

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 4th July, 2016 at 9.30 am in the Committee Suite, King's Court, Chapel Street, King's Lynn

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs V Spikings (Chairman)
Councillors Mrs C Bower, A Bubb, Mrs S Buck, C Crofts, Mrs S Fraser (sub),
A Morrison, M Peake, Mrs S Squire (sub), M Storey, D Tyler, G Wareham,
A White, Mrs A Wright and Mrs S Young

An apology for absence was received from Councillor P Colvin, I Gourlay,
J Moriarty, Mrs E Watson and T Wing-Pentelow

PC10: **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 6 June 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

PC11: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST****Item 16/00867/CM Land South of Back Street Gayton**

Councillor A White declared a non pecuniary interest in the item as a Member of the County Education Committee and did not vote thereon.

Councillor Storey declared a non pecuniary interest as a County Councillor.

PC12: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no urgent business under Standing Order 7.

PC13: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Councillors attended under Standing Order 34:

Name	Item	Application
Cllr T Smith	8/1(c)	King's Lynn 16/00097/FM
Cllr C Sampson	8/2(a)	Boughton 16/00753/0
Cllr Lord Howard	8/2/(g)	North Wootton 16/00376/0

PC14: **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

The Chairman reported that any correspondence received had been read and passed to the relevant officers.

PC15: **RECEIPT OF LATE CORRESPONDENCE ON APPLICATIONS**

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

PC16: **INDEX OF APPLICATIONS**

The index of applications was noted.

a **Decisions on Applications**

The Committee considered schedules of applications for planning permission submitted by the Executive Director, Geoff Hall (copies of the schedules are published with the agenda). Any changes to the schedules are recorded in the minutes.

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

(i) **15/000942/OM**

Castle Acre: Massingham Road: Hybrid Application: Full planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of four dwellings (Class C3) with associated access, landscaping and infrastructure and outline planning application (including access) erection of up to 11 dwellings (Class C3): The Holkham Estate and Grange Developments

The Principal Planner introduced the report and stated that Members might recall that this application was approved at the Planning Committee meeting held on 11 January 2016, subject to the signing of a Section 106 legal agreement.

It was reported that progress had been made with the Section 106 agreement but the wording of the legal document had proved more difficult to agree given the number of landowners involved. This had delayed the process somewhat, although negotiations were underway between the legal representatives of both parties.

Given that the applicants both continued to be committed to the development at the site which benefited from the Committee resolution to grant subject permission subject to a Section 106. The applicant's

sought an extension of time of 1 month to finalise and agree the Section 106.

As significant work had already been undertaken it would make no sense to refuse the application at this stage just because the legal agreement had not been signed within the originally stated time period. Accordingly, the Committee was requested to extend the time period to allow for the wording of the legal agreement to be finalised and the document signed by all interested parties. Despite the request of the applicants it was suggested that another 2 month period was allowed to ensure that the required work could be completed and to prevent the need to seek further authorisation for additional time from the Planning Committee.

There was no requirement to review the application itself as there were no material changes to the application or policy terms. However for information the previous application was attached to the report.

RESOLVED:(A) That, the application be approved subject to conditions and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement.

(B) In the event that the Section 106 Agreement is not completed within 2 months of the date of this Committee meeting, the application shall be refused due to the failure to secure affordable housing.

(ii) 15/00135/OM

Downham Market: Land east and south of Denver Hill: Outline application for up to 170 dwellings, all matters reserved apart from access: The Grosvenor Partnership 3LP

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was located to the south and east of Downham Market, bounded by the A1122 on the south boundary, Ravensway and Denver Hill to the north east boundaries, Nightingale Lane and Crow Hall Cottages to the north and open farmland to the east boundary. Nightingale Lane was a Restricted Byway (PROW RB23) and ran from the north boundary south through the site to the frontage crossing over the A1122 and south towards Denver.

The site was outside the Development Boundary for Downham Market and thus countryside as identified by the Local Plan 1998 and Core Strategy. The site was a preferred allocation for Downham Market under Policy F1.4 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Submission Document 2015.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the Town Council's recommendation was contrary to the officer recommendation and as a result of the level of County contributions.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Form and character
- Highways issues;
- Residential amenity;
- Flood risk and sustainable drainage;
- Archaeology;
- Ecology;
- Section 106 matters;
- Any other matters requiring considerations prior to the determination of the application; and
- Crime and disorder

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Councillor Frank Daymond, on behalf of Downham Market Town Council addressed the Committee objecting to the application.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Richard Brown, Agent addressed the Committee in support of the application. He requested that the wording for condition 16 relating to the infrastructure was “constructed”, rather than “completed”.

The Chairman expressed concern that the infrastructure should be in place prior to the build commencing.

A debate ensued on the positioning of the proposed roundabout on the site, which Councillor Wareham suggested that it should be on the Denver crossing which he considered was a dangerous junction. Comments were also made about the roundabouts being too close together. The Principal Planner responded that the area of land suggested at the Denver junction did not form part of the application and was not in the applicant’s ownership. The Assistant Director reported that the proposal in the application had satisfied the County Council’s safety audit.

Councillor Wareham suggested that the County Council in whose ownership he believed the Denver junction land to be could take the decision to bring forward their land to improve the junction. The Executive Director explained to Committee that the decision relating to moving the proposed junction did not rest with the applicant, but the County Council and would then require a four armed roundabout rather than three armed. Members were advised that consideration had to be given to the application as it stood, because a refusal would be subject to Appeal, which the County Council would not defend.

Councillor Wareham proposed that the application be refused, seconded by Councillor Mrs Wright.

Confirmation was sought by Councillor Squires as to the satisfaction by other agencies as to the bat, newt and wildlife population, to which it was confirmed that it had been deemed acceptable with the conditions imposed. The Principal Planner also confirmed that trial trenching had been carried out across the site with which the Historic Environment Service had indicated their satisfaction.

Councillors Buck and Bubb pointed out that the site was well placed, in Flood Zone 1 with good access to the town and Railway station and in accordance with the emerging local plan.

The Chairman reminded Members that the site had been considered as part of the LDF process and supported for development.

Councillor Storey expressed concern at the number of cars which would be using the Denver junction on the A10 which he considered to be a dangerous junction.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the question relating to the provision of allotments for the development, the Principal Planner reminded Members that the matter was specified in the emerging Policy, which was not yet adopted, confirmation was sought as to whether the Committee considered the site warranted 2 allotment plots. Councillor Morrison proposed that 2 plots be provided on site as an additional condition. This was agreed.

Councillor D Tyler commented that with the growth of Marham and half hourly train services being planned the houses were needed and should be approved.

On being put to the vote the proposal to refuse the application on the grounds that the current access arrangements were unacceptable by virtue of highway safety, the proposal was lost.

On being put to the vote the substantive recommendation, including the addition of the 2 allotment plots was carried.

Councillors G Wareham, M Storey and A White requested that their votes against be recorded.

RESOLVED: (A) That the application be approved subject to conditions, with the addition of the condition to provide 2 allotment plots on site, and the satisfactory completion of the Section 106 Agreement.

(B) In the event that the Section 106 Agreement is not completed within 4 months of the date of this Committee meeting, the application be refused due to the failure to secure affordable housing, public open space and play facilities, SUDS design and maintenance, and County contributions.

(iii) 16/00097/FM

King's Lynn: Land north of Lynnsport: Construction of 54 dwellings, associated access road, footways and new areas of public open space and associated external works: BCKLWN & Lovell Partnerships

The Principal Planner introduced the report which presented the application seeking full planning permission for the erection of 54 dwellings, associated access roads, footways and new areas of public open space. Eight of the dwellings would be affordable.

The site comprised approximately 1.7ha of informal open space and was predominantly covered by grass, with areas of scrub; an area of hardstanding was located in the north-west corner. A permissive footpath ran north / south across the site connecting the existing residential development to the north with the Lynnsport site to the south. The footpath was hard surfaced and lit by streetlamps and connected with the wider pedestrian network to the north via a concrete bridge over the Bawsey Drain which also served as vehicular access to the allotments to the west of the site. This vehicular access would be retained and improved and used solely to serve the allotments with the residential development being served via the Lynnsport Access Road.

The site formed part of the Lynnsport complex (which comprised c.29ha of sports pitches, athletics facilities, indoor sports area, a nature area, areas of amenity space and areas of unused scrub land). The site had residential uses to its north (on the opposite site of the Bawsey Drain and Front Way), and allotments to the west. The Lynnsport complex lay to the south and east of the site, the latter on the opposite side of the recently approved Lynnsport Access Road which would run in a southerly direction from Edward Benefer Way to Green Park Avenue.

The site formed part of a wider housing allocation in the emerging Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Pre-Submission Document, January 2015, and within Built Environment Type D as depicted on the current Local Plan Proposals Maps. The site was within Flood Zones 2 and 3.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of Development
- Flood Risk and Drainage
- Form and Character
- Residential Amenity
- Access, Transport and Parking
- Open Space, Recreation and Ecology
- Trees and Landscaping
- Affordable Housing and Other Contributions
- Crime and Disorder

The Principal Planner reported that a further issue had been raised regarding the allotments on the site and whether they were offered statutory protection. Advice was being sought on the issue, but it did not affect any planning decision taken today as it would be dealt with under different legislation.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Sue Bruce addressed the Committee objecting to the application.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Dale Gagen addressed the Committee in support of the application.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Fergus Bootman, Agent addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor T Smith addressed the Committee asking for the replacement by the Council of any amenity land lost in the application. He expressed the concerns of residents about the current situation with lorries on the site and their associated damage, he asked that the enforcement of conditions be stringently carried out.

The Principal Planner explained that the Open Space element was covered by a S106 agreement, giving provision for it on the site, and making a contribution to the existing play equipment nearby. The land was not currently being used for allotments, but in the event it required it, permission from the Secretary of State would be sought. He also confirmed that no contribution had been sought by the County Council for School places.

The Chairman expressed concern that there were buildings on site which comprised a top floor flat over 3 garages, only one of which would be within the control of the flat occupier. The ability to obtain mortgages for such properties was also questioned. The Principal Planner advised that similar such units existed on other developments, and suitable insulation in accordance with building regulations would be installed in the floor.

Councillor Mrs Wright expressed the view that the designs of the building were not acceptable and did not offer an uplifting place to live. She also questioned how residents would leave the site in an emergency with one access road in. The Principal Planner explained that a second access route was not required for developments with less than 100 dwellings, but there was pedestrian access from the site and in an emergency access or egress could be made across the green areas.

Questions were asked about the drainage and storage on site, to which it was confirmed that the self-adopted driveways were of permeable material and tanked, with water butts at the properties to collect some roof water for retention.

The Assistant Director reminded Members that the site was an allocation under the LDF process, and there was a considerable amount of open space in the area. The site was in town, with a cycle track, and was sustainable. The works to the drain on the site would

assist with taking surface water from not only this site but the surrounding areas.

Councillor Mrs Buck expressed concern about the proposal, with the loss of green space when there were brown field sites which could be used. She proposed refusal of the application on the grounds of sustainability and policy F23. There was no seconder for this proposal.

Councillor Morrison asked if the levels of affordable housing should be higher, he also encouraged the provision of allotments on the site.

The Executive Director reminded Members of their responsibilities in relation to the planning aspect, and the proposal needed to be considered in these terms. However in acting as owner the Councillors could input into a proposal as they saw fit but this must take place outside of the planning process through the Panel/Cabinet processes. The Planning Committee had to consider the application in front of it.

The Chairman proposed that the application be deferred in order to re-look at the issue of flats above 3 garages, the general design of houses, and the provision of the allotments. On being put to the vote the deferment was approved.

RESOLVED: That the application be deferred in order for the flats above garages to be re-considered and the general design of the properties, and ensure the provision of allotments.

(iv) 16/00753/O

Boughton: South of Jubilee Lodge, Mill Hill Road: Outline application with some matters reserved: Site for construction of four dwellings: Mr B M Burton & S R Chalmers

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site amounted to approximately 0.3ha and was located on the west side of Mill Hill Road, Boughton. The site abutted the Conservation Area.

The proposal was for outline permission for four dwellings with all matters reserved bar access. The indicative site plan indicated large dwellings with garages to the front of the plots. The plan indicated that existing field accesses would be retained with one being upgraded to serve the dwellings and the other (adjacent the south boundary) being retained to serve the field to the rear of the site.

A public footpath was located to the south of the site which was not affected by the proposal.

The proposal had been advertised as affecting the setting of a Conservation Area as well as a Departure from the Development Plan.

The application had been referred to the Committee at the request of Councillor Sampson.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Form and character and the impact of the Conservation Area;
- Highways;
- Any other matters requiring consideration prior to the determination of the application.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr B Burton addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor C Sampson addressed the Committee in support of the application. He drew attention to the fact that there had only been 3 objections, and none from statutory consultees. He acknowledged it fell outside the village guidelines but considered it should be approved as infill and would not in his opinion detract from the village built environment. The applicant would live in 1 of the properties.

The Principal Planner acknowledged that there had been some delay in getting the comments from Historic England on the application as mentioned by the Speaker, but explained that the site didn't comply with the Site Allocations document. She considered that the gap in the built environment contributed positively to the Conservation area and the village.

Councillor Wright drew attention to the fact that the Conservation Officer had commented that it could look acceptable, and no comments had been received from historic England. She drew attention to the fact that by providing housing in smaller villages, services and facilities may then be provided. She considered that the build was sustainable, and proposed that the application be approved. This was seconded by Councillor Squires.

Attention was drawn to the fact that there was a Doctors surgery in the village of Boughton.

Councillor Crofts did not consider that 4 houses was sensitive infill.

On being put to the vote the application was approved.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as it was deemed as sensitive infill, in accordance with policy DM3 relating to infill development in smaller villages and hamlets, and was considered to be sustainable development. The conditions to be approved following consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

(v) 16/00831/F
Castle Acre: Heritage View, Castle Square: Single storey extension to create dining area, dormers to replace rooflights, free-standing pre-manufactured garden room: Mr & Mrs Moriarty

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application comprised a detached bungalow and associated amenity space, situated to the south-east of Castle Square off Bailey Street, Castle Acre.

The site was located within Built Environment Type C and Conservation Area as depicted on the Local Plan Proposals Map.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the applicant was Councillor Moriarty.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon the Conservation Area and Listed Building;
- Impact upon Neighbour amenity; and
- Other material considerations.

RESOLVED: That, the application be approved, as recommended.

(vi) 16/00876/CU
Denver: Fir Tree Farm, 110 Sluice Road: Conversion of studio to single dwelling (no external alterations): Mr R Howes

The application site was located on the northern side of Sluice Road, Denver and comprised an existing studio building and part of the residential curtilage associated with Fir Tree Farm, 110 Sluice Road the latter of which was a relatively large two storey farmhouse that was located immediately south east of the existing studio.

The site was located predominately within the countryside as defined by the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan (1998) Inset Map for Denver. A small part of the site, including the access drive and majority of the existing building was located within Built Environment Type C.

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

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety;
- Other considerations; and
- Crime and disorder

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr R Howes addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The County Highways representative responded to the points raised by the applicant regarding the measurement of visibility for driveways onto the highway and confirmed that the measurement would be taken from the centre of the drive access point. He drew attention to the fact that the land to the left of the drive was overrun because of the visibility issues.

Councillor Crofts asked if the studio currently generated its own traffic, to which it was conformed that it was an ancillary to the farmhouse.

Councillor White, as Councillor for the area drew attention to the fact that the vast majority of traffic coming from the site would be turning left, as the only reason to go right would be to the local public house at the end of the road. Councillors Peak and Storey confirmed this view, and commented that the speed of vehicles along the road was not fast.

It was proposed that due to the low amount of traffic along the road, and the minimum number of right hand turns from the site that the application be approved. On being put to the vote the application was approved.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, the conditions to be approved following consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

(vii) 16/00867/CM

Gayton: County Matter application: Change of use from agricultural field to a 1FE (210 place) primary school and ancillary works: Land south of Back Street, north of the drain and east of Winch Road: Executive Director of Children's Services

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that application proposed a new school on Back Lane at Gayton and was made by Norfolk County Council as the Local Education Authority. The application was to be determined by Norfolk County Council as the Borough Council was a consultee.

The application related to a 1.6ha site on the southern side of Back Street, Gayton at the junction with Winch Road. The site was part of a

field in agricultural use with more fields to the south and east. Residential development was located to the north on Gayton Road and to the west on the opposite side of Winch Road.

The application proposed a 210 place primary school in a single building located along the northern edge of the site. Vehicular access would be off Winch Road with a pedestrian access of Back Street. Parking was provided within the site for 25 cars plus 2 disabled spaces. A 2.0m wide footway was proposed across the northern edge of the site with dropped kerbs to allow people to cross Back Street and get to the existing footway on the opposite side.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination by the Assistant Director.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Flood risk and drainage; and
- Traffic and transport

The Principal Planner presented the report and drew attention to the permission granted for 40 dwellings on the south side of Back Street, the road widening conditions for which were conflicting with those being suggested for the road narrowing for the school. It was also suggested that the materials which were being proposed for the site which was designed to be barn like should include a better palate of materials such as pantiles.

The Chairman proposed that a qualifying statement of the Council's support in principle for the new school should be made. This was agreed.

Councillor A White declared a non pecuniary interest in the item as a Member of the County Education Committee and did not vote thereon.

Councillor Storey declared a non pecuniary interest as a County Councillor.

Councillor Mrs Wright commented that she did not support the design of the building, particularly in a pretty village, which should reflect its vernacular. Councillor Mrs Bower confirmed that position and asked what arrangements were being made for the dropping off and picking up of children in front of the school.

The Principal Planner informed Members pick ups and drop offs would take place on the road outside the school.

Councillor Bubb asked what the flooding history was to the site, to which the Principal Planner responded it was not tidal, but was flood risk 2 & 3. Councillor Fraser also drew attention to the need to ensure the sewage system was up to par, as it was a problem in Gayton.

RESOLVED: (i) That the Borough Council welcomes the provision of a new school in Gayton.

(ii) That, the Committee raises concerns that matters relating to flood risk must be addressed and the conflict between access arrangements approved under application 15/01888/OM and the proposed narrowing of Back Street is resolved, along with the need to provide a drop off area for the children and parents.

(iii) The applicant should be encouraged to adopt a palette of materials that better reflects the agricultural style of building that the new school attempts to emulate.

At 12.40pm the Committee adjourned and re-convened at 1.10pm.

(viii) 16/00311/F

Heacham: Land north of 14 Caius Close: Construction of dwelling: Mr P Fade

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site comprised a triangular parcel of land, measuring approximately 189 square metres. The land was currently used as residential garden to the side of no.14 Caius Close, Heacham.

Full planning permission was sought for the construction of a two storey end terraced dwelling.

Heacham was classified as a Key Rural Service Centre within the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the view of the Parish Council was at variance with the officer recommendation.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenities;
- Highway safety;
- Other material considerations

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Jason Law addressed the Committee in support of the application.

RESOLVED: That, the application be approved, as recommended.

(ix) 15/01879/F

**Holme next the Sea: Drove Orchards, Thornham Road:
New retail unit: Drove Orchards Ltd**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was part of the Drove Orchards Farm site located on the northern side of the main A149 coastal road which ran between Hunstanton in the west and Wells in the east. The site was approximately 1 km west of the village of Thornham but was located within the parish of Holme next the Sea. The village of Holme was approximately 1.5 km away.

The site comprised a parcel of land to the eastern side of the existing courtyard area at the front of the orchard site.

The surrounding orchards were located to the north, east and west of the site. Other existing retail and commercial uses are to the east of the site, set around the gravelled courtyard area which also served as part of the parking area for the wider site. South of the site on the opposite side of the road were open arable fields.

The application sought full planning permission for one new retail unit for a use which was already on another part of the site without the benefit of planning permission.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Mrs Bower and the view of Holme next the Sea Parish Council was contrary to the officer recommendation.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Use of the site;
- Impact upon the AONB;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity;
- Accessibility; and
- Highway safety

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Jason Law addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Mrs Bower commented that following the recent explanations about the future plan for the overall site, she, and she believed the Parish Council were content that their concerns had been addressed.

RESOLVED: That, the application be approved, as recommended.

(x) 16/00376/O
North Wootton: Land at The Priory, Nursery Lane: Outline application: 3 new dwellings: Mr S Evans

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located within an area defined as Built Environment Type A according to Local Plan Proposals Maps for North Wootton. North Wootton acted to support the growth of King's Lynn in Policy CS02 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011.

The site was relatively flat and lower than the road level and was bounded by hedgerows and contained trees.

The proposal sought outline planning permission with all matters reserved for the erection of 3 properties. A centralised access would be provided to serve the properties.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the views of North Wootton Parish Council was contrary to the officer recommendation.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon visual amenity;
- Impact upon designated heritage assets;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Rachel Panks addressed the Committee objecting to the application.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Jason Law, Agent addressed the Committee in support of the application.

In response to the Public speaker's comments, the Principal Planner explained that the site would form part of the built environment in the emerging Local Plan. He considered that the impact of the perceived loss of openness of the site, when there were open fields opposite was not significant enough to warrant refusal. The garden of the Priory had been divided into 2 parts, and the hedge would be replanted with a visibility splay and the site had an enclosed feel.

The Chairman asked if as the site was much lower than the surrounding area if it flooded, particularly with the pond as part of the overall site. She also referred to the fact that part of the beauty of the area were the interspersed spaces, and the proposal removed a green part of the village. The Principal Planner confirmed it lay lower than the

rest of the site, but explained that surface water conditions had been added, nothing more had been suggested to be more robust.

Councillor Bubb considered it may be acceptable but that 3 dwellings was too many.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor Lord Howard addressed the Committee objecting to the proposal, stating he had received representations from parishioners and the Parish Council, the view of which was that it would do damage to the local environment, but also that the site was extremely wet. He confirmed that as a landowner within the area he was often asked to clear land drains further down the water chain but there was potential flooding on the spot with surface water.

Councillor Bubb proposed that the application be refused. This was seconded by Councillor Wareham.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused, because of the loss of an important open space within the street-scene, the impact on the setting of the adjacent listed building and potential flooding issues on the site.

(xi) 16/00417/O
North Wootton: Land at Gatehouse Lane: Outline application all matters reserved: Proposed residential dwelling: Mr D Mitchell

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site comprised a parcel of land measuring approximately 1097sq.m, situated on the southern side of Gatehouse Lane, North Wootton.

The land was located within the countryside and AONB.

Outline planning permission was sought for the construction of a dwelling with all matters reserved.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the views of North Wootton Parish Council was contrary to the officer recommendation.

The Principal Planner then outlined the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Character of the landscape;
- Trees;
- Highways safety; and
- Other material considerations

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as recommended.

(xii) **16/00175/F**

Ringstead: 94 High Street: Retention and completion of the sub-division of 94 High Street: Mr David Wann and Ms Anelli Taylor

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located within an area designated in the 1998 Local Plan as Built Environment B within Ringstead.

Ringstead was classified as a Smaller Village and Hamlet according to Policy CS02 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

The application site comprised of a two storey end terraced property which had been the subject of extensive alterations and extensions.

The proposal sought consent for the subdivision of the original part of the property to provide a single bedroom unit.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the views of Ringstead Parish Council was contrary to the office recommendation.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon visual amenity;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material considerations

The Principal Planner drew attention to the late correspondence which contained requested conditions from Norfolk County Council.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended with the addition of the Norfolk County Council conditions set out in late correspondence.

PC17: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received the Schedule of Decisions determined by the Executive Director.

The meeting closed at 2.00 pm