



Planning Committee
Monday, 2nd March, 2026 at 9.30 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. **Minutes** (Pages 2 - 14)

To confirm as a correct record the Minutes of the Meeting held on 2nd
February 2026

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

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 2nd February, 2026 at 9.30 am in the Assembly Room, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ

PRESENT: Councillor F Bone (Chair)
Councillors B Anota, T Barclay, R Blunt, A Bubb, M de Whalley, P Devulapalli, S Lintern, J Moriarty (sub), C Rose, A Ryves, Mrs V Spikings and M Storey

PC86: APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor de Winton (Councillor Moriarty substitute).

The Chair thanked Councillor Moriarty for being a substitute at the meeting.

PC86: APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor de Winton (Councillor Moriarty substitute).

The Chair thanked Councillor Moriarty for being a substitute at the meeting.

PC87: MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2026 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

PC88: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

PC89: URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7

There was no urgent business under Standing Order 7.

PC90: MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34

The following Councillors attended and addressed the Committee under Standing Order 34:

Cllr de Whalley	9/2(a)	Congham
Cllr A Beales	9/2(b)	Great Massingham
Cllr J Kirk	9/2(e)	Walsoken

PC91: **CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE**

The Chair reported that any correspondence received had been read and passed to the appropriate officer.

PC92: **RECEIPT OF CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED AFTER THE PUBLICATION OF THE AGENDA**

A copy of the correspondence received after the publication of the agenda, which had been previously circulated, was received. A copy of the agenda would be held for public inspection with a list of background papers.

PC93: **DECISION ON APPLICATIONS**

The Committee considered schedules of applications for planning permission submitted by the Assistant Director for Planning and Environment (copies of the schedules were published with the agenda). Any changes to the schedules will be recorded in the minutes.

RESOLVED: That the applications be determined, as set out at (i) – (viii) below, where appropriate to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chair.

(i) 25/01552/FM

Denver: Land to the east of Ryston Road: Change of use of agricultural land to sui generis for secure dog walking: Tiggys Paddock

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application was for the change of use of approximately 1.04ha agricultural land to a secure dog walking (sui generis) use at land to the east of Ryston End in Denver.

The site was located to the east of Ryston Road. The application site comprised of an existing access from Ryston Road and 1.04ha of agricultural land. The wider setting of the site encompassed agricultural land bound by woodland to the west, protected under a Tree Preservation Order (reference TPO/00085/W1) and trees along the north, east and south boundaries. Furthermore, Denver Footpath 21 was located along the south of the application site.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Hodson.

The case officer advised that there was a correction to Condition 2, which had been outlined in the correspondence received after the publication of the agenda.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, as set out in the report.

The Committee raised concerns about noise impact on neighbouring properties and the effectiveness of proposed fencing and landscaping. Officers clarified that while landscaping would provide visual screening, it would not significantly attenuate noise, and management plans would be required to address potential nuisance. Conditions had been included to require further details on boundary treatments and landscaping, particularly along the southern boundary adjacent to the public footpath.

Members discussed the risk of dogs jumping fences and the interaction between dogs on the field and those on the adjacent footpath. Officers confirmed that a two-metre-high stock fence with timber posts and mesh would be installed, and further details would be agreed through planning conditions. The management plan would also address operational aspects, including the number of dogs allowed on site at any one time.

Concerns were also raised about dog waste and the potential for the field to become unpleasant. Officers explained that the applicant would require users to pick up after their dogs, and a waste company would be contracted to manage any missed waste.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (13 votes for and 1 abstention).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended subject to the correction to Condition 2, as detailed in the correspondence received after the publication of the agenda.

(ii) 25/01391/FM

Docking: Land east of Bennet Mews, south and west of Sandy Lane: Full planning application: Erection of 5 no. single storey dwellings, garages, vehicular / pedestrian access, landscaping and associated infrastructure; together with change of use of parts of the site to residential curtilages (for existing dwellings): Vello Ltd

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

The case officer introduced the report and advised that full planning permission was sought for the erection of five single storey dwellings together with change of use of parts of the site to residential curtilages (for existing dwellings) at land adjacent to, but outside of the development boundary for Docking.

The development would see four open market dwellings and one affordable dwelling constructed.

The proposal had been amended since its original submission from 6 dwellings to 5 dwellings. This would now result in a total of 9 dwellings using the existing private access which was the maximum allowed under NCC Highways policy.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of the Planning Sifting Panel.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, as set out in the report.

The case officer drew the Committee's attention to a correction on page 52 of the agenda (supplementary revised report issued) and the need to amend conditions 12, 13 and 15, both detailed in the correspondence received after the publication of the agenda.

In accordance with the public speaking protocol, Mr Alan Presslee (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Committee discussed Anglian Water's objection, which centred on the limited capacity of the Heacham water recycling centre. Officers explained that while Anglian Water was legally required to connect new developments, the scale of the proposed five dwellings was considered too small to justify requiring the developer to upgrade the treatment plant or provide off-grid solutions. Members debated whether it was reasonable to impose conditions for alternative sewage treatment, such as septic tanks, and whether the local plan's requirements for adequate foul water treatment were being met. The Assistant Director advised that Anglian Water did not object to the Local Plan following consultation with them.

Councillor Ryves proposed that the developer should be required to provide on-site sewage treatment, citing concerns about cumulative impacts on the sewage system and the precedent set by other developments. This was seconded by Councillor Fry.

Officers responded that connection to the main sewer was the preferred option according to the Environment Agency's hierarchy, and that alternative solutions would be disproportionate for a development of this size. The cost and practicality of on-site treatment were also discussed.

Councillor Moriarty raised concerns about the distance residents would need to move bins to the collection point, which could exceed 100 metres. Officers acknowledged this as a compromise due to the site layout and agreed to strengthen the relevant planning condition to ensure the bin storage area would not impact visibility or neighbouring properties.

Councillor Spikings proposed that the application should be deferred to allow officers to seek additional information from Anglian Water, the developer, and the Environment Agency regarding sewage infrastructure, cumulative impacts, and the feasibility of alternative drainage solutions. This was seconded by Councillor Anota.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to defer the application and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (12 votes for and 2 against).

RESOLVED: That the application be deferred to allow officers to seek additional information from Anglian Water, the developer, and the Environment Agency regarding sewage infrastructure, cumulative impacts, and the feasibility of alternative drainage solutions.

The Committee then adjourned for a comfort break at 10.57 am and reconvened at 11.10 am

(iii) 25/01684/F

**Congham: Little Congham House, Grimston Road:
Proposed Self-Build conversion of outbuilding to a single
dwelling with extensions and erection of cart shed: Mr &
Mrs J Diksa**

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

Councillor de Whalley left the meeting and addressed the Committee under Standing Order 34.

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application was for the proposed self-build conversion of an outbuilding to a single dwelling with extensions and erection of a cart-shed.

The application site was located within the Congham development boundary as seen within the policies map as defined by the Local Plan 2021-2040 and Figure 3: Strategic gaps of Grimston, Pott Row, Roydon and Congham Neighbourhood Plan.

The site comprised an area of land measuring approximately 1439 m² and accommodated an outbuilding constructed of a variety of materials such as carrstone, knapped flint, chalk and brick.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor de Whalley and the officer recommendation was contrary to the views of the Parish Council.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, as set out in the report.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Nick Borrman (supporting) and Alan Loy (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor de Whalley addressed the Committee outlining his concerns to the application.

In response to concerns about a historic spring on the site and the risk of flooding, referencing anecdotal evidence and previous incidents, Officers explained that no hard evidence of a spring was available but agreed to strengthen the pre-commencement condition on surface water drainage to explicitly include groundwater and potential springs, ensuring any issues would be addressed before development commenced.

Committee members discussed the scale and design of the proposed extension, the use of zinc roofing, and the impact on neighbouring amenity. Officers confirmed that the design was considered appropriate for the context, and that the extension would not constitute overdevelopment. The use of zinc was deemed acceptable due to its colour and compatibility with local materials.

Councillor Lintern queried whether permitted development rights should be removed to prevent further extensions or alterations. Officers explained that, as the site was within the development boundary and the proposal was considered acceptable in scale, removal of permitted development rights was not deemed necessary.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application and to strengthen condition 11 on groundwater and surface water management and, after having been put to the vote, was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the application be:

- (A) **APPROVED** subject to the completion of a legal agreement to secure the dwelling as a self-build dwelling. If the agreement is not completed within 4 months of the Committee resolution but reasonable progress has been made, delegated authority is granted to the Assistant Director / Planning Control Manager to continue negotiation to complete the agreement and issue the decision and to strengthen condition 11 on groundwater and surface water management.

(B) REFUSED If in the opinion of the Assistant Director / Planning Control Manager no reasonable progress is being made to complete the legal agreement within 4 months of the date of the Committee resolution, the application is refused on the failure to secure the dwelling as a self-build in line with LP31.

(iv) 25/01974/F

Great Massingham: The Dabbling Duck, 11 Abbey Road: Overflow car park (retrospective): The Dabbling Duck

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

The case officer introduced the report and reminded Members that they might recall that application reference 25/00323/F for the retention of an overflow car park to be utilised in association with The Dabbling Duck public house was considered and ultimately approved by Planning Committee on 28 July 2025. Since that date, it had become evident that, despite the retrospective nature of that application, the boundaries of the site had not been accurately shown on the approved plans. As a result, at the Discharge of Condition stage when considering the additional landscaping condition around the fire break and hedgerow, the proposed landscaping works were outside of the approved red line and therefore not able to be controlled.

The application sought planning permission for a scheme with a revised site area. All other details were the same as the approval, bar for the increase in site area from approximately 902 m² to 1530 m², allowing some 555 m² area around the perimeter of the application site to be landscaped with a proposed hedgerow and 2 m fire break and fencing, as per the arrangements of the extant approval.

The application comprised part of a wider agricultural field, the north boundary to which ran parallel to the edge of a public right of way, known as Great Massingham FP7 to the north. Access to the car park had been created through the existing car park at the rear of the public house, where a single width access was provided between the main building and an adjoining dwelling.

The application site was positioned just outside of the Conservation Area, the boundary to which ran along the back of the houses to the east and to the north. Existing dwellings across the field at Abbeyfields to the north, were within the Conservation Area.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Beales.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, as set out in the report.

In accordance with the public speaking protocol, Linda Swallow (objecting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Beales addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Committee raised concerns about fire risk due to vehicles parked on dry grass near crops, referencing a previous fire incident. Officers explained that the Fire and Rescue Service had no objections. The applicant had provided mitigation measures such as a firebreak.

The visual impact of the car park on neighbouring properties and the public footpath was discussed. The Committee considered that effective year-round screening should be provided. The Committee debated the merits of native versus evergreen hedging. The Planning Control Manager advised that Condition 2 could be amended to require a majority evergreen mix to provide better screening in winter.

Given the retrospective nature of the application, the Committee emphasised the need for prompt implementation of the new hedge and boundary treatments. Officers agreed to include a timetable for submission and planting, taking into account the appropriate season for establishing new hedges. This was proposed by Councillor Bubb, seconded by Councillor Spikings and agreed by the Committee.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application subject to condition 2 being amended to require a majority evergreen hedge and a clear timetable for implementation and, after having been put to the vote was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, as recommended, subject to condition 2 being amended to require a majority evergreen hedge and a clear timetable for implementation.

(v) 25/01660/CU

**Walpole: 8 Folgate Lane, Walpole St Andrew:
Retrospective application of change of use of a house of six
residents (care included) (C3b) to a care home up to three
children aged 8-18 (C2): Gabriela James**

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

The case officer introduced the report and advised that the application was a retrospective application for the change of use of a house of six residents (care included) (Use Class C3(b)) to a care home up to three children (Use Class C2) at No 8 Folgate Lane in Walpole St Andrew. No 8 was a four-bedroom bungalow, following recent renovations.

The application site was approximately 0.08ha in size, located to the northwest side of Folgate Lane, which was located within the development boundary and Neighbourhood Plan area of Walpole St Peter, St Andrew and Marsh.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Blunt.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, as set out in the report.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Kim Lawrence (objecting and also speaking in relation to 25/01660/CU) and Nichola Brown (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to issues raised by the Committee, it was clarified that while planning was concerned with land use, behaviour and care quality were regulated by Ofsted and other agencies.

As the Committee had been sitting for three hours, it was agreed to continue to sit for a further one hour.

Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed that a temporary permission be granted for a one-year period to allow for a review of the situation after a year. This would give the community and the care provider an opportunity to address concerns. This was seconded by Councillor Bubb.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application for a 12-month temporary period and, after having been put to the vote was carried (13 votes for and 1 abstention).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved for a temporary 12-month period.

(vi) 25/01661/CU

Walpole: 10 Folgate Lane, Walpole St Andrew: Retrospective application of change of use of a house of six residents (care included) (C3b) to a care home up to three children aged 8 – 18 (C2): Gabriela James

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube](#)

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application was a retrospective application for the change of use of a house of six residents (care included) (Use Class C3(b)) to a care home up to three children (Use Class C2) at No.10 Folgate Lane in Walpole St Andrew. No.10 was a three-bedroom bungalow.

The application site was approximately 0.08ha in size, was located to the north-west side of Folgate Lane, which was located within the development boundary and Neighbourhood Plan area of Walpole St Peter, St Andrew and Marsh.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Blunt.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, as set out in the report.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Nichola Brown (on behalf of Elizabeth Wallace supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed that temporary permission be granted for a one-year period to allow for a review of the situation after a year. This would give the community and the care provider an opportunity to address concerns. This was seconded by Councillor Storey.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application for a 12-month temporary period and, after having been put to the vote was carried (13 votes for and 1 abstention).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved for a temporary 12-month period.

The Committee adjourned at 1.10 pm and reconvened at 1.40 pm

Councillor Anota left the meeting.

(vii) 25/00275/F

Walsoken: Sibley House, Station Road: Proposed erection of kennel buildings, within the confines of existing buildings (to be repaired and rebuilt) and creation of external exercise area for operational use: Michelle Wade

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the site was located on the western side of Station Road, Walsoken and within the open countryside. The proposal was to allow the erection of dog kennels within the confines of the existing agricultural buildings. This would involve rebuilding one structure which currently only had a brick plinth, and the refurbishment and rebuilding of a fire damaged agricultural building. In addition, the area to the rear (west) of these agricultural buildings will be used as a dog exercise area and the building immediately adjacent to this exercise area would be used as a whelping room. The proposal would be for the keeping and breeding of dogs only and not for any dog boarding / day care purposes.

At the current time the applicant had a breeding licence for two dogs which she keeps in the dwelling known as Sibley House along with

three other pet dogs (five in total). There are an additional 11 German Shepherd dogs (GSD) which were currently kept on site, without planning permission and within wooden kennels and it is those dogs which would be rehoused within these kennels, should the application be approved.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Kirk and the views of the Parish Council are contrary to the officer recommendation.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, as set out in the report.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Cyril Dodd (objecting) and Chris Walford (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Kirk (objecting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Planning Control Manager advised that there was a breeder's licence issued in 2025 for 2 years and was on the register.

In response to issues raised by the speakers, the case officer explained the history to the application and how the dogs became in the applicant's ownership. She added that it was hoped with the new kennels this would have a much higher level of insulation and reduce the noise impact which was currently happening at the moment. With regards to the fencing, some of the fencing was shown at 1.2 m in height but some was shown as a 2 m close boarded fencing, and this was highlighted on the plans. It was considered that the Management Plan was robust. With regards to animal welfare, this was addressed on page 151 of the report.

Committee members debated the adequacy of fencing and Councillor Lintern proposed an amendment to condition 4 to require a 2m high close board fence around the exercise area for the kennels for security and noise attenuation. This was seconded by Councillor Mrs Spikings.

The case officer clarified the distances from the site to the nearest dwelling, and this was shown on Google Earth.

In response to queries, the case officer clarified the licensing requirements and the number of dogs permitted, with a cap of 11 adult dogs and restrictions on litters.

Councillor Bubb proposed that Condition 2 was amended to ensure that the dogs were only moved into completed kennels to the written satisfaction of the local planning authority, this was seconded by the Chair.

In relation to waste management, Councillor Spikings proposed that condition 10 be amended to require provision of a temporary dog waste bin on site until permanent waste management was in place. This was seconded by Councillor Lintern.

The Democratic Services Officer then conducted a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application, subject to amendments to conditions 2, 4 and 10 as detailed above and an informative on the decision regarding licensing and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (5 votes for, 4 against and 4 abstentions).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, as recommended subject to the amendments to Conditions, as follows:

- Amend condition 4 to require a 2-metre-high close boarded fence around the exercise area for the kennels.
- Amend condition 10 to require provision of a temporary dog waste bin on site until permanent waste management is in place.
- Amend condition 2 to ensure that the local planning authority is satisfied that the kennel buildings are fully completed before dogs are moved in.
- Add an informative to the application regarding the licensing requirements for dog breeding and kennel operation.

Councillor Barclay left the meeting.

(viii) 2/TPO/00709

King's Lynn: Land north of Nos. 140 to 176 Elvington and bordering the east side of Spring Lane Cycleway and footpath: To consider objections to the Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 2/TPO/00709, Woodland to the north of 140 – 176 Elvington and determine if the order be confirmed, making it permanent, confirmed with modifications or not confirmed

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

The Arboricultural Officer presented the report and advised that the purpose of the report was to consider objections received in respect of Tree Preservation Order 2/TPO/00709, which was made on 25 September 2025.

The report outlined:

- The reason for the Tree Preservation Order
- An outline of the objections received
- A summary of the objections received

- The Officer response to the objections
- The conclusion and recommendation

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr A Panteli (objecting to the TPO) and County Councillor Rob Colwell (supporting the TPO) addressed the Committee in relation to the report.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to confirm Tree Preservation Order 2/TPO/00709 without modification and, after having been put to the vote was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That Tree Preservation Order 2/TPO/00709 be confirmed without modification.

PC94: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

The meeting closed at 3.00 pm