

## DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Development Committee held on Thursday, 19 March 2026 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 L Paterson
Cllr J Toye	Cllr K Toye
Cllr L Vickers	

**Members attending:** also Cllr T Adams  
Cllr K Leith

**Officers in Attendance:**

- Development Manager (DM)
- Solicitor
- Democratic Services Officer – Regulatory Committees
- Senior Planning Officer (SPO – AW)
- Development Management Team Leader (DMTL – CR)
- Senior Planning Officer (SPO – JB)
- Senior Planning Officer – Abrogulture (SPO-IM)

### 102 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr P Neatherway, Cllr V Holliday and the Assistant Director – Planning

### 103 SUBSTITUTES

None.

### 104 MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Committee meeting held Thursday, 19<sup>th</sup> February 2026 were approved as a correct record subject to an amendment from Min 98, noting that Cllr L Vickers had left the meeting.

### 105 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

### 106 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman, Cllr P Heinrich, declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda items 9 and 12. As both Local Ward Member, and a Member for North Walsham Town Council, who had considered and voted on these items, he would abstain from participating or voting on these applications. He confirmed he would relinquish the Chair for these items to the Vice-Chairman, Cllr R Maconald. The Chairman would exercise his right to speak as Local Ward Member only.

**107 CROMER - RM/25/0776 - RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION (DETAILS RELATING TO APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT AND SCALE) PURSUANT TO OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION PO/23/0596 (ERECTION OF UP TO 118 DWELLINGS AND UP TO 60 UNITS OF SPECIALIST ELDERLY CARE ACCOMMODATION WITH PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, LANDSCAPING AND SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE SYSTEM (SUDS) AND VEHICULAR ACCESS POINT (OUTLINE WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED EXCEPT FOR ACCESS), LAND OFF OVERSTRAND ROAD, CROMER, NORFOLK.**

Officers Report

The SPO – AW introduced the officers report and recommendation for approval, subject to conditions. She offered a verbal update to the officer's report, and confirmed the Agricultural report referenced D, had been superseded with version E in December 2025.

The case officer outlined the sites' location, site context, historical use, and noted that the site had been allocated for development within the Local Plan (adopted in December 2025) under C16. The outline planning permission (PO/23/0596) was approved by Development Committee in December 2023, before being granted in May 2024. The principle of development had been agreed and would be largely controlled by the approved S106, and conditions of the outline. The care home, which formed part of the outline application, would come forward as a separate reserve matters application.

Objections from residents and Cromer Town Council has been received. These primarily related to issues of flooding, and biodiversity.

The SPO-AW noted the proposed site plan was in broad accordance with the outlined development plan. The storey heights plan complied with condition 7 of the outline application, and ENV6 of the North Norfolk Local Plan. The scheme would be divided into three distinct character areas, with varying densities, building styles, and materials. Visuals and details were provided of each character area.

Towards the centre of the site were three proposed three-storey apartment blocks proposed for affordable dwellings. The scheme would provide 53 affordable homes, 45% of the development, above the 35% requirement of the new Local Plan. The proposed housing mix was informed by discussions with a preferred registered provider and was supported by the Housing Strategy team. All dwellings would meet M42 accessibility standards, with four homes meeting M43 standards. The scheme would exceed the requirements for CC3 for sustainable construction and meet CC4 achieving higher water standards.

The SPO-AW confirmed the Landscape Plan and noted that the majority of green spaces were located around the edges of the proposed development to help create and maintain the proposed landscape buffers established in the outline application. A green space was proposed for the centre of the site, also in accordance with the outline planning permission. The Landscape plan had been subject to a series of revisions with following feedback, with the applicant demonstrating a commitment to address landscape concerns. A raingarden and reed planting had been introduced to the landscape proposals as part of the SUD's features, and the overly large attenuation basin was reduced slightly to retain additional trees. The proposed planting scheme included greater street scene planting, with a greater variation of native trees, including fruiting trees. Landscape Officers raised no objection to the

final proposal. Outline conditions 11, 12, and 13 relating to landscape and ecology were considered to be met.

Although not a requirement at the time for the outline application in 2023, BNG was agreed to be provided. The 2023 application included a memorandum of understanding which identified an area of land to the North of Holt Road, Cromer, as a potential location for offsite BNG mitigation. This option was explored, however would not provide a complaint BNG scheme. The required BNG units would instead be provided through Langley Abbey Environment Project, a registered provider who were considered could deliver the required mix of grub and ditch units in accordance with BNG trading rules.

With respect to matters of flooding and drainage, the SPO-AW affirmed that the applicant had worked extensively with the LLFA and Anglian Water in order to address both surface water and drainage concerns at the site. Condition 9 of the outline approval required detailed designs of the surface water drainage scheme to be submitted and agreed as part of the reserve matters application. After several alterations to the drainage strategy, including amendments to the detention basin and infiltration's SUD's features, the LLFA had confirmed the discharge of condition 9, and raised no objection to this reserve matters planning application. Anglian Water had also reviewed the submitted foul main location drawing, and had confirmed that this was acceptable, offering no objections to the scheme. As such, Officers considered there were no substantive evidential grounds to refuse the development on the basis of flood risk or foul water connectivity.

#### Public Speakers

Colin Robb – Cromer Town Council  
John Sansby – Objecting  
Margaret Wade – Objecting  
Jessica Groome – Supporting

#### Local Member

Cllr T Adams, member for neighbouring Cromer Town Ward, spoke on behalf of Local Ward Member, Cllr E Tooke, who was unable to attend the meeting.

Cllr T Adams noted the site had historically been the subject of some controversy, due to the on and offsite flood risks. He considered the site had reluctantly been approved, as part of the Local Plan, with the inclusion of site-specific policies on flooding prevention, but he argued that these policies were not being met through the proposal. Specifically, policy C16 of the adopted Local plan stated, '*Enhancement to sewerage infrastructure should be undertaken prior to the first occupation of any dwelling to prevent detriment to the environment and comply with Water Framework Directive obligations;*' and that '*greenfield run off rates are not increased;*'

He argued that the Committee in making its determination, must have confidence that the drainage infrastructure provided is sufficient, and reflected that the evidence that Anglian Water would adopt the planned infiltration basin was absent, as were details of how this would be maintained. Cllr T Adams sought assurances that the proposal would not lead to an increase in surcharge, overflow, and further occurrences of flooding. He provided a video of flooding on Station Road, a nearby connecting road, provided by a resident, during a downpour. Cllr T Adams advised that several properties locally had experienced flooding internally, as well as to

gardens, with one household receiving a grant this year for a flood proof door through the National and Norfolk County Council grant system. He argued that the foul water and drainage system had not been improved following the video. Without confirmation from Anglian Water that the development would not increase the risk of flooding to the nearby area, that the existing system had the capacity required to take the additional 10l a second, and details of how the infrastructure was to be maintained, approval of the application should not be granted. In addition, he sought details from the applicant of what would occur when the proposed planned system on site surpassed capacity. Cllr Adams considered appendix G of the submitted Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy provided an inconsistent story. The Developer initially sought plans for drainage to accommodate 14.63l per second in the outline application but were informed by Anglian Water it would achieve 6, with a figure of 10l a second eventually reached, something Cllr T Adam's considered had been arrived at without justification or evidence. The Lead Local Flood authority had raised a series of objections to the proposal, though it was noted their stance had since changed. Local residents remained suspicious that the drainage capacity had been paired back to accommodate the needs of the site.

Cllr T Adams advised he was a member of a local Flood Watch group and so had a firsthand experience attending incidents at any hour of the day and had witnessed overflowing sewage in this location.

He accepted that there would be a loss of biodiversity through the site, though was disappointed this could not be provided locally.

Cllr T Adams shared in the concerns raised by Cromer Town Council that the pavements opposite were narrow, even for a moderate size buggy, which would have a detrimental effect on residents' access to open space.

The Cromer Town Member urged the developer to consider an earlier trigger point for funding contributions to the nearby playground, not withstanding the existing S106 agreement, as 50% occupation was a long way off.

Cllr T Adams urged the Committee to defer consideration of this application pending assurances to those site specific policies detailed in C16.

#### Committee Debate

- a. The SPO- AW advised that Highways matters were a separate condition discharge from this application. There were section 278 works to improve highways and access around the site, but these were not considerations for this reserve matters application.
- b. The DM stated it was essential that the Committee were clear precisely what was being asked of it. The principal of development had been accepted, with outline planning permission having been granted by Committee. The Committee were asked therefore to consider specific reserve matters and matters that were required to be considered at reserve matters stage. Officers were satisfied that the level of detail provided was sufficient enough for the Committee to reach their determination. The DM recognised that the LLFA do object to applications quite regularly, and it is not unusual for them to raise concerns. In this instance they had considered the application in detail with various iterations of documents and made no objection to the current proposal. As the statutory consultee, their representation carried weight. Officers would not recommend approval if they were not confident

with the information provided.

- c. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett spoke out against the officer's recommendation and advised that she was very familiar with the site, stating that she had always had concerns with respect to flooding. She recalled the historic use of the site as a golfing practice ground, and suggested the golf club may have moved location due to ground conditions, referring to the site as a 'sink.' Cllr A Fitch-Tillett was critical that Anglian Water could cope with existing flooding in the area, as demonstrated in the video provide by Cllr T Adams. She reflected that rainfall was not simply an issue for drainage capacity but negatively contributed to cliff erosion also, something Coastwise were monitoring and working on closely. She concluded the application should be refused due to ground water concerns and their future impact.
- d. The SPO-AW advised it was important to recognise there was existing ground water runoff from the site, going into the drains. The proposal would introduce a very large, lined, detention basin, with 25% spare capacity for a 1 in 500-year storm event. The proposal sought to improve existing issues with respect to flooding.
- e. Cllr L Vickers noted Anglian Water made no objection to the proposal, however concerns had been raised by a member of the public who had experience in water management. She questioned whether the detention basin would be suitable to requirement, and how it would be maintained. With reference to the video provided by Cllr T Adams, she sought official confirmation as the veracity of the video that this represented storm flood, and not a burst water main.
- f. The SPO-AW confirmed that, as part of the flooding and drainage proposals, there would be ongoing maintenance. Management reports were attached and would be adopted by Anglian Water as part of the S104 agreement.
- g. The DM reiterated that a legal agreement had been signed as part of the original outline application, which included a specific chapter on SUD's. Elements and details of the SUD's scheme were required before work commenced on site. The Council would have control over the final scheme both in terms of conditions on the outline permission and the S106 obligations.
- h. Cllr M Hankins commended the case officer for her detailed report and welcomed the significant S106 contributions attributed with the development. He recognised the positive contribution the development would have as a solution to the housing shortage in this area. However, having listened to the public speakers, he recognised there was a dispute regarding flood protection and drainage. Having recently attended a meeting with Anglian Water, he was critical of their responses to future developments. Cllr M Hankins was concerned by the conflicting evidence provided with respect to flooding.
- i. The council's Solicitor noted the difficult situation the Committee was in and stated that the outline application had a number of protections relating to drainage in it. The S106 agreement also had detailed provisions relating to sustainable urban drainage. She commented that the difficulty the Committee were in was that this was a reserve matters application, and reserve matters only deals with 5 aspects including landscaping, and layout. It does not cover

flooding issues. She advised that the Committee needed to be careful about what they are being asked to determine.

- j. The DM stated that conditions on the original outline application required details to be submitted as part of the reserve matter submission. Typically, reserve matters applications deals with issues not dealt with at the outline stage. In this instance, there were conditions on the original outline permission which did require some details be provided at the reserve matters stage relating to matters of surface water drainage. The applicant had supplied the information requested. The LLFA not Anglian Water were the statutory consultee with respect to surface water management matters, they, as statutory consultee, advised that there were no grounds for objection on the surface water drainage details. The DM stated if the application were refused because of surface water drainage details, it would be challenging for the Council to defend its position. He affirmed that this was an allocated site within the recently adopted local plan, and development was expected on this site. The Planning service considered there was sufficient information for the Committee to support a decision for approval. Concerns were noted, and the DM reflected that it was unlikely that all parties would ever be happy with the information. He advised that it was important that the Council make a reasonable and rational decision.
- k. The Solicitor recited the 5 aspects dealt with by reserve matters. She understood Members concerns with respect to flooding, but affirmed this was not a consideration with this application.
- l. Cllr L Paterson agreed this was challenging application. On reflection of the comments made by the Solicitor, that the Committee should consider matters of layout, landscape, scale and nature, he stated he was comfortable. Cllr L Paterson proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation.
- m. Cllr R Macdonald stated he was happy with the 5 areas identified by the Solicitor. He questioned that matters of flooding had been raised subsequent to the outline application, and enquired if the outline permission had addressed this. He expressed his concern granting permission should the development advisedly contribute to flooding issues. He noted the Solicitors advise that drainage matters were not relevant but stated that flooding had to be a relevant issue.
- n. The Chairman recalled all issues were widely discussed at the outline application stage.
- o. Cllr J Toye thanked officers for their guidance. He noted that the Committee were only asked to consider those 5 aspects identified by the Solicitor. Cllr J Toye considered the design of the scheme to be acceptable, and of local vernacular. The provision of dwellings had not increased or decreased compared to the outline application, and landscaping provision had been increased. Cllr J Toye shared in many Members disappointment that BNG would be achieved offsite, but accepted this was allowed. Further, he was concerned with existing issues of drainage in the local community which had not been addressed by Anglian Water, but accepted this was not a matter for the Committee. Irrespective of whether the scheme was built out, those issues existed already and needed to be addressed by the appropriate authority. Moving forward, Cllr J Toye sought assurances over controls to ensure proper maintenance of the identified concerns. Cllr J Toye seconded

the officers recommendation.

- p. The Chairman asked whether conditions could be strengthened to ensure the maintenance scheme was in place.
- q. The SPO-AW confirmed the submitted flooding and drainage report contained details of maintenance. It had been designed to be an adoptable standard. Maintenance would form part of the approved document.
- r. The Chairman permitted Cllr T Adams to speak again. Cllr T Adams asked, if the drainage matters were resolved as part of the outline application, why the applicant had, at a considerable expense, brought a consultant from Rossi Long with them today. The outline application was for access and all other matters reserved. The Committee did not see any significant detail with respect to drainage in the outline application. Some discussion has taken place regarding the 14.63l per second figure, however Cllr T Adams did not believe the Committee had been offered the chance to discuss drainage considerations at any point.
- s. The DM advised, counter to the Solicitors comments regarding reserve matters, that the outline application did have specific conditions which required additional information with relation of flooding, and others, be submitted as part of the reserve matters application. Specifically, the condition required details of all the surface water drainage issues, and management of surface water drainage at the reserve matter stage. The applicant had satisfied this condition and brought their drainage engineer along to the meeting should there be any technical questions raised by the Committee. He affirmed that matters of drainage were a consideration today.
- t. Cllr T Adams reflected that this was not clear and that the Committee did not have the opportunity to debate drainage issues, and how these accord with policy.

**IT WAS RESOLVED**

**That Planning Application RM/25/0776 be APPROVED in accordance with the officer's recommendation.**

**108 HEMPTON - PF/25/0961 - SELF-STORAGE FACILITY WITH 212 CONTAINERS, PERIMETER FENCING, LANDSCAPING, AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT LAND SOUTH OF HEMPTON POULTRY FARM, HELHOUGHTON ROAD, HEMPTON, NORFOLK**

Officers report

The DM introduced the officers report and revised recommendation for approval following deferment at the December 2025 Development Committee meeting.

He outlined the sites' location, layout, topographical elevations, indicative plans, and identified the key issues for consideration.

Whilst the scheme was considered by Officers to be a departure from NNDC Policy E3, Officers attributed weight to the broader economic benefits the scheme would be, as detailed latest submission from the applicant in which they anticipated, once fully operational, the development would generate revenues of approximately £216,000 per annum with a net profit of approximately £119,000. This income would be re-invested into the Raynham Estate to support its long-term sustainability.

However, absent controls to tie the business to the estate, the DM advised that the weight to be attributed would need to be tempered to "moderate".

Concerns of bio-security raised by Committee at the December 2025 meeting had been addressed.

The DM reflected this was a finely balanced application. Notwithstanding the departure from the Development Plan, in all other areas the proposal was considered acceptable and the material considerations identified were capable of attracting sufficient weight to justify the departure from the Development Plan.

#### Public Speakers

Graham Robinson Hodges – Supporting

#### Local Member

Not present.

#### Committee Debate

- a. Cllr L Paterson and Cllr A Brown were supportive of farm diversification, however expressed concern that the application was not proposed to be tied to the estate and whether the site could be sold off. Cllr A Brown was critical of the submission from Lanpro and considered the 2 page letter lacked sufficient evidence to justify Committee support. Irrespective of whether there was a precedent elsewhere, he felt the site must be tied to the Estate, as each application must be considered on their own merits.
- b. The DM recognised there was an element of risk in not tying the estate with the land. If permission were granted and the land sold, that income would be derived and would benefit the estate. It was noted that the Council had not tied the land with other applications made by the Raynham Estate.
- c. Cllr J Toye expressed his support for the application and placed weight on the benefits to the wider local economy, including supporting of other businesses through the storage units.
- d. Cllr P Fisher recognised this was a finely balanced application, but following receipt of the additional information to address prior concerns, he could not find reason to not support the application.
- e. Cllr L Paterson proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation, seconded by Cllr P Fisher.

## RESOLVED

That Planning Application PF/25/0961 be APPROVED in accordance with the officer's recommendation.

### 109 CROMER - PF/25/2851 - ERECTION OF WOODEN CABIN IN REAR GARDEN (RETROSPECTIVE) AT 65 RANDALL CRESCENT CROMER, NORFOLK, NR27 0FD

Officers report

The DMTL – CR introduced the officers report and recommendation for approval.

He outlined the sites' location and relationship with neighbouring dwellings. Images of the wooden cabin from the garden, and neighbouring properties were provided.

3 public objections has been received in addition to an objection from the Town Council.

With respect to matters of design, whilst it was an unusual building for the setting, it was not untypical. It was noted that there were several garden sheds in the nearby vicinity, and the wooden cabin was not visible from public vantage points. Officers consider that the design of the garden building complies with the Local Plan policies HOU6 and ENV8.

Had the cabin been sited 2m from the garden boundary, and without the attached chimney, it would have complied with permitted development.

Officers noted the host dwelling's garden was slightly higher than adjacent gardens. Whilst the building was visible from neighbouring properties, Officers consider there was no unacceptable loss of outlook, and that there would be very limited overshadowing to the end of neighbouring gardens, which would not justify refusal.

#### Public Speakers

Colin Robb – Objecting

#### Local Member

The Local member, Cllr T Adams, spoke against the officer's recommendation. He supported neighbouring residents' concerns that the cabin was too large, resulting in some overshadowing and loss of light. He considered the imposing structure was incongruous with the residential setting.

#### Committee Debate

- a. Cllr K Toye considered this a finely balanced application and shared in neighbours' concerns having seen the photographs provided. These were small gardens, increasing the visual impact of the cabin on neighbour's amenity.
- b. Cllr L Paterson did not consider the application merited coming to Committee.

- c. Cllr P Fisher noted had the application been re-sited it would have fallen under permitted development.
- d. Cllr L Patterson proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation, seconded by Cllr P Fisher.

**RESOLVED**

**That Planning Application PF/25/2851 be APPROVED in accordance with the officer's recommendation.**

**110 NNDC TPO (GREAT SNORING) 2025 NO.23 - GREAT SNORING TPO 25 1086 - LAND ON THE BOUNDARY OF METHODIST CHAPEL AND SOUTH HOUSE**

Officer report

The SLO – IM, introduced the officers report and recommendation that the TPO be confirmed.

She outline the sites' location within the conservation area, tree location, aerial views and site photographs showing good canopy coverage and healthy leaf percentages. The tree was considered to contribute positively to the street scene in the centre of Great Snoring.

The tree was reported to show signs of Ash Dieback Disease. Ash Dieback Disease (ADD) was noted in the UK in 2012. In the following years most ash trees have been exposed to the fungal spores and large numbers of trees have died, however, many of the trees that have survived the initial wave of infections are showing a tolerance to the disease.

Norfolk County Council guidance for ADD, advises that removal work was not considered necessary for trees with 0-50% die back. Felling would usually be considered around 50-75% die back. There was an issue of evidence to justify removal.

Public Speakers

None.

Local Member

Not present.

Committee debate

- a. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett proposed and Cllr J Toye seconded the officers recommendation. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett requested that advise been provided to the owner suggesting removal of the ivy.

**RESOLVED**

**That TPO/25/1086 be confirmed in accordance with the officers recommendation.**

**111 NNDC TPO (NORTH WALSHAM) 2025 NO.22 - NORTH WALSHAM TPO 25 1085**

## **- LAND AT END OF MUNDESLEY ROAD**

**The Chairman, Cllr P Heinrich vacated the Chair for this and the next item, as he was both Local Member, and Member for the Town Council who had considered the proposals. He spoke on these items as Local Member only and did not participate in Committee debate or the vote. Cllr R Macdonald served as Chairman.**

### Officers report

The SPO-IM introduced the officers report and recommendation that the TPO be confirmed.

She outlined the sites' location, located within the allocated site NW16. Images in and around the site were provided, including aerial images and historic maps.

The trees at the site composed of a mixture of native species woodland along Paston Way, field boundary oak trees, native species hedgerow trees and ornamental garden trees that are a mix of prominent and valued landscape features that contribute positively to the local appearance, character and biodiversity value of the area.

Officers sought a balanced approach that would support the proposed residential development, whilst maintaining the trees more broadly. It was accepted that the development access would result in tree loss where the route intersects with Paston Way.

### Public Speakers

Eric Seward – Supporting

### Local Member

Local Members, Cllr K Leith and Cllr P Heinrich spoke in support of the TPO. They accepted, reluctantly, that trees would need to be lost to accommodate development of NW16, but considered it necessary to ensure delivery of the roundabout. Cllr K Leith noted the importance of trees in response to the Climate Crisis.

### Committee Debate

- a. The Committee expressed their support for the TPO and the balanced approach taken. Cllr L Vickers asked if an application for NW16 had been received. The DM advised this had been submitted and would be with the Committee in due course.
- b. Cllr A Brown proposed acceptance of the officer's recommendation, seconded by Cllr P Fisher.

## **RESOLVED**

**That TPO 25/1085 be CONFIRMED in accordance with the officers recommendation**

**112 NORTH WALSHAM EAST - PF/25/2503 - REPLACEMENT OF 8 GARAGES/STORAGE SHEDS WITH 5 SHIPPING STORAGE CONTAINERS**

## **(PART RETROSPECTIVE) - LAND REAR OF 1 NELSON ROAD, NORTH WALSHAM, NORFOLK**

### Officers report

The SPO-JB introduced the officers report and recommendation for approval.

He outlined the sites' location, within a largely residential area, and advised the site was well enclosed. The application was part retrospective following the removal of some garages. Photos in and around the site were displayed, and details of the proposed containers and indicative fence treatment.

The SLO-JB states, as existing, the application site contains eight garages, spread along the southern boundary of the site. If used in a similar manner, the change from 8 garages to 5 shipping containers alone was unlikely to result in unacceptable impacts on the amenity of neighbouring occupants.

With the imposition of conditions, Officers considered that the proposal was acceptable in terms of land contamination risk, in accordance with Policies CC13 and ENV6 of the NNL. The principle of development was considered to be acceptable and, subject to a suite of planning conditions, the proposal was considered by officers acceptable in relation to design, amenity, highways and contamination matters.

### Public Speakers

Leon Wagge – Supporting

### Local Member

Local Member, Cllr K Leith, spoke against the application. She considered the application unsuitable for the residential setting, and contrary to ENV4. The site was accessed via a narrow track, from Nelson Road which was already constrained due to the proliferation of cars parking on the road. Residents had reported issues with potential contamination of the land, including the burying of asbestos, and concerns that the site was being used for commercial purposes (as supported by photographs) The Local Member was concerned that CCTV located in the shipping containers could result in overlooking of neighbour properties, and that floodlighting would have a negative impact on residential amenity. Cllr K Leith urged the committee to refuse the application or defer to enable a site visit.

Cllr P Heinrich shared in the concerns raised by Cllr K Leith, particularly indications of commercialisation which would be challenging to control, and insufficient details regarding the reported potential for contaminated materials. He agreed that a site visit was the best way to proceed.

### Committee Debate

- a. Cllr L Paterson sought clarification regarding the classification of the land and expressed reservations regarding the application. The DM advised that it was sui generis, and if granted would need to be tightly controlled given the close proximity to neighbours.
- b. Cllrs M Hankins and K Toye shared in concern of local residents that there was buried contamination, and the lack of subsequent inspection.

- c. From the images provided by residents, Cllr K Toye, Cllr P Fisher and Cllr A Brown expressed scepticism that the units were being used for domestic storage purposes. Cllr L Vickers expressed sympathy with local residents and considered conditions relating to domestic use only would be difficult to enforce.
- d. Cllr J Toye considered the location was unacceptable, and questioned the officer's assessment that this was a betterment than the preexisting sheds.
- e. The SPO-JB accepted that this was a difficult use to class. Issues relating to contamination could be addressed by condition, as could use of the shipping containers for commercial purposes. The DM advised that the activity occurring on site as existing was not a reflection on what would occur under the proposed permission. If used for commercial purposes, there would be a greater impact on neighbours.
- f. Cllr L Paterson proposed deferral to enable a site visit, seconded by Cllr A Brown.

#### **RESOLVED**

**That planning application PF/25/2503 be DEFERRED to enable a site visit.**

#### **113 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE**

The Committee noted the management performance report.

#### **114 APPEALS SECTION**

The Committee noted the appeals report.

#### **115 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**The Press and Public were excluded on the advice of the Councils Solicitor at 12.03pm to receive urgent legal advice.**

The meeting ended at 12.17 pm.

---

Chairman