

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

Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 7th June, 2017 at 9.30 am in the Assembly Room, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs V Spikings (Chairman)
Councillors A Bubb, C J Crofts, A Morrison, T Parish, M Peake, Miss S Sandell, M Storey, D Tyler, Mrs E Watson, A White, Mrs A Wright and Mrs S Young

PC1: **APOLOGIES**

PC2: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest in relation to these applications.

PC3: **DECISIONS ON APPLICATIONS**

The Committee was invited to determine the following application, which had been adjourned from the meeting held on Monday 5 June 2017, and had been the subject of a site inspection held earlier today:

- (i) **17/00445/F**
Old Hunstanton: 1 Sea Lane: New vehicular access: Mr & Mrs Wase

The Principal Planner advised that there were no outstanding points following the site visits.

Councillor Blunt asked why there was a need for a new access. The Assistant Director explained that County Highways considered that using the access onto Sea Lane was an exacerbation of use. The Committee needed to consider the proposed access in its own right.

Councillor Blunt disagreed with the advice from County Highways, as he considered that the proposed access was dangerous. He considered that it would be dangerous trying to exit the access with people standing at the bus stop and walking across the pavement. He also had concerns relating to the visibility from the right hand side.

The Assistant Director advised that without County Highway support an objection on highway grounds would be difficult to sustain.

Councillor Miss Sandell expressed concern regarding the loss of wall in the Conservation Area.

The Assistant Director explained that in relation to the loss of the wall, the Committee would need to consider whether it preserved or enhanced the character of the Conservation Area.

Councillor Mrs Wright added that the small piece of land with the village sign on it was also part of the Conservation Area and the proposal would have an impact on this. She was also concerned in relation to highway safety particularly with the visibility to the right and with people standing at the bus stop.

Councillor Morrison referred to the people waiting at the bus stop at the time of the site visit and suggested that they were not all waiting for the bus to arrive but were objectors to the application. He added that the visibility to the left was adequate and he did not think that the post would be in the way when looking to the right.

Councillor Mrs Watson supported the application and added that she considered that the access was satisfactory.

Councillor Storey stated that this was a busy area, with the bus stop, shop, hotel opposite the site and the Sea Lane access. He added that when on the site visit, he could see parking on both sides of the road and considered that the safest point of access was from Sea Lane.

Councillor Crofts agreed that an entrance from Sea Lane would be better. He also agreed that the area was cluttered. He also referred to the hedge on the right hand side, which was out of the applicant's control.

The Executive Director explained that County Highways and the Inspector had stated that the applicant could not use the existing access as this would create a shared parking area and shared amenity space. This application had been submitted in response to the appeal decision.

In relation to highway safety, the Executive Director stated that he was a little surprised that County Highways had not raised any concern in relation to the application. He did consider that the area was 'cluttered' with the junction to Sea Lane, the adjacent bus stop, layby and hotel opposite, and County Highways were asked to look at the application again. However Highways had confirmed that they were content with their recommendation.

Councillor Parish stated that he agreed with the comments made by Councillor Crofts. He added that he understood that County Highways were only a consultee. He considered that their advice was not correct in this instance.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings stated that the whole issue of the annex was to retain it with the main building. She added that the existing driveway was in the correct location whereas the proposed

new driveway would cause inherent problems with the shop, Lodge Hotel, bus stop, etc.

Councillor Mrs Spikings then proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that by taking out some of the wall would change the form and character of the area and would introduce an alien feature into the street scene. It would fail to preserve or enhance the conservation area. This was seconded by Councillor Mrs Wright.

Councillor Crofts referred to the trees and commented that in a conservation area, trees were automatically covered by a Tree Preservation Order. The Assistant Director explained that if permission were to be granted then there would be no objection to the removal of the trees.

Councillor Storey wished to add highway safety as an additional reason for refusal.

The Executive Director explained that the alternative access could not be used and the Committee needed to consider the proposed access only. He urged the Committee to accept the advice from County Highways, as if the application went to appeal those reasons for refusal would need to be defended.

Councillors Blunt and Storey stated that they would be prepared to go to appeal to defend that reason at appeal and felt that on this occasion the advice from County Highways was not correct.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to refuse the application on the grounds of the impact on the conservation area and highway safety grounds, which was carried.

RESOLVED: That, the application be refused, contrary to recommendation for the reasons described above.

(ii) 17/00444/F

Old Hunstanton: Removal of condition 2 of planning reference number 2/85/3706/CU/F/BR to enable the two storey dwelling and the annex to form two separate planning units: Mr & Mrs Wase

The Assistant Director advised that as the previous application to create a new access had been refused, this application would no longer be able to satisfy the previous appeal decision and therefore should be refused.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings therefore proposed that the application be refused, given the findings of the previous appeal decision and the conflict with it, which was seconded by Councillor Mrs Wright. The precise wording for the reasons for refusal would be

agreed following consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman. This was agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: That, the application be refused, contrary to recommendation, with the precise wording for the reasons for refusal to be agreed following consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

The meeting closed at 11.05 am