

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

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Thursday, 8th February, 2018 at 12.30 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, Mrs S Fraser, G Hipperson, A Morrison, T Parish,  
M Peake, D Tyler, Mrs E Watson, Mrs A Wright and Mrs S Young

**PC1: APOLOGIES**

Apologies of absence were received from Councillors Mrs Buck, Sandell, Storey, Wareham and White.

**PC2: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**PC3: DECISION ON APPLICATIONS**

The Committee was invited to determine the applications, which had been adjourned from the meeting held on 5 February 2018, and had been the subject of a site inspection held earlier in the day.

**(a) 17/02342/F**  
**Snettisham: 36A common Road: Construction of two dwellings: G H Owen Property Ltd**

The Principal Planner advised that the applicant's agent had submitted additional correspondence which clarified that it was not possible to connect to the public sewer and therefore it was intended to install a sewerage treatment plant. The Environment Agency had accepted the use of a sewerage treatment plant.

In response to a query raised on the site visit, the Principal Planner clarified that the distance from No.5 would be 1.3m from the boundary. The first floor window would serve an ensuite but this was proposed to be conditioned to be obscured glazing.

In response to a question from Councillor Parish, the Assistant Director explained how the sewerage treatment plant would work and that it would be in the same way as The Meadows.

Councillor Hipperson stated that he had no objection to the proposal but would have preferred to have seen velux windows instead of dormers.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings stated that the existing dwellings in the vicinity were spacious and not cramped. She considered that the proposed chalet bungalow style dwellings would alter the appearance of the area. She proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that the proposed chalet bungalow dwellings would be too high and over-dominant. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Mrs Young.

In response to a query from Councillor Peake, the Principal Planner clarified the height of the proposed new dwellings in relation to the existing dwellings.

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 dwellings, by virtue of the height proposed, would be out of keeping with the design and scale of neighbouring dwellings, and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and overly dominant in the street scene. This is contrary to the relevant provisions of the NPPF, Policy CS08 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan.*

**(b) 17/00025/FM**

**Hunstanton: Whitleys Stationers Press, 19-21 Church Street: Demolition of old print works and the construction of 15 number 2 bed flats and 1 number 1 bed flat with associated car parking: Waterfield Dudley Ltd**

The Chairman reminded the Committee that there was a proposal on the table to refuse the application by Councillor Mrs Wright, seconded by Councillor Morrison on the grounds of the principle of development and the impact upon residential amenity.

The Principal Planner informed the Committee that there were no rights of access for the properties at the back of the site.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings explained that whilst on the site visit, a gentleman had informed the Committee that it was on the deeds that he had a right of access. The Assistant Director advised that this was a civil matter and any granting of planning permission would not override any existing rights.

Councillor Morrison expressed concern in relation to the application because of the height and mass of the proposed new building. He considered that the site could be utilised more sympathetically to the cottages.

It was confirmed that the proposed new building would incorporate some carstone.

Councillor Mrs Wright stated that following the site visit her opinion on the scheme had not changed. She acknowledged that the site needed to be developed but in a more sensitive way. She considered that the current design was not right for the area. She suggested that if the building was set back with some landscaping at the front then this might help to soften it.

Councillor Parish added that the height was too much and supported the comments made by Hunstanton Town Council. He considered that the building would block all the light for the cottages.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings stated that looking at the eastern elevation, she found the right hand side to be acceptable but felt that the rest of the building needed to be lowered. She considered that the current proposal would not add to character of the Conservation Area.

Reference was made to the carstone wall at the rear of the building and the Principal Planner explained that part of it was within the application site and the other part was not.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to refuse the application on the grounds of overdevelopment, design, height, that the building was located on the pavement edge, overshadowing and that it would be harmful to the Conservation Area, which was carried.

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

1. *The proposed development, due to its design and excessive height is considered to be overly dominant in the street-scene, something exacerbated by the fact that the proposed building is right up against the back edge of the pavement. The development therefore fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area, contrary to the provisions of the NPPF and policies CS08 and 12 of the Core Strategy, and policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan.*
2. *The proposed development by virtue of its height and siting in relation to neighbouring properties is considered to result in an unneighbourly form of development specifically in relation to overshadowing and overbearing issues. The proposal is therefore contrary to the relevant provisions of the NPPF and policy DM15 of the Site Allocation and Development Management Policies Plan.*

(c) **17/02049/F**

**Docking: Chalfont House, High Street: Proposed one and a half storey dwelling and cart shed: Mr Nick Johnson**

The Assistant Director informed the Committee that since the meeting on Monday, County Highways had confirmed that the site had been visited to assess the access, and as reported in the agenda, they raised no objection to the application.

Councillor Parish referred to the Planning History set out in the report, and that two applications had been refused. The Planning Inspector had dismissed an appeal in 1998 for the site on grounds that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of this part of the village. He added that the Parish Council were also saying that the area was overdeveloped.

Councillor Parish proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that the proposal would be overdevelopment of the area and would be harmful to the form and character of the area, however there was no seconder for the proposal.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings expressed concern that there would be 3 drives all coming out of one entrance.

Councillor Morrison referred to the farm vehicles also using the entrance, as the Committee saw when on the site visit.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings made reference to the trees that were to be removed as part of the application and to the late correspondence where the agent had indicated that tree T18 would be replaced with an indigenous tree capable of growing to an equivalent size, and asked where this would be.

The Principal Planner highlighted on the plans where the new planting would be provided.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed an additional condition to ensure that any trees would be replaced with semi-mature trees, which was agreed by the Committee.

**RESOLVED:** That, the application be approved, as recommended, subject to an additional condition to ensure that any trees would be replaced with semi-mature trees.

**The meeting closed at 1.12 pm**