

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

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 4th September, 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 Lawrence, A Morrison, T Parish, M Peake, Miss S Sandell, G Wareham, Mrs E Watson, Mrs J Westrop, Mrs A Wright and Mrs S Young

An apology for absence was received from Councillor M Storey, D Tyler and A White

PC33: **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors D Tyler, M Storey and A M White.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings thanked Councillors Lawrence and Mrs Westrop for acting as substitute at the meeting.

PC34: **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Meetings held on 31 July 2017 and the reconvened meeting held on 3 August 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

PC35: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Crofts declared a prejudicial interest in item 8/1(f) – Outwell, as he was the applicant.

PC36: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no urgent business under Standing Order 7.

PC37: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Councillors attended under Standing Order 34:

<b><i>Name</i></b>	<b><i>Item</i></b>	<b><i>Application</i></b>
C E Joyce	8/1(d)	17/01008/F, King's Lynn
A Beales	8/1(d)	17/01008/F, King's Lynn

PC38: **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC39: **RECEIPT OF LATE CORRESPONDENCE ON APPLICATIONS**

A copy of the summary of late correspondence received since the publication of the agenda, which has been previously circulated, was tabled. A copy of the summary would be held for public inspection with a list of background papers.

PC40: **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 application be determined as set out at (i) – (vii) below, where appropriate to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chairman.

- (i) **17/01211/F**  
**Crimplesham: 2 Springfield Road: Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 17/00016/F: single storey bungalow and access – to vary already approved drawings: Mr and Mrs Langridge**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that permission was sought to amend the plans previously approved for the construction of a bungalow at 2 Springfield Close, Crimblesham. The amended plans sought a slightly larger bungalow than that originally permitted.

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;
- Form and character;

- Neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety;
- Crime and disorder; and
- Other material considerations.

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

**(ii) 17/00635/F**  
**Heacham: 56 North Beach: Raised caravan base and balcony terrace: Mr Ivor Brand**

The Principal Planner advised that the proposal would bring the caravan up to the same height as the one next door.

Councillor Mrs Wright made reference to an application which had been refused by the Planning Committee for a dwelling in Hunstanton, and it was asked what the difference was between the two applications. The Assistant Director explained that the caravan was authorised to be on the site by virtue of a lawful development certificate, as it had been there for more than 10 years.

The Assistant Director also confirmed that the caravan had no restrictions on all year round occupancy.

Councillor Parish explained the Parish Council's objection in more detail. He added that the Parish Council considered that the coastal strip had been become overdeveloped over the years. He also referred to the plan with the agenda and to the fact that many plots had been sub-divided. The Parish Council considered that the row of houses which was visible from the beach detracted from the ambience of the area.

Councillor Parish also referred to the letter of representation in the report, where it talked about a caveat being added to any permission granted regarding the maintenance of the road, which was not in a good condition, and if each owner were to do their bit with regards to fulling potholes then the road would be more accessible to emergency and service vehicles.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings informed the Committee that she had a caravan at Heacham some 30 years ago and the road from North Beach to Hunstanton was in a terrible condition. She added that there had been a huge uplift in the area and there had to be a balance between what the area was at present and making it appear too industrial.

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

**(iii) 17/00296/F**  
**Hockwold cum Wilton: Land between 15 and 19 Nursery Lane: Detached dwelling with cart shed (garage): Mr Mark Want**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that full planning permission was sought for the erection of a detached 2.5 storey, four/five bedroom dwelling with detached garage.

The site was located within the development boundary of Hockwold, which was classified as a Joint Key Rural Service Centre with Feltwell. The site was located within Hockwold Conservation Area and within Flood Zone 1.

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:

- Principal of development;
- Highway safety/history/appeal;
- Form and character and impact on Conservation Area;
- Neighbour amenity; and
- Other material considerations.

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

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings then invited the County Highways Officer to outline their objection to the application.

The County Highways Officer explained that the original application had been refused, and went to appeal, and the Planning Inspector found the access not to be suitable. An application then came forward to make alterations to the wall which offered a slight improvement to visibility. However in relation to this current application the visibility splays were still short by some distance in both directions. He also confirmed that traffic on the road was light and referred to the appeal decision.

The Executive Director informed the Committee that County Highways had taken the traffic survey into account when making an assessment of the application. He advised the Committee that the sole issue was access and whether or not it was safe. He also referred to paragraph 13 of the Inspector's Decision where it stated that 'the proposal would be prejudicial to highway safety and would not accord with Policy CS11 of the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Council Core Strategy which requires that development proposals provide for safe and convenient access.'

In response to a query regarding whether a mirror could be placed opposite the access to help with visibility, the County Highways Officer explained why County Highways did not support the use of mirrors as they could cause glare for other road users and needed to be maintained.

The Principal Planner advised the Committee that the wall had been demolished and the replacement wall had not been constructed.

Councillor Mrs Wright referred to the comments made by the Parish Council, who she considered knew the area well, and that the design of the proposed dwelling enhanced the area. She therefore proposed that the application be approved, on the grounds that the proposal would enhance the form and character. This was seconded by Councillor Peake.

Councillor Peake explained that the traffic was not excessive along Nursery Lane or fast. He acknowledged the concerns raised by County Highways but considered that this was a good site waiting to be developed, which would improve the street-scene.

Councillor Lawrence added that the traffic movements were very light and it would be a shame to lose the site. In addition, Hockwold Parish Council was in favour of the proposal.

The Assistant Director reiterated that the proposal did not accord with Policy CS11.

Councillor Hipperson asked for further details regarding the alternative scheme, which had been mentioned. The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings advised that the access was not in the applicant's ownership.

The County Highways Officer explained that the applicant did offer an alternative scheme which would have benefitted the existing and proposed dwelling, however the land was in separate ownership.

The Executive Director advised the Committee that the access was substandard and did not meet County Council standards. If the application was approved, then it would be going against County Highway advice and the Appeal Decision. He added that the character of the area had not changed and the Inspector's Decision was still relevant.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to approve the application, on the grounds that the house would have a positive impact on the conservation area and the Committee felt that the highway impact was not severe, as set out in the NPPF paragraph 32, which was carried.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved, contrary to recommendation, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions to

be agreed with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, for the following reasons:

*The house would have a positive impact on the conservation area and the Committee felt that the highway impact was not severe as set out in the NPPF paragraph 32. This was felt to outweigh the highway objections raised to the scheme.*

*The Committee then adjourned at 10.25 am and reconvened at 10.35 am*

**(iv) 17/01008/F**

**King's Lynn: Hardings Way: Construction of three new access roads off the southern end of Hardings Way and relocation of bus gate: Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application related to land at the southern end of Hardings Way, King's Lynn close to its junction with Wisbech Road.

Hardings Way was a single two-way carriageway which reduced to single 'give way' carriageway for a short length. It had a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) which currently restricted its use for buses and cycles only.

The application sought full planning permission for the construction of three new access roads off the southern end of Hardings Way and relocation of the existing bus gate 15m further north. Hardings Way to the north of the bus gate would continue to be a bus route. A revised drawing (dwg no. PK6062-HP1-002B) was received on 17 July 2017 in order to address comments raised by Norfolk County Highways.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the applicant was the Borough Council and there had been objections to the proposed development. The application had also been called-in by Councillor Joyce.

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

- Principle of development;
- Highway safety;
- Other considerations; and
- Crime and disorder.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Joyce addressed the Committee. Councillor Joyce queried why the application was being considered by the Planning Committee rather than Norfolk County Council. He added that this was a well-used route for pedestrians and cyclists. He stated that County Highways had been paid to design the

scheme and what credibility could be given to their response which was no objection.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor A Beales addressed the Committee and explained the purpose of the application, which was all about regeneration. He added that the application was not about opening up the road to traffic or Hardings Pits, and he acknowledged the open green space. He added that the Council wanted to work with the Association not against it and it would not be affected by the application.

The application would move the gates by 15m north. In response to Councillor Joyce's point he explained that the Highway Authority were bound by statutory guidance, which was why they designed the scheme.

Councillor Beales referred to the different areas of land and explained that the Overton's existing business was subject to temporary access arrangements, and this application would regularise that. Finally, Councillor Beales wished to reassure the Committee that this was a classic regeneration scheme and would open up 5 acres of land.

The Principal Planner confirmed that this was not a County Matter application.

The Principal Planner also highlighted Footpath No.23 on the plan. She explained that there was currently no access through the Wagg & Jex site, and if any future development came forward there was an opportunity for the Public Right of Way to be opened up again.

Councillor Parish stated that the Committee should have considered this application together with any housing development so that the environmental impact could be considered.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings reminded the Committee that they could only consider the application in front of them, which were the changes to the road.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings then drew the Committee's attention to the late correspondence and the need to add additional conditions, which was agreed.

**RESOLVED:** That, the application be approved, as recommended, subject to the addition of conditions as outlined in late correspondence.

(v) **17/01048/F**

**Outwell: Land E Church Field SW of 54 Well Creek Road and E of Baldwins Drove: Construction of general purpose agricultural barn: Mr James Vickers**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application for full planning permission proposed the construction of a general purpose agricultural barn. The barn was to be constructed with timber cladding on the elevations above a brickwork base, white UPVC windows and profiled steel roof sheets. The barn would provide a cart shed/hay store, workshop/store and rest room on site.

The site was located outside the development boundary of Outwell, which with Upwell was twinned together as a Key Rural Service Centre in the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (SADMPD) 2016.

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;
- Form and character;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity;
- Highway issues; and
- Other matters.

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

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed an additional condition to require the mobile home to be removed from the site within one month of completion of the barn, which was agreed.

**RESOLVED:** That, the application be approved, as recommended, subject to the imposition of an additional condition to require the mobile home to be removed from the site within one month of completion of the barn.

**(vi) 17/01326/F**

**Outwell: Arc Rouge, Lowside: Alterations and extension to dwelling: Mr & Mrs Chris Crofts**

Councillor Crofts declared a prejudicial interest and left the meeting during consideration of the item.

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application was for full planning permission for alterations and extension to the dwelling, Arc Rouge, located to the east of Lowside, Outwell. The proposal comprised a single storey extension to the rear elevation.



The application site was located within the settlement boundary of Outwell. Outwell was grouped together with Upwell as a Key Rural Service Centre in Policy CS02 – Settlement Hierarchy of the Core Strategy (2011).

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the applicant was an elected member of the Planning Committee.

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

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

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

**(vii) 17/01128/O**

**Stow Bardolph: Horseshoe Farm, 241 The Drove, Barroway Drove: Outline application all matters reserved: Erection of two chalet bungalows: Mr Thomas Heffernan**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that outline planning permission was sought for two dwellings on a parcel of agricultural land with frontage onto The Drove, Barroway Drove. All matters were reserved for future consideration.

Barroway Drove was defined as a ‘Smaller Village or Hamlet’ in the settlement hierarchy defined in the Core Strategy of the LDF. The site was located in an area classed as countryside and within Flood Zone 3 and Hazard Zone of the Council-adopted Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the Environment Agency’s Tidal River Hazard Mapping area.

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;
- Flood risk;
- Impact upon appearance of locality and effect on neighbouring properties; and
- Other material considerations.

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

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings stated that she supported the application as did the Parish Council. She explained that Barroway Drove was much like Marshland St James, with linear development. She considered this application to be infill development. She added that the land had not been farmed for years and had been left fallow. The proposal was for two chalet bungalows which people were desperate for, and the site was close to Downham Market Railway Station and there was a bus route. She referred to the Core Strategy where it acknowledged that in some rural areas the car was essential. In addition, the floor levels could be raised to overcome any flooding issues.

Councillor Mrs Spikings therefore proposed that the application be approved, on the grounds that it was an infill plot; the flooding issues could be overcome and the proposal would not have a negative impact on the area. This was seconded by Councillor Lawrence.

Councillor Lawrence added that there was a need for housing especially bungalows in the Borough. He considered the proposal to be an infill plot and it would be sympathetic to the area.

The Executive Director explained the purpose of Policy DM3 to the Committee.

The Assistant Director informed the Committee that in the past two years there had been several infill developments in Barroway Drove, which had resulted in the consolidation of certain parts of road frontages in the settlement.

The Assistant Director noted the general support from the Committee for the development but suggested that the application be deferred to enable further consideration to be given to raising the levels of the proposed dwellings and the impact this could have on the neighbouring dwelling, which was agreed by the Committee.

**RESOLVED:** That, the application be deferred to enable further consideration to be given to raising the floor levels of the proposed dwellings and any impact this could have on the neighbouring dwelling.

PC41: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

**RESOLVED:** That, the report be noted.

**The meeting closed at 11.20 am**