

## DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Development Committee held on Thursday, 19 February 2026 in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 9.30 am

<b>Committee Members Present:</b>	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 K Toye	Cllr L Vickers

**Members attending:** also Cllr C Rouse  
Cllr P Porter  
Cllr S Butikofer

**Officers in Attendance:** Development Manager (DM)  
Principal Lawyer (PL)  
Head of Planning  
Development Management Team Leader – PR (DMTL-PR)  
Development Management Team Leader – CR (DMTL – CR)  
Trainee Planning Officer – HG (TPO – HG)  
Trainee Planning Officer – NW (TPO-NW)  
Democratic Services Officer – Regulatory Committees

### 89 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr J Toye.

### 90 SUBSTITUTES

None.

### 91 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Development Committee meeting held Thursday 11<sup>th</sup> December 2025 were approved as a correct record.

### 92 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

### 93 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr M Batey declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda Items 8 and 10. He stated he was pre-determined, so would abstain from voting.

Cllr A Brown declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 10, and stated he was pre-determined, so would abstain from voting.

Cllr V Holliday declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 9, and stated that she was pre-determined, so would abstain from voting.

**94 HOLT - PF/24/2530 - ERECTION OF 23 DWELLINGS (INCLUDING 7 NO. AFFORDABLE DWELLINGS) WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING, LANDSCAPING AND CREATION OF PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AT LAND NORTH OF VALLEY LANE, HOLT, NORFOLK**

Officers Report

The DMTL-PR introduced the Officers report and recommendation for approval subject to revised conditions detailed in the Officers presentation.

He outlined the site's location, proposed site plan including open space to the western boundary, indicative views photos in and around the site, and details of the mix of housing proposed. Officers considered the design to be of a very high standard, and appropriate for the setting. The Strategic Housing Team had been consulted on the application and were content that the proposal would meet affordable housing needs.

The DMTL-PR noted the relationship with the Stables building, adjacent to the site, and provided images of shadowing projections. Officers were satisfied that the proposal was acceptable in this regard.

The DMTL-PR addressed the key issues and confirmed that this was an allocated site within the adopted Local Plan (H17). Whilst there was a shortfall in the number of proposed dwellings proposed when compared to the Local Plan, it was acknowledged that there were significant constraints with respect to Habitat creation and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) which must be addressed.

Whilst the site was designated a nature recovery site, this was a recent change, and the Local Plan was well advanced when this status was granted. Officers were content that the Planning Inspector would have given due regard in his considerations. The proposed mitigation was considered by Officers to be substantial and appropriate.

Public Speakers

Maggie Prior – Holt Town Council  
John Wells – Objecting  
Steve Barrett – Objecting  
Iona Chamberlin – Objecting  
Val Bowers – Objecting  
Jamieson Bird Supporting

Local Members

Cllr M Batey abstained from commenting.

Cllr C Rouse stated his opposition to the proposed development and argued that the application failed to comply with policies CC9 and CC10. He considered that Local Plan site H17 was inappropriate for development, providing an ideal ecological buffer between the town and Spouts Hill, and argued that other sites were more appropriate for development. He shared in objecting speakers concerns that existing

highways issues would be exacerbated, and that the proposal would result in a loss of privacy and overlooking of neighbours. He urged the Committee to listen to residents' views and refuse the officers recommendation.

### Committee Debate

- a. The DM addressed comments raised by objectors and stated that as this was a designated site within the Local Plan, as such, this consideration should be afforded significant weight. The key test in approving the application was whether it complied with the development plan. The Nature recovery strategy was designated in November 2025, prior to Local Plan adoption, but after the Inspector had provided his decision letter. The Chairman reflected that the site had been through considerable consultation as part of the Local Plan and was supported by the Planning Inspector. Residential development on this site was therefore acceptable in principle.
- b. Cllr V Holliday proposed deferment to enable a site visit, seconded by Cllr P Neatherway.

### **THE MOTION FOR A SITE VISIT was lost**

- c. With respect to environmental matters, The DMTL-PR advised that the Heads of Terms for the S106 agreement set out onsite and off-site mitigation. This was a significant and detailed consideration. Cllr A Brown asked about details of how surface water run off would be controlled during the construction phase, and what provision there would be for protected species on site including hedgehog highways. The DMT-PR confirmed a flood risk assessment had been submitted by the developer, supported by the LLFA. Hedgehogs would be accommodated through the proposed wildlife corridor.
- d. Cllr M Hankins reflected this was a sensitive development in a rural area and commended the developer and officers for their efforts. He was disappointed with the lack of pedestrian footpath provision and queried the Highways Authority's comments. The DM confirmed a balanced justification had been provided by the developer as to why there was no public access from the site to Spouts Hill. The steep geography of the site would not be DDA compliant therefore alternate accessible provision to Spouts Hill would be provided elsewhere. The DM reiterated the Highways Authority made no objection to the development, and that their conditions were captured in the full list.
- e. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett considered the application to be a very attractive proposal and congratulated the developer. Cllr P Fisher agreed that this was one of the best-looking proposals he had seen since sitting on Committee. He reflected that as this was an allocated site, with no statutory objections, if the application were refused, something much worse would likely come in its place.
- f. Cllr L Paterson proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett seconded.

### **RESOLVED**

**That Planning application PF/24/2530 be APPROVED subject to**

**1. Securing of S106 Obligations as set out at Section 6 of the report "developer**

contributions” (including Affordable housing, financial contributions) and Section 5 of the report for on & off-site Biodiversity Net Gain (inclusive of monitoring contributions) and translocation land.

&

2.Imposition of conditions including any considered necessary by the Assistant Director - Planning including matters relating to:

- Time Limit for implementation
- In accordance with approved plans
- Materials
- Landscaping details, implementation and management
- Mitigation and enhancement as set out in Ecological Assessment
- Construction Management Plan (CEMP)
- Highway access
- Provision of parking and retention
- Implementation and retention of refuse and recycling
- Drainage strategy and mitigations
- Permitted Development Right restrictions
- BNG Delivery (LEMP)

*The meeting was adjourned at 10.45am till 11.01am*

*Cllr L Paterson left the meeting*

95 **CLEY-NEXT-THE-SEA - PF/25/1571 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING NON-TRADITIONAL CONSTRUCTION DWELLING AND CONSTRUCTION OF REPLACEMENT DWELLING WITH ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING AND WIDENING OF ACCESS (SELF-BUILD) AT THORNHILL FARM, BRIDGEFOOT LANE, CLEY-NEXT-THE-SEA, HOLT, NORFOLK NR25 7BB**

#### Officers report

The DMTL-PR introduced the Officers report and recommendation for approval.

He outlined the site's location plan, topography, proposed and existing elevations, and provided images in and around the site, noting the existing indigenous planting and mature trees. It was highlighted that the existing dwelling was of a modest timber clad construction with a pitch cable roof. The proposed development would be for a modern, contemporary, design with green roof.

The DMTL-PR outlined the key issues for consideration. It was noted that the site lay within the designated countryside and within the national landscape. Whilst the proposal was for a larger dwelling than existing, officers considered the proposal complied with policy HOU 6 in that it would not have a material increased impact on the surrounding area.

The proposal would introduce energy efficiencies through the installation of air source heat pump, EV charging, solar and special water provisions.

#### Public Speakers

Richard Allen – Cley Parish Council  
Sasha Edmonds – Supporting

### Local Member

Cllr V Holiday objected to the proposal which she considered to be an extensive new build on a site with an existing dwelling. The Local Member disagreed with the officer's assessment of policy HOU 6 and argued that the proposal would have a significant material impact on the appearance of the surrounding area with the proposed dwelling being twice as large as the existing dwelling and nought 0.8 metres higher. Further she argued that the proposal failed to comply with policy ENV 2. Whilst the timber cladding was welcomed this was located on the least prominent elevation. Cllr V Holiday considered the natural screening on the north and North West boundary was particularly at issue, and noted this was where there was an extensive amount of glazing introduced. The Local Member considered the application failed to comply with dark skies policies.

### Committee Debate

- a. Cllr P Fisher considered the site to be in a remote location, with no immediate neighbours, and that appropriate provisions had been made through the use of reduced transmission VLT glazing.
- b. Cllr A Brown noted the fallback position and welcomed the energy efficiencies proposed. He noted the site was within a sensitive location in the Glaven Valley Rural Conservation Area, and shared in concerns regarding light spill, agreeing that the council should look to introduce a stronger dark skies policy. The DMTL-PR advised that the existing dwelling could introduce new glazing with planning permission, and new external lighting without the need for permission. Whilst the proposal would result in an increase in the total amount of glazing, this would be controlled, as would the use of external lighting, which Officers welcomed.
- c. Cllr R MacDonald proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation, seconded by Cllr K Toye.

### **RESOLVED**

**That Planning Application PF/25/1571 be APPROVED subject to conditions covering the following matters and any others deemed necessary by the Head of Planning:**

- **Time limit**
- **Development in accordance with approved plans**
- **Materials (inc flint sample panel)**
- **Accordance with ecological mitigation and enhancement measures**
- **Hard and soft Landscaping details**
- **Implementation of landscape proposals**
- **Accordance with Arboricultural Method Statement**
- **Replacement of tree failures (10 years)**
- **External Lighting**
- **Specification for glass of a VLT value less than .65**
- **Removal of Permitted Development rights**

- Access in accordance with NCC specifications
- Visibility splays
- Levels
- Water efficiency
- EV parking

96 HOLT - PF/25/2133 (APPLICATION 1) - REPLACEMENT WINDOWS (RETROSPECTIVE) AT 2 THE BEECHES, STATION ROAD, HOLT, NORFOLK, NR25 6AU & HOLT - LA/25/2134 (APPLICATION 2) - REPLACEMENT WINDOWS (RETROSPECTIVE) AT 2 THE BEECHES, STATION ROAD, HOLT, NORFOLK, NR25 6AU

#### Officers report

The TPO-HG introduced the officers report and recommendation for refusal.

He outlined the sites' location plan and photos of the windows before and after alteration.

#### Public Speakers

Maggie Prior – Holt Town Council  
Gina Ward – Supporting

#### Local Member

Cllr M Batey abstained from commenting.

#### Committee Debate

- The DM confirmed that he had brought the applications to Committee as Development Officer. The applications would set a precedent and have implications across the district. The matter came to the attention of the enforcement team following the submission of a complaint. The DM stated that it was to the applicant's credit that she did submit a planning application on being made aware that permission was required.
- The Committee expressed its sympathies with the applicant. Cllr L Vickers noted that the applicant was entirely innocent, but that use of UVPC windows on a listed building was inappropriate.
- Cllr A Brown appreciated that this was a difficult situation and thanked Mrs Ward for her attendance. He expressed his concern that she had been misinformed when sold the property and that the appropriate organisations failed to do their due diligence. He wondered whether a compromised situation may be achievable, for example a different approach be taken to the front elevation facing Station Road and encouraged the applicant to recover costs with her solicitors. Cllr L Vickers also queried if a compromise could be reached.
- Cllr K Toye and Cllr P Fisher agreed that the situation was unfortunate and unfair, but that it was difficult for the Committee to approve the application on planning grounds especially in the knowledge it would set a precedent.

- e. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett sympathised with the applicant, having found herself in a similar situation, and urged the applicant to pursue the matter with her solicitors. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett affirmed that as a planning authority the Committee must consider the application on planning grounds, noting that weight must be given to the listed building status.
- f. The DM advised that this was a civil matter which should not inform the planning process. The officers report provided a balanced analysis, arguing that the heritage harm outweighed the environmental benefits. Whilst each application is considered on its merits, it is reasonable for neighbours to expect a similar decision, therefore the outcome of this application would have a direct impact.
- g. Cllr A Fitch-Tillet proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation, seconded by Cllr P Fisher with respect to PF/25/2133.
- h. The Chairman confirmed that a sperate vote would be held for each application.

## **RESOLVED**

### **That Application PF/25/2133 be REFUSED**

- i. Cllr A Fitch-Tillet proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation, seconded by Cllr P Fisher with respect to LA/25/2134

## **RESOLVED**

### **That Application LA/25/2134 be REFUSED**

- 97 THURSFORD - PF/25/2102 - CHANGE OF USE FROM AGRICULTURAL LAND TO A DOG WALKING FIELD WITH ASSOCIATED SECURE CAR PARKING, SHED FOR USE BY DOG WALKERS, ASSOCIATED VEHICULAR ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS TO SERVE DOG WALKING FIELD AND A CAR PARK FOR THURSFORD CEMETERY AS USERS CURRENTLY HAVE TO PARK ON THE HIGHWAY AT LAND TO THE NORTH OF THURSFORD CEMETERY, GUNTHORPE ROAD, THURSFORD, NR21 0BP**

#### Officers report

The DMTL-CR introduced the officers report and recommendation for refusal.

The key issue for consideration was the objection raised by the Highway Authority. Images were shown in and around the site, including the access road. The unclassified rod was considered to be insufficient for the proposed development due to its narrow width, absence of passing opportunities, subpar construction quality, and limited visibility at nearby road junctions.

If the proposal were approved, it is expected to create conditions that could negatively impact highway safety, in violation of policies ENV 8 and CC 9 outlined in the Local Plan.

#### Public Speakers

Jeremey Bolton – Thursford Parish Council  
Victoria Cushing – Supporting

### Local Member

Cllr S Butikofer expressed her support for the application, which was compliant with policies SS1 and SS2. Whilst Gunthorpe Road was a narrow country lane, there was a clear line of site. The introduction of parking for the cemetery would improve vehicular traffic and stop the need for members of the public to park on Gunthorpe Road when attending the cemetery. The Local Member was highly critical of the Highways Authority's comments, in both their reference to a historic incident which was not detailed on their website, and their view that the proposal would result in a negative increase in the number of vehicle movements. It was noted that the proposal was forecast at most to result in one additional vehicle movement per hour during operational hours, if the Highways Authority considered that one extra vehicle per hour was an issue, it was incumbent on them, as the relevant authority, to improve the road.

The Local member stated that hedge at issue was owned by NNDC, however the applicant had kindly agreed they would maintain it should the application be approved. Cllr S Bütikofer encouraged the Committee to approve the application, arguing that greater weight should be afforded to farm diversification and supporting local business.

### Committee Debate

- a. The Committee expressed their support for comments made by the Local member and public speakers. Cllr V Holliday welcomed the provision of a dog walking filed which would encourage dog walkers away from the National Landscape.
- b. As the officer's recommendation must first be considered before a contrary proposal is made, Cllr P Fisher proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation, seconded by the Chairman.

### **THE MOTION WAS LOST**

- c. The DM summarised the debate and representations and noted members comments on the benefits of walking dogs outside of the National Landscape, supported by policy.
- d. Cllr P Fisher proposed the application be approved, seconded by Cllr M Hankins, and added, in addition to prior comments justifying approval, that benefits from the proposal including parking at the cemetery, and visibility splay improvements offered by the applicant, outweighed highways harm.
- e. The DMTL-CR offered a suggested list of conditions. Cllr V Holliday asked that the provision of dog waste bins be added.

### **RESOLVED**

**That Planning application PF/25/2102 be APPROVED subject to conditions, final wording the be delegated to the Head of Planning.**

- Time limit (3 years)
- Accordance with approved plans
- Materials as submitted
- Parking to be provided prior to first use
- Landscaping to be provided in accordance with approved plans
- Use limited to individuals only no groups
- Restricted to opening times as submitted
- Prior agreement of any external lighting
- Adequate bin provision to be provided
- Submission of a BNG plan

In addition, the permission cannot be released until the applicant has provided, and had agreed, a baseline BNG metric.

**98 WALCOTT - PF/25/2618 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING ATTACHED OUTBUILDING AND ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AT CHURCH COTTAGE, COAST ROAD, WALCOTT.**

Officers Report

The TPO – NW introduced the officers report and recommendation for refusal. She outlined the sites' location, proposed and existing elevations as well as images in and around the site.

Public Speakers

None

Local Member

Cllr P Porter expressed her support for the application, noting that the parish council made no objection. The extension would make the building more habitable for the residents and strengthen the wall nearest the road, which was regularly impacted by heavy goods vehicles. There were no nearby neighbours which would be impacted.

Committee Debate

- a. Cllr P Fisher asked what discussions had taken place with the applicant. The TPO – NW advised conversations had been held with the applicant however a compromised approach was unable to be achieved.
- b. Cllr A Brown proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation, seconded by Cllr R Macdonald.

**RESOLVED**

**That Planning application PF/25/2618 be REFUSED.**

**99 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE**

The Committee noted the Performance Update report.

**100 APPEALS SECTION**

The Committee noted the appeals reports.

**101 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

The meeting ended at 12.55 pm.

---

Chairman