

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK**PLANNING COMMITTEE****Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 5th December, 2016 at 9.30 am in the Committee Suite, King's Court, Chapel Street, King's Lynn**

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs V Spikings (Chairman)
 Councillors R Blunt (sub), Mrs C Bower, A Bubb, Mrs S Buck, C J Crofts,
 Mrs S Fraser, A Morrison, T Parish (sub), M Peake, M Storey, D Tyler,
 Mrs E Watson, T Wing-Pentelow, Mrs A Wright and Mrs S Young

An apology for absence was received from Councillor J Moriarty and G Wareham

The Chairman thanked Councillors Blunt and Parish for being a substitute at the meeting.

PC55: MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 7 November 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings.

PC56: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings declared an interest in item 8/2(f) - Upwell, as she owned some land in the vicinity. She had no financial interest in the application.
- In relation to item 8/2(f) – Upwell, Councillor Crofts declared that he was a Member of Upwell Parish Council but was not a member of their Planning Committee.

PC57: URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7

In relation to item 8/1(b) – Heacham, the Assistant Director referred the Committee to the late correspondence and explained that the Council believed that deferring the application to the next Committee meeting, to enable agreement on an amended design and then consultation to take place, was the most appropriate course of action, which was agreed by the Committee.

PC58: MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34

Name	Item	Application
C E Joyce	8/1(c)	16/01105/OM
A Tyler	8/2(d)	16/01810/F

PC59: **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC60: **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.

PC61: **INDEX OF APPLICATIONS**

The Committee noted the Index of Applications.

(a) **Decisions on Applications**

The Committee considered scheduled 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) – (xiii) below, where appropriate to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chairman.

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

The Senior Planner introduced the report and explained that Members might recall this application which had been deferred from September's Committee 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.

Since that time the applicant had submitted revisions to the layout of the affordable housing. They remained within the first phase of the development towards the front of the site, but were now sited in different blocks, with other market housing between. They remained close to the proposed play area and existing village facilities.

Revised access arrangements had been proposed and a re-consultation exercise had been undertaken. The amended scheme had been reviewed by the Highways Authority, Parish Council and local residents. The Highways Authority raised no objection on highway safety grounds, subject to conditions relating to off-site highway works,

the need to enter into a Non-Adoption Agreement (NAA) regarding the maintenance of the site roads, the extending of the 30 mph speed limit to cover the site frontage along Choseley Road, the need for a Construction Traffic Management Plan and other standard conditions. The Parish Council considered the changes and confirmed that they wished to approve the revised plans.

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 the dwellings would be affordable units.

The majority of the site was located within the village settlement of Docking and within the development boundary. 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 it had been deferred from an earlier meeting.

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 Ian Johnston (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to a query, the Senior Planner explained the car parking provision for the scheme.

Concern was expressed by some Members of the Committee that the affordable housing had not been pepper-potted across the site but had been put in blocks in one corner of the site.

The Assistant Director advised that the amended layout did accord with the Council's affordable housing policy guidance. He added that with

larger schemes such as this, blocks of no more than 8 were acceptable.

One Member of the Committee commented that the applicant had gone a long way to address the concerns raised by the Committee and highlighted that the parking would now be at the rear rather than along Choseley Road, which had been a concern.

Councillor Morrison (Ward Member) stated that he knew that the village was longing for this site to be developed. He referred to the area at the rear of the site which would be for recreation and informed the Committee that this area could be contaminated. The Senior Planner confirmed that condition 11 covered this.

The Senior Planner also confirmed that the play space would be able to accommodate play equipment and the management and maintenance of the public open space would be controlled through the Section 106 agreement.

In response to a query regarding safety measures for the ponds, the Senior Planner explained details of the open space and ponds would be provided in the landscape management plan.

The Senior Planner also explained that Condition 26 required the development to be carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures set out in the Ecological Appraisal Update, and the issue of hibernating hedgehogs would be highlighted.

The Senior Planner also explained that each unit had its own private space, together with a rear access for each property.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings stated that she was pleased that the scheme provided affordable housing but she considered that it was not pepper-potted across the development.

One member of the Committee suggested that pepper-potting meant scattered across the site, and that the Affordable Housing Policy needed to be revisited. In relation to this scheme, he considered that the affordable housing had been provided in a hamlet. However, he considered that the applicant had gone a long way to address the concerns of the Committee.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings considered that the applicant had ample time for this to be amended, as the Committee had asked for the affordable housing to be pepper-potted. She therefore proposed that the application be refused.

The Executive Director advised that when the application was deferred, the applicant had reconsidered the layout of the scheme and followed the Council's policy on affordable housing. He considered that the right

course of action would be to review the Affordable Housing Policy, if Members were not happy with it.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings stated that she understood the advice given, however the Committee had asked for the affordable housing to be pepper-potted, which she considered had not taken place.

The Assistant Director read out the affordable housing policy guidance to the Committee.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings added that she did not feel that the affordable housing would be fully integrated and create a mixed community. The proposal to refuse the application was seconded by Councillor Mrs Fraser.

One Member of the Committee stated that congratulations should be passed onto the applicant, as the design of the houses particularly at the front of the site would fit in with the rest of the village. She added that the affordable housing had been positioned in the best location, nearest to the school and facilities.

Councillor Morrison (Ward Member) added that there was something to be said for the row of houses being together as this did replicate something further along the street. He informed the Committee that the Parish Council supported the proposal. He queried who to contact if the water pressure deteriorated for the village.

The Executive Director advised that Anglian Water had a statutory duty to provide those services. He also explained that this application stood in its own right and had to be determined on its own merits, as would any other site.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to refuse the application on the grounds that the location of the affordable housing would not be fully integrated with the rest of the site and would not create a mixed community, but was lost.

Councillor Mrs Spikings asked for her vote to be recorded against the following resolution.

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 Legal Agreement to secure an affordable housing contribution, County contributions, open space, local area of play, SUDS management and maintenance and habitats tariff within 4 months of the date of resolution to approve.

- (ii) **16/01713/FM**
Heacham: Reg J Stainsby & Son, 43 Lynn Road: Demolition of existing building and construction of Class A1 (retail) food store together with access, car parking, landscaping and associated engineering works: Lidl UK GmbH

The application had been deferred.

- (iii) **16/01105/OM**
King's Lynn: Site west of St Peters Road, West Lynn: Outline application with some matters reserved: Residential development for 44 dwellings: V W Wolfe & T D Wolfe

The Senior Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was approximately 1.7ha of scrub land on the western side of St Peter's Road, West Lynn and to the north of West Lynn Drain. The site contained a ditch that ran north to south which then extended part way along the southern and northern boundaries of the site.

The application site was the majority of the land allocated for residential development under Policy E1.14 – West Lynn, west of St Peter's Road of the Site Specific Allocations and Development Management Plan Document. Policy E1.14 was for at least 49 dwellings, however taking into account the property at 4 Bramley Close and 105 St Peter's Road having been removed as part of this outline application, this application sought permission for 44 dwellings with only access being determined at this stage.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the financial contribution towards West Lynn School's expansion would be in excess of £60,000.

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

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Highways impact;
- Flood risk and drainage;
- Ecology;
- Affordable housing;
- Open space;
- Infrastructure provision; and
- Other material considerations

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Bridget Jones (objecting), Mr C Skinner (objecting) and Mr C Parsons (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor C Joyce addressed the Committee.

Councillor Joyce stated that he had called in the application so that the decision would be made in public. He explained that in the 1990's the applicant had proposed a single dwelling on the land however this had been refused because the site was in the countryside, a decision he had disagreed with at the time.

His main concern regarding the application related to the school. He acknowledged that the applicant was providing some parking spaces as part of the application, however, the land that the school sat on was too small. He informed the Committee of other potential development in West Lynn coming forward and the impact of that on the school.

He stated that he did not object to the principle of development but felt that the scheme should reduce to allow the school to expand. He concluded that there must be a way to allow development and for the school to be able to expand.

The Assistant Director explained that this was an allocated site for housing in the Local Plan, and there was no requirement in policy to expand the school.

In response to a comment, the Executive Director explained that when the local plan was produced it went out to consultation with all service providers including GPs, Anglian Water, Norfolk County Council, etc. At that time the question was asked as to whether there was capacity in the area for the proposed allocations and Norfolk County Council Education Authority had been asked that question. He added that policies were in place to give clarity to everyone – landowners, officers, etc.

One member of the Committee stated that all primary schools in the area were about to become academies.

Another member of the Committee stated that the 17 letters of objection needed to be taken into account.

In response to a question regarding whether a traffic survey had undertaken, the Senior Planner explained that as the site was an allocated site, any survey works would have been carried out prior to being allocated.

RESOLVED: (A) That, the application be approved, subject to conditions (including the additional condition outlined in late

correspondence), and completion of a Section 106 agreement within 4 months of the date of the decision.

(B) That in the event that the Section 106 agreement is not completed within 4 months of the date of this Committee meeting, the application shall be refused due to the failure to secure affordable housing, public open space, county contributions, habitats mitigation contribution and the provision, maintenance and management of SUDS.

(iv) 16/01327/FM

King's Lynn: Land at Greenpark Avenue: The construction of 9 dwellings, associated access roads, footways and new access of public open space and associated external works: BCKLWN

The Planner introduced the report and explained that the application sought full planning permission for the erection of public open space. Thirteen of the dwellings would be affordable.

The site extended to approximately 3.58ha and was situated around 200m west of the main Lynnsport site. The site was bisected by Greenpark Avenue, resulting in two relatively narrow strips of land comprising grass and dense scrubland situated either side of the highway. The site was bounded to the west by residential development fronting onto Columbia Way and to the north east and east by the Lynnsport Complex. To the northwest there was an area of further dense scrubland. The southern boundary was marked by a drainage ditch running east-west beyond which an area of public space was located and a wider area of disused amenity land which formed part of a redundant and restored landfill site. The latter element was currently being brought into use as amenity land as part of the Lynnsport Open Space Strategy.

The site formed part of a wider housing allocation in the recently adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (SADMP), September 2016.

The site was located within Flood Zones 2 and 3.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as it was a Borough Council application with objections.

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

- Principle of development;
- Flood risk and drainage;
- Form, character and design;
- Residential amenity;
- Access, transport and parking;

- Open space, recreation and ecology;
- Trees and landscaping;
- Affordable housing and other contributions; and
- Crime and disorder

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr M Coote (objecting), Sue Bruce (objecting), Fergus Bootman (supporting) and Dale Gagen (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In relation to a comment made from the public speaker regarding the inclusion of bungalows within the scheme, the Planner explained that bungalows had been originally included, however this would have received an objection from the Environment Agency. Therefore the bungalows had been removed from the scheme.

Reference was made to other countries which used innovative approaches to this problem, and it was asked whether this Council should be looking for a solution. Accommodation for the elderly and disabled people should be provided and it would be feather in the Council's cap if a solution could be found.

The Planner explained the measures that would be required to overcome the objection from the Environment Agency and it was considered that this would not be acceptable in design terms and it was not for the Local Authority to look at design solutions.

It was explained that the Urban Panel was very keen for the Council to look ahead and do something slightly different.

The Assistant Director explained that the Council, as Local Planning Authority, could not insist that bungalows were provided. He reiterated that the applicant did want to include bungalows in the scheme but this would have received an objection from the Environment Agency.

In response to questions, the Planner explained that:

- The details of the water butts would be provided as part of the SuDS condition, and it was not necessary to see a design of them at this stage.
- The Planner highlighted the phases of development and open spaces on the plan. It was also explained that the applicant would be providing 11,000 sq.m of open space, which was in excess of the policy requirement.
- 15 visitor parking bays were located around the site.
- Some of the spurs off Greenpark Avenue would be adopted and some un-adopted. The un-adopted spurs would have permeable paving. The spurs were highlighted on the plans.

In response to a comment regarding including bungalows within the scheme, the Assistant Director explained that the applicant could give

this further consideration but he did not consider that this should stop this application being determined. He added that care needed to be given regarding this because the Council was the applicant.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings drew the Committee's attention to late correspondence and the need to correct Condition 17, which was agreed.

RESOLVED: (A) That, the application be approved, subject to conditions (including the amendment of Condition 17 as detailed in late correspondence) 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.

(v) **16/00426/F**
Downham Market: Land to the south of 17 Railway Road: Variation of Condition 24 of planning permission 13/01164/FM to allow the link road to be constructed in advance of the occupation of the 62nd open market dwelling: H C Moss (builders) Ltd

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site amounted to 3.37ha and was located to the south of Railway Road, Downham Market and to the east of the Ben Bailey Homes development. The northern area of the site was located adjacent to the Downham Market Conservation Area.

Planning permission was granted in May 2014 for residential development of 97 dwellings with public open space (planning ref: 13/01164/FM). Condition 24 of the permission required that the link road between Richmond Road to the south and Primrose Avenue (Ben Bailey Homes development) to the north-west corner should be provided no later than the commencement of the 50th dwelling on the site. This was to ensure that the highway link was provided in the interests of the proper planning of the area. The condition was imposed in full knowledge that there was a ransom strip between the application site and the Ben Bailey Homes development and to allow time for this matter to be resolved.

The current application was to vary Condition 24 of 13/01164/FM to increase the number of units that could be occupied to 62 open market dwellings before the link road was provided.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the Town Council objected to the proposal.

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

- The principle of varying Condition 24; and
- Any other matters that require consideration prior to the determination of the application.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Simon Platt (objecting), Mr Frank Daymond (objecting on behalf of the Town Council) and Mr Dadge (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Principal Planner explained that she had been advised that negotiations were taking place between the applicant and owner of the ransom strip.

The Committee discussed the application and acknowledged that it was a difficult application to determine as the Council appeared to be caught between the applicant and landowner, however, it was felt imperative that the link road was provided.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that the revised trigger point did not give enough certainty that the link road would be provided. This was seconded by Councillor Morrison.

Councillor Wing-Pentelow proposed that the application be deferred for a cycle to allow the negotiations to continue, which was agreed.

RESOLVED: That, the application be deferred for a cycle to allow the negotiations to continue between the parties.

(vi) 16/01690/F
Downham Market: 43 Bexwell Road: Erection of residential dwelling and associated works: Mr Gary Ridgewell

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application was made for full planning permission for the erection of a single 3 bed bungalow on land to the rear of 43 Bexwell Road, Downham Market.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the views of the Town Council were contrary to the officers' recommendation.

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

- Principle of development;
- Access; and
- Impact on residential amenity.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Frank Daymond (objecting on behalf of the Town Council) and Mr A Fisher (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

(vii) 16/01678/F

Heacham: 9 Lamsey Lane: Conversion of existing garage/workshop to holiday annexe: Mr and Mrs MacGowan-Rudd

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the land was situated on the north-east side of Lamsey Lane, Heacham to the south of the hub of the village and approximately 100m south of South Moor Drive.

The application sought to convert and extend the existing garage/workshop at 9 Lamsey Lane to form a one-bedroom holiday annex.

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012, the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Core Strategy 2011 and the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Development Management Policies Plan 2016 were particularly relevant to this application.

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;
- Form and character and amenity;
- Tourism;
- Highways; and
- Other considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Michael Williamson (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to a query regarding where the amenity area for the holiday home was, the Senior Planner explained that there would not be a separate amenity space for the holiday home.

The Senior Planner also identified on the plans the parking area, which was at the front of the property.

It was asked whether the number of weeks per year could be limited when the holiday home was used and how could that be policed. The

Assistant Director explained that condition 6 covered that. He also explained that the register would only be looked at if a complaint had been received.

Councillor Mrs Wright stated that she was unhappy with the proposal. She therefore proposed that the application be refused on the grounds of a cramped form of development and lack of amenity area. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Mrs Young.

It was highlighted that it had been written into the supporting case that the future use of the building could be as a granny flat. Reference was made to the fact that a business plan had been mentioned, however, only three lines of text could be found.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to refuse the application on the grounds that the proposal would be a cramped form of overdevelopment on the site, was not in-keeping with the surrounding area and there was a lack of amenity and private space, which was carried.

Councillor Parish abstained from the following vote.

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

'The proposal represents overdevelopment of the site and a cramped form of development, contrary to the provisions of the NPPF, policy CS08 of the Core Strategy, and DM15 of the Site Allocations & Development Management policies document.

The lack of a private amenity space for the proposed annex, and the lack of separation between the proposed annex and the donor property, is considered to be contrary to provisions of the NPPF, policy CS08 of the Core Strategy and policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management policies document.'

The Committee then adjourned at 12.35 pm and reconvened at 1.15 pm

(viii) 16/01810/F

King's Lynn: Wind Turbine, SW Point Cottages, Cross Bank Road: To allow the engineering works to be carried out to implement a stopping up order to BOAT1: Mickram Ltd

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located within an area designated as countryside according to the Site Specific Allocation and Development Management Plan Document.

The site was located between the River Great Ouse and the byway Open to All Traffic (BOAT).

Members might recall that the most recent application, 16/01022/F to provide a semi-circular road to divert the BOAT around the perimeter of the blade swept area of the applicant's turbine, was refused by Committee; the preceding application, 16/00531/F to erect 300m of roadway had been withdrawn.

This application sought consent to provide a semi-circular roadway approximately 1.5m outside of the blade swept area in order to overcome the reason for refusing 16/01022/F.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of the Assistant Director – Environment & Planning.

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

- Planning history and principle of development;
- Impact upon amenity;
- Flood risk;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material considerations.

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

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor A Tyler (Ward Member) addressed the Committee. He stated that having heard the previous speaker he supported his submission. He referred the Committee to the report – Impact upon Amenity – where it stated that 'the proposal could be seen as a form of betterment over and above the requirements of condition 11 of 14/00398/F'. He added that he would agree with this having visited the site on more than one occasion. He considered it to be a quiet and secluded area and had only met one member of the public. He added that he forgot the presence of the turbine. He considered that if the diversion route was agreed there would be no danger to the public. He therefore supported the application.

Councillor Mrs Buck (Ward Member) added that alterations had been made to the scheme. She referred to the Public Right Of Way Officer's comments where it stated that it would be important to visually mark the edge of the byway as there would be a vertical drop at that point, and asked whether this could be conditioned. This was agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: That, the application be approved as recommended, subject to the imposition of an additional condition to visually mark the edge of the byway.

**(ix) 15/02068/CU
Pentney: Pentney Lakes Leisure Park, Abbey Road:
Change of use of land to accommodate 31 holiday lodges,
change of use of the existing office accommodation to a
restaurant/reception: Luxurious Leisure Ltd**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that Pentney Lakes Leisure Park was located to the east of Common Road, Pentney.

The application site comprised the existing office building to the entrance to the site and various plots within the Lakes complex, all of which were accessed via an internal track leading around the site.

The site was located in the countryside as defined by the Core Strategy 2011 and the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016.

The proposal was for the change of use of land to accommodate 31 holiday lodges and the change of use of the existing office accommodation to create a restaurant and reception.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the Parish Council objected to the proposal.

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

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Highway issues; and
- Any other matters requiring consideration prior to the determination of the application.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Andrew Ramm (objecting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Reference was made to the Norfolk Wildlife Trust's comments regarding how the previous permission addressed the ban within the Section 106 on motorised craft using Bird Lake, and whether this had been addressed. The Principal Planner explained that the site was subject of an over-arching Section 106 Agreement to protect sensitive features of the site, and this application would not alter that.

In response to a query the Principal Planner explained that the applicant proposed OMAR Homes lodges across the 31 plots. Twenty-one plots would have twin lodges and the remaining 10 plots located on the south boundary of the site adjacent to the water ski club would

have single unit lodges. The units would be log cabin style and would be conditioned accordingly.

RESOLVED:(1) That, the application be approved, subject to conditions (including amending condition 4, as detailed in late correspondence) and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement within 4 months of the date of this resolution.

(2) That the application be refused in the event that the Section 106 Agreement had not been completed within 4 months of the resolution due to the failure to secure the communal facilities and to prevent further sub-division of the site.

(x) 16/01608/F
Upwell: Site off The Cottage, Stonehouse Road: Proposed single storey agricultural shed: Mr C Morton

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings declared an interest as she owned some land in the vicinity. She had no financial interest in the application.

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site (0.589 ha) comprised the north-eastern corner of a hayfield off Stonehouse Road. The site was bounded to the south and west by an agricultural paddock. To the north was Stonehouse Road and to the east was scrub and low hedgerow. The site was located outside the defined village development area in the recently adopted Site Allocations & Development Management Policy Document and outside the Upwell Conservation Area.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon character and appearance of the countryside;
- Highway issues; and
- Other material considerations.

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

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

(xi) 16/01524/F
Walpole Highway: Windyridge, Mill Lane: Relocation and retention of mobile low capacity incinerator for the disposal

of waste cat litter and small animal incineration: Nicolle Grange

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site comprises a two storey cottage and outbuildings on an application site measuring 0.13ha. There was an existing cattery business, Country Lodge Cattery, operating from the outbuildings on the site; with a small dog grooming facility also available behind the reception area on site. The incinerator on site was currently located behind a timber cladded fence, which acted as a screen between the cattery building, reception area and the dwelling on the site.

The application proposed the relocation and retention of a mobile low capacity incinerator for the disposal of waste cat litter and small animal incineration.

Walpole Highway was classified as a Rural Village within the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy.

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

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

- The principle of development and planning history;
- Neighbour amenity; and
- Other material considerations

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

(xii) 15/01955/F

West Dereham: Woodside Barn, The Row: Variation of Condition 2 attached to planning permission 11/00695/F: Proposed conversion and extension of domestic outbuilding to residential dwelling making use of an altered access to form shared driveway with Close View. Application to also include the alteration of existing land to form rear amenity space and parking and turning to the front: MRC Group

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located within West Dereham, a Smaller Village and Hamlet in the adopted Local Plan.

The application sought to amend a previous consent 11/00695/F which granted conversion and extension of a barn to a detached dwelling. Specifically the applicant was seeking to vary condition 2 and amend the approved plans to allow the use of air source heat pumps and some minor modifications to the fenestration.

The conversion was complete but the dwelling was currently vacant, awaiting a decision on the application prior to sale.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Visual impact; and
- Noise and amenity issues.

RESOLVED: That, the application be approved as recommended.

(xiii) 2/TPO/00554

Burnham Thorpe: Rear of 2 Creake Road: To consider whether to confirm, not confirm or amend the Order: Holkham Hall

The Arboricultural Officer introduced the report and explained that the Cherry Tree (T1) was situated in the rear garden of 2 Creake Road, Burnham Thorpe on the property boundary with Blacksmiths Lane. T1 could be clearly seen along Creake Road, both from the east and west, was clearly seen along the entire length of Blacksmiths Lane and both the eastern and western approaches along Walsingham Road.

The Committee noted the following:

- The reason for making the Tree Preservation Order;
- An outline of objections and representations;
- Response to objections.

The Arboricultural Officer explained that the tree contributed greatly to the character and appearance of the street-scene and the wider landscape, both now and more importantly into the future. It was considered that the reasons put forward by the objector were of sufficient weight to overcome the harm to the character and appearance of the locality that would occur should the tree be removed. It was therefore recommended that the order was confirmed.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr C Yardley (supporting) addressed the Committee in support of the Order.

RESOLVED: That, the Order be confirmed without modification.

PC62: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

The meeting closed at 2.00 pm