Alice Kemp- Applicant

The ADP brought to the attention of the Committee the support previously expressed to the Committee in connection with this application by both the ward member and the parish council given that both had indicated they wish to speak but were not present.

Member Debate

- a. Cllr Paterson supported the changes made to the application and Cllr Fitch-Tillett welcomed the live/work element.
- b. Cllr Vickers, Cllr Fitch-Tillett and Cllr Fisher noted the previous use of the site as a haulage depot.
- c. The DM clarified certain changes to the design following a question from Cllr Holliday, including that the height of the ridge had been reduced by 1.6m. The ADP reminded the Committee that at their last meeting the 2 issues had been

Cllr Holliday spoke against approval. She referred to both policy EN4 and the Blakeney Neighbourhood plan and believed the proposal to be in contravention of both. She referred to the proximity to the neighbouring property, the impact to its light and the neighbour's right to light as well as the need to understand the daylight testing results further. She urged the Committee to reject the application requiring the applicant to redesign and reposition the property on the site.

Members Debate

- a. The DM provided guidance, following a question from the Chair, that given that the Blakeney Neighbourhood Plan was published after the Core Strategy it was the Neighbourhood Plan that had precedence where there was conflict between it and the adopted Core Strategy.
- b. Cllr Hankins and Cllr Brown raised issues surrounding the right to light and the shadow analysis that had been undertaken.
- c. Cllr Paterson and Cllr Fitch-Tillett noted that the applicant could install a 2m fence without planning permission and noted the impact of such a fence on the shading to the neighbouring property, Cllr Fitch-Tillet expressed concern at the loss of privacy to neighbouring property.
- d. Cllr Brown commented on the differences in levels and heights of the proposed property and that of the neighbour and expressed concern over the lack of distance to that property as well as the impact of the fence or an alternative hedge.

Cllr Paterson proposed and Cllr Hankins seconded the recommendation.

It **WAS RESOLVED** by 5 votes in favour, 3 against with 2 abstentions that the Application be approved subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions including those summarised below (plus any amendments to these or other conditions considered to be necessary by the Assistant Director of Planning).

1. In accordance with approved plans
2. External Materials
3. Hard and Soft Landscaping
4. Boundary Treatments – small mammal gaps
5. External Lighting
6. VLT Glazing
7. Air Source Heat Pump details
8. Vehicle Parking
9. Cycle Parking
10. Bin Storage
11. Obscure Glazing
12. Removal of Permitted Development Rights (Class B and C of Part 1 of Schedule 2)

11 BLAKENEY - PF/25/0522 - DEMOLITION OF TWO-STOREY DWELLING AND ERECTION OF REPLACEMENT TWO-STOREY DWELLING (PART-RETROSPECTIVE) AT 8 LANGHAM ROAD, BLAKENEY, HOLT, NORFOLK, NR25 7PG

SPO-OL presented the report to the Committee. She provided a site history, site location, photographs of the site and the proposals. The main issues related to the design and impact on residential amenity The Recommendation was for approval.

Public Speakers

Rosemary Thew- Blakeney Parish Council

Edward Hackford-objecting

Local Member.

Cllr Holliday spoke against approval of the application. She referred to policy EN4 as well as the Blakeney Plan, believing that the application failed to comply with either. She raised concern about the design, the height of the building and the proximity to other properties. She brought to the attention of the Committee that she believed the proposals greatly reduced the light to the neighbouring property and was concerned over the flood lights and air source heat pump.

Members Debate

Cllr Fisher proposed and Cllr Brown seconded that the matter be deferred to allow members to attend a site visit.

It **WAS RESOLVED** by 9 votes in favour and 1 abstention, to defer the matter to allow the members to attend a site visit.

12 DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE PROCESS REPORT

The ADP presented the report and explained to the Committee that this was an annual review of the Call-in form and process. He noted that he believed that the process was working well and that has helped with transparency.

Cllr Brown noted that given the proposed national reforms to the planning process, adding a footnote to the form stating it was subject to any national reforms might be sensible.

It **WAS RESOLVED** unanimously to accept the report with the amendment suggested by Cllr Brown.

The ADP presented the urgent item of business, being the authorisations from Committee to the Assistant Director for Planning. He noted that the post of Assistant Director for Planning may be vacant for a period to enable recruitment of his replacement and therefore it was necessary to ensure that the actions delegated by the Committee to the person in that role could be exercised by other officers, namely the Director for Service Delivery or others authorised by him in writing.

It **WAS RESOLVED** unanimously to accept the recommendation.

13 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE

The DM presented the report to the Committee for noting.

14 APPEALS SECTION

The DM presented the report to the Committee, bringing to their attention one appeal decision in Sheringham relating to change of use.

The meeting ended at 12.15 pm

Chairman