

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

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 9th April, 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 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, Mrs A Wright and Mrs S Young

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Mrs S Buck

PC101: **MINUTES**

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

PC102: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

PC103: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no urgent business under Standing Order 7.

PC104: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Councillors addressed the Committee under Standing Order 34:

<i>G Middleton</i>	<i>8/1(d)</i>	<i>King's Lynn</i>
<i>B Ayres</i>	<i>8/1(f)</i>	<i>Terrington St John</i>
	<i>8/1(h)</i>	<i>Tilney St Lawrence</i>

PC105: **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC106: **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.

PC107: **INDEX OF APPLICATIONS**

The Committee noted the Index of Applications.

PC108: **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) – (x) below, where appropriate to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chairman.

- (i) **17/01961/RM**  
**Clenchwarton: Land east of No.40 Warrens Road: Reserved matters application: Application for proposed development of one residential dwelling: Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the reserved matters application sought permission for the construction of a residential dwelling at land east of No.40 Warrens Road, Clenchwarton.

The application site was located within the settlement of Clenchwarton. Clenchwarton was designated as a Key Rural Service Centre in Policy CS02 – Settlement Hierarchy of the Core Strategy (2011) which recommended limited growth of scale and nature appropriate to secure the sustainability of the settlement.

The site comprised a rectangular plot that had outline permission granted. Vehicular access to the site was provided by the existing Warrens Road.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the application had been made on behalf of the Borough Council.

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

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Access;
- Flood risk; and

- Other material considerations.

Councillor White expressed concern that the estate would be losing a green space.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings explained that on the opposite side of the road there was a large green space and the dwellings had plenty of garden space.

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

**(ii) 17/01709/F**

**Docking: Land west of Fakenham Road, Stanhoe:  
Proposed glamping site: Mr M McGinn & Ms S Brooks**

The Senior Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located on the western side of the B1445 at Bircham Newton. The site was part of a larger field which was generally grassed and open in nature.

The main B1454 Fakenham Road formed the eastern boundary of the site. To the north was Dreamy Hollow Woodland Campsite and to the south was the remainder of the field within the applicant's ownership. Beyond the field boundary to the south was a private residential property. To the west was another part of the grassed field (outside the applicant's ownership) with a wooded area beyond. Residential properties in Monks Close were further west.

In policy terms the site was within open countryside.

Full planning permission was sought for the change of use from agricultural land to a 12 pitch glamping site with shepherd's huts, 3 additional shepherd huts for use as a reception building, shower block and toilet block, a detached warden's lodge with separate access and parking, a new vehicular access point onto Fakenham Road, 12 parking spaces, vehicular turning area, bin storage area, land banking/landscaping and fencing.

The Senior Planner explained that if the Committee were minded to approve the application then a Section 106 Agreement would be required to secure appropriate visibility.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as it had been called in by Councillor Morrison.

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

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon visual amenity;
- Highway safety;

- Impact upon neighbour amenity; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Matthew McGinn addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Morrison (Ward Member) advised the Committee that he believed that the benefits of the application outweighed the harm. He referred the Committee to the conclusion on page 26 of the agenda, where it stated that no objection in principle was raised in relation to the use of the land for camping, which was shown to be appropriate for the site. Councillor Morrison also made reference to the permission given for Dreamy Hollow, where the Highways objection had been overcome.

Councillor Morrison explained that care had been taken with the design and scale of the shepherd's huts and care had also been taken with the planting. With regards to the on-site residential accommodation, he explained that he did not think it unreasonable to have on-site residential accommodation with the 12 shepherd's huts and the accommodation would be temporary. He added that to put it in to context, Docking was a Key Rural Service Centre where permission had been granted for over 100 homes.

Councillor Morrison further explained that this application would not harm the countryside and would promote tourism and West Norfolk.

Councillor Morrison proposed that the application be approved, on the grounds that it would promote tourism and enhance the countryside, which was seconded by Councillor Mrs Wright.

The Assistant Director explained to the Committee that for a similar scheme the Committee had not allowed any warden's accommodation. Although each application needed to be considered on its own merits, the Committee needed to be consistent in their decision making.

In relation to the hours of operation and what hours the warden would be required, the Assistant Director explained that this was outlined on page 23 of the agenda.

Councillor Mrs Wright added that the proposal was different from other glamping sites. She did not understand the objection in relation to the warden's accommodation as it would also act as a security measure.

Councillor Hipperson suggested that if permission was to be granted then the warden's accommodation should be tied to the shepherd's huts.

Councillor Parish added that no evidence had been put forward for the residential accommodation element of the scheme. He added that policies were in place for the protection of the countryside and these

policies should be followed. He added that it should be seen whether the business would work before allowing residential accommodation.

The Assistant Director advised that it was the view of officers that there was not a need to live on the site.

Councillor Bubb stated that the residential accommodation would provide security for when the site was not occupied. The Assistant Director explained that it would not prevent someone from being on the site during the day, but they would not be able to live on the site.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings added that she felt that the vision for the future was to be supported. In addition, people should be encouraged to try new things.

Councillor White asked that, if the Committee were minded to approve the application, could some of the shepherd's huts be erected prior to the residential accommodation. The Assistant Director advised that a condition of this nature would be reasonable.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to approve the application, subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure visibility, and appropriate conditions to be imposed following consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, including a condition that 5 shepherd huts should be completed before the residential accommodation was occupied, which was carried.

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

*That the benefits of the development to tourism and the local economy outweighed the harm to the character and appearance of the countryside*

and subject to:

- The completion of a Section 106 Agreement within 4 months of the date of the Committee to secure visibility;
- Appropriate conditions to be imposed following consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman; and
- A condition be imposed to ensure that the provision of 5 shepherd huts on site be completed before the residential accommodation was occupied.

(iii) **18/00125/F**

**Gayton: Manor Farm, Back Street: Conversion and extension of workshop outbuilding to dwelling house, addition of workshop/plant room and associated works: Mr & Mrs A Beales**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site comprised a detached barn associated with Manor Farm house, situated on the northern side of Back Street, Gayton.

Full planning permission was sought for the conversion and extension of the outbuilding to a dwelling house and associated works.

Gayton was classified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the applicant was Councillor Beales.

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

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

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

**(iv) 18/00021/F**

**King's Lynn: 15 Field Lane, Gaywood: Construction of a detached dwelling: Messrs Dickerson and Barlow**

The Senior Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located within Gaywood/Newlyn area of King's Lynn:

It contained a two storey semi-detached dwelling with side garden and off-road parking.

The proposal sought consent for the erection of 1 detached dwelling within the garden area of 15 Field Lane, Gaywood.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination by Councillor Middleton.

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

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

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Middleton addressed the Committee in support of the application. Councillor Middleton

referred to the site's history over the last 18 months and the applicants had worked closely with the Planning Officers. He added that he did not feel that the proposal would be out of character in the area. Councillor Middleton outlined the type and ages of the dwellings in the vicinity. He referred the Committee to late correspondence, where two letters of support from the neighbours had been received.

Councillor Middleton further explained that the existing property would as part of the proposal, benefit from two off-road car parking spaces. He referred to the amount of garden space and advised that he had seen recent development in the town where little or no garden space had been provided.

Councillor Bubb added that looking at the drawing the proposal looked to fit in quite well, however from the photographs the proposal looked tight.

The Assistant Director referred to the map on page 37 of the agenda, which demonstrated how much garden land would be left. He also referred to the Planning Inspector's decision, which had dismissed the appeal. He added that the shape of the garden was awkward.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings added that she had sympathy with the applicants, however after visiting the site there would be little remaining amenity space whereas the other properties in the vicinity had much larger gardens. She considered that this was the right recommendation for the application.

Councillor Wareham added that some people wanted to downsize and have smaller gardens.

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

**(v) 18/00138/F**

**Northwold: Parish Council Land, School Lane:  
Development of Parish Council land to change of use from  
allotment land to community car park: Northwold and  
Whittington Parish Council**

The Principal Planner presented the report and explained that permission was sought for the change of use of 0.11ha of former allotment land to a community car park. The car park would provide 24 x 7 x 2.5m spaces on grass reinforcement mesh and would utilise two existing accesses onto School Road using an 'in' and 'out' circuit. The 'in' would utilise the existing western access and the 'out' would utilise the existing eastern access. The latter would also continue to provide field access for land to the rear of the cemetery (which itself was to the rear of the allotment).

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was contrary to the Local Highway Officer recommendation.

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

- Principle of development;
- Highway safety;
- Neighbour amenity and crime and disorder; and
- Other material considerations.

The Principal Planner advised the Committee that since the publication of the agenda, an amended plan had been received from the Parish Council to remove condition 4, which would require all vehicles including cemetery vehicles to exit the area via the designated exit from the proposed car park, thus avoiding the use of the cemetery vehicular access as an exit point and the need to widen the said access. The reason for the amendment was to avoid extra cost to the Parish Council in carrying out significant groundworks to widen the cemetery access point, and to avoid the removal of the wrought iron gates and posts, along with the conifer to the north-west, which had been features of the entrance to the area for many years.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Cliff Anderson (Vice-Chairman of the Parish Council supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings then invited the County Highways Officer to explain the Local Highway Authority's (LHA) objection to the application. It was explained that the LHA was not against the principle of the application but they just wanted a safe egress from the site, as lots of people would be using the car park every day. The new proposal would direct all traffic through an egress which they had no control of its visibility. If the neighbour did grow vegetation, which they were entitled to do, then visibility could be at near blind levels. The County Highways Officer explained that their objection could easily be removed by moving the exit over and away from the neighbouring property where they would have control of the land required for the splay being within their ownership or they could increase the width of the existing cemetery access for two way flow and utilise it as the only vehicle access/egress.

Councillor White proposed that the application be deferred for one cycle to allow the amended scheme to be properly considered.

Councillor Peake stated that the proposal would be of great benefit to the community. He urged the Committee to support the application and to remove condition 4.



Councillor Mrs Wright supported the comments made by Councillor Peake and added that this would be a facility for the community. The Parish Council wanted to improve the parking for the area.

Councillor Storey added that the Parish Council was well advised as to what went on in their parish and to come up with a scheme which they felt would work. He explained that cars were parked along the road and there was now an opportunity to put in a new car park in the village which would be of benefit, especially at school times. He added that the village hall only had a small car park.

The County Highways Officer agreed that a car park would be beneficial however the car park needed a safe exit for vehicles using it in the future.

Councillor Crofts seconded the proposal to defer the application.

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

**RESOLVED:** That, the application be deferred.

*The Committee adjourned at 11.00 am and reconvened at 11.10 am*

**(vi) 18/000024/F  
Terrington St John: Surgery House, Mill Road: Erection of  
3 x 4 bedroom dwellings: Hereward Services Ltd**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was that of Surgery House which was located off a private drive on the northern side of Mill Road, within the defined village development area of Terrington St John. It contained a traditional farmhouse style dwelling and associated outbuildings, located in approximately 0.2ha of unkempt garden and grounds. It was surrounded by residential development with a pair of cottages fronting the shared driveway, bungalows fronting Mill Road, houses to the east beyond a small play area, bungalows to the immediate north and a residential care home (Burman House) to the west.

The application sought full planning permission for the erection of three 4 bedroomed dwellings and garages.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Ayres, and 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 form and character;

- Impact upon neighbouring properties;
- Highways issues; and
- Other material considerations.

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

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Ayres addressed the Committee on behalf of Terrington St John Parish Council. He explained that the Parish Council was concerned about the size and width of the access road and considered that the width of the entrance should be increased. The Parish Council also had concerns in relation to the drainage and the well on the site.

With regards to the bat survey, it appeared that both parties had different figures which needed to be addressed.

He concluded that there was no doubt that this site was right for development however he hoped that the Parish Council's concerns would be taken on board.

The Principal Planner advised that in relation to the bat survey and the impact of lighting, condition 10 on page 64 of the agenda covered this.

With regards to the access, the Principal Planner advised that there was a condition to cover access arrangements and the Local Highway Authority had no objection to the application.

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

**RESOLVED:** That, the application be approved as recommended, subject to condition 2 being amended as outlined in the late correspondence.

**(vii) 18/00083/F**

**Thornham: Thornham Deli, High Street: Siting of marquee from 1<sup>st</sup> October to 30 April (retrospective): J Thompson**

The Senior Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site comprised of Thorham Deli, which was on the southern side of High Street, Thornham. Thornham was classified as a Rural Village according to Policy CS02 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

The site was located outside of the development boundary of Thornham but was contained within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and formed part of the setting of the Conservation Area.

The proposal sought consent to retain a marquee which had been erected on the site to be used in association with Thornham Deli between 1<sup>st</sup> October and 30<sup>th</sup> April 2018 in any given year.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon the AONB;
- Impact upon the setting of Thornham's Conservation Area;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety issues; and
- Other material considerations.

The Senior Planner advised the Committee that the flue had been withdrawn from the proposal.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Stavely (objecting on behalf of Mrs Tynedale-Atkins) and Wendy Brookes (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Mrs Watson expressed concern in relation to the application. She explained that it looked very unsightly and was noisy. She objected to the statement that it was of benefit to the village, it was not a benefit to residents. She added that it did not look like buildings or the surrounding houses and detracted from the area. The applicant also submitted a planning application following objections. Permission was granted in the first instance for the village to have a shop however residents could not get their shopping from the shop now. Councillor Mrs Watson also explained the village hall car park and Deli car park was full on many occasions which lead to parking on the road. She had been approached by a number of residents who were concerned about the application. She considered that the marquee was not in-keeping with the AONB.

Councillor Mrs Watson therefore proposed that the application be refused on the grounds of design, impact on the Conservation Area and AONB. This was seconded by Councillor Mrs Fraser.

Councillor Mrs Fraser endorsed the comments made by Councillor Mrs Watson and considered that the marquee was out of keeping. She agreed that it could not be classed as a village shop.

Councillor Mrs Wright added that the Deli was an asset to the area but she considered that the marquee was out of keeping and supported the comments previously made.

The Assistant Director advised that the Committee needed to consider that this was a temporary structure.

Councillor Bubb suggested that a conservatory building on the side might more preferable to the current structure and might help to alleviate some of the issues.

Several Members of the Committee also commented that the structure was out of keeping and detrimental to the AONB.

The Assistant Director explained if the Committee were minded to refuse the application, then an enforcement notice would be served which would give the applicant 28 days to remove the structure from the site.

Councillor Mrs Watson clarified that she did use the Deli herself, and considered that it did add something to the area. However, what she objected to was the marquee at the side of the building in the AONB.

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 retention of the marquee from the 1<sup>st</sup> October to the 30<sup>th</sup> April would by virtue of its appearance and scale cause harm to the setting of Thornham's Conservation Area and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The white canvass material of the marquee would be in stark contrast to the surrounding building materials and in combination with the scale of the marquee, the proposal would be unduly prominent. The harm caused to the setting of Thornham's Conservation Area and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty by retaining the marquee for this temporary period is not considered to be outweighed by any form of public benefit. The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraphs 17, 56, 58 64, 115, 131, 132 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework; National Planning Practice Guidance; Policies CS06, 07, 08 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011; Policy DM15 of the Site Allocation and Development Management Policies Plan 2016.*

**(viii) 18/00188/F**

**Tilney St Lawrence: 14 St Johns Road: Change of use of agricultural land to proposed commercial car park/new access (CDR Services) and garden and associated fencing: CDR Services**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application was for the change of use of agricultural land which was adjacent to the development boundary to a commercial car park and access for the adjoining business which carried out car repairs. The application also included boundary fencing and a relatively small area of land which would become garden land to 14 St John's Road. The principle of the change of use complied with Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy 2011 and it was not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the countryside.

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 on countryside;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Highways issues;
- Flood risk issues;
- Crime and disorder act; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor B Ayres addressed the Committee in relation to the application. He referred to the objection from the Parish Council that the proposal would be detrimental to the countryside and open space. He had concerns in relation to the height of the fencing and surface water run-off but believed that both issues had been addressed. He asked whether a condition could be imposed to ensure that no vehicle sales took place and the site was just used for parking.

He referred to the letters of objection with regard to working hours and asked whether this could be conditioned given its location in a residential area.

The Principal Planner advised that no car sales would take place on the site and this could be conditioned if the Committee wished.

In response to a query regarding the working hours, the Assistant Director advised that there was an existing business.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings then drew the Committee's attention the late correspondence and the need to add an additional condition 7. She also proposed that an additional condition be imposed to ensure that no car sales took place from the car park, which was agreed by the Committee.

Councillor Parish referred to lighting for the car park. The Principal Planner advised that no lighting had been shown on the plan. If the applicant wanted to use flood lights on columns then they would have to apply for permission.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved as recommended, subject to the imposition of an additional condition as outlined in late correspondence (condition 7), and an additional condition to ensure that no car sales took place from the car park.

**(ix) 18/00066/F**

**Titchwell: Land north-west of junction with Choseley Road and east of track north of Orchard Cottage, Main Road: Proposed development to a small commercial holiday business to include six accommodation lodges, a reception lodge and proposed parking area near entrance: Mr Patrick Wales**

The Senior Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located on the northern side of the main A149 coastal road which ran through the village of Titchwell. During the course of the application the site boundary had been reduced in scale from 1.97 to 0.72 hectares (ie. approximately 36% of the original site).

The site was currently part of a grassed field although had not been used for agricultural purposes since 2010. The applicant claimed that the field was currently used as a private camping site.

The site was within open countryside which was designated as the North Norfolk Coast AONB and Heritage Coast. It was within 10m of a Ramsar Site, Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area and SSSI Buffer Area.

Full planning permission was sought for the proposed change of use of the land to form a commercial holiday business to include six accommodation lodges, a reception lodge and proposed parking area for 16 vehicles along the southern boundary of the site. The existing vehicular access point to the south east corner of the site would be improved.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination 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 AONB;
- Impact upon the Conservation Area;
- Ecological matters;
- Highway safety;

- Arboricultural implications;
- Flood risk; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Richard Stoney (objecting) and Mr Patrick Wales (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

It was clarified that the application did not require a full time warden living on the site.

Councillor Mrs Watson stated that she supported the application. She explained that the lodges had been designed to look like RSPB hides and were sympathetic with the setting. Lighting had also been carefully considered in that the light would not be able to escape. She added that the site was well screened along the boundary with the A149 as trees had been planted and were already growing. The lodges themselves had been designed to be very low. She explained that she went past the site several times a week and it was difficult to see into it.

Councillor Mrs Watson added that the applicant had shown great diligence in respecting the night time skies and habitat. This would be a totally different concept to the other sites offering tourist accommodation.

The Assistant Director referred to the comments made by the Norfolk Coast Partnership on page 80-81 of the agenda, who had raised an objection due to its sensitive location in the undeveloped heritage coast although they acknowledged that the nature of the proposal and level of design was of an exceptional standard.

Councillor Mrs Wright agreed with the comments from the Norfolk Coast Partnership and added that this was an area of open coastal marshes and people expected this when they came to the area.

She added that the design was excellent but this was not the right location for it.

Councillor Morrison stated that he thought that the scheme was sympathetic and well planned but in the wrong location. He added that people came to look at the open space and it was high quality countryside. He considered that it would be wrong to allow any accommodation on the north side of the A149.

Councillor Bubb asked whether the lodges were permanent buildings. He also referred to the RSPB buildings themselves. He also considered it to be a good scheme but in the wrong location.

Councillor Morrison explained that the RSPB buildings had been covered with planting.

The Assistant Director advised that the lodges were structures.

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

(x) **17/01669/F**

**Walpole: Caravan at Hill Farm, West Drove North, Walpole  
St Peter: Retention of mobile home: Mr & Mrs K Barnes**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that planning permission was sought for the retention of a mobile home for a temporary period of time in order to allow further time for the self-building of a dwelling (already granted planning permission) on the neighbouring plot of land. This was considered acceptable for a temporary period of time after which the mobile home should be removed and the land returned to its original state.

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:

- Planning history;
- Principle of development;
- Crime and disorder; and
- Other material considerations.

The Principal Planner pointed out a correction to Condition 1 on page 16 which should refer to mobile home rather than building.

It was agreed that Condition 1 be amended to ensure that upon occupation of the dwelling, the mobile home be removed from the site within 28 days.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved as recommended, subject to Condition 1 be amended to refer to a mobile home and to ensure that upon occupation of the dwelling, the mobile home be removed from the site within 28 days.

PC109: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

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

**The meeting closed at 12.35 pm**