

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

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on
Monday, 4th November, 2019 at 10.30 am in the Assembly Room - Town
Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ**

PRESENT: Councillor C J Crofts (Chair)
Councillors Miss L Bambridge (sub), F Bone, C Bower, A Bubb,
M de Whalley (sub), C Hudson, C Joyce, J Kirk, B Lawton, C Manning,
J Moriarty (sub), S Patel, C Rose, S Sandell, S Squire and D Tyler

PC45: **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Parish, Ryves and Storey.

PC46: **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 7 October 2019 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

PC47: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest declared.

PC48: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no urgent business under Standing Order 7.

The Assistant Director referred the Committee to the late correspondence where it suggested that item 8/2(g) should be deferred to allow the correct land ownership certificates to be served, which was agreed by the Committee.

PC49: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Members attended and addressed the Committee under Standing Order 34:

Councillor Sampson	8/2(a)	19/01572/F
Councillor Morley	8/2(b)	19/01485/F
Councillor Holmes	8/2(d)	19/01442/F
Councillor G Howman	8/2(e)	19/00904/F
Councillor Mrs M Wilkinson	8/2(e)	19/00904/F

PC50: **CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE**

The Chair, Councillor Crofts reported that any correspondence received had been read and passed to the appropriate officer.

PC51: **RECEIPT OF LATE CORRESPONDENCE ON APPLICATIONS**

A copy of the late correspondence received after the publication of the agenda, which had been previously circulated, was tabled. A copy of the agenda would be held for public inspection with a list of background papers.

PC52: **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) – (ix) below, where appropriate, to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chair.

The Chair, Councillor Crofts expressed his thanks to Councillor Hipperson for his time on the Committee as he had stood down, due to his mayoral duties preventing him from always being available for the Planning Committee. Councillor Howland would be taking his place.

Councillor Moriarty endorsed the comments made about Councillor Hipperson, but explained that he did not think that the Committee was now proportionate and would be challenging the meeting.

The Assistant Director explained that advice had been received from both the Democratic Services Officer and Eastlaw, and he read out the advice received from Eastlaw. The advice was that Councillor Howland could sit on the Planning Committee as a Conservative representative.

Councillor Moriarty added that, in the past, he had been told that he could not appoint someone from another political party to sit in a different group's vacancy on the Planning Committee.

(i) **19/01046/RMM**

Gayton: Land east of Rosemary Lane, west of Hills Crescent and south of Rampant Horse Cottage, Lynn Road:

Proposed residential development: Freebridge Community Housing

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained to the Committee that the application sought reserved matters approval for 24 dwellings following the grant of outline planning permission under application 15/01946/OM.

Access was approved at outline stage, so this reserved matters application sought approval of layout, appearance, scale and landscaping.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor de Whalley and the officer recommendation was contrary to the views of the Parish Council.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration, namely:

- Condition compliance;
- Form and character;
- Residential amenity;
- Highway safety; and
- Landscaping.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Neil Attwell (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) and Chris Parsons (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to comments raised from the public speakers, the Principal Planner advised that density had been dealt with at the outline stage and the indicative layout showed 24 dwellings which had been secured via the Section 106 agreement.

Councillor Sandell welcomed the application for an affordable housing scheme of this nature.

In response to a comment from Councillor Lawton regarding moving the public footpath, the Principal Planner advised that the Public Rights of Way Officer had raised no objection to the location of the footpath nor had County Highways.

The Principal Planner also outlined to the Committee the type and tenure of the units on site.

Councillor Bambridge reiterated the comments made by Councillor Sandell and welcomed the scheme. In relation to the comments on density, she highlighted that whole village was dense and was made up of a lot of small cottages, and considered that this scheme would fit in well.

Councillor de Whalley expressed concern in relation to the parking arrangements and considered that the proposed car park would not be sufficient to mitigate against that. He added that users of the village hall and residents using the local facilities would want to use the car park. The secure fencing would also be oppressive for residents and would not fit in with Gayton as a whole.

In response to a question, the Assistant Director advised that access had already been approved, and County Highways would have, at that stage, considered issues such as visibility splays and parking standards. The scheme did, in fact, provide more parking that it needed to.

The Principal Planner advised that external lighting would be covered by condition 7.

Councillor Moriarty referred to condition 6 and proposed that this should be amended to read: Within 3 months of the occupation of the *first* dwelling hereby permitted the visitor parking area shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter for that specific use. The amendment was seconded by Councillor Rose and agreed by the Committee.

Councillor Manning stated that he had concerns in relation to the layout and could not support the application.

With the required number of supporters, Councillor Moriarty requested that a recorded vote be taken on the proposal to approve the application, as follows:

For the Motion	Against Motion	Abstain
Crofts	De Whalley	
Bower	Manning	
Bubb		
Howland		
Hudson		
Kirk		
Lawton		
Moriarty		
Patel		
Rose		
Sandell		
Squire		
Bambridge		
Tyler		

The proposal was therefore carried.

RESOLVED: That, the application be approved, as recommended, subject to condition 6 being amended to:

Within 3 months of the occupation of the *first* dwelling hereby permitted the visitor parking area shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter for that specific use.

(ii) **19/01572/F**

**Barton Bendish: Land at Hall Farm, Boughton Long Road:
New dwelling for essential rural worker (gamekeeper):
Albanwise Ltd**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located within the countryside to the south-west of the village of Barton Bendish. The site was within an area of hardstanding, with a number of existing barns surrounding it, with a pair of semi-detached dwellings to the west. Access was from Boughton Long Road.

The application sought full planning permission for a four bedroom, two-storey detached cottage style dwelling with associated driveway/parking and rear garden.

The applicant had advised that the dwelling was needed to provide accommodation for a gamekeeper in connection with the Grey Partridge Project.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Need for an additional dwelling;
- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Highways; and
- Other material considerations.

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

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Sampson addressed the Committee in relation to the application, as follows:

'We have read the Officer's Case Summary for this application and I think much of it is very good. My surprise and disappointment is that the interpretation of the evidence leads to the recommendation to refuse the application.'

The Grey Partridge is on the Red List of Endangered Species which means it is in serious danger of dying out as a British Breeding Bird. For many that would be a tragedy. The conservation project by Albanwise Farms is aiming to prove that by sympathetic land use and farming methods across the whole estate the birds can recover their population by natural methods. This is a slow process and requires close supervision to succeed. The progress of the project is closely followed by many of the main Conservation Organisations which emphasises its importance.

The Gamekeepers Operational Base is at Hall Farm and includes workshops, stores, garaging and some seasonal workers accommodation units. The head gamekeeper/wildlife manager currently lives about one and a half miles away, which in commuting terms is not far, but when you are in a 24/7 job and frequently have to respond to situations at very short notice it is a long way and can be a time-consuming journey. Rural crime is a huge problem and ranges from straight theft of expensive equipment to illegal hare coursing. Living "on top of the job" is a significant advantage in trying to combat these threats. This proposed new dwelling allows the main person involved in the Grey Partridge Project to fulfil this supervisory roll much more effectively than he can at present.

The estate does indeed own several other dwellings and had any of them been suitable then of course they would have been considered for the purpose. However, none of them are in acceptable locations. The case notes suggest that Winnold House might be utilised for the purpose, well, all I can suggest is that someone looks at the map and does a recce to see how impractical that idea is.

The proposed new house is to all intents and purposes to be built on a brownfield site as the footprint is on the site of what appears to have been an old barn and associated outbuildings now long redundant and largely demolished. It is shielded from the minor road to the front by the existing farm buildings which form part of this operational farmyard.

The house currently occupied by the gamekeeper will be retained by the estate for future occupation and will not be sold off at great profit.

The need for a rural worker arising from a non-profitable enterprise is queried in the case notes. The project is part of the whole operation of the estate which is accepted as being a viable concern. If a benevolent owner is prepared to subsidise some aspect of a larger, profitable business that cannot be held against him as is the case here.

To sum up, I believe that the application more than satisfies the various requirements of Policy DM6 (Housing Needs of Rural Workers) some of which I have mentioned and all of which are contained in the application. I am convinced that the officer's recommendation to refuse the application is not supported by her own case summary. None of the statutory consultees have raised any objections. Therefore,

members, I urge you to recognise the need for this house which will be of essential value for the Grey Partridge Project and useful for the wider benefit of the Estate's continuing viability and to approve this application.

In response to comments made, the Principal Planner explained that the Wildlife Manager currently lived in an estate house, which was centrally located. The Grey Partridges were wild therefore there was not a need for the dwelling based on the security or welfare of the birds themselves.

Councillor Joyce added that he considered that there was a need for the dwelling in accordance with DM6 but he would only support it if the dwelling was tied to the Wildlife project.

Councillor Mrs Bower pointed out to the Committee that the conservation scheme had already been a success.

Councillor Patel added that he had read the documents and considered that the need for the new dwelling was fully justified and he therefore supported the application.

Councillor Crofts asked whether consideration had been given to converting the barn at the rear of the site.

The Principal Planner advised that discussions had been held with the applicant about the potential to convert one of the existing barns to a dwelling and this had been outlined in the report.

Councillor Sandell added that it was unreasonable to expect the Wildlife Manager to travel 1.5 miles at 4.00 am during the winter months, and it was a valuable role that was being carried out. She also supported the need to tie the dwelling to the wildlife conservation project, if the application were to be approved.

Councillor Patel added that barn conversions could be a costly exercise.

Councillor Hudson stated that the proposed new dwelling was two storey, when the barns were all single storey, she therefore did not consider it to be suitable for the area. She added that there were conversion opportunities available which would be more suitable.

Councillor Joyce then proposed that the application be approved, subject to the new dwelling being tied to the wildlife manager role. He considered that the application was in accordance with Policies DM3 and DM6 and paragraph 77 of the NPPF. This was seconded by Councillor Squire.

The Assistant Director advised that paragraph 79 of the NPPF would be more appropriate.

With the required number of supporters, Councillor Moriarty asked for a recorded vote to be taken on the proposal to approve the application, as follows:

For Motion	Against Motion	Abstain
Bone	Crofts	
Bubb	Bower	
Joyce	Howland	
Kirk	de Whalley	
Patel	Hudson	
Rose	Lawton	
Sandell	Manning	
Squire	Moriarty	
Bambridge		
Tyler		

The proposal to approve the application was carried.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, contrary to recommendation, and subject to appropriate conditions to be agreed following consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair and to ensure that the new dwelling was tied to the wildlife manager role, for the following reasons:

The proposed new dwelling is considered to meet a functional need, and is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy DM06 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD, and paragraph 79 of the NPPF.

(iii) 19/01485/F

**Bircham: Toft Lodge: Stanhoe Road, Bircham Tofts:
Retention of shed on adjacent land: Mr Chestney**

The Principal Planner presented the report and informed the Committee that retrospective permission was sought for the retention of a shed for domestic use on agricultural land designated as countryside.

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

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

- Principle of development; and
- Impact on character of countryside.

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

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Morley addressed the Committee in relation to the application, as follows:

By its very positioning, the land beneath the applicant's shed can no longer be used for horticulture but the building is an essential facility for the ongoing agricultural use of the applicant's field. The shed is to store agricultural equipment which will minimize deterioration of the mechanical aids and therefore service failures, and let's not forget theft.

The applicant has attested that the shed will be used for no other purpose and without this equipment the field would not have been restored from the fly tipped wilderness that it was.

In refusing to endorse this application, the Planning Department has cited paragraph 170 of the National Planning and Policy Framework, as it is considered that this shed is at odds with the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

What shed of typical construction meets this criteria?

However, the phrase, "maintaining intrinsic character" is contained, as an example, in only 1 of 6 sub paragraphs, of paragraph 170, each of which provide planning officers scenarios on which to base their judgements. However, the overarching requirement of paragraph 170 for the Authority to consider is, and I quote, "planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment". I do not believe it is a stretch to say – that is exactly what the applicant is doing; enhancing the environment, now, and for the future. Continuous retention of the shed will only improve the natural environment both now and going forward.

The Planning Department also reference Core Strategy 06 – Rural Areas; which states, inter-alia, that local character and a high quality environment must be maintained. There can be no doubt that the applicant is achieving this for the Parish of Bircham and what you can see of the shed from the road (and which should be fully obscured as the previously poorly maintained boundary hedge fills out) does not, in many eyes and, more importantly, in the eyes of adjacent villagers, mar the environment.

Therefore, I would contend that this application is within the essence of the Core Strategy 06.

The Department also cites Development Management Policy No. 2. Yes; this field is outside of the Development Boundary of Bircham but this application does not entertain further development – merely and more appropriately, farm diversification as permitted within the guidelines of both Core Strategy CS02 and Strategy CS06.

Committee, in summary:

The applicant has removed an eyesore from the village and is replacing it with a cultivated field, including a shed, which is environmentally sound and which, as well as encouraging and supporting wild plants and local wildlife, will be an educational foray for his child and who knows how many of his play mates and school friends. The application has the support of the village and the support of the Parish Council with important caveats to disbar future commercial use. Also, it does maintain the integrity of the village Development Boundary.

For the reasons I have outlined in this statement, I submit that this application be supported but that the future safeguarding conditions, as recommended by the Bircham Parish Council, be included as an integral part of the acceptance.

Councillor Sandell stated that she had driven past the site numerous times, and the shed would not have been noticed. She considered that it did not have a massive impact on the character of the conservation area.

Councillor Bone added that the shed was wooden and therefore a temporary structure and he considered that it enhanced the area. In addition, the wood would weather over time.

Councillor Lawton informed the Committee that the site was not too far from an industrial area. He added that he would like the shed to be used only for the purposes outlined by the applicant and not for commercial gain.

The Principal Planner explained that the applicant had been advised to include land around the shed as well. The status of the land was agricultural and was outside the development boundary and for domestic purposes.

With the required number of supporters, Councillor Moriarty requested that a recorded vote on the recommendation to refuse the application be undertaken, as follows:

For motion	Against motion	Abstain
Crofts	Bower	
Bubb	Bone	
	Howland	
	de Whalley	
	Hudson	
	Joyce	
	Kirk	
	Lawton	
	Manning	
	Moriarty	
	Patel	

Rose
Sandell
Squire
Bambridge
Tyler

The recommendation for refusal was therefore lost.

Councillor Mrs Bower then proposed that the application be approved on the grounds that the shed did not negatively impact on the character of the countryside, and was needed to maintain the adjacent area of the land in the ownership of the applicant. This included a condition to ensure that the shed was for the purposes outlined by the applicant and not for commercial gain. This was seconded by Councillor Squire, and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, contrary to recommendation, and subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, to be agreed following consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair, including a condition to ensure that the shed was for the purposes outlined by the applicant and not for commercial gain, for the following reasons:

The shed did not negatively impact on the character of the countryside, and was needed to maintain the adjacent area of land in the ownership of the applicant.

(iv) 19/01239/F

Burnham Market: Land SE at junction south of Joan Shorts Lane and east of Creake Road: Construction of new GP surgery: Medcentres Plc

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was located on the edge of Burnham Market, adjacent to the Conservation Area and within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Burnham Market was designated a 'Key Rural Service Centre'.

This 0.44 hectare site was a corner part of a larger arable field with road frontages to the west (Creake Road) and to the north (Joan Shorts Lane). A hedge ran along the entire road frontage, apart from a gap at the north-west corner to allow access for farm vehicles.

There was a slight downward slope across the site running towards both Creake Road and Joan Short's Lane. Open agricultural land was to the east, south east and south.

To the north of the site were a series of agricultural brick and flint faced barns with pantile roof. These were sited immediately on the northern side of Joan Shorts Lane. Further south, beyond the open field, was a

pair of cottages on the road and a series of barns set back from Creake Road.

To the west of the site, on the opposite side of Creake Road, were residential properties which were mainly two storeys in height, set hard up to the back of the footpath.

Full planning permission was sought for the construction of a new GP surgery with dementia suite, access road, car parking and area of land to facilitate the clinical needs as set down by the Clinical Commissioning Group.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as it raised issues of wider concern and the recommendation was contrary to Norfolk Coastal Partnership comments.

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

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty;
- Design and landscaping;
- Impact upon heritage assets;
- Impact upon neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety;
- Protected species;
- Flood risk and drainage;
- Other material considerations; and
- Planning balance and conclusion.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Dr D Ince (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Sandell informed the Committee that she was a patient of the surgery and full endorsed the comments made by the public speaker. She added that the current surgery was not fit for purpose. The proposal would be a great asset for the area and stop the need for elderly people having to travel to King's Lynn for appointments.

Councillor Lawton agreed with the comments made by Councillor Sandell but explained that the bus route was quite a walk for elderly patients, an asked whether it could be rerouted.

Councillor Moriarty referred to the pictures of what the surgery would look like. He expressed concern that the proposed surgery would not fit in with the surrounding flint barns. He was disappointed that the proposal failed to include any materials of local character which would help to soften the elevation.

The Chair, Councillor Crofts agreed with the comments made by Councillor Moriarty. He added that he was not against a new facility

but considered that an element of flint would be in-keeping with the barns next to it.

Councillor Squire explained that flint was very expensive and agreed with the comments that the need for a new surgery outweighed the need for flint.

The Chair, Councillor Crofts advised that the application could be deferred to see if a better design could be achieved.

The Assistant Director advised that officers had tried to get the applicant to incorporate some flint into the design. They were agreeable to use clay pantiles but not to incorporating flint. The Committee needed to consider whether the provision of a community asset outweighed the concerns about design.

Councillor Lawton pointed out that flint was very expensive now and that there were many brick buildings in Burnham Market.

Councillor Joyce asked how long the application would be deferred for as the NHS was unlikely to offer the funding for a long period of time.

Councillor de Whalley expressed some concern that in terms of bus routes, this would be determined by the local bus operators. He considered that the benefit of the application would outweigh the concerns raised about materials.

With the required number of supporters, Councillor Moriarty asked for a recorded vote to be carried out:

For motion	Against motion	Abstain
Crofts		
Bower		
Bone		
Bubb		
Howland		
De Whalley		
Hudson		
Joyce		
Kirk		
Lawton		
Manning		
Moriarty		
Patel		
Rose		
Sandell		
Squire		
Bambridge		
Tyler		

The recommendation to approve the application was carried.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

(v) **19/01442/F**

Hilgay: 1B New Road: Construction of two storey extension: Mr & Mrs Danny Bennett

The Principal Planner presented the report and explained that the proposal was for the construction of a two store side extension at a semi-detached property known as 1B New Row, Hilgay. The site was located approximately 55 metres from the junction with High Street. The site was bounded on all sides by residential properties and their curtilage.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Parking and access;
- Form and character;
- Impact on neighbours; and
- Other material considerations.

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

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Holmes addressed the Committee in relation to the application. Councillor Holmes explained that an objection had been received from the neighbour to the north. He explained that the access was quite limited. He advised that the objector's fence had been damaged during construction of the new dwellings and she had to pay for the damage herself.

The track serving the properties was unmade and served other properties, some had vehicular access and others only had pedestrian access and this was noted by the Planning Inspector at the appeal. He referred to the appeal decision, paragraph 5 where the Inspector had stated that development would be acceptable provided it was a modest size. The proposal built up to the boundary and queried whether access should be left for repair work, etc.

The Principal Planner explained that the Inspector had considered that the property could be extended. There was a parking condition on the original planning permission and this would have to be varied if required. She also considered that a 3 bedroom property was a modest size. The proposal allowed for 2 car parking spaces and to be able to turn around and travel back. The property could be extended

up to the boundary and any party wall issues would be covered under separate legislation.

With the required number of supporters, Councillor Moriarty asked for a recorded vote to be carried out.

For Motion	Against Motion	Abstain
Crofts	de Whalley	Moriarty
Bower		
Bone		
Bubb		
Howland		
Hudson		
Joyce		
Kirk		
Lawton		
Manning		
Patel		
Rose		
Sandell		
Squire		
Bambridge		
Tyler		

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

The Committee then adjourned at 12.30 pm and reconvened at 1.05 pm.

- (vi) **19/00904/F**
King's Lynn: Car park, Centre Point: Erection of 7 no. dwellings and associated car parking plus provision of 9 car parking spaces to the existing public car parking: Blend Properties LLP

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that full planning permission was sought for the erection of 7 dwellings with associated parking plus an additional 10 car parking spaces to the south of the existing BCKLWN car park.

The site was located within the development boundary of King's Lynn and currently accommodated c.24 car parking spaces that previously formed part of the aforementioned BCKLWN car park.

The site was within Flood Zone 1 as depicted on the Local Authority's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

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

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

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

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Howman addressed the Committee in relation to the application, as follows:

Thank you Chair, and good morning Councillors. I am Gary Howman, ward Councillor who asked that this application be called in for your consideration.

As my photos show, the site is currently part of a good size car park which serves the busy neighbourhood centre of Fairstead in Kings Lynn. It provides access to the Fairstead Doctors Surgery, the Borough Councils own Community Centre, Fairstead primary and nursery school and the local shops. Some people also use it as overflow parking for the QE hospital, which is a five minute walk away.

This plan to cram in seven houses - with 2 parking spaces each - will result in the loss of about half the public car park, at least 30 spaces. That means a busy car park will become overloaded and at times inaccessible causing disruption and road safety concerns. The school run in particular will be dangerous with cars having to park all along the adjacent William Booth Road, which is a through road and main bus route.

In the background papers, there is a transport survey which suggests that there will be minimum impact if parking spaces are lost. This survey was not conducted by County Highways, but was paid for by the applicant and only lasted 3 days. It has not been independently verified.

Their idea for access to new houses through what remains of the car park is a poor one. This will surely lead to anti-social parking and tension amongst residents and car park users. Nobody will be managing this site to ensure safe or peaceful parking.

I agree there is a need for more housing, especially social housing and the Government have set targets. However I believe houses should be built in suitable locations. There are plenty of other sites far more suitable for development, very close to this area. Look at all the space around the recent development at Kings Reach, less than a mile away. You could build 50 more houses there and nobody would object. All the infrastructure is in place.

The Council sold this land to the NHS over 10 years ago in good faith for the building of a new Doctors Surgery. The report says it was surplus land but that is the applicants view and not a statement of fact. Planning permission was granted in June 2010 for the new surgery but it didn't proceed. Last year the NHS sold the land at auction and we now know who to. I believe the NHS had a moral obligation to offer this back to the Council for public use if they weren't going ahead with the new surgery. You may be aware that the future of the existing Fairstead doctor's surgery is under review. The wider

community hope the surgery will be modernised and enlarged. If that happens, it would probably need more parking spaces and not less.

Now I will turn to the consultation. I note the original objection by County Highways and the reservations expressed by the Internal Drainage Board. It seems the Kings Lynn Area Committee were not consulted and as they are the only version of a local council, that is a serious omission. The public reaction is clear from the report but there is far more on the Planning website. That shows unanimous and credible opposition to the plans, much along the lines of what I have said today. Over 70 public comments are recorded, none are in favour. I have spoken to dozens of people over the last few months and nobody has shown any support for this plan.

If this application is approved, think of the disruption during construction. This is part of a well-used car park surrounded by houses and roads in a busy estate. Where is the building compound going to go, the builders vehicles and delivery lorries? All this whilst the car park is in use by children going to the schools, patients visiting the surgery, shoppers and users of the community centre. Is the building of 7 private houses really worth the ongoing inconvenience and irritation this will cause to hundreds of local residents?

As elected members we are supposed to listen to the public. I have listened to residents and hopefully represented their views today. I believe this land should be returned to Council ownership for the benefit of the community and not be used to profit a housing developer. Therefore I urge the Committee to reject this ill-conceived application.

Councillor Mrs Wilkinson addressed the Committee in relation to the application, as follows:

Thank you Mr Chairman for allowing me to address your Committee. When I first arrived in the Fairstead Estate in 1967, the land before you today was being grazed by Mr Seaman's dairy herd. There were no facilities and my daughter had to attend Howard's School in Gaywood Park. As time went on the estate expanded, the 2011 census shows almost 6,500 people living on the estate. That is 50% more than Hunstanton. The population of Fairstead has increased further since 2011 as the King's Reach development has progressed. The estate is now serviced by shops including a chemist, schools, community centre and doctor's surgery. The doorstep green is an amenity much appreciated. They are all in close proximity to the car park which services these vital facilities. I refer you to Norfolk Parking standards which states that for 2 or 3 bedroom properties there should be 2 car parking spaces. When much of the Fairstead Estate was built, car ownership was much less that it is now. Many properties on Fairstead have only one parking space with others having none. The car park at Centrepoint caters for those properties with parking below the standard in close proximity, in addition to servicing the community facilities. In brief the car park itself is a vital amenity to local residents living on the estate. The loss of these car parking spaces would have a very adverse impact on residents living on the estate.

I refer you to NPPF 92 which states I quote “to provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should: guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community’s ability to meet its day-to-day needs”.

Google earth is as independent a study as it is possible to get. A look at the most recent taken in September 2018 showed a well-used car park, contradicting the applicant’s own survey. I do hope that the Committee will accept that I am not as nimble on my feet as I was in 1967, and I do acknowledge that it is anecdotal when I say that, often when Cllr Howman gives me a lift to a meeting at the community centre that the car park is full with no spaces.

I refer you to DM9 which states “the Council will encourage the retention of existing community facilities and the provision of new facilities particularly in areas with poor levels of provision and in areas of major growth.” Rather than loose the car parking spaces the policy says there should be new car parking. DM9 goes on to say I again quote: “development leading to the loss of an existing community facility will not be permitted unless it is demonstrated that either: the area currently served by it would remain suitably provided following the loss, or if not it is no longer viable or feasible to retain the premises in a community facility use.”

On the subject of Norfolk Parking Standards I refer also to the Government’s Manual for Streets reference 8531. They agree that a private car parking space should be 2.4 m by 4.8 m. This is smaller than for public car parking spaces which should be 2.5 m by 5 m. Both are too small for vehicles often used by modern day families with some people carriers, or to be precise MPVs, measuring well over 5 m. Manual for Streets says there should be 6 m when a vehicle is making a right angle turn in to its parking space. At first sight this suggests there should be a minimum of 10.8 m being made up of 4.8 m for the parking space itself and an additional 6 m to make the right angle turn into the parking space. This 10.8 m would be between the property fence and the red line. However, with the refuse collection point away from several properties, and no access other than via the parking spaces, an additional path would need to be present between the car parking spaces and the property fences. As by definition this will involve a person with a wheelie bin, the path should at least meet the minimum of 2 m for footpaths to allow for the wheelie bin pusher and someone on a mobility scooter or perhaps someone pushing a buggy to pass without causing damage to a parked vehicle.

In response to comments raised, the Principal Planner advised that no affordable housing would be provided as part of the scheme as the size of the site was under the threshold for the need to provide affordable housing. With regards to the car park itself, she explained that the applicant could erect barriers to prevent people parking there at any time.

Councillor Joyce referred to the turning head and stated that the tail of the 'T' was outside the red line.

The Principal Planner advised that Norfolk County Highways had not raised any objection to the application and it fell on the blue land.

However on reviewing the plan, the Assistant Director advised that it was important to establish who owned the blue land.

Councillor Bambridge commented that the car park had always been full when she had tried to use it. It was also used for parking by workers and visitors to the hospital.

Councillor Joyce referred to distances within the manual for streets and stated that this proposal did not comply with that. In addition, the extra 10 parking spaces would be provided on amenity land. He also queried the space for cycles and contamination.

The Assistant Director advised that there were conditions attached which dealt with the issues of contamination.

The Assistant Director suggested that as there were several questions raised, which required further clarification, the application should be deferred. This was agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: That, the application be deferred.

(vii) 19/01231/F

Outwell: Land east of Church Field, south west of 54 Well Creek Road and east of Baldwins Drove: Construction of general purpose agricultural barn (partially retrospective): Mr James Vickers

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was located to the south of Cemetery Road, and accessed by a track that formed part of Baldwins Drove. It was located outside the development boundary for Outwell and was therefore classified as countryside.

The development was for the erection of an agricultural storage building and with a workshop and rest room. It was a revised design of a previously approved development of the same description under reference number 17/01048/F approved at Planning Committee on 14 August 2017.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Character and appearance; and
- Other material impacts.

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

In response to comments raised the Principal Planner advised that the proposal was not in accordance with the original consent in terms of its current built appearance. Given that the time elapsed between the original consent and the current application for retrospective consent (in-part), combined with the fact that the building itself was watertight, it was reasonable to impose a condition to remove the mobile unit within 2 months of the date of the decision.

The Chair made reference to the fact that the Enforcement team had advised that the 2 touring caravans on the site had been sold and were to be removed. The Enforcement team were monitoring the site.

With the required number of supporters, Councillor Moriarty asked for a recorded vote to be carried out, on the proposal to approve the application:

For motion	Against motion	Abstain
Bubb	Bower	Crofts
Hudson	Howland	Bone
	De Whalley	Lawton
	Joyce	Manning
	Kirk	Rose
	Moriarty	Squire
	Patel	
	Sandell	
	Bambridge	
	Tyler	

The recommendation to approve the application was therefore lost.

It was then proposed by Councillor Mrs Bower and seconded by Councillor Patel that the application be refused on the grounds that the proposed changes to the design gave an unduly domestic appearance which was not suitable for an agricultural building such as this, which was carried.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused for the following reasons:

That the proposed changes to the design gave an unduly domestic appearance, which was not suitable for an agricultural building, such as

this, contrary to DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD.

Councillor de Whalley left the meeting at 1.44 pm.

(viii) 19/00223/F

Terrington St Clement: Green Bank Farm, Green Marsh Road: Retrospective application for retention of extension to existing garage and material change of use of extension for use as upholstery business: Mr L Kiley

RESOLVED: That, the application be deferred.

(ix) 19/00765/F

West Winch: Land north of 34, east of 32 and south of 28 Hall Lane: Outline application with some matters reserved for proposed residential development of five properties: Mr P Burt

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that Ivy Farm was located between The Common and Hall Lane, West Winch with vehicular access onto Hall Lane approximately 70 m south of its junction with Long Lane.

Residential development was located to the immediate south with dwellings on Laurel Grove and Walnut Avenue. There was a further farm to the north (Myrtle Farm) with two houses fronting Hall Lane.

Outline permission was sought on approximately two thirds (0.33 ha) of the overall farm site to demolish the existing agricultural buildings and create five building plots. Access was to be considered at this stage and showed access to serve two dwellings off Hall Lane, and three further plots, plus the remainder of the farm, via Walnut Avenue (off Laurel Grove). All other matters were reserved for future consideration.

The site was located within the village development boundary for West Winch contained in Inset E2 of the Site Allocations & Development Management Policies Plan and also in the North Runcton & West Winch Neighbourhood Plan area.

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 form and character of locality;
- Highway issues;

- Amenity issues; and
- Other material considerations

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mrs Garrod (objecting), Terry Gibson (supporting on behalf of the Parish Council) and Ian Bix (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to queries raised, Councillor Joyce proposed that the application be deferred to enable further discussions to be held with the applicant regarding amending the application site, which was seconded by the Chair, Councillor Crofts and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: That, the application be deferred.

PC53: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

RESOLVED: That, the report be noted.

PC54: **PLANNING & ENFORCEMENT - QUARTERLY REPORT**

The Committee was provided with the quarterly report covering performance for the second and third quarters of 2019.

It was noted that the total number of live cases was 331 with 291 cases having been closed. In addition, 22 formal notices had been served/

RESOLVED: That, the report be noted.

PC55: **PLANNING & ENFORCEMENT APPEALS - QUARTERLY REPORT**

The Committee was provided with the quarterly report update covering performance for the period 1 July 2019 – 30 September 2019.

It was noted for the third quarter of 2019, 6% of all appeals were allowed. For the 12 month period to 30 September 2019 an average of 12% of all appeals were allowed. This was below the national average figure of around 32% of all appeals allowed.

RESOLVED: That, the report be noted.

The meeting closed at 2.10 pm