

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

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on  
Monday, 5th March, 2018 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 R Blunt (sub), A Bubb, C J Crofts, Mrs S Fraser, G Hipperson,  
A Morrison, T Parish, M Peake, Miss S Sandell, M Storey, D Tyler, G Wareham,  
Mrs E Watson, A White and Mrs A Wright

**PC92: APOLOGIES**

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

The Chairman thanked Councillor Blunt for being a substitute at the meeting.

**PC93: MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 5 February and of the Reconvened Meeting held on 8 February 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings.

**PC94: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**PC95: URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no urgent business under Standing Order 7.

**PC96: MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Councillor addressed the Committee under Standing Order 34:

<i><b>Name</b></i>	<i><b>Item</b></i>	<i><b>Application</b></i>
B Long	8/2(g)	17/02419/F, Marshland St James

PC97: **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC98: **RECEIPT OF LATE CORRESPONDENCE ON APPLICATIONS**

A copy of the 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.

PC99: **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) – (xii) below, where appropriate to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chairman.

(i) **17/01517/FM**

**Brancaster: Land south of Saw Mill Road: Construction of 12 residential units (10 open market, 2 affordable): Bullock Homes Ltd**

The Senior Planner introduced the report and explained that the application was for 12 dwellings, including 2 affordable units, on the edge of the village. The site was allocated site G13.1 – land east of Mill Road, Brancaster for at least 5 dwellings.

The site was in an elevated position above the roadside and was outside but formed part of the setting of the Conservation Area, and along with the whole of Brancaster was contained within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The form and character comprised bungalow development to the north and west of the site, with denser forms of two storey development further north near the junction of Mill Road and Main Street.

The development was considered to be in accordance with national and local policy, and acceptable when considered against other material considerations.

The application had been referred to the Committee at the request of Councillor Mrs Watson.

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

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon the Conservation Area and Brancaster Church;
- Impact upon the AONB;
- Other form and character issues;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety;
- Arboricultural matters;
- Protected species;
- Impact upon European Designated Sites;
- Affordable housing;
- Drainage; and
- Other matters

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr S Oliver (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) and Mr J Law (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to a comment from the objector regarding traffic issues, the Senior Planner advised that there had been no objection from County Highways.

Councillor Mrs Watson informed the Committee that she would have liked to have seen fewer properties on the site. She also had concerns in relation to fact that the level of the site was higher and the new properties would have an overbearing effect on the existing bungalows on Church Road.

Councillor Mrs Watson also explained that parking was a problem particularly in the summer months. She expressed concern in relation to the use of timber on the new properties as this was not commonly used in Brancaster. In addition, a large portion of the hedge had been removed to achieve the required visibility splays.

The Senior Planner explained that it had been acknowledged in the report that the site was over 1 m higher than the neighbours to the north but given the separation distances it was felt that the relationship between the existing and new dwellings would be acceptable. It was also explained that the applicant intended to replace and enhance the hedge. The applicant also proposed to widen Mill Road and to provide a footpath. It was considered that the new dwellings would not be excessively high as the design had taken into account the topography of site.

The Assistant Director informed the Committee that ample parking had been provided on the site.

In response to a query, the Senior Planner pointed out on the plans where the timber boarding had been included.

It was explained that the scheme was predominately brick and flint and the timber had been included to break up the materials.

Councillor Blunt asked whether the width of the highway would be reduced to accommodate the new footpath. The Senior Planner confirmed that the road would not be reduced.

Via the use of Google earth, the Senior Planner highlighted the verge and where the footpath would be provided.

Reference was made to the timber features and that this was not the vernacular of Brancaster.

Councillor Parish made reference to the fact that the original application was for 5 dwellings, however the applicant had been encouraged to provide 12 dwellings. He also referred to the comments from the Norfolk Coast Partnership who had stated that they supported the application in general, and hoped that all their issues raised would be taken on board and dealt with. Councillor Parish also referred to condition 14 which required any lighting scheme to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority. However, the Borough Council was not the Local Lighting Authority and in this case it would be Brancaster Parish Council.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings explained that the LDF Task Group had put forward 5 dwellings for the site, however the Inspector added at least 5 dwellings. She considered that the site could accommodate 12 dwellings and that a footpath would be provided making it safer for pedestrians.

In response to Councillor Parish's comments regarding condition 14, the Assistant Director explained that it would be very unlikely that street lights would be provided for the scheme but the condition had been added in case a street lighting scheme came forward.

In relation to points raised regarding the use of timber cladding, he advised the Committee that the conditions could be amended to remove the use of timber cladding.

In response to a comment from Councillor Storey regarding second homes and affordable housing, the Executive Director advised the Committee that developers would build homes and people would buy them, which was the market economy and the Council had no control over this. The Parish Council through the Neighbourhood Plan could impose thresholds on second homes and would encourage them to

take the initiative and modify their plan. There were other changes to legislation emerging, which would be covered by a future training session.

The Executive Director added that as the site had been allocated within the Local Plan, the principle of development had already been established. The Committee needed to consider whether the scheme as submitted was acceptable.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed that conditions 2, 4 and 5 be amended to remove the use of timber cladding, which was seconded by Councillor Sandell and agreed by the Committee.

**RESOLVED:** (A) That, the application be approved, subject to conditions and the completion of a Section 106 agreement that secures the affordable housing provision, within 4 months of the date of this decision, and conditions 2, 4 and 5 being amended to remove the use of timber cladding.

(B) That, the application be refused in the event that the Section 106 agreement was not completed within 4 months of the date of this Committee meeting, on grounds of failure to secure affordable housing provision.

**(ii) 17/01704/RM**

**Bircham: Cherry Ridge, Docking Road, Great Bircham: Reserved Matters Application: Proposed dwelling following partial demolition of donor dwelling: Mr N Courtenay**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application related to a detached dwelling and its garden curtilage at Cherry Ridge on the eastern side of Docking Road, Great Bircham.

Reserved matters consent was sought for the construction of a two storey detached dwelling following partial demolition of the existing property.

Great Bircham was classified as a Rural Village within the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy.

The application had been referred to the Committee 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 amenities;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Philippa Sewell (on behalf of the Parish Council) and Jason Law (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings referred to the garden land which was outside the village boundary. The Assistant Director advised that the applicant had to demonstrate that the land had been used as a garden for more than 10 years.

The Principal Planner advised that the extension and alterations to Cherry Ridge had been dealt with under a separate application.

Councillor Morrison stated that he was pleased that the Parish Council had altered their position in relation to the application and that the footpath would be extended. He hoped that the hedge line conditioned to create a defined boundary between the built environment and countryside as suggested by the Parish Council.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings advised that condition 2 dealt with additional hedge planting.

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

**(iii) 17/02072/F**

**Brancaster: Land south of Manor Farm and east of Manor Farm Barns, Main Road. Erection of detached dwelling with hardstanding and landscaping. Means of access from Broad Lane: Langton Homes**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site comprised an irregular shaped parcel of land measuring approximately 1074.8 m<sup>2</sup>. The land was once garden land associated with Manor Farm House. The site was situated on the northern side Main Road, Brancaster but was accessed from the western side of Broad Lane.

Brancaster was classified as a Key Rural Service Centre as listed in the Core Strategy's Settlement Hierarchy.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety;

- Trees; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr S Oliver (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) and Mr M Flood (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Mrs Watson expressed concern in relation to the additional amount of the traffic on Broad Lane. The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings pointed out that County Highways had raised no objection to the application subject to conditions.

Councillor Morrison referred to Policy 1 of Brancaster's Neighbourhood Plan which related to the size of houses and encouraged the provision of smaller dwellings up to three bedrooms. He considered that the current proposal of 4 bedrooms with en-suites would go against the Neighbourhood Plan.

The Assistant Director advised that the proposal did currently accord with relevant policies in Brancaster's Neighbourhood Plan but he was aware that they were looking to revise the Plan.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed that permitted development rights should be removed, which was seconded by Councillor Mrs Watson and agreed by the Committee.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved as recommended, subject to the imposition of an additional condition removing permitted development rights.

**(iv) 17/02033/F**

**Docking: Kingsdown, Stanhoe Road: 2 no. dwellings following demolition of existing bungalow: Fernie Projects (Kingsdown) Limited**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was located on the southern side of Stanhoe Road, Docking and contained a detached bungalow. Docking was classified as a Key Rural Service Centre according to Policy CS02 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

The proposal sought consent to demolish the existing bungalow and replace with a pair of semi-detached 2 storey dwellings.

The Principal Planner referred the Committee to the late correspondence and the need to amend conditions 2, 6, 7, 9 and 10 to refer to drawing number 02D.

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;
- Impact upon the Conservation Area;
- Other form and character;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material considerations.

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

Councillor Morrison stated that the site was in a suitable location for one dwelling, which was what the Parish Council would have wanted if it had a Neighbourhood Plan. He considered that the proposal was a cramped form of development. He also felt that the car parking at the front of the site was cramped. He considered that the proposal would not fit in the street-scene or enhance the form and character of the area.

The Principal Planner advised that there was sufficient space provided for each dwelling for pedestrian access.

Councillor Morrison then proposed that the application be refused on the grounds of overdevelopment for the site. This was seconded by Councillor White who added that the parking and turning area at the front of the site was also cramped.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to refuse the application on the grounds that the proposal represented overdevelopment of the site and insufficient space had been provided for the parking and turning area, which was agreed.

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

*The proposed development, by virtue of the width of the pair of semi-detached dwellings and the parking and turning arrangements to serve the proposed dwellings results in a cramped form of development that is considered to be an overdevelopment of the plot. This is considered to be poor design contrary to the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF, CS08 of the Core Strategy and DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan.*

**(v) 17/02131/F**

**Great Massingham: Land west of 119 Summerwood Estate:  
Proposed construction of 2 new three bedroom two storey  
semi-detached houses with associated parking, gardens,**



**bike and bin storage. Also the construction of 5 new parking spaces with separate vehicular access to satisfy condition 5ii) of the approved outline consent number 14/00184/O: Rosemount Development Consultants Limited**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was contained within the development boundary of Great Massingham.

Great Massingham was classified as a Key Rural Service Centre according to Policy CS02 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

The site had been used as an overspill parking area which was accessed via the Summerwood Estate.

The Committee was reminded that an application on this site was granted planning permission for a pair of semi-detached dwellings, 14/00184/) with all matters reserved.

This was a full application for a pair of two storey semi-detached dwellings with off-road parking and the provision of 5 parking spaces, as originally imposed under condition 5 of 14/00184/O.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as objections to a planning application had been received on a Borough Council site.

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

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material considerations.

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

**(vi) 17/02367/F**

**Hunstanton: 97 & 99 South Beach Road: Extension of Lees caravan site at no.91 South Beach Road for the siting of touring caravans/tents at 97-99 South Beach Road: Mr & Mrs Lee**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was located within the Coastal Flood Risk Hazard Zone for Hunstanton on the eastern side of South Beach Road, Hunstanton set behind the existing built form.

The site contained a newly refurbished detached dwelling that was the subject of an approval for a replacement dwelling with occupancy

condition imposed (16/01550/F). The adjacent site, No.97 once contained a property but this had been burnt down in 2010 and left abandoned. No.97 was subsequently refused a replacement dwelling under delegated powers.

The proposal was to extend the adjacent caravan park into where No.97 once stood and across into No.99 to provide 11 pitches for touring for either tent or caravan use. The property at No.99 would be retained.

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

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

- Planning history;
- Principle of development;
- Flood Risk; and
- Other material considerations.

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

The Assistant Director drew the Committee's attention to the strong advice from the Environment Agency outlined on page 48 of the agenda in relation to flood risk. The last paragraph concluded 'We have considered the findings of the FRA in relation to the likely duration, depths, velocities and flood hazard rating against the design flood event of the development proposals. We agree that this indicates that there will be a danger for all people (eg. there will be a danger of loss of life for the general public and the emergency services).

The Executive Director explained that in that area the land was protected by flood defences. However the EA had stated that the flood defences in that area would fail at some point. He acknowledged that there were other caravans in the area but these were subject to historical permissions. The Council had adopted a consistent approach in relation to sites within the Coastal Flood Risk Hazard Zone where the risk from coastal flooding was particularly high, and that approach had been upheld at appeal.

Councillor Mrs Wright explained that the difficulty was that this was a sea side resort and the promotion of tourism was needed. She added that there were existing caravans in the area that had permission. The applicant's site already had occupancy conditions imposed from April to September. She considered that the improvements should be made to the defences. Councillor Mrs Wright proposed that the application should be approved, which was seconded by Councillor Mrs Fraser.

The Executive Director explained that the Environment Agency had adopted a consistent approach for planning applications in that area. They had stated that it was not the case of if the flood defences will fail but when they will fail.

Councillor Morrison added that whilst he did have sympathy with the applicant, the Council had made a policy to uphold the advice of the Environment Agency. He further added that people forgot how quickly the water levels could rise. With regard to the historic permissions connected to the other sites, he advised that the Committee could not do anything about that.

Councillor Mrs Wright asked that if it was so cut and dry in relation to the determination of applications in that area, then why the Council still accepted planning applications.

The Executive Director advised that the Council could not refuse to determine an application. He added that Hunstanton Town Council had chosen to disregard the advice from the Environment Agency which was why the application had come to the Committee for determination.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed, with the required number of supporters, that a recorded vote be carried out on the proposal to approve the application, as follows:

<b>For Motion</b>	<b>Against Motion</b>	<b>Abstentions</b>
Mrs S Fraser	Mrs V Spikings	C J Crofts
G Wareham	M J Peake	
Mrs A Wright	R Blunt	
	T Bubb	
	G Hipperson	
	A Morrison	
	T Parish	
	Miss S Sandell	
	M S Storey	
	D Tyler	
	Mrs E Watson	
	A M White	

The proposal to approve the application was therefore lost.

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

**(vii) 17/02398/F**  
**Hunstanton: Workshop store, 1C Seagate Road: Proposed dwelling following demolition of existing garage/workshop: Mr D Lloyd**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was located within the development boundary plan for Hunstanton.

Hunstanton was classified as a main town according to Policy CS02 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

The site contained an existing flat roof concrete block single garage with concrete apron on the front.

The proposal sought consent to demolish the garage and erect a split level dwelling with undercroft parking.

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

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

- Planning history and principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Jason Law (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Mrs Wright informed the Committee that she liked the design and felt that it would improve the area. She therefore proposed that the application be approved, on the grounds that the proposal would enhance the form and character of the area and made a positive contribution to the street scene. This was seconded by Councillor Mrs Fraser and, after having been put to the vote, was agreed.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved, contrary to recommendation and subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, following consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman for the following reasons:

*The proposed development would enhance the form and character of the area and make a positive contribution to the street scene.*

*The Committee adjourned at 12.40 pm and reconvened at 1.12 pm*

**(viii) 17/00211/RM**

**Marshland St James: Land opposite Bramble Cottage,  
Dades Lane: New detached four bedroom house: Mr & Mrs  
Davey**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application was for a new four bedroom detached house. The proposed new dwelling would be located outside the development boundary of Marshland St James and therefore within the countryside. There was no justification put forward with regard to housing needs for

a rural worker. It also failed the sequential test as there were areas within the development boundary and parish of Marshland St James, which were within a lower flood risk area. In addition, the proposal was served by a narrow road which was considered inadequate to serve the proposed development.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Long.

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

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

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Staci Davey (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor B Long addressed the Committee in support of the application. He explained that Marshland St James had been allocated 20 new homes within the Local Plan however over 100 had been granted permission, due to the lack of a 5 year supply of housing, some of which were starting to be built but none were affordable. The applicants had lived in the village for 28 years and wanted to stay and raise their children, which added to the sustainability of the village. The children would also attend the local school. The new village hall had also just opened. Councillor Long explained that the site next to the plot had been granted planning permission, which included a turning circle. After this plot, the road ended and became a track. He explained that there had been no objection from the Parish Council and most people accepted that the village had to grow. In terms of the objection from County Highways, he explained that the road currently functioned perfectly well as it was. He concluded that as the site was next to a plot which had permission, the site could be classed as infill development.

Councillor Storey proposed that the application be approved as he considered it was a suitable infill site and would enhance the form and character of the area. This was seconded by Councillor Wareham.

The Executive Director advised the Committee that, as stated by Councillor Long, 20 houses had been allocated with the Local Plan but around 100 had approval therefore the village had lots of other housing coming forward. He referred the Committee to the reasons for refusal of the application – flooding, highways and that the site was in the countryside.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to approve the application, which was carried.

The Chairman and Councillors Crofts and Hipperson asked for their abstention to be noted.

**RESOLVED:** That, the application be approved, contrary to recommendation, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions to be agreed following consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, for the following reason:

*The development represented suitable infill development that would enhance the form and character of the area.*

*The Committee adjourned at 10.40 am and reconvened at 10.55 am*

**(ix) 17/00211/RM**

**Methwold: North of 49 Main Road, Brookville: Reserved matters application: Construction of three dwellings – reserved matters for plot 2: Mr & Mrs A Judge-Grief**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application was for reserved matters for Plot 2, in accordance with the outline application 'Construction of three dwellings' reference 16/01039/O at north of 49 Main Road, Brookville. The proposal was for a substantial detached four bedroom bungalow with detached garage and garden store.

The site was located to the west of the main route through the settlement of Brookville.

The application had been referred to the Committee as the recommendation was contrary to the Local Highway Authority comments.

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

- Principle of development;
- Form and character; and
- Highways/Access.

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

The Principal Planner explained that there had been considerable negotiation between NCC Highways, the agent and applicants and land registry as to how best to move the situation forward, as the Local Highway Authority were unable to clarify exactly where the highways owned land ends and considered that it was third party land. The

applicant had approached the Land Registry to acquire the land however they said that they would not sign the land over to the applicant as it was highway land and it was common sense looking at the rest of the village. On this basis they were not able to enter into a legal agreement to serve the visibility splay.

Taking the situation into account, officers considered that appropriate conditions could be attached to the planning consent to secure the visibility splay required by NCC Highways. Whilst it was accepted that part of the verge to the front of the site was not within the ownership of the applicant, the applicant had sought to clarify the situation and based on the evidence provided to date officers were satisfied that this was the most suitable approach.

Councillor White asked that if the application was approved, would the applicant have problems complying with the condition. The Principal Planner explained that all the applicant would have to do was to provide the visibility splay.

Councillor Storey echoed that a great deal of work had been undertaken in relation to this application, and both County Highways and the applicant had done their best to achieve a satisfactory outcome. He therefore supported the recommendation of approval.

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

**(x) 17/02093/F**

**Old Hunstanton: Sea Haven, 7 Wodehouse Road: Single storey rear extension, loft conversion with dormer windows and roof lights, internal alterations and external alterations including cladding and windows: Mrs Rachel Allpress**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the land was situated on the south side of Wodehouse Road, Old Hunstanton, 110m west of Waterworks Road and 90m east of Ashdale Park and within the settlement boundary of the village.

The application sought a single storey rear extension, loft conversion with dormer windows and roof lights, internal alterations and external alterations including cladding the rear extension and replacing the windows.

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 Borough Council Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (SADMP) 2016 were relevant to this application.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as it was called to the Committee by Councillor Mrs Bower.

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

- Principle of development;
- Form and character of the locality;
- Scale and design;
- Residential amenity; and
- Other considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Angela Blenkinsop (objecting), David Mcleod (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) and Brendan Tracey (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor White expressed concern that the proposal would be too large for the site. The Assistant Director advised that the proposal would not be any wider but would be higher.

The Principal Planner explained why the chimney stack had been moved.

Councillor Mrs Wright expressed concern over the loss of light for No.9 Wodehouse Road.

The Principal Planner advised that condition 4 requested details of the chimney cowl.

Councillor Morrison stated that as the person living at No.9 was an artist, the important light direction was from the north. He also asked where the chimney/cowl was in relation to the objector's window.

The Assistant Director explained that reference to the Right to Light was something covered by separate legislation. The Committee needed to make a judgement on the application in front of them, and its impact on the neighbouring property.

Councillor Parish proposed that a site visit be carried out, however there was no seconder for the proposal.

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

**(xi) 16/01449/F**

**Pentney: Land north east of The Pines, Abbey Road:  
Retention of fencing, gated access and track: Mr Derek Berry**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application sought retention of the fencing to the front of the application site adjacent to Abbey Road, the gated access onto the highway and an access track which had been put across the application site.



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;
- Highways issues;
- Crime and Disorder Act; and
- Other material considerations.

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

Councillor Parish referred to the comments from the Parish Council and proposed an additional condition to require a hedge planted inside the fencing, however there was no seconder for the proposal.

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

**(xii) 17/02174/O**

**Walpole: Land on the south side of Walnut Road, Walpole  
St Peter: Outline application: Development consisting of 2  
x 2 and 3 bedroom semi-detached houses to satisfy  
affordable housing requirement for overall site G.109.1 – 1  
unit for rent, 1 unit for shared ownership: c/o Agent**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was within Site Allocation G109.1 Walpole St Peter – land south of Walnut Road of the SADMP and as such development was acceptable in principle. The proposal accords with site allocation policy G109.1 of the SADMP as well as other relevant planning policies and material considerations.

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;
- Design;
- Residential amenity;
- Highways;
- Flood risk;
- Crime and disorder; and
- Other material considerations.

**RESOLVED:** (A) That, the application be approved subject to conditions and completion of a Section 106 Agreement being completed within four months of the date of resolution to secure affordable housing provision.

(B) That the application be refused should the Section 106 Agreement not be completed within the timescale above, due to the lack of affordable housing provision.

PC100: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

Councillor Hipperson declared that he was related to the applicant in relation to application 13/01846/NMA\_1, Shouldham.

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

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

**The meeting closed at 2.00 pm**