

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Development Committee held on Thursday, 11 December 2025 in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 9.30 am

Committee Members Present:	Cllr P Heinrich (Chairman)	Cllr R Macdonald (Vice-Chairman)
	Cllr M Batey	Cllr A Brown
	Cllr P Fisher	Cllr A Fitch-Tillett
	Cllr M Hankins	Cllr V Holliday
	Cllr P Neatherway	Cllr L Paterson
	Cllr J Toye	Cllr K Toye
	Cllr L Vickers	

Substitute Members:

Officers in Attendance:	Democratic Services & Governance Officer, Development Management and Major Projects Manager, Lawyer and Claire Shopland Committees
	Senior Planning Officer (SPO – JB)
	Senior Planning Officer (SPO – JS)
	Senior Planning Officer (SPO – MB)

78 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr A Varley.

79 SUBSTITUTES

Cllr T Adams was present as a substitute for Cllr A Varley.

80 MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Committee meeting held Thursday 16th October 2025 were approved as a correct record subject to typographical corrections on p.3 with the spelling of Cllr A Fitch Tillett's and Cllr L Paterson's names.

81 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

82 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr A Brown declared a non-pecuniary interest with respect to planning application PF.24.2057 (Brinton). He stated that he was pre-determined and so would abstain from voting on the application.

Cllr A Fitch Tillett declared a non-pecuniary interest with respect to planning application RV.25.2056 (Happisburgh). As former portfolio holder for the Coast she was a staunch advocate for the scheme and as such considered herself to be pre-determined and would abstain from voting.

Cllr T Adams declared a non-pecuniary interest with respect to planning application PF.25.0961 (Hempton). He stated that he was pre-determined and so would abstain from voting on the application.

83 **HAPPISBURGH - RV/25/2056 - ACCESS TRACK TO LIGHTHOUSE LANE TO SERVE EXISTING PUBLIC CAR PARK AND NEW CAR PARK TO ALLOW FOR ROLLCBACK OF EXISTING CAR PARK; ANCILLARY WORKS, WITHOUT COMPLYING WITH CONDITIONS 2 (APPROVED PLANS), 3 (LANDSCAPING), 14 (ACCESS TRACK FROM LIGHTHOUSE LANE), 15 (GATES/BOLLARD/CHAIN/OTHER MEANS OF OBSTRUCTION) AND 21 (OFF-SITE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS) OF PLANNING PERMISSION PF/22/2510 TO ALLOW NEW ACCESS POSITION OFF LIGHTHOUSE LANE TO ALIGN WITH OPPOSITE NEIGHBOURS GARAGE AND PREVENT CAR HEADLIGHTS SHINING INTO THE DWELLING FROM THE SITE EGRESS CARRIAGEWAY.**

Officers Report

The Case Officer (SPO-JB) introduced the officers report and provided details regarding the site's location, aerial views, photographs in and around the site, and technical drawings of the proposed variations.

It was noted that the proposed EV charging provision fell short of the requirements under the emerging Local Plan (CT6), which should be afforded significant weight due to its advanced stage. Officers considered the fall-back provision of no EV charging and concluded this was a significant material consideration which justified departure from the emerging plan.

An issue regarding land ownership had been identified, and a new 21-day consultation notice period had been issued.

Public Speakers

None.

Local Member

The Local Member, Cllr L Paterson, expressed his support for the scheme and endorsed improvements to signage and passing places.

Committee Debate

- a. In response to Cllr A Brown, the Development Manager advised that he was unaware of any financial implications.
- b. Cllr P Fisher proposed, and Cllr L Paterson seconded, acceptance of the officer's recommendation.

IT WAS RESOLVED

That Application RV/25/2056 be **APPROVED** subject to the expiration of the revised land ownership certificate notice period (December 30th) expiring without raising any new material planning considerations, as well as conditions listed below:

Imposition of conditions as per the previous approval (minus the time limit condition) together with two new conditions added to control / deliver the following:

- The use of land within the blue line for visibility splays for traffic leaving the site.
- The submission and approval of electric vehicle charging scheme.

Final wording of conditions to be delegated to the Assistant Director – Planning

84

BRINTON - PF/24/2057 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND ERECTION OF REPLACEMENT DWELLING WITH GARAGE AT HOMESTEAD, SHARRINGTON ROAD, BRINTON, MELTON CONSTABLE, NORFOLK, NR24 2QG.

Case Officer

The Case Officer (SPO-JS) introduced the officer report and recommendation for approval subject to conditions. She provided details of the site's location, existing and proposed site plan and elevations, technical drawings of the approved 2014 application (which had lapsed), images in and around the site showing the dilapidated existing dwelling, and images of the dwelling in 2009.

Public Speakers

Sarah Hayden – Brinton and Sharrington Parish Council
 Keith Parks – Objecting
 Anthony Hudson – Supporting

Local Member

The Local Member, Cllr A Brown, objected to the application. He expressed his concern that the site would be prone to flooding, which would be further exacerbated by surface water runoff, as well as through the loss of trees. He supplied images of the road servicing the property, noting it was prone to flooding. The Local Member stated that a more detailed flood analysis was required.

Cllr A Brown considered the application contrary to policies EN4, EN2 and HO 8 of the Core Strategy, and argued that the design, scale and mass of the proposed dwelling was disproportionately large for the setting within two designated conservation areas. The Local Member was critical of the calculation used to determine floor space, noting that it failed to account for the proposed 1st floor.

Committee Debate

- a. The Chairman sought clarity how much weight should be afforded the 2014 application, and whether flooding was a material consideration. The Case Officer and Development Manager confirmed the approved 2014 application was a material consideration, noting it had been approved under the existing core strategy. The Development Manager stated that flooding was also a material consideration and noted that if the proposal was for a new build dwelling in the countryside, as opposed a replacement dwelling, it would be assessed differently under policy.
- b. With respect to matters of flooding, Cllr T Adams, Cllr J Toye, and Cllr V Holliday expressed concern that the application may exacerbate issues. Cllr T Adams asked what consideration had been given to foul drainage matters and sought clarity if the Local Flood Authority (LFA) had been consulted on

the application.

- c. The Case Officer advised that the existing septic tank would be replaced with an acceptable Package Treatment Plant. The SPO-JS confirmed that although the LFA had not been formally consulted, as the proposal fell below the relevant thresholds for requiring a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment, she was mindful residents' comments and so sought guidance from the LFA who informally advised that the site lay in Flood Zone 1, and was therefore not at risk of fluvial flooding, and that they had no record of flooding to the dwelling. This was supported by NNDC's own records.
- d. The Chairman and Cllr Fitch-Tillett noted the images provided to the Committee by Cllr A Brown and considered that it was difficult to conclude if the flooding was as a result of water running from the site. Cllr Fitch-Tillett was content that matters pertaining to flooding could be appropriately addressed by condition.
- e. Cllr T Adams and Cllr V Holliday asked how the loss of trees may be mitigated. The Case Officer affirmed the Landscape Officer was content with the application and that the application was supported by a Landscape Management Plan. Cllr L Vickers disagreed with inferences that the Landscape Officer was critical of the scheme, as she felt their comments had been favourable.
- f. Cllr V Holliday endorsed concerns raised by Cllr A Brown with respect to NNDC Core Strategy Policies EN4 and HO8 and affirmed that consideration should be given to light pollution and the use of reduced VLT glazing. The Development Manager advised that Officers were satisfied that the proposed application complied with policy HO 8.
- g. Cllr A Brown stated that although the proposed dwelling maybe sit below Brook House, it was markedly larger than the existing dwelling. The Development Manager suggested, following discussion with the Principal Lawyer, that a condition be applied with respect to ground levels, ensuring the proposed dwelling continued to sit below neighbouring Brook House.
- h. Cllr L Paterson proposed, and Cllr M Hankins seconded, acceptance of the officer's recommendation with the suggested ground level condition included. Cllr L Paterson considered the 2014 approval granted under the existing core strategy, to be a key consideration which should be afforded significant weight.

IT WAS RESOLVED

That Planning Application PF/24/2057 be APPROVED subject to conditions outlined in the officer's report, as well as a condition pertaining to Ground Levels.

Final wording of conditions and any other considered necessary to be delegated to the Assistant Director – Planning

Case Officer

The Case Officer (SPO-MB) introduced the officers report and recommendation for refusal. He provided details of the site's location plan, aerial views, proposed block plan and landscaping, an artist's impression of the street scene, images in and around the site, dimensions of the containers, and made references to an alternate site located with Fakenham – application PF/21/0065.

Public Speakers

Charles Judson – supporting

Local Member

A written statement from the Local Member, Cllr N Housden in support of the application was relayed to the Committee. The Local Member placed significant weight on the economic benefits of the proposal, and the need for farm diversification. He considered the site acceptable as it would pragmatically take vehicle movements away from the Town Centre and would have a reduced highway and environmental impact.

Committee Debate

- a. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett expressed her surprise and concern to have received an email from the leader of the Council, Cllr T Adams, lobbying Members to support the application. Cllr T Adams stated he was within his rights to write to Members and expressed his support for the application, as the Raynham Estate Plan was of strategic consideration to the district.
- b. The Principal Lawyer confirmed Officers were aware of the correspondence and provided guidance to the Committee on the matter. The Principal Lawyer advised that Members of the Council could be lobbied by fellow Members. The Leader, Cllr T Adams, would not be voting on the application (and had earlier advised he would abstain from voting). She instructed the Committee to maintain an open mind when considering the application, and not to place undue weight on the representation made by the Leader, just because he is the Leader.
- c. Cllr A Brown recognised the economic benefits the proposal would bring if granted and sought assurances that the business would remain part of the Raynham Estate and not sold separately.
- d. Cllr T Adams noted the significant scale of the adjacent business which was already well serviced by HGV vehicles. He argued the proposal would result in employment generation, which he argued would benefit both the local economy and the district as a whole. He noted there were no statutory consultee objections to the proposal, and he considered that it complied with policies relating to farm diversification under the emerging Local Plan.
- e. The Chairman reminded the Committee that they must consider the planning application as presented and not broader matters.
- f. The Development Manager advised that the Planning Service had not been in receipt of the level of detail which Officers considered would justify a departure from policy, including financial information and details regarding

farm diversification. This information had been requested but not received.

- g. Cllr L Paterson proposed, and Cllr P Fisher seconded, deferral of the application due to a lack of information regarding farm diversification, and how the application would support the estate. Cllr V Holliday added that she would like to see greater detail on the wider economic benefits to the district, specifically employment, when the proposal is next presented to committee.
- h. Cllr R Macdonald expressed his concern regarding the location of the site in relation to the adjacent poultry farm and the impact of Avian Flu issues.

IT WAS RESOLVED

That Planning Application PF/25/0961 be DEFERRED.

86 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE

The report was noted.

87 APPEALS SECTION

The report was noted.

88 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

The meeting ended at 10.58 am.

Chairman