

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on
Monday, 3rd July, 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, Mrs S Fraser, G Hipperson, A Morrison, T Parish,
M Peake, Miss S Sandell, M Storey, G Wareham, Mrs E Watson, A White,
Mrs A Wright and Mrs S Young

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Mrs S Buck and D Tyler

PC13: **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs S Buck and D Tyler.

The Committee wished Councillor D Tyler a speedy recovery.

PC14: **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 5 June 2017 and the Reconvened Meeting held on 7 June 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

PC15: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declaration of interests.

PC16: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no urgent business under Standing Order 7.

PC17: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

There were no Members present under Standing Order 34.

PC18: **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC19: **RECEIPT OF LATE CORRESPONDENCE ON APPLICATIONS**

A copy of the summary of late 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.

PC20: **INDEX OF APPLICATIONS**

The Committee noted the Index of Applications.

(a) **Decisions on Applications**

The Committee considered schedules of applications for planning permission submitted by the Executive Director for Planning & Environment (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) – (ix) below, where appropriate to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chairman.

(i) **16/02140/FM**

Brancaster: Land south of 14 to 32 and east of Dolphin Place, Town Lane, The Close, Brancaster Staithe: Proposed construction of new residential dwellings, roads, open space and associated landscaping: Fleur Hill LLP

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was located on the southern side of The Close at Brancaster Staithe, which was accessed off the southern side of the main A149 running through the village.

The site was currently arable agricultural land and extended to 0.7 hectares. There were hedge boundaries around two sides of the site to the north and west. Undeveloped arable farmland was to the south, with existing residential development to the north in The Close and to the west, accessed from Town Lane. There was more arable land to the east between the nearest residential development in Common Lane.

The land levels changed across the site and the land was of grade 2 agricultural quality.

The form and character of the residential development in The Close comprised mainly of two storey runs of terraced and semi-detached properties. Town Lane was characterised by detached dwellings of various designs.

The site was within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The site was an allocation for Brancaster Staithe under Policy G13.2 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016, with the policy requiring at least 10 dwellings on 0.7ha.

The application was for full planning permission and sought planning permission for proposed residential development of 12 dwellings with access off The Close. During the course of the application the site boundary had been amended to follow that of the allocated site shown in Policy G13.2.

The application had been referred to the Committee at the request of Councillor Mrs Watson and the views of Brancaster Parish Council were contrary to the officer recommendation.

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

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon AONB and visual amenity;
- Form and character;
- Highway impacts;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity;
- Trees and landscape;
- Ecology;
- Affordable housing;
- Open space;
- Flood risk and drainage;
- S106 matters; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Steven Harvey (objecting), Edward Gould (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council and Jamie Bird (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to comments raised by the objectors, the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings asked whether the housing could be subject to the local connection criteria. The Executive Director explained that this would only be relevant for an exception site, which this was not.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings stated that an affordable housing policy for villages should be looked at sooner rather than later.

In relation to the Inspector's comments with regards to the Local Plan at examination stage, the Assistant Director explained that the Inspector had acknowledged the objection put forward by the Parish Council but there had been no objection from County Highways. The

Inspector considered that the site had scored the best and was satisfied that the allocation was sound.

Councillor Mrs Wright referred to an archaeological dig which had taken place and that the Historic Environment Service had not made any comments in relation to the application.

The Assistant Director explained that the Historic Environment Service (HES) was not a statutory consultee. They were sent the weekly list of planning applications and it was up to them to comment on the applications of interest to them. The Assistant Director advised that the HES team had lost resources but officers relied on them to feedback any comments.

Councillor Mrs Wright stated that she would not like the area to become a 'ghost village' in the winter months. She urged officers to look at ways to stop this happening otherwise there would be a crisis.

The Executive Director advised that second home ownership had been an issue for many years and there were currently no Government restrictions regarding who someone could sell a house onto.

However, the Government was now attaching weight to Neighbourhood Plans, and St Ives Council had been subject to a judicial review by a developer for having a second home restriction within their Neighbourhood Development Plan. The judicial review was unsuccessful.

The Executive Director advised that Brancaster Parish Council could amend their Neighbourhood Plan if they wished to introduce a policy specific for the village, which they could do faster than the Council could. He added that the Council would be happy to work with the Parish to make an amendment to the Neighbourhood Plan. However, the Policy would only be applicable for new properties and the vast majority of properties in Brancaster could be sold as second homes.

The Parish Council could also bring forward an exception site on their land or a landowner could bring forward an affordable housing scheme.

Councillor Mrs Watson stated that she had a great deal of difficulty with this application and had sympathy with the residents of Brancaster. She referred to the two letters of objection from the Parish Council back in 2013. She explained that Brancaster was full of visitors in the summer months and parking was a problem. She considered that the proposed 30mph speed limit would not help matters and yellow lines would start to urbanise the village. She added that access to The Close was bad enough now and the provision of two car parking spaces was not enough.

Councillor Mrs Watson also considered that the amount of second homes was higher than the figure quoted by the applicant (40%). She

added that Brancaster was a wonderful community and if it became overwhelmed by second homes then it would lose the community feeling.

The Executive Director referred to the two letters mentioned by Councillor Mrs Watson and explained that there were many consultation stages for the Local Plan. The Parish Council did make representation to the Inquiry and the Inspector properly considered the issues raised by them.

Councillor Crofts referred to the situation at St Ives Parish Council, and added that the policy needed to be changed. He suggested that the application should be deferred until Brancaster Parish Council had changed their Neighbourhood Plan.

The Executive Director advised that in order to amend a Neighbourhood Plan there would still be a number of stages to go through and it would be at least 12-18 months. It would however still be faster than looking to amend the Local Plan. He explained that it would be unreasonable to defer the application for 18 months. The Committee needed to determine the application in accordance with the current adopted policy.

The Executive Director added that this was a good scheme and fitted well into the area. In terms of who would buy the houses, he explained that there was no control over that and if the Parish wanted that control then it was in their gift for future applications.

Councillor Morrison stated that a material planning consideration was the impact on the AONB. The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings advised that this had been considered when the site came forward for allocation.

Councillor Morrison referred to page 20, 4th paragraph where it stated that in terms of layout and design it is considered the proposed development pays sufficient regard to the existing surrounding development. He referred to the proposed gate and asked where this would be situated. The Principal Planner highlighted this on the plan.

Councillor Morrison informed the Committee that the applicant had stated that he intended to develop the rest of the land.

The Executive Director advised that in relation to the applicant's future intentions, it would be sensible for him to retain an option for the future, however, this parcel of land had not been put forward as a Local Plan allocation. The applicant could bring forward a larger scheme in the future but that had no relevance on this application.

In relation to the impact on the AONB, he explained that the Inspector had taken that into account at the Local Plan Inquiry.

The Executive Director added that the Committee needed to consider whether the scheme would harm the AONB. In addition, Norfolk Coast Partnership considered that the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the AONB.

Councillor Bubb informed the Committee that where a village had a National Park in it, those villages were subject to a local occupancy criteria. Because Brancaster had an AONB, this should enable the Parish Council to have such a scheme for the area.

The Assistant Director explained that there was a policy mechanism in place already for exception sites and advised the Parish Council to talk with the Council's Housing team.

Councillor Parish congratulated the public speakers objecting to the application. He referred to the response from County Highways and queried whether their response was wrong in this instance. He added that the building of houses would cause disruption in Brancaster.

The Assistant Director explained that the site was an allocated site and as such the suitability of the access would have been looked at during the process. He added that the access and the number of parking spaces conformed to County Highways standards. There was no reason to object to the application on highway grounds.

In response to a query regarding the design of the proposed dwellings, the Assistant Director advised that materials would be controlled by Condition 3.

Councillor Storey expressed concern that the site was Grade 2 agricultural land. He asked for clarification in relation to where the affordable housing was sited. The Principal Planner highlighted the affordable housing on the plan. Councillor Storey expressed concern that in his opinion the affordable housing had not been pepper-potted across the site. He added that he felt for the community of Brancaster.

The Assistant Director advised that the affordable housing had been pepper-potted in accordance with the Council's own housing policy and there was no policy requirement for the houses to have garages.

The Principal Planner advised that Plot 1 had two car parking spaces in front of it and plot 2 had part of a garage block and one parking space.

The Executive Director advised that it was being assumed that the houses would be for second homes however this was not guaranteed. He further added that there were no reasons to refuse the application.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings drew the Committee's attention to the late correspondence and the need to amend Conditions 2 and 6, which were agreed.

RESOLVED: (A) That, the application be approved, subject to conditions and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement within 4 months of the date of resolution to approve and the amendment of conditions 2 and 6 as outlined in late correspondence.

(B) 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 failure to secure affordable housing, habitat mitigation fee, maintenance and management of public open space, SUDs design and maintenance.

(ii) 17/00825/F

**Flitcham with Appleton: 33 Church Road, Flitcham:
Demolition of existing flat roof rear extension and side 2
storey pitched roof element and construction of new 2
storey pitched roof side and rear extension with detached
garage: Client of Holt Architectural Ltd**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located within the Conservation Area of Flitcham. Flitcham was classified as a Rural Village according to Policy CS02 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011.

The application site contained one of a pair of semi-detached two storey properties that were constructed solely from red brick.

The application had been the subject of a recently refused application for two storey, single storey extensions and detached garage, 16/01482/F and subsequently dismissed appeal APP/V2635/D/16/316385.

The proposal sought consent for single, two storey extensions and a detached garage, which was trying to address the reasons for dismissing the appeal.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the site had been the subject of a recently dismissed appeal.

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

- Principle of development and planning history;
- Impact upon the Conservation Area and general form and character issues;
- Highway safety;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity; and
- Other material considerations.

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

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

- (iii) **17/00735/F**
Holme next the Sea: Sandy Ridge, Broadwater Road:
Variation of condition 10 of planning permission 16/00323/F
(replacement dwelling): To amend previously approved
drawings: Mr David Gray

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site comprised a triangular plot of land containing a detached dwelling of single storey height, a series of domestic outbuildings and associated garden land. The site was bounded to the south by a detached dwelling. To the south, on the south side of Broadwater Road, was a caravan whilst to the north and north-east were the coastal marshes and open land leading out towards the sea.

In policy terms the site was in countryside and within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). It was in or close to nature conservation sites of national and international importance including an SSSI, National Nature Reserve, Special Protection Area, Ramsar Site and Special Area of Conservation.

The area was also in a high risk flood zone (Flood zone 3 and Tidal Hazard Area).

The Planning Committee granted full planning permission for a replacement dwelling following the demolition of the existing chalet bungalow and ancillary structures on the site in 2016 (ref: 16/00323/F).

The current application sought variance of condition 10 of planning permission 16/00323/F to amend the previously approved drawings.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Form and character and impact on AONB;
- Nature and conservation issues;
- Flood risk;
- Residential amenity; and
- Other matters.

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

Councillor Mrs Wright queried the use of the word Hamlet, as she understood this to mean somewhere without a Church. It was explained that the policy term was 'smaller village and hamlet' and Holme was classed as a smaller village.

Councillor Mrs Wright added that the proposal did not reflect the other properties built along Broadwater Road.

The Principal Planner then outlined the changes to the application and compared them with the approved scheme.

Councillor Morrison considered that the fenestration was too fussy.

Councillor Storey stated that the proposed dwelling had an industrial feel to it and he did not agree with the design.

The Principal Planner advised that the design had been modified to meet the applicant's needs and budget.

Councillor Parish agreed with the comments from the Norfolk Coast Partnership, and added that the proposed rooflights would add light to the sky at night.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings referred to page 52 of the agenda, 4th paragraph which talked about the use of materials. She added that she would like to see original materials used.

Councillor Mrs Spikings then proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that the proposed amendments to the design were a retrograde step and the impact of rooflights on the night sky. This was seconded by Councillor Mrs Wright.

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:

'The proposed amendments to the design were considered to be a retrograde step, particularly the revised fenestration, loss of traditional materials and the rooflights, which also were considered to adversely impact upon the darkness of the night sky in this particular area. This is considered to be contrary to policies DM5 and DM15 of the Site Allocations & Development Management Policies Plan, policies CS06 & CS07 of the Core Strategy, and the NPPF which seeks a high standard of design.'

- (iv) **17/00466/F**
Hunstanton: 99 South Beach Road: Removal of condition 16 of planning permission 16/01550/F to allow 12 months unrestricted occupancy: Mr Justin Wing

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that Members might recall this application from the previous meeting in June to allow further information to be obtained, in view of comments made by the applicant that the existing bungalow on the site could be occupied for 11 months of the year.

Following the meeting, it had been established that the current dwelling would be occupied for 11 months of the year.

The application site, 99 South Beach Road, Hunstanton was located in the Coastal Hazard Zone (Holme to Wolferton Creek) and Flood Zone 3.

The site had recently benefited from permission for a replacement dwelling which was subject to an occupancy restriction, condition 16, 16/01550/F, in line with Policy DM18 (Coastal Flood Risk Hazard Zone) of the Site Allocation and Development Management Policies Plan.

The application sought consent to remove condition 16 to allow 12 month occupancy of the new dwelling.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Mrs Bower and the views of the Town Council were contrary to the officer recommendation.

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

- Principle of development and planning history; and
- Flood risk

The Principal Planner drew the Committee's attention to the late correspondence, which attached an appeal decision received this week, which had been dismissed in connection with Policy DM18.

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

In response to a comment by the applicant that the case officer had offered an 11 month occupancy condition and then subsequently retracted it, the Assistant Director explained that internal discussions had taken place on the issues around the case, and the potential recommendation going forward. However, an appeal decision had been received which upheld the Council's policy adopted at the end of last year and it was considered that the policy needed to be upheld. It was explained that the preferred approach of the Environment Agency was to prevent any new or replacement dwellings. However during the Local Plan process, a compromise was sought with the Environment Agency, which was a concession of 6 months occupancy restriction.

The Assistant Director acknowledged that there was a mixture of occupancy restrictions, however following receipt of the appeal decisions and the importance of flood risk, it was considered important to follow the advice from the Environment Agency.

Councillor Parish advised that he would like to support officers in their stance and added that it did not just affect Hunstanton but also Heacham. He was pleased to see that clear rules had been introduced. He added that the restrictions put on by the Environment Agency were a necessity.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings queried what was happening with regards to the future maintenance of the coastal strip.

The Executive Director advised that further communication was held with the Environment Agency following the last Planning Committee meeting. He also referred to a letter sent from the Leader of the Council to Mr Ruston, Acting Chairman of the Hunstanton Coastal Community Team. The Environment Agency had assessed that the standard of protection offered by the flood defences in the Coastal Flood Risk Hazard Zone was low. Because of that the Environment Agency had put forward a response that they did not want any new development in that area but recognised that it would be difficult to sustain given that the new properties would offer a degree of betterment. A compromise was negotiated for a 6 months occupancy condition.

The Executive Director read out extracts from the letter sent by the Leader of the Council to Mr Ruston.

Councillor Miss Sandell stated that the advice from outside bodies should be listened to.

In response to a further question regarding whether an officer had sent an email to the applicant, the Executive Director advised that it was not being suggested that the applicant was lying, but that it was not for that officer to take that decision. The Council had taken a stance and that was its current position.

Councillor Mrs Watson asked what would happen to the dwellings with various consents. The Executive Director acknowledged that there was a mixture of consents, which would have to remain but from this point going forward the situation should not be made any worse.

Councillors Peake and Mrs Spikings asked for their vote to be recorded in favour of the following resolution.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as recommended.

**(v) 17/00666/F
Hunstanton: Kiosk at North Promenade: Placement of a
Kiosk: Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the land comprised an area of the concrete surfaced northern promenade at Hunstanton. The site abutted the western side of The Green was set on the south side of The Pier and was within the designated Conservation Area.

The application sought full planning permission for the siting of one additional kiosk utilising 15 m² ground floor area of the northern promenade.

The application was referred to the Committee for determination as the applicant was the Borough Council and objections had been made to the proposal.

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012, the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council Core Strategy 2011 and the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (SADMP) 2016 were relevant to the application.

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

- Principle of development;
- Flood risk;
- Impact upon the conservation area/visual amenity; and
- Other material considerations.

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

Councillor Parish stated that he supported the objection raised by the Town Council in relation to the application, and asked why such an application was needed.

Councillor White added that market forces would prevail.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings asked whether this was a suitable location for it, given its proximity to the bandstand, etc.

Councillor Mrs Wright asked what the kiosk would look like and she was also not clear where it would be located in relation to the skate park. As the site was located within the conservation area she felt that the Committee should at least see what it would look like.

The Assistant Director explained that the application was for a change of use.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings added that more seats in that area would be more beneficial. She proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that the proposed kiosk was in the wrong location; it was not known where the skate park would be located and the impact on the conservation area. This was seconded by Councillor Mrs Wright.

Councillor Morrison stated that as this was a temporary structure it considered that it was acceptable.

Councillor Crofts added that this was a holiday area and he could see no reason to refuse kiosks on the sea front.

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

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

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

(vi) **17/00144/F**

Ringstead: The Gin Trap, 6 High Street: Single and half storey side extension: Astley Period Homes Ltd

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was located within the village of Ringstead, which was classified as a Smaller Village and Hamlet according to Policy CS02 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011.

The site was on the eastern side of High Street, within the Conservation Area and contained The Gin Trap Public House, which was Grade II listed and its associated holiday accommodation.

The proposal sought consent for a single storey side extension and internal layout revisions.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon Grade II listed building and conservation area;
- Highways issues; and
- Impact upon neighbour amenity

The Principal Planner explained that another letter had been received after the deadline for late correspondence. She explained that the issues raised in the letter had been addressed within the report.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Reddington (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) addressed the Committee in relation to this application and the following application (17/00145/LB). Mr Reddington was allocated 6 minutes to address the Committee (3 minutes per application).

The Principal Planner clarified that the application proposed an extension to the existing restaurant.

Councillor Mrs Wright stated that she knew the area very well, and that the Parish Council was right in that the public house had become a victim of its own success. She stated that the public house was incredibly busy and parking was very difficult, with the village having narrow lanes.

She referred to page 84 of the agenda where it stated that 'based on the net increase of useable area being less than 5 m² and no additional covers being proposed, there was no requirement to provide additional parking in accordance with Norfolk Parking Standards. However, Norfolk County Council Highways initially raised concern in relation to the ad-hoc parking arrangements within the site and existing shortfall in parking leading to an increase in on-street parking in the vicinity.

RESOLVED: That, the application be approved as recommended, subject to the amendments in late correspondence.

(vii) 17/00145/LB

Ringstead: The Gin Trap, 6 High Street: Listed building application for single and half storey side extension: Astley Period Homes

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that The Gin Trap was a public house listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest in September 1984 and noted as being c.1700 with C19 details. It was a two storey building constructed of whitewashed clunch with brick dressings and a dentil eaves cornice. The red pantiled roof had coped parapet gables, one axial and south end gable stock. There were lean-to single storey outshots to north and south, and a two storey outshot rear.

The application sought listed building consent to demolish the existing outshot to the southern end of the building and replaced it with a larger single and half storey extension. It was essentially a revised proposal following the withdrawal of an earlier application in 2016.

A corresponding planning application was also before the Committee for consideration.

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

The Principal Planner outlined the key issue for consideration when determining the application, namely the impact of the proposal on the significance of the building which was a designated heritage asset.

Councillor Mrs Wright referred to the design of the proposed extension, which she considered to be out of keeping and characterless.

Councillor Hipperson stated that it was a great shame, after hearing that the Parish Council would be closing a gate to stop patrons parking, that the Parish Council and owners of public house could not work together.

In response to a query from Councillor Bubb regarding the cellar, the Assistant Director proposed that an additional condition be imposed requiring details of the plant and machinery to be agreed. This was agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended, subject to the imposition of an additional condition requiring details of the plant and machinery to be agreed.

(viii) 16/02007/O

Syderstone: The Limes, Rudham Road: Outline application: Erection of two new single storey dwellings: Mrs Francis

The application was made for outline planning permission for the demolition of the existing bungalow and erection of 2 new bungalows on land at The Limes, Rudham Road, Syderstone.

The site was linear in form with the northernmost part of the site containing the existing bungalow and its obvious domestic curtilage, the southernmost part of the site was largely overgrown with substantial hedges around the southern and western boundaries. Trees on the eastern boundary had been removed.

The development boundary within the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan dissects the curtilage with the northern/north eastern section within the boundary but the southern section was outside.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Amenity;
- Highways; and
- Trees.

The Principal Planner informed the Committee that a letter of objection had been received after the close of late correspondence.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as recommended.

(ix) 17/00777/O

West Walton: Land rear of Oakland Lodge (Fronting Common Road), Lynn Road, Walton Highway: Outline planning application for single building plot for 2-storey detached dwelling: Mr Kevin Peploe

The Principal Planner was for outline planning permission for one two-storey dwelling which fronted onto Common Road. The site was within the development boundary where the construction of a dwelling was acceptable in principle. There have been previous refusals on the application as well as a dismissed appeal. Although since the appeal there had been policy changes and more development had taken place in the locality, it was considered that the restricted size of the site, as well as its location to the front of two existing old cottages would lead to an unacceptable and cramped form of development and did not represent high quality development as required by the NPPF.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Planning history;
- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Highways issues;
- Flood risk;
- Other material considerations; and
- Crime and Disorder.

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

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

PC21: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received Schedules relating to the above.

The meeting closed at 12.30 pm