

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

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on  
Thursday, 3rd August, 2017 at 1.00 pm 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, G Hipperson, T Parish, M Peake, D Tyler,  
G Wareham, A White, Mrs A Wright and Mrs S Young

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Mrs S Fraser, A Morrison,  
Miss S Sandell, M Storey and Mrs E Watson

**PC1: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors Storey, White and Young declared an interest in item 8/2(g)  
– King's Lynn as a Member of Norfolk County Council.

**PC2: DECISIONS ON APPLICATIONS**

The Committee was invited to determine the following applications which had been adjourned from the meeting held on Monday 31 July 2017, items (a) – (c) had been subject of site inspections held earlier in the day, item (d) had been deferred from the meeting:

- (a) 17/00876/F**  
**Brancaster: Ternstones, Main Road, Brancaster Staithe:**  
**Demolition of existing bungalow and provision of a new dwelling: Mrs H Bright**

The Principal Planner advised that a query had been raised on the site visit in relation to ridge height of the existing dwelling, which she confirmed as 10.25m and the ridge height of the proposed new dwelling was 14.76m. The Principal Planner also advised that the number of bedrooms for the existing bungalow was 3. Planning permission had been granted to increase this to 4 but had not been implemented.

Following a query from Councillor Mrs Wright, the Assistant Director advised that the roofing material proposed was slate.

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

- (b) 17/01135/F**  
**Hunstanton: Sea Gulls, 35 Lighthouse Lane: Erection of garage/car port: Mr Ian Wallace**

Councillor Wareham stated that he agreed with the officer recommendation and considered that there was sufficient room on the site for the garage to be re-sited elsewhere on the plot.

Councillor Crofts considered the proposal to be an alien feature in the street-scene.

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

**(c) 17/00309/FM**

**Congham: Congham Hall Hotel, Lynn Road, Grimston: Extensions and alterations to hotel/spa and erection of new buildings and structures for use as additional hotel rooms (use class C1), erection of new buildings and structures for short term holiday accommodation, new spa treatment room, gym & administration uses, access alterations and associated infrastructure and works: Congham Hotels Ltd**

The Principal Planner confirmed that the work would be carried out in four phases.

The Assistant Director informed the Committee that the development would not require an Environmental Impact Assessment to be carried out, and a Screening Opinion explaining this was placed on the file.

Councillor Wareham stated that having seen the site before, he could appreciate the amount of work which had been carried out. He added that the Committee had walked round the site and assessed each phase and he considered that none of the development would be intrusive in the area, and he supported the recommendation of approval.

Councillor Mrs Wright referred to the wall on the right hand side of the herb garden, and asked if this would be retained? The Principal Planner advised that the plans did not show the wall.

Councillor Mrs Wright further added that it was an old wall and asked if it could be conditioned to retain it. The Assistant Director reminded the Committee that any condition imposed had to be reasonable and meet the required tests. The Committee needed to ensure that by retaining the wall, it would not prejudice the development.

Councillor Parish referred to the 4 phases of development and considered that it was 2 phases too many. He referred to the amount of conditions that some of these needed to be addressed so that local people could see what was intended. He also considered that the proposals in the woodland would have an adverse effect and this could set a precedent.

The Assistant Director reminded the Committee that each application had to be considered on its own merits, and this application had its own individual issues that needed to be considered.

Councillor Hipperson stated that he had no objection with the development up until it went into the woodland. He considered it to be development in the countryside.

The Assistant Director advised the Committee that this was proposing development in the countryside but that the Council had policies in place to support this form of tourism related development.

Councillor Tyler stated that he commended the applicant, and this was clearly a well-run business. He considered that the scheme would be sympathetic to the area and had been well thought out. He would be voting in favour of the application.

Councillor Mrs Young stated that she agreed that phase 1 and 2 would be an advantage however if the woodland area was to be developed then this needed to be sympathetic to preserve the area.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings stated that the Committee had looked at the site and that the current business had come a long way and needed to look to the future. She added that investment had been made into the business. She considered that the proposal had been designed sensitively. The applicant was proposing to carry out the development in stages and conditions had been put in place. She felt that the scheme would complement the existing and would give employment to local people.

Councillor Mrs Wright referred to the fact that the parkland was registered on the Norfolk Heritage Explorer.

The Assistant Director explained that this was not a statutory designation and it was not known who had put the parkland forward on the register.

Councillor Crofts added that the vast majority of the scheme was acceptable, however, he had concerns in relation to excessive intrusion into the countryside and would not be voting in favour of the application.

In response to a comment from Councillor Mrs Wright, the Assistant Director explained that it was the applicant's choice to submit the four phases together.

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

- (d) **17/01072/CM**  
**King's Lynn: Land north of Outfall south off Transmission Cables, west of Cross Bank Road: County Matters Application: Erection of anaerobic digestion facility (to process up to 19,250 tonnes of biomass/slurry) including reception/office building and workshop, two digesters two storage tanks, combined heat and power plant, energy crop storage area and ancillary plan. Engineering works to resurface a section of the Byway open to all traffic: Mikram Ltd**

The Principal Planner advised that Norfolk County Council did not have any details of the elevations.

In response to a comment from Councillor Parish, the Assistant Director explained that the Council did have policies in relation to Renewable Energy.

Councillor Parish added that added that anaerobic digestors were the subject of investigation and because the corn was being grown specifically for the digestors they were not as green as first considered.

Councillor Wareham also expressed concern in relation to growing food to fuel the digestors. He also felt that not enough information had been supplied in order for a decision to be made.

The Assistant Director explained that some of the issues raised were global issues. He also explained that Norfolk County Council were the decision making body, and had given the Borough Council the information they had received. Clearly the County Council felt the information they had received in terms of plans were acceptable and allowed them to make a decision.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spkings stated that Norfolk County Council had asked the Borough Council for a view and therefore should have provided further information and felt that it was within the Committee's remit to say so.

Councillor Mrs Wright asked if there was any information on emissions. The Assistant Director advised the Committee that emissions would be covered by a permit from the Environment Agency under separate legislation. The Environmental Permitting process would control all emissions from the processes on the site, including noise and odour. It was explained that the planning process should not replicate other legislation so an objection would not be sustainable on noise and odour grounds.

The Chairman and Councillor Wareham asked for their support for the following recommendation to be recorded.

**RESOLVED:** That, no objection is raised subject to the satisfactory resolution in regards to the safety of the highway users of Crossbank Road, flood risk and landscape. The Committee also raised concerns in relation to the lack of detailed plans and information regarding emissions.

**The meeting closed at 1.50 pm**