

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

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on  
Monday, 7th September, 2015 at 10.00 am in the  
Committee Suite, King's Court, Chapel Street, King's Lynn**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Mrs V Spikings (Chairman)  
Councillors Mrs C Bower, A Bubbs, Mrs S Buck, P Colvin, C Crofts, A Morrison,  
M Peake, M Storey, D Tyler, Mrs E Watson, Mrs J Westrop (sub), A White,  
T Wing-Pentelow, Mrs A Wright and Mrs S Young

An apology for absence was received from Councillors I Gourlay, J Moriarty and  
G Wareham

**PC32: MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 27 July 2015 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings.

**PC33: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following declarations of interest were declared:

- Councillor Westrop declared an interest in item 8/1(e) - The Stables, Downham Market but took no part in the debate or decision.
- Councillor Peake declared a prejudicial interest in item 8/1(l) – Stoke Ferry, as this was his daughter's application, and left the meeting during consideration of the item.

**PC34: URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was none.

**PC35: MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

There were none.

**PC36: CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC37: **RECEIPT OF LATE CORRESPONDENCE ON APPLICATIONS**

A copy of the summary of relevant correspondence received since the compilation 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.

(a) **Decisions on Applications**

The Committee considered schedules of applications for planning permission submitted by the Executive Director, Geoff Hall (copies of the schedule signed by the Chairman are attached to the signed Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee).

**RESOLVED:** That, the applications be determined as set out at (i) – (xvi) below, subject where appropriate to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal set out in the schedules signed by the Chairman.

(i) **15/01005/F**

**Brancaster: Little Saltings, Broad Lane: Variation of Condition 3 to planning permission 11/00188/F: to allow the annex to be used as a holiday let: Mr and Mrs Mason**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the entire application site was located within Built Environment Type C, a Conservation Area, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and abutted a designated SSSI, Ramsar site and SPA to the north and west.

The site contained a detached bungalow and a converted outbuilding to the front with access provided via the unadopted Broad Lane, a public right of way which had been used as an annex and holiday accommodation for the last year.

The outbuilding was granted permission by the Planning Committee in April 2011, 11/00188/F, to be converted into an annex with a restrictive condition that restricted its use to ancillary accommodation only in connection with the main house.

The application sought consent to revise the condition to regularise its use as an annex/holiday accommodation unit.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the views of the Highways Officer is contrary to the officer recommendation.

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

- Planning history and principle of development;
- Highway safety;

- Flood risk and
- Other material considerations.

The Principal Planner referred to the late correspondence and explained that within it he had reported the actual visibility instead of the required visibility splay. He then read directly from the Norfolk County Council's representation, giving the actual and required splays.

The Planning Control Manager advised the Committee that a Government Statement had been released last week relating to unauthorised development which could now be taken into account as a material consideration. However, it was considered that this statement would not have an effect on this recommendation.

Councillor Crofts asked whether County Highways objected to the original application. The Principal Planner confirmed that County Highways had not objected to the original application, subject to a condition that the unit be occupied as an annex.

Councillor Mrs Watson explained that visibility was not good at the corner which was why people did slow down. She added that she did not think that a holiday use would generate more traffic as the owners could use the main house for bed and breakfast. She therefore would like to see the application approved.

The County Highways Officer explained that the greenery had been cut down since the photographs had been taken. He also explained that a small element of land belonged to Highways but the larger element of land was privately owned.

Councillor Storey asked whether a mirror could be placed on the telegraph pole on the opposite side of the road. The County Highways Officer explained that from a Highway's perspective they would not support the use of mirrors where there was a shortfall in visibility.

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

- (ii) **15/00887/F**  
**Burnham Market: Locksley Cottage, North Street:**  
**Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of two**  
**link-detached dwellings and two semi-detached dwellings:**  
**Prime Territory Ltd**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site comprised a single, detached, residential dwelling and associated garden land on the north side of North Street within the centre of Burnham Market. The immediate surrounding area was mixed residential and commercial in character, with a variety of predominately retail uses focussed around 'The Green' to the west.

The application site was located within an area defined as Built Environment Type C and was partly within the Conservation Area and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, according to Local Plan Proposals Maps for Burnham Market.

Planning consent was granted in 2013 for a village car park and residential estate on land to the rear of the site known as Foundry Field. This was currently under construction. The car park would be immediately adjacent to the northern part of the application site.

Members might recall a recent application for 4 dwellings on the site, 14/01571/F, which was refused on the proposal being an overdevelopment of the site for its poor design.

The application sought to overcome these issues and sought consent to demolish the two storey dwelling and construction of four dwellings; two link-detached dwellings and two semi-detached dwellings.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the discretion of the Executive Director.

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

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon the Conservation Area;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material considerations.

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

In response to a query from the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings, the Principal Planner confirmed that there would be no tandem parking, with 3 spaces per unit.

Councillor Mrs Watson expressed concern that there would be 12 cars entering and exiting the site, and impact this could have.

Councillor Morrison explained that he was against the original application, however he considered that the applicant had made an effort and reduced the sizes of the units and provided car parking spaces on the site. He added that he preferred to see development within the village rather than spread out.

He therefore proposed that the application be approved on the grounds that the design was acceptable and the proposal was in-keeping with the character of Burnham Market and would enhance the Conservation Area.

The proposal to approve the application was seconded by Councillor White.

Councillor Storey stated that he did not consider the proposal overdevelopment when the Council had a lack of a 5 year land supply.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to approve the application, with conditions to be agreed in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, which was agreed.

Councillor Mrs Wright abstained from the following vote.

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

*The proposal represented a sustainable form of development that would preserve the character of the Conservation Area and would not constitute over-development of the site.*

**(iii) 15/00668/F**

**Burnham Overy: The Brambles, Gong Lane: Erection of a replacement dwelling and ancillary annex following demolition of the existing dwelling and outbuildings, together with the creation of an alternative vehicular access: Mr and Mrs Cooper**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site formed a square shaped parcel of land, measuring approximately 1233 square metres and was occupied by a chalet style dwelling known as 'The Brambles', an associated 1.5 storey outbuilding/annexe and garden land associated with 'The Brambles'.

The site was situated on the eastern side of Gong Lane within the settlement boundary for Burnham Overy Staithe, as identified by the Local Plan Proposals Map. Burnham Overy Staithe was classified as a Rural Village within the Settlement Hierarchy set out in the Core Strategy. It was also located within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Full planning permission was sought for a replacement dwelling, a detached ancillary annexe and creation of an alternative access.

The application had been referred to the Committee as the views of Burnham Overy 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;
- Impact upon the AONB;
- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material considerations.

Councillor Storey referred to the street-scene and the dwellings around it. He also referred to the comments made by the Parish Council regarding the scale, mass and impact on the landscape, which he agreed with.

Councillor Bubb also agreed with the comments made by the Parish Council in relation to the black weather boarding which he considered was out of character.

The Principal Planner advised that the final colour of the weather boarding was subject to a condition

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings made reference to the supporting case where referred to threshing bars. She added that there was a mix of style and materials along Gong Lane, and this would be the last house along it. She highlighted that design was in the eye of the beholder and people would have different opinions. In its location, there would not be any passing traffic.

Councillor Mrs Watson explained that the use of black boarding was used on lots of buildings towards the harbour. She considered the design to be fantastic and fitted into the area.

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

**(iv) 15/01054/O**

**Castle Acre: 75 Foxes Meadow: Outline application: Detached 2 bedroom bungalow and pair of detached garages serving both proposed dwelling and existing dwelling: Ms Maureen Carlton**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site comprised of a parcel of garden to the south of 75 Foxes Meadow, Castle Acre on the corner of Back Lane and Foxes Meadow. The site was within an area defined as Built Environment Type D according to Local Plan Proposals Map for Castle Acre and within an area defined as a Key Rural Service Centre.

The application sought outline approval with all matters reserved.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination because the views of Castle Acre 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;
- Impact upon visual amenity;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material considerations.

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

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

*The Committee then adjourned at 11.05 am and reconvened at 11.15 am.*

**(v) 15/00997/F**

**Downham Market: The Stables, Bexwell Road: Conversion of former offices to form three 2-bedroom residential units, alterations to coach house to form one 2- bedroom dwelling and constriction of one pair of 3-bedroom semi-detached cottages: Mr John Murphy**

Councillor Westrop took no part in the debate or decision, having declared an interest earlier in the meeting.

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the proposal was for the conversion of offices to three, single-storey dwellings; conversion of an existing coach house to one, 1.5 storey dwelling and the construction of a pair of two-storey, semi-detached dwellings.

The site was located to the north of Bexwell Road, Downham Market and benefitted from an implemented scheme for the conversion of the offices to two, single storey dwellings; the conversion of the coach house to one dwelling and the construction of one, detached, two-storey dwelling.

As such, the proposed development would result in an increase of 2 dwellings over and above the consented and implemented scheme.

The site was located within Built Environment Type C as identified in the King's Lynn & West Norfolk Local Plan, 1998. The site was also within a Conservation Area and within Flood Zone 1.

The application was a resubmission of a similar refused application that was presented to the Committee at its meeting held in June 2015. The previous application was the same as the current application except that instead of a pair of semi-detached dwellings there was a

terrace of three dwellings, and a net increase in 3 (rather than 2) on the consented and implemented scheme.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Form and character and impact on conservation area;
- Highway safety;
- Residential amenity; and
- Other material considerations.

The Principal Planner advised the Committee of the need to add an additional condition relating to the use of obscure glazing to the en-suite bathroom and utility room for the semi-detached dwellings.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr J Sutton (objecting), Town Councillor Frank Daymond (objecting) and Mr J Stephenson (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor White considered that the applicant had overcome the objections raised in relation to the previous scheme.

Councillor Mrs Young asked whether the access was suitable for emergency services. The Principal Planner advised that Norfolk County Council had raised no objection to the application.

In response to a query from the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings regarding overlooking into Kingfisher House and Cedar House, the Principal Planner clarified the distances involved.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings drew the Committee's attention to the need to add an additional condition to the pair of semi-detached dwellings requiring obscured glazing, as outlined by the Principal Planner, which was agreed.

**RESOLVED:** That, the application be approved as recommended, subject to the imposition of an additional condition requiring obscure glazing in the bathrooms, en-suite and utility rooms.

**(vi) 15/01023/F**

**Harpley: Land to the rear of 11 Cross Street: Proposed new dwelling: Andy Spooner Developments Ltd**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was within Built Environment Type C according to



Local Plan Proposals Maps for Harpley. Harpley was classified as a Rural Village according to Policy CS02 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011.

The site comprised the garden area to 11 Cross Street, Harpley and was elevated above Back Street and Church Lane.

Planning permission was granted under delegated authority for a single storey dwelling under reference: 14/00930/O with all matters reserved. The proposal sought consent for a 2 storey cottage style dwelling and lean-to carport.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the view of Harpley Parish Council was contrary to the officer recommendation.

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

- Principle of development and planning history;
- Impact upon visual amenity;
- Highway safety; and
- Trees

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

Councillor Bubb expressed concern to the fact that there would be no vehicular parking for No.11. The Principal Planner referred the Committee to the second paragraph on page 65 of the agenda which referred to highway safety.

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

**(vii) 15/00936/F**

**Heacham: Woodland, Land east of Hunstanton Road and south of Robin Hill: Erection of 2.4m high stock proof fencing: Samphire Developments**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was a long strip of land 57m in length and 1.5m wide which ran along the western side of the A149. The application site was to the eastern side of land which was within the ownership of the applicant to the south of Robin Hill.

The application sought planning permission to erect a 2.4 m high stock proof boundary fence which would consist of fence posts situated 2.4m apart and wire fencing between with barbed wire to the top strand.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the views of Heacham Parish Council was contrary to the officer recommendation.

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

- Principle of development;
- Visual impact;
- Highways issues; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr T Parish (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to comments made by the public speaker, the Planning Control Manager advised that the Norfolk Wildlife Trust did not object to the application. The issue for him related to the visual impact and the height of the fence.

Councillor White asked whether there was any stock and if any trees would be damaged as a result of the proposal.

The Principal Planner advised that the proposal did not include any works to trees. He added that the fence was not to keep stock in but more to keep people out.

The Executive Director explained that there was no application for tree works, and commented that it was difficult to see how the fence would be erected to the proposed height without damaging any trees.

Councillor White asked for assurance that a tree works application was received before planning permission was granted.

The Planning Control Manager suggested that the application be deferred to consider the potential impact on the trees, which was agreed by the Committee.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be deferred to seek more information about the impact of the fence upon the trees and to seek clarification on the need for a fence of the height proposed.

**(viii) 15/01045/F**

**Ingoldisthorpe: The Shieling, Sandy way: Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of two new dwellings (revised design): Mr D Heffer**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located within Built Environment Type D according to Local Plan Proposals Maps for Ingoldisthorpe and within a 'Rural

Village' according to Policy CS02 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011.

The proposal sought consent for the demolishing the existing detached property on the sit and constructing a pair of semi-detached chalet style properties.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination because the views of Ingoldisthorpe 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 and planning history;
- Impact upon form and character;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material considerations.

Councillor Mrs Wright abstained from the following resolution.

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

**(ix) 15/00985/F**

**Marshland St James: Land at School Road: Construction of terraced housing consisting of two 2-bedroom and two 3-bedroom dwellings (four in number) on former farm yard: Client of Hereward Services**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located on the north-eastern side of School Road, Marshland St James approximately 250m from Hickathrift cross roads (junction of Smeeth Road, Walton Road and School Road). It comprised an area of former farmyard which was now unkempt grassland commonly used for parking and turning of vehicles at school drop-off and pick-up times (primary school was located some 100m away on the opposite side of the road). It was enclosed by a barn style dwelling 'The Trundle' to the north-west, stables to the rear beyond a close boarded fence and mature hedgerow and tree to the south-east with agricultural land beyond.

The site was identified as being beyond the development area of the village and had been the subject of historical refusals and a dismissed appeal.

The application sought full permission for the construction of a terrace of 4 dwellinghouses (two 2-bed and two 3-bed units) with a central undercroft access and associated parking and turning area to the rear.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Brian Long and the recommendation was contrary to a previous appeal decision.

The Principal Planner then outlined the key issues to be considered when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon form and character of the locality;
- Impact upon amenity of adjoining property;
- Highways implications;
- Flood risk; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Bryon Putt (objecting) and Mr R Markillie (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Crofts stated that he knew the area well and the site was only 50-60 yards to the primary school. He added that the road was busy at school times but this was the same in other villages. He considered that it was a sustainable area. In addition, on the opposite side of the road from the site, was a site allocation for 15 dwellings.

Councillor Bubb commented that there were no chimneys shown on the plans for the dwellings. He also asked how wide were the parking spaces. The Principal Planner advised that the width of parking spaces were slightly in excess of Norfolk County Standards. The County Highways Officer advised that the Manual for Streets document which included widths for car parking spaces was last revised in 2007.

Councillor Westrop referred to the comments made by the Council's CSNN and asked how this had been addressed.

In response, the Principal Planner explained that there would be some noise and disturbance during the construction phase but this was to be expected.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings stated that starter homes were really needed in this area.

The Planning Control Manager explained that a condition should be added regarding the disposal of foul and surface water, which was agreed by the Committee.

**RESOLVED:** That, the application be approved as recommended, subject to the imposition of an additional condition regarding the disposal of foul and surface water.

**(x) 15/00845/O**

**Methwold: Land north east of 14 Whiteplot Road, Methwold  
Hythe: Outline application for two detached 2-3 bedroom  
dwellings: Mr & Mrs McGroary**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site comprised land on the north western side of Whiteplot Road, Methwold Hythe. There were existing residential properties immediately to the south west and farm buildings to the north east.

Methwold Hythe was defined as a Smaller Village and Hamlet under the settlement hierarchy of Policy CS02 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy (2011). However, in accordance with the NPPF (2012) this was currently considered out of date given that the Council did not have a five year supply of deliverable housing sites.

The application sought outline planning permission with all matters reserved for 2 no. detached 2/3 bedroom dwellings.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as a proposal for the construction of 2 no. dwellings on the site was dismissed at appeal in 1999.

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

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety;
- Other considerations; and
- Crime and disorder

The Principal Planner referred the Committee to page 103 of the agenda, and explained that the Condition numbers 2 and 4 needed to be swapped round.

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

**(xi) 15/00884/F**

**Northwold: Land adjacent to No.27 Church Lane,  
Whittington: Proposed new chalet bungalow: Mr Mervyn  
Douglas**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was almost wholly within what was the settlement boundary of Whittington (as defined by the Local Plan Proposals Maps). The rear of the site was located within flood zones 2 and 3, but where the dwelling was proposed was within flood zone 1. The

difference between flood zones was due to a significant change in levels between the rear (north) and front (south) of the site.

Permission was sought for the erection of 1 no. detached dwelling.

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

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

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

Councillor White pointed out that the site was opposite a children's play area.

The County Highways Officer explained that the Manual for Streets also covered rural roads.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings stated that she could understand the reason why the property has been designed as it had because of the flooding issues and for the view of the river. She added that it was a quiet lane.

Councillor Peake referred to the late correspondence where it stated that the property was formerly occupied by a business. He added that the site was the end of the line of properties and considered that it would enhance and improve the street-scene. He therefore proposed that the application be approved on the grounds that there was previously a business running from the site and the traffic generated by it should be given weight, it was a lightly trafficked road and the positive benefits of the provision of a house would outweigh the highway objection. The proposal was seconded by Councillor White.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to approve the application with conditions to be agreed following consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, which was carried.

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

*That there was previously a business running from the site and the traffic generated by it should be given weight, it was a lightly trafficked*

*road and the positive benefits of the provision of a house would outweigh the highway objection.*

*The Committee then adjourned at 12.32pm and reconvened at 1.10pm*

**(xii) 15/00950/O**

**Stoke Ferry: Plot south west of Marmic, Fen Drove,  
Wretton: Outline application for proposed residential  
development: M & M Norfolk Services Ltd**

*Councillor Peake left the meeting during consideration of the application.*

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located outside the settlement boundary of Wretton (as defined by the Local Plan Proposals Maps) in land designated as countryside.

Outline permission, with all matters reserved, was sought for the erection of a dwelling house following demolition of existing buildings on the site.

The buildings to be demolished formed part of a wider mixed use site (in the same ownership as the application site) comprising B2 (car repair/sales), horsiculture' and keeping of dogs. The buildings to be demolished had B2 use (granted under application 2/88/4971/F which followed previous temporary consents (2/83/3106/F & 2/80/3084/F).

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the application had been made by a Councillor.

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

- Principle of development;
- 5-year land supply;
- Flood risk;
- Loss of employment land;
- Residential amenity; and
- Other material considerations.

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

In response to comments raised by the public speaker, the Principal Planner explained that the proposal would represent the provision of an additional dwellinghouse on the a brownfield site that would not be of significant or demonstrable harm to the intrinsic character of the countryside. However the site was isolated and lacked accessibility. In relation to flood risk the application failed both the sequential and

exceptions tests. It was therefore concluded that on balance the adverse impacts of the proposed development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF.

The Executive Director explained that in the absence of a 5 year land supply, then the application should be assessed against the NPPF where there was a presumption in favour of sustainable development. He added that the most significant issue was flooding, as visually the proposal would not cause harm.

Councillor Storey referred to the fact that the Council did not have a 5 year land supply. He added that the site area had been identified as countryside however looking at the buildings he considered that what was proposed was better than what was already on site. He also pointed out that there was another house further along the road and there were no flooding issues in that area. He considered the proposal to be sustainable development as the site was not far away from Wretton, and that the site lends itself for development.

Councillor Storey proposed that the application be approved and he considered that the proposal would enhance the form and character of the area and attached weight to the fact that the site was brownfield. He also considered that the proposal would not cause significant and demonstrable harm. The dwelling could also be sited within Flood Zone 1 on the site.

The proposal for approval was seconded by Councillor White.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings referred to the policy within the LDF which recognised the use of the car for the King's Lynn hinterland.

Councillor Crofts added that any flood mitigation measures could be taken into account at the reserved matters stage.

**RESOLVED:** That, the application be approved, contrary to recommendation, subject to conditions to be agreed following consultation with the Chairman, for the following reason:

*That the proposal would enhance the form and character of the area and weight is attached to the fact that the site is brownfield. It is also considered that that proposal would not cause significant and demonstrable harm, and therefore as set out in the NPPF it should be considered under the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The dwelling could also be site within Flood Zone 1 on the site and use flood mitigation measures, if necessary, overcoming the flood risk objection.*

(xiii) 15/01082/F

**Tilney St Lawrence: The Coach & Horses, Lynn Road:  
Smoking shelter for public house: Elgoods & Sons Ltd**



The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located on the eastern side of Lynn Road, Tilney All Saints, and related to the Coach and Horses Public House. The public house was two storey and was constructed in brick which was painted cream with clay tiles to the roof. Car parking was located to the south of the Public House. To the east of the Public House was a camping and caravan site.

The property was Grade II listed and listed building consent had also been applied for.

Planning consent was sought for a smoking shelter to the side of the public house. There was currently an unauthorised shelter which would need to be altered should the application be approved.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as there had been a previous appeal decision.

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

- Design and impact upon the listed building;
- Neighbour amenity; and
- Other material considerations

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

**(xiv) 15/01083/LB**

**Tilney St Lawrence: The Coach & Horses, Lynn Road:  
Smoking shelter for public house: Elgoods & Sons Ltd**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the Coach and Horses Public House was listed grade II, and was a two storey T plan building of the late C17 with later additions and extensions.

The application sought listed building consent for the erection of a smoking shelter situated to the south of the restaurant area and the east of the disabled toilet facility. It would replace the existing smoking shelter which was erected without consent in late 2013.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as there had been a previous appeal decision.

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

- The impact of the proposal on the significance of the building which was a designated heritage asset.

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

**(xv) 15/00918/F**

**Walpole: Model Farm, Frenchs Road, Walpole St Andrew:  
The erection of one wind turbine with a hub height of  
24.8m: Mr Andrew Bateman**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was on the south western side of Frenchs Road, Walpole St Andrew. The site was located on land forming the Model Farm agricultural holding.

Planning consent was sought for the erection of one wind turbine with a hub height of 24.8m and a tip height of 36.6m.

Planning consent was approved last year for two wind turbines with a hub height of 25.1m and a tip height of 35.1m. This application was on the site of one of the previously approved turbines.

The application had been referred to the Committee to determine as the proposed turbine was too high to be approved under delegated powers.

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

- Principle of development;
- Planning history;
- Visual impact;
- Ecology;
- Heritage assets;
- Amenity;
- Highways safety; and
- Other material considerations.

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

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

**(xvi) 2/TPO/00525**

**Bagthorpe with Barmer and Barwick: Hyde Close: To  
consider whether Tree Preservation Order 2/TPO/00525  
should be confirmed, modified or not confirmed in the  
light of objections: Jark Resourcing Plc**

The Arboricultural Officer presented the report and outlined the following:

- The site;

- Reason for making the Tree Preservation Order;
- Outline of objections and representations
- Response to the objections and representations

The Committee was then asked to consider whether the Order should be confirmed in light of objections received.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Colin Davison (objecting to the confirmation of the Order) and Sylvia Langfield (supporting the confirmation of the Order) addressed the Committee.

**RESOLVED:** That the Order be confirmed without modification.

PC38: **INDEX OF APPLICATIONS**

The Index of Applications was noted.

PC39: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received the Schedules relating to the above.

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

**The meeting closed at 2.05 pm**