

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 5th September, 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, C J Crofts, Mrs S Fraser, I Gourlay, J Moriarty, A Morrison, M Peake, M Storey, D Tyler, G Wareham, Mrs E Watson, A White, T Wing-Pentelow, Mrs A Wright and Mrs S Young

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Mrs S Buck

PC27: **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday 1st August and the Reconvened Meeting held on Thursday 4 August 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings.

PC28: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following declarations of interest were declared:

In relation to item 8/2(d) – Hockwold cum Wilton, Councillor Storey explained that he had been advised not to take part in the debate or vote thereon.

Councillor Crofts declared a pecuniary interest in item 8/3(g) – Upwell, and would leave the meeting during consideration of the application.

PC29: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

The Assistant Director advised the Committee that item, 8/3(d) – East Winch had been withdrawn from the agenda by the applicant.

The Committee was invited to extend the deadlines for the completion of Section 106 agreements, for the following applications, which had already been determined by the Committee.

- 15/01053/F – Main Road, West Winch
- 15/01786/OM – Stave Farm, 3 Chapel Road, Pott Row.

RESOLVED:(1) That in relation to application 15/01053/F, authority be granted to complete the Section 106 Agreement.

(2) In relation to application 15/0176/OM, authority be granted to extend the period for the completion of the Section 106 agreement by one month to 4 October 2016.

(3) That the Monitoring Officer be invited to attend the next meeting of the Committee to give an update on any outstanding Section 106 agreements.

PC30: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Councillors attended under Standing Order 34:

Name	Item	Application
D Pope	8/3(g)	16/01005/F

PC31: **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC32: **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.

PC33: **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, where appropriate to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal set out in the schedules signed by the Chairman.

- (i) **2/TPO/00547**
Dersingham: 16 Park Hill: To consider whether Tree Preservation Order 2/TPO/00547 should be confirmed, modified or not confirmed in the light of objections: Mr and Mrs M Judd

The Arboricultural Officer introduced the report and outlined:

- The reason for making the Order;
- Outline of objections and representations
- Response to objections.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr P Williams (supporting the confirmation of the order, on behalf of Nos. 1, 3, 5, 7, 12a and 14 Park Hill) addressed the Committee.

Councillor Wareham, in raising an objection to the confirming of the Tree Preservation Order, proposed that the Committee should carry out a site visit, as he had concerns that the making the Tree Preservation Orders was down to one individual officer.

The Assistant Director explained that an objection to the making of the Order had been received and that was why it was in front of the Committee to determine whether to confirm the Order or not.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings having visited the site, supported the confirmation of the Order.

Councillor Mrs Bower had also visited the site and considered that the trees enhanced the area and supported the confirmation of the Order.

The Committee then voted on the proposal for a site visit and, after having been put to the vote, was lost.

In response to a comment, the Arboricultural Officer explained that the root growth depended on the soil type and structure. In this particular case with the soil structure, there was no evidence to suggest that the roots would cause any damage. The Arboricultural Officer advised that there was no charge for tree works, if a member of the public made a Tree Works Application.

RESOLVED: That, the Order be confirmed without modification.

(ii) 16/00305/OM

**Clenchwarton: Land west of The Grange, 262 Main Road:
Outline application: Construction of 16 dwellings: Mr P A J
and P R Kitchen**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that Members might recall that this application which, with its counterpart (15/02008/O), was deferred from June's Committee meeting to negotiate the inclusion of a financial contribution towards play equipment. The principle of this had now been accepted by the applicant, and a contribution would be sought via the Section 106 Agreement.

The application was in outline for residential development on a site measuring approximately 0.89ha to the south of Main Road, Clenchwarton. The site formed the western element of one of the three housing allocations identified in the emerging Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Pre-Submission Document for Clenchwarton and Policy G25.3 related specifically to development of this allocation. Application 15/02008/O was for four dwellings – totalling 20 dwellings across the two sites / allocation.

The site was countryside but had residential development to the east and north (on the opposite side of Main Road).

The site was located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and formed part of a wider agricultural field.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was contrary to the Parish Council recommendation and level of financial contribution.

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

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety;
- Flood risk;
- Drainage;
- Affordable housing and other contributions; and
- Other material considerations.

The Principal Planner advised that the distance to the playing field was approximately 250/300m. In order to access it, the Main Road would need to be crossed.

In relation to the access, the Principal Planner advised that all matters were reserved and would be designed out at reserved matters stage. In relation to the level of financial contribution for the play equipment, the Committee was advised that the Parish Council had been involved with the negotiations with the applicant.

RESOLVED: (A) That, the application be approved, subject to conditions and completion of a suitable Section 106 Agreement within 4 months of the date of resolution to approve.

(B) That, the application be refused in the event that a suitable Section 106 Agreement is not completed within 4 months of the resolution to approve.

**(iii) 16/00654/FM
 Docking: Former Granaries Site, Station Road:
 Construction of 77 dwellings and ancillary buildings:
 Avada Ltd**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application sought full planning permission for the construction of 77 dwellings and ancillary buildings on the former Granaries site at Station Road, Docking. 15 of these would be affordable units.

The majority of the site was located within the village settlement of Docking and within the Built Environment Type D as depicted on the Local Plan Proposals Map. The western part of the site containing the office building and the land further west was, however, outside of the adopted village settlement boundary and classed as countryside.

The site was immediately adjacent to the Conservation Area with the Conservation Area boundary abutting the southern and south eastern part of the site.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the views of Docking Parish Council was contrary to the officer recommendation and affordable housing contribution.

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

- Principle of development;
- Design, character and appearance;
- Impact on wider landscape;
- Impact upon nearby Conservation Area;
- Highway issues;
- Affordable housing;
- Loss of employment land;
- Residential amenity; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr M Abel (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) and Mr I Johnston (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Principal Planner advised the Committee on a point of clarification that the open space land was outside the development boundary, but the area where the dwellings were to be located was within the new proposed village boundary.

In relation to a concern regarding the lack of pepper-potting of the affordable housing, the Principal Planner highlighted the location of the affordable housing. He explained that the policy did refer to groups of no more than 8. However in this particular case, there was a group of 15 units which would be accessed off different roads, and it was

considered that the design of the affordable housing units worked well and integrated into the overall scheme.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings expressed concern that the affordable housing units did not integrate into the scheme and that most other developments all had a mix of units. She added that the design of the scheme had a lot of merit using local materials but felt that the affordable housing grouped together was not acceptable.

Other Members also agreed that the affordable housing units should be pepper-potted. The issue of the junction was also raised that heavy farm vehicles used this particular road.

The Principal Planner advised that County Highways considered that the realignment around Choseley Road and Station Road was an acceptable layout in highway safety terms.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings suggested that the application be deferred in order to allow the applicant to give further consideration to the layout of the affordable housing units, and that County Highways could be re-consulted on the proposed realignment of the junction.

In relation to a query regarding the barn type units, the Principal Planner highlighted these on the plans and explained the elevations to the Committee.

Councillor Morrison (Ward Member) explained to the Committee that the site was a brownfield site and should be developed. He explained that remediation works were required on the site which would be at a cost to the developer.

With regards to density, Councillor Morrison did not think that this was too bad but this and the other developments in the pipeline would be a huge addition to the village and could have an effect on drainage, schools, etc.

In relation to the pepper-potting of the affordable housing, he explained that he had spoken to the Parish Council at length regarding this issue, however they did not appear to be too bothered about this and referred to the terraced housing within the village.

He added that the site would be developed very well. Once half of the site had been developed, then the affordable housing would have to be built and this would be good for the village. He also liked the recreational areas and considered the houses to be aesthetically pleasing using good materials.

However he was aware that the access was of concern and gave examples of the vehicles using that stretch of road. He welcomed the idea of a deferment.

In response to a query regarding the size of gardens, the Principal Planner explained that there was a variety of garden sizes.

Councillor Mrs Wright expressed concern that the Docking was becoming full of large brick houses and was sympathetic with the comments made by the Parish Council. She added that Docking would become a large village and supported the deferment of the item.

In relation to the open space, the Principal Planner explained that it would be controlled through the Section 106 Agreement. He further explained that not all of it would be equipped and highlighted the spaces on the plan.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to defer the application for a cycle in relation to the pepper-potting of affordable housing and that County Highways be re-consulted in relation to the safety of the access in view of the large agricultural vehicles using the road/access, which was agreed.

RESOLVED: That, the application be deferred.

(iv) 15/00654/FM
Heacham: Summerville Residential Home, Fenway:
Construction of dementia home: Mr Raj Sehgal

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application related to the site of Summerville House care home, the entrance to which was off Fenway, around 120m from the junction with Folgate Road. Folgate Road was an adopted highway but Fenway was a private road with limited public rights over it as a public by-way.

Summerville House currently consisted of a cottage linked to a converted barn. It provided residential and respite care for the elderly (including dementia care and care for people with Alzheimer's). It currently accommodated 26 residents in 20 rooms. The resident's rooms were in the existing converted and extended barn with the linked cottage providing staff accommodation for night staff.

The proposal was to demolish the existing cottage and construct a new free-standing building to provide an extra 35 single bedrooms across the ground and 1st floors with 5 staff bedrooms on the second floor in the roof.

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

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

- Principle of development;

- Heritage assets;
- Highways and traffic; and
- Flooding.

Mr T Parish (objecting on behalf of Heacham Parish Council) and Mr J Law (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In relation to a concern regarding the potential impact on Fenway, the Principal Planner highlighted the nearest residential dwelling on the plan. He also explained that in light of the information provided by the applicant, the increase in vehicular traffic was not considered to be material in terms of road safety or in terms of the impact upon the condition of Fenway, maintenance of which would continue to be a private matter as it was at the moment. The Committee could take a different view and impose a condition, if it was felt necessary.

Several Members of the Committee reiterated the need for such a facility and felt that this was an ideal location, having up to date facilities and a secure garden area.

The Principal Planner explained that there was an allocation at Hunstanton for a similar facility and Policy CS09 was in place to support this.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

The Committee adjourned at 11.00 am and reconvened at 11.10 am

(v) 15/02108/OM
Hockwold cum Wilton: 195 Main Street: Outline application with some matters reserved: Proposed residential development of 26 dwellings on land adjacent to Wilton Farm: Mr Nathan Enefer

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was a parcel of agricultural/paddock land (1.8ha) on the northern side of Main Street, Hockwold-cum-Wilton, between the edge of the defined village and Wilton Farm.

The site was located in an area defined as countryside, adjoined and had a frontage strip within the Conservation Area, located in Flood Zone 1 of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and within the consultation buffer of the Breckland SPA.

The application sought outline permission for the residential development of 26 dwellings, access, layout and appearance were to be considered at this stage and scale and landscaping to be dealt with as reserved matters.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the views of Hockwold cum Wilton 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 ecology;
- Impact upon heritage assets;
- Highway issues;
- Crime and disorder; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr N Enefer (supporting) and Mr S Sutton (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

As a point of clarification, the Principal Planner explained that the wall was in the Conservation Area but the site itself was just outside of it.

The Principal Planner also confirmed that Hockwold and Feltwell were Key Rural Service Centres.

In response to a query from the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings in relation to reason for refusal 4, the Principal Planner referred to page 69 of the agenda, points 1-8 and explained that no amended plans had been received to address the issues.

The Principal Planner also explained that insufficient information had been provided by the applicant in respect to the likely impact the development would have upon the adjacent European designated site. She added that the RSPB and Natural England were relied upon as a statutory consultee. She further added that the Council had sought to avoid allocation land for new housing in this location in order to avoid such adverse effects on the Breckland SPA. Indeed this site was rejected at the preferred options stage of the LDF.

In response to further queries regarding the Breckland SPA and buffer zone, the Principal Planner explained that a legal opinion had been sought regarding the ability of the Council to grant planning permission in the absence of information that allowed it to carry out an appropriate assessment as required by the Habitats Regulations 2010 (as amended). On the basis on the opinion it was the officers' advice that the grant of permission without being able to carry out an appropriate assessment would breach the Habitats Directive and the Habitats Regulations 2010.

The Principal Planner also confirmed that Wilton Farm was an undesignated Heritage Asset but not listed.

The Assistant Director explained that the Borough Council was consulted on the Special Protection Area.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as recommended.

(vi) **15/02008/O**

**Clenchwarton: Land east of The Grange, Main Road:
Outline application: Construction of four detached houses:
Client of JCJ Planning**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that Members might recall this application, which with its counterpart (16/00305/OM), was deferred from June's Committee Meeting to negotiate the inclusion of a financial contribution towards play equipment. The principle of this had now been accepted by the applicant, and a contribution would be sought via the Section 106 Agreement.

The application was in outline for residential development on a site measuring approximately 0.33ha to the south of Main Road, Clenchwarton. The site formed the eastern element of one of the three housing allocations identified in the emerging Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Pre-Submission Document for Clenchwarton and Policy G25.3 related specifically to development of this allocation. Application 16/00305/O was for 16 dwellings – totalling 20 dwellings across the two sites / allocation.

The site was countryside but had residential development to the west, north (on the opposite side of Main Road) and east.

The site was located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and formed part of a wider agricultural field.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was contrary to the Parish Council recommendation and level of financial contribution.

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

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety;
- Flood risk;
- Drainage;
- Affordable housing and other contributions; and
- Other material considerations.

RESOLVED: (A) That, the application be approved, subject to conditions and completion of a suitable Section 106 Agreement within 4 months of the date of resolution to approve.

(B) That, the application be refused in the event that a suitable Section 106 Agreement is not completed within 4 months of the resolution to approve.

(vii) 16/00910/RM

**Congham: Land adjacent to Deerwood, St Andrews Lane:
Reserved Matters Application: Three detached dwellings:**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located on the northern side of St Andrews Lane, Congham. To the west and east of the site were residential properties, to the south and north was farmland.

The site was located within countryside. Congham was classed as a Smaller Village and Hamlet within the Settlement Hierarchy of the Core Strategy

The application sought reserved matters consent for the construction of three detached dwellings. All matters were reserved at the outline stage.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the views of Congham Parish Council were contrary to the officer recommendation.

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

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

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr J Sandberg (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to a query, the Principal Planner explained the distances between the plots and the boundaries.

Councillor Wareham proposed that condition 5 (relating to obscure glazing) be removed, which was seconded by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings and after having been put to the vote, was carried.

In response to a query, the Principal Planner displayed plans which showed the finishes of the houses and described the materials to be used.

RESOLVED: That, the application be approved as recommended subject to condition 5 being removed.

(viii) 16/00913/F

Dersingham: Tit Willow, 16 Park Hill: Renovation and loft conversion of dwelling: Mr and Mrs Judd

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the land was situated on the eastern side of B1140 Hunstanton Road, Dersingham; approximately 360m north of the village centre, in an area designated Built Environment Type D in the 1998 Local Plan.

The application sought to renovate and re-roof the existing detached bungalow at Tit Willow, 16 Park Hill, Dersingham with an extension to the rear north-east elevation in conjunction with a loft conversion.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Residential and visual amenity;
- Trees;
- Ecology; and
- Other material considerations.

The Principal Planner suggested that Condition 4 be amended and read out what the new condition would be.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Coral Shepherd (objecting on behalf of Nos. 3, 5, 7 and 14 Park Hill) and Mr M Judd (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Bubb (Ward Member) explained that he had called-in the application to the Committee as there was a degree of local interest however he had declined to get involved and the other Ward Member for Dersingham took the lead. He could not see any reason to refuse the application.

Several Members of the Committee commented that the proposal would enhance the area.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to amend Condition 4, which was agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended, subject to condition 4 being amended, as follow:

No development or other operations shall commence on site until the existing trees to be retained (marked T1, T2 and T3 on drawing 0811-16/02 REV C received 22/08/16) have been protected before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of development or other operations by:

- 1 Fencing, in accordance with BS5837:2012:
 - To the whole of the root protection area for retained tree T1 and, as detailed on the drawing 0811-16/02 REV C, for part of the root protection areas for retained trees T2 and T3.
 - To the south west side of the access drive that falls within the root protection area for retained trees numbered T2 and T3.

- 2 Ground protection, in accordance with BS5837:2012 (vehicle movement), to be provided to the surface of that area of the access drive that falls within the root protection area for retained trees numbered T2 and T3 (as detailed on the drawing 0811-16/02 REV C).

The fencing and ground protection shall be retained intact for the full duration of the development until all equipment, materials and surplus materials have been removed from the site.

If the fencing or ground protection material is damaged all operations shall cease until it is repaired to the standards applied in BS5837: 2012.

Nothing shall be stored or placed in any fenced or ground protected area in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavations be made without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

- (ix) **16/01191/F**
East Winch: Land east of 32 Town Close: Construction of a new 3 bedroom detached dwelling: Mr and Mrs Baljinder Anota

RESOLVED: That, the application be withdrawn from the agenda at the applicant's request.

- (x) **16/00976/F**
Heacham: 27 Malthouse Crescent: Construction of a dwelling: Mrs Bosewell

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located within an area designated as Built Environment Type D according to Local Plan Proposals Maps for Heacham.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the views of Heacham Parish Council were contrary to the officer recommendation.

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

- Principle of development and planning history;
- Form and character issues;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material considerations

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr T Parish (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) and Mr I Bix (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings referred to condition 5. The Principal Planner clarified that this condition could be removed if the Committee felt that was necessary.

The Principal Planner also advised that the boundary treatment would be a 1.8 m close boarded fence and the existing hedge would be retained.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings stated that having visited the site, she considered that the proposal would be cramped form of development.

Councillor Mrs Wright agreed that the proposal would be a cramped form of development and would be detrimental to the form and character. She therefore proposed that the application be refused, which was seconded by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings, who added that the fence was also out of character and should be a reason for refusal.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to refuse the application which was carried.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused, contrary to recommendation for the following reasons:

1. *The proposal would result in a cramped form of development out of keeping with the form and character of the area; and*

2. *The proposed fence would result in an incongruous feature in the street-scene.*

The Committee adjourned at 12.29pm and reconvened at 1.05pm

**(xi) 16/01219/F
Ringstead: Journeys End, 6 Peddars Way North: Proposed replacement dwelling: Patterson Homes (Norfolk) Ltd**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located within Built Environment Type D according to Local Plan Proposals Maps for Ringstead.

Ringstead was classified as a Smaller Village and Hamlet according to Policy CS02 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011.

The site contained a 1930s bungalow and was on the eastern side of Peddars Way North.

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

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

- Principle of development and planning history;
- Form and character;
- Impact upon the AONB;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety; and
- Any other material considerations

Councillor Mrs Wright referred to the Parish Council objection and comments from Norfolk Coast Partnership. She proposed that the application be refused on the grounds of mass and scale, the proposal would dominate the street-scene and would impact the AONB. This was seconded by Councillor Morrison.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings referred to condition 7 and the need for obscure glazing, which she considered could have been designed out.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to refuse and, having been put to the vote, was carried.

RESOLVED: That, the application be refused, contrary to recommendation, for the following reasons:

The development, by virtue of its mass and scale, would have an adverse impact upon the countryside which is in the AONB.

(xii) 16/01005/F
Upwell: Fen Regis House, 9 Town Street: Demolition of existing warehouse and erection of new food store to rear with associated parking: Saxondale Properties Ltd

Councillor Crofts left the meeting during consideration of the application.

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located within the defined village in Built Environment Type C according to the Local Plan inset map for Upwell and also within the village development boundary in the SADMPD.

The current proposal sought to demolish the existing shop, workshops and outbuildings and construct a new food store to the rear of the site with a new access and associated parking at the front.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as Councillor C J Crofts was a part-owner of the application site.

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

- Principle of development;
- Effect on form and character of the locality;
- Effect on residential amenity;
- Contamination;
- Access and highway matters;
- Crime and disorder; and
- Any other material considerations.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Pope addressed the Committee in support of the application. He welcomed the 18 car parking spaces which would be provided within the site together with dedicated spaces for people with disabilities. This would negate the need for any on-street parking and the potential for gridlock with delivery lorries. The proposal would also bring the site back into employment use and create jobs. The retailer would be able to offer a comprehensive range of products. He urged the Committee to approve the application.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings stated that there had been no objections to the application and the proposal would add to the village. The proposal also offered parking and choice for customers.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

PC34: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

The meeting closed at 1.40 pm