



**Planning Committee**  
**Monday, 2nd September, 2024 at 10.00 am**  
**in the Assembly Room, Town Hall, Saturday Market**  
**Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ**

**Reports marked to follow on the Agenda and/or Supplementary Documents**

1. **Receipt of Late Correspondence on Applications (Pages 2 - 6)**

To receive the Schedule of Late Correspondence received since the publication of the agenda.

**Contact**

Democratic Services  
Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk  
King's Court  
Chapel Street  
King's Lynn  
Norfolk  
PE30 1EX  
Tel: 01553 616394  
Email: [democratic.services@west-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@west-norfolk.gov.uk)

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**02 September 2024**

**SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED SINCE THE PUBLICATION OF THE AGENDA AND ERRATA**

**Item No. 9/1(a) 23/01446/F Page No. 7**

**Third Party Representation: ONE** additional letter of **OBJECTION**, with comments summarised as follows:

Response is made to the agent/architect's email dated 13th August 2024. It is noted that the agent/architect has had to be corrected by the planning officer regarding this application for previously submitting inaccurate plans, changes to boundaries; existing outbuildings; and for showing inaccurate boundaries to farmland – a point confirmed publicly in the many objections by the owner the surrounding farmland.

In their original application the applicants incorrectly stated Rose Cottage being their home address and said proposed works would not affect existing parking arrangements.

Land identified within the green markings on a submitted plan (available online with the submitted representation) is owned by Appletree Cottage and has no covenants upon it in terms of usage, as confirmed by deeds (and solicitors) which are already online. Therefore, it is stated that they are legally entitled to use the land as they please and have used the large lawn as main private front garden since purchasing the property in Sept 2021, reference is made to evidence in support of this.

The retention of stables (2/98/0929/F) was applied for by the previous owner, on July 6th 1998, 26 years ago and it not considered relevant. It has historically, and continues to be used, as a storage shed and an outdoor oil painting space. The agent/architect refers to the private garden as a parcel of land. It is stated as private front garden which would be overlooked if the application were to be granted (see attached photos – available online).

It is raised that in the previous planning meeting the case officer referred to the private front garden as a 'paddock' and given the agent/architect's point about it having been used for a 'Caravan and Motor Home club' it cannot be both. The previous owner chose to use this large front lawn as a Certified Location (CL) for a maximum of five small motorhomes or touring caravans. This does not require a site licence or planning permission, but a certificate from the Caravan and Motorhome Club (applied for on an annual basis, should you choose to do so).

Comments are made reiterating the ongoing neighbour disputes and history of neighbour relations on the site.

Reference is made to Norfolk Heritage Explorer where it describes how archaeologists found early medieval human remains in the gardens of Rose Cottage and the adjacent house – attention is drawn to the use of language and that these are recorded as gardens.

**Correction:** It is noted that the footing of the agenda from pages 9 – 24 incorrectly states the planning reference starting with 24/, this should however be 23/01446/F.

**Neighbourhood Plan:** The Grimston, Pott Row, Roydon and Congham Neighbourhood Plan has been “made” on Tuesday 27th August and now must be given full weight in decision making.

**Assistant Director’s Comments:**

Civil issues have previously been discussed within the deferred item's updated report as are matters of parking.

Based on planning history and information provided, the lawful use of the land to the north of the site has not been confirmed as garden land via a Certificate of Lawfulness. However, an assessment of overlooking from the extension and any impact on this land has been undertaken and been found acceptable.

In terms of the new Neighbourhood Plan, each policy is assessed in turn below.

**POLICY 1 – Strategic Gaps –** The site is not within a strategic gap as outlined within the Neighbourhood Plan (Figure 3).

**POLICY 2 – Infrastructure and Sustainable Growth –** As an extension to an existing dwelling (householder application) it is not considered that the requirements of this policy would be relevant.

**POLICY 3: Housing Type and Mix –** this policy is not relevant as the proposal is not for 2 or more dwellings.

**POLICY 4: Design and Landscaping – Form and Character** is assessed within the main report for this application and is considered acceptable. It is not considered that this policy changes this assessment as the development would respond to local distinctiveness and character (considering the character assessments). The development would be of an appropriate density, scale and layout, using vernacular materials. The rural character of the site and locality would be retained and existing features such as trees are not shown to be removed – however it is important to note that they could be outside of the application without consent.

**POLICY 5: Density of New Housing Development –** The development would accord with this policy as it would be in keeping with the predominant pattern of development in the area and the site’s context. Sufficient outdoor amenity space would remain. As an extension, the development would not reduce any gaps between existing dwellings and would be subordinate to the original dwelling. Parking is discussed in detail in relation to this site within the officer’s report.

**POLICY 6: Energy Efficiency –** This policy sets out elements that are encouraged and as this is not a new house, a statement regarding energy efficiency is not required.

**POLICY 7: Location of New Housing –** this policy is not relevant as this proposal is not new housing.

**POLICY 8: Roydon Common buffer zone –** The development is not within the buffer zone and would also be exempt as a householder application.

**POLICY 9: Biodiversity –** Whilst the policy wording states that all development proposals will need to demonstrate at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity, as a householder application the development is exempt from Biodiversity Net Gain by law. Therefore, less weight is attached to this policy given the circumstances.

POLICY 10: Key Views – The development could be considered to be within the Key View 10 (View approaching Grimston from Gayton). However, the application site would be to the rear periphery of this view and in addition, based on the assessment of acceptable form and character it is considered that the development would be sited, designed and of a scale that does not significantly harm or undermine the view.

POLICY 11: Local Green Space – The development would not impact any identified local green space.

POLICY 12: Dark Skies – external lighting is not proposed for this scheme however this would not usually be controlled for a householder application.

POLICY 13: Surface Water Management – based on the scale of development it is not considered that surface water details would be required.

POLICY 14: Heritage Assets – The Conservation team have been consulted on this application and do not object to the final scheme. It is considered that there is appropriate information to assess the application in terms of heritage impact and the proposal is considered acceptable.

POLICY 15: Sustainable transport - The proposal is not for new residential development – rather an extension so this policy is not relevant.

POLICY 16: Traffic and speed – This application is not major residential development, so the policy is not relevant.

**Item No. 9/2(a) 24/00622/FM Page No. 25**

**Agent:** Submitted amended plan, drawing no. 2583-06B, showing adequate provision for bin storage address condition 13 on page 43 of the agenda.

**Waste and recycling Manger:** No objection to the proposal.

**Assistant Director's Comments:**

Accept amended plan to alter the wording of condition 13. The comments made by the Waste and Recycling Manager are noted.

**Amended Condition** As a result of the submitted amended plan, Conditions 2 (approved plans) and 13 (bin storage) are required to be amended below:

2 Condition: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out using only the following approved plans:

2583-03F – Plans As Proposed

\* 2583-04B – Elevations As Proposed

\* 2583-06B – Site Plan

2 Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

13 Condition: Prior to the first occupation of the building, the waste and recycling storage area as shown on approved plan No. 2583-06B, shall be implemented and maintained thereafter as such.

13 Reason: In order to provide adequate on-site waste facilities in the interests of future occupiers of the site and local amenity, in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS08; SADMPP Policy DM15; and the provisions of the NPPF.

Item No. 9/3(a) 24/00349/F Page No. 44

**Applicant Supporting Statement (summarised for clarity)**

The proposal is to replace an existing house that is on Hamilton Road West, which in the words of the Conservation Officer “is an area of architectural experimentation, with a number of different styles and eras of houses being present.” I think it is fair to say that No.2 is of little architectural merit and therefore considering it “is situated in a sensitive location being adjacent to listed buildings and adjacent to the Old Hunstanton Conservation Area” and “Sea Lane is a traditional street scene with cottages of traditional materials forming the majority of the building stock”. It has been imperative to work with the Conservation Officer to appease concerns as raised and then produce a proposal that is acceptable.

Through listening, hard work, compromise and change we have achieved a great result. Each site is taken as an individual case and this is no different. We are proposing an enhancement, replacing a house that no doubt had seen better days. Quite ahead of its time, it is actually timber framed. But the era of the build did not match let alone future proof energy efficiency and performance. We were commissioned to explore two options – refurbish and extend or rebuild. These simple fabric details determined early on that we should look at producing a new house that will last decades and not work with significant compromises which also limited the chances of aesthetic and spatial improvements.

On the opposite corner of Hamilton Road West there was until 2010 a modest bungalow set back from Sea Lane. This was replaced with a modern two storey dwelling quite different to the setting of the Conservation Area and nearby more traditional vernacular but, adding to the patchwork of architectural experimentation - chalk set into a very contemporary façade with metal profile roof.

There are several examples of new / replacement dwellings in the village, of many different styles and materials. We feel this proposal, having taken on board the Conservation comments and introducing carstone, utilising this on the Sea Lane elevation and the on the entrance wall, along with brick and pantiles, integrates the proposal into the setting.

The garage remains much as existing and the house extension is 1.5 storeys with low roof eaves. The contemporary element sits where the existing 2 storey stands presently.

This statement is to be read as a positive, a summary of how results happen when working a proposal up with the officers.

The Cedars is an opportunity not simply to replace a dwelling but to introduce a much more considered dwelling adding to and not impacting on the setting, appreciated in the two directions of travel up and down Sea Lane. This is a quality proposal – interesting to look at with stepped profile, using traditional materials, lowered roof lines on the boundaries, integrated and yet also individual and forward thinking. A sustainable dwelling that will positively contribute to the setting, the Conservation Area, the village.

We are very grateful to have had the chance to work with the officers and welcome their recommendations of approval. We hope you also can support the proposal here at the Committee meeting.

**Assistant Director's Comments:**

The above supporting statement is noted.

**Item No. 9/3(b) 24/01136/F Page No. 63**

**Cllr Rust:** Page 67 refers to planning consent M3950 being given on 11<sup>th</sup> November 1969. Queries whether this is correct.

**Assistant Director's comments:** Planning consent was granted for the property under the aforementioned reference in 1969 as cited in the report.