

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Development Committee held on Thursday, 18 September 2025 in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 9.30 am

Committee Members Present:	Cllr P Heinrich (Chairman)	Cllr A Brown
	Cllr P Fisher	Cllr M Hankins
	Cllr V Holliday	Cllr P Neatherway
	Cllr K Toye	Cllr L Vickers
	Cllr L Paterson	Cllr C Ringer
	Cllr W Fredericks	Cllr J Boyle

Officers in Attendance:	Development Manager (DM)
	Legal Advisor (LA)
	Senior Landscape Officer (SLO)
	Development Management Team Leader (DMTL)
	Trainee Planning Officer (TPO)

55 CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTIONS

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

56 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies had been received from Cllr Batey, Cllr Fitch-Tillet, Cllr MacDonald, Cllr J Toye and Cllr Varley.

57 SUBSTITUTES

Substitutes were noted as Cllr Fredericks, Cllr Ringer and Cllr Boyle.

58 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 21st August 2025 were approved as a correct record.

59 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

60 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Holliday noted that in respect of item 8 she would be abstaining.

61 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

DMTL-CR presented the report to the Committee. He summarised the background and provided site plans, elevations, photographs including from inside the neighbouring property and explained the main issues. He detailed the changes to the parking arrangements since the site visit, and provided details relating to the air conditioning units and the lighting. He informed the Committee that issues relating to the boundary wall were not part of the planning application under consideration. The recommendation was for approval.

Public Speakers

Rosemary Thew -Blakeney Parish Council
Statement of Objection read from Ms Rosser and Mr Smith

Local Member

Cllr Holliday spoke against approval of the application. She referenced non-compliance with the Blakeney Neighbourhood plan, the impact on the amenity of the area, the streetscape and the practicalities of the parking arrangements as reasons for the application to be refused. She also noted the impact on light to the neighbouring property and expressed concern relating to both the air-conditioning units and the lights.

Members Debate

- a. Cllrs Hankins and Cllr Patterson asked questions relating to the boundary wall and the DM-TL explained that if the wall was under 2m it wouldn't need consent and if it was over that height the applicant would need to make a separate planning application.
- b. Cllr Patterson, Cllr Toye and Cllr Ringer expressed concern over the practicality of the parking arrangements. Whilst Cllr Vickers noted that there had been a previous property on the site with parking.
- c. The DM-TL provided the committee with information on the ridge and eaves height based on the plans.
- d. Cllr Brown noted the Blakeney Neighbourhood plan and the weight that it should be given in the Committee's consideration. The DM brought policies 6 and 9 of the Neighbourhood plan to the attention of the Committee and explained that as it was adopted after the core strategy, the Neighbourhood plan took precedence. He also reminded the Committee of the emerging plan and the significant weight they should give to this. He brought their attention to ENV6 and ENV8. He also explained to the Committee that they should assess the application as if the building had not been built.
- e. The Chair asked for clarification about the lighting and whether if the application was approved the lighting could be conditioned- the DM-TL confirmed that was the case.
- f. The Legal Adviser advised the Committee that issues relating to reduction in light to the neighbouring property was a civil matter, although planning authorities can consider the impact of a development on a neighbour's overall amenity. She also advised that any concern over cctv (overlooking the neighbouring property) was an issue that could be dealt with by the neighbour making a complaint to the Information Commissioner rather than the Committee.

The Chair proposed and seconded the recommendation for approval.

IT WAS RESOLVED by 2 votes for, 9 votes against, with 1 abstention to reject the recommendation.

- g. Cllr Brown proposed rejection of the application citing the reason being that insufficient consideration had been given to the Blakeney Neighbourhood plan. The DM advised that policy 7 of that plan referred to the scale needing to be appropriate to the area and that, together with Core Policy EN4, and giving weight to emerging policies ENV 6 (amenity) and ENV8 (high quality design), appeared to address the issues raised by the Committee. Cllr Brown confirmed agreement and noted it was unfortunate that the applicant hadn't appeared before the Committee.
- h. Cllr Holliday referred to policy 9 of the Neighbourhood plan, the DM advised that policy 7 appeared more relevant although this policy may be cross-referenced. Members confirmed, on a question from the DM, that the amenity/noise impact of the air-conditioning units and the height of the apex roof were additional factors in their consideration.

It was proposed by Cllr Brown and seconded by Cllr Fisher that the application be refused.

IT WAS RESOLVED by 9 votes for, 2 against and 1 abstention to refuse the application.

62 NNDC TPO (BRISTON) 2025 NO.12 BRISTON - TPO 25 1075 - LAND AT THREE OAKS, NORWICH ROAD, BRISTON, MELTON CONSTABLE, NORFOLK NR24 2HT

SLO-IM presented the report to the Committee, providing site information and history, aerial and other photographs and details of the issues. The recommendation was that the Tree Preservation Order be confirmed.

Member Debate

- a. The SLO confirmed, following a question from Cllr Vickers, that the owner of the property had not objected to the order.

Cllr Patterson proposed and Cllr Hankins seconded the recommendation that the order be confirmed.

IT WAS RESOLVED unanimously to confirm the Order.

63 NNDC TPO (FAKENHAM) 2025 NO.16 FAKENHAM - TPO 25 1079 - LAND AT 1 FERNBANK COTTAGES, CHURCH LANES, FAKENHAM

SLO-IM presented the report to the Committee. The Committee was provided with the background, site map, photographs of the area, historic maps, photographs of the issues caused by the tree and photographs of the proximity of the tree to properties. The recommendation was for the Tree Preservation Order to be confirmed.

Members Debate

- a. Cllr Vickers, as local member, expressed sympathy with the property owner noting the proximity of the tree to the house. The SLO confirmed that pruning work had been approved and that the tree was well seated and there was no reason to suggest the tree would not have a long, safe, and useful life.
- b. Cllr Brown noted that the tree had been there a long time and the SLO confirmed that a previous owner of the property had made a previous application. The SLO provided the Committee with information regarding the Council's liability for decisions (within 1 year).

Cllr Ringer proposed and Cllr Boyle seconded that recommendation that the order be confirmed.

IT **WAS RESOLVED** by 11 votes for and 1 abstention to confirm the Order.

64 WOOD NORTON - PF/25/1192 - INSTALLATION OF 36 GROUND MOUNTED SOLAR PANELS. THE PANELS WILL BE MOUNTED ON A FRAME SYSTEM AND MAX HEIGHT OF 1.5M. THEY ARE TO BE MOUNTED ALONGSIDE THE WESTERN BOUNDARY OF OUR CURTILAGE 2M AWAY FROM THE BOUNDARY AT FIELD BARN COTTAGE, WINGS LANE, WOOD NORTON, DEREHAM, NORFOLK, NR20 5DH

TPO-HG presented the report to the Committee, providing a site plan, aerial and other photographs and elevations. The recommendation was for approval.

Members Debate

- a. Cllr Hankins stated that as local member neither he, or the local Parish Council had any objection, and he believed that the site and the solar panels were not obtrusive.

Cllr Patterson proposed and Cllr Ringer seconded the recommendation for approval.

IT **WAS RESOLVED** unanimously to approve the application subject to conditions including a 3 year time limit for commencement, development in accordance with approved plans, removal of equipment when no longer required and a BNG implementation condition. The wording of conditions and any others considered to be necessary, to be delegated to the Assistant Director for Planning.

65 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE

The DM presented the report to the Committee for noting.

66 APPEALS SECTION

The DM presented the report to the Committee, noting that there continued to be significant delays with the Planning Inspectorate deciding appeals.

The meeting ended at 11.01 am.

Chairman