

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

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on  
Thursday, 7th June, 2018 at 10.30 am in the Council Chamber, 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, T Parish,  
Miss S Sandell, Mrs E Watson and Mrs S Young

**PC10: APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

**RESOLVED:** That Councillor Mrs S Fraser be appointed as Vice-Chairman for the meeting.

**PC11: APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs Bower, Morrison, Peake, Storey, D Tyler and White.

**PC12: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**PC13: DECISIONS ON APPLICATIONS**

The Committee was invited to determine the application below, which had been adjourned from the meeting held on 4 June 2018, and had been the subject of a site inspection held earlier in the day:

**18/00198/F**

**Old Hunstanton: The Bungalow, Waterworks Road: Construction of 3 dwellings following demolition of existing bungalow: Mr D Lloyd**

Councillor Crofts stated that he still supported the application following the site visit. He felt that the proposal would not be as high as the former Linksway Hotel and referred to the modern building on the opposite side of the road and considered that the proposal would fit in with the area. In addition, he thought that the access would provide a better visibility splay. He found the scheme to be acceptable and would be an attractive addition to the area.

Councillor Mrs Watson added that the house opposite was on rising land and that she would be interested to know the height of it. Furthermore, the Parish Council had considered the proposal and

supported it. She added that she welcomed the site visit and felt that the proposal fitted in well with the house next door, which was of modern design. She considered that it also gave a good view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Councillor Bubb added that following the site visit, he still supported the officer recommendation.

Councillor Parish supported the comment made by Councillor Bubb, and added that Norfolk Coast Partnership also had concerns in relation to the application with regards to the amount of glazing and light pollution.

Councillor Westrop agreed with the previous speakers and added that she considered that the site would be cramped.

Councillor Mrs Young asked whether a condition could be imposed regarding controlling light pollution.

The Assistant Director explained that there were roof lights incorporated into the scheme and glazing, therefore the light would spill out. He drew the Committee's attention to page 39 of the agenda, where it asked if the Committee considered that a contribution towards ecology was still relevant, given that the number of units on the site had been reduced to 3, if the application was likely to be approved. The Assistant Director added that applicant would have to provide CIL contributions and a habitat contribution.

Councillor Hipperson added he would prefer to see 2 houses on the site rather than 3.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings stated that she also would prefer to see 2 houses on the site and that they needed to be more in-keeping, retaining some of the natural habitat, if possible.

Councillor Parish reiterated the comments from the North Coast Partnership regarding dark skies and keeping light pollution to a minimum.

The Assistant Director explained that there was unlikely to be any external lighting but any light pollution would come from the design.

Councillor Crofts referred to the history of the site and the fact that officers had originally recommended approval for 4 units on the site, which the Committee refused and was then dismissed at appeal.

The Assistant Director advised that when an application was dismissed at appeal, it then effectively gave a new starting point for the consideration of the application. Officers considered that the Inspector's reasons for dismissing the appeal had not been adequately addressed.

Councillor Mrs Fraser also felt that the site was more suitable for 2 dwellings and had concerns in relation to the amount of traffic using the road that would be generated by 3 dwellings.

Councillor Mrs Watson advised that the traffic witnessed at the site visit would have been going to the Golf Club.

In relation to an ecology contribution, should the Committee be minded to approve the application, it was proposed by Councillor Parish that the amount should be £50,000, which had been proposed under the previous application. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Bubb and, after having been put to the vote, was lost.

Councillor Crofts proposed that the ecology contribution should be £37,500, which was seconded by Councillor Mrs Watson and, after having been put to the vote was agreed.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to approve the application, subject to conditions to be agreed following consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, including an ecology contribution of £37,500, which was lost.

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

**The meeting closed at 11.04 am**