

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

Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 2nd December, 2019 at 11.30 am in the Assembly Room - Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ

PRESENT: Councillor C J Crofts (Chair)

Councillors F Bone, C Bower, A Bubb, M Howland, C Hudson, C Joyce, B Lawton, C Manning, J Moriarty (sub), T Parish, S Patel, C Rose, S Sandell, S Squire, D Tyler and D Whitby (sub)

PC56: APOLOGIES

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

PC57: MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 November 2019 were agreed as a correct record.

PC58: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

PC59: URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7

There was no urgent business under Standing Order 7.

PC60: MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34

The following Members attended under Standing Order 34:

G Howman	8/1(a)	19/00904/F
Mrs M Wilkinson	8/1(a)	19/00904/F
A Holmes	8/3(d)	19/01339/F
P Kunes	8/3(f)	19/01498/F

PC61: CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE

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

PC62: 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.

PC63: 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) – (xi) below, where appropriate, to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chair.

(i) 19/00904/F

King's Lynn: Car Park, Centre Point: Erection of 7 no. dwellings and associated car parking plus provision of 10 car parking spaces to the existing car park: Blend Properties LLP

The Principal Planner introduced the report and reminded the Committee that the application had been deferred from the last meeting, to address issues relating to land ownership; access to bins and bikes, the need for a turning head, compliance with Manual for Streets and concerns relating to the public parking in the private residential bays. The report went on to address those issues raised. An amended plan had been received from the applicant, which sought to address the concerns raised at the previous meeting.

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 called-in by Councillor Howman.

The Principal Planner then outlined 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 as follows:

'As the first photo shows, the site is part of a car park which serves the busy neighbourhood centre of Fairstead in Kings Lynn. It provides access to a primary and nursery school, the Doctors Surgery, the Council's own Community Centre and the local shops.

The Fairstead estate was built in the 1960s to provide council housing for those in need. It remains a less than affluent area and we do need more housing but it should be social or at least affordable housing. Not one of these units will be for affordable housing which to me is shameful.

This plan to squeeze in seven houses will result in the loss of about half the car park. That means it will become overloaded and inaccessible at times causing disruption and road safety concerns. The school run in particular will be dangerous with cars having to park on the adjacent William Booth Road, which is a through road and busy bus route.

All of this car park used to be owned by the Borough Council, but some years ago the Council sold part of it to the NHS to build a new Doctors Surgery. Planning permission was granted in 2010 but it didn't go ahead. Last year the NHS sold the land at auction to a private developer. I don't think the Council would ever have sold off this community car park for private housing but that is the situation we are facing.

Access to and from these houses will apparently be a narrow route through what is left of the public car park. This will surely lead to indiscriminate and anti-social parking causing tension amongst residents and car park users. Nobody will be managing this site to ensure safe or peaceful parking. The access route is planned to go between the disabled bays you can see in the second photo - a poor idea in my view.

The public reaction to this application is very clear - nobody wants it. Some opposition is mentioned in your report but there is far more on the Planning website. Over 60 comments are recorded, none of which are in favour. I have spoken to dozens of people over the last few

months and nobody has shown any support for this plan. Kings Lynn doesn't have a Parish Council as such but the Kings Lynn Area Consultative Committee have opposed the development because they share the concerns of residents. To use their own words "the proposal would be of no benefit to the community".

If this application is approved, think of the disruption during construction. This is 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 the delivery lorries? All this whilst the car park is in use by children going to the schools, patients visiting the surgery, shoppers and users trying to get to our community centre.

Is the building of 7 private houses really worth the ongoing inconvenience and irritation this will cause to hundreds of local residents? There are other local sites where you could build 50 houses and nobody would object. The damage to the local economy is also worth mentioning. A reduced car park with poor access will put people off visiting the shops and discourage users of our own community centre.

This land was never earmarked for housing - only for community use and more recently a doctors' surgery. Unfortunate circumstances means a private developer is now hoping to make a profit out of it. I still hope the land can be returned to Council ownership for the benefit of the community.

As elected members we are supposed to listen to the public. I have listened to residents and hopefully represented their views today. I am asking you to listen as well and urge you to reject this ill-conceived application.'

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Mrs Wilkinson addressed the Committee in relation to the application. She stated that she was still of the same view that the Borough Council still owned part of the car park. She asked what the logic was for condition 10. She had concerns about the use of the amenity land for car parking. She added that conditions 10 and 11 did not comply with the Manual for Streets or Norfolk Parking Standards. She added that the area had been used for public car parking for nearer 50 years and not 12 years as acknowledged by the applicant. She asked the Committee to refuse the application on the loss of amenity land.

In response to a question from Councillor Joyce, the Senior Planner confirmed that the appropriate notices had been served on the landowner (Borough Council).

Councillor Joyce raised issues in relation to:

- How would conditions 10 and 11 be enforced which, if they could not be enforced, were ultra vires according to the Diplock Ruling in the Civil Service Union V Civil Service Minister
- The waste collection point.
- Inadequate space to bring the bin out.
- The lack of natural surveillance by the introduction of 6ft fences.
- There needed to be a 6m turning area.
- Had a percolation test been carried out for the soakaways.
- The car park at the south was amenity land.
- The gardens for the proposed dwellings were small.
- Where was the safe and secure cycle storage.

The Senior Planner explained that there was scope for the 10 car parking spaces to be moved further onto the grassed area to provide more space. With regards to the amenity land, it would normally be considered amenity land if it offered some visual enhancement or was a play area but in this instance it was considered that the value of this land would not outweigh the provision of car parking.

With regards to the footpath, it was explained that the Borough Council did own it and the applicants were providing this through the site. Drainage was covered by condition.

Councillor Parish expressed concern that the proposal would worsen the conditions for the community.

The Chairman, Councillor Crofts explained that the owners of the site could fence it off. He added that when the site was sold to the Health Authority there should have been a clawback provision included.

Councillor Bone stated that the car park was heavily used and to take it away would be to the detriment of the community.

Councillor Squire expressed concern in relation to the design of the proposed dwellings, which she felt were very bland and uninspiring.

Councillor Joyce then proposed that the application should be refused, as the proposal was contrary to: DM9, DM15, DM16, DM17, DM22, and the National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 7, 20, 91, 92, 93, 97, 98, 102, 105, 110, 122, 124, 127, 130 and 182.

Councillor Joyce also asked for clarification as to who would maintain the car park and route, whether it would be the Borough Council or the applicant. The Senior Planner advised that this would primarily be the Borough Council.

With regards to the proposed reasons for refusal, the Assistant Director advised that realistically weight could be put on two of the reasons for refusal that were put forward, namely the loss of a community facility, and poor layout and design.

Councillor Joyce confirmed that he was satisfied with the two reasons for refusal outlined by the Assistant Director and, if the application went to appeal, third parties could add additional reasons.

The proposal to refuse the application was seconded by Councillor Hudson.

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:

(1) The proposed development would result in the loss of a community facility (car park) that would be of detriment to the users of the facilities, and would lead to additional on-street parking. This was contrary to the relevant policies in the Development Plan and in the NPPF.

(2) The proposed development is considered to be of poor design and layout particularly through its bland appearance and poor amenity for future occupiers of the dwellings, by virtue of overly small gardens and limited manoeuvring areas, and is considered to be contrary to the relevant Development Plan policies and the NPPF.

(ii) 19/00405/F

West Acre: Abbey Farm, River Road: Retrospective application for the siting of containers: West Acre Estate

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application had been referred to the Planning Committee on 7 October with a recommendation to approve. The application was deferred without discussion due to the submission of late representations from the agent, offering a supporting statement which presented additional information on the nature of the use of the containers. Clarification was therefore required as to the status of each of the containers for further consideration of the issues.

In light of the new information, which indicated that only 2 out of the 15 containers were being used by the business owners of Abbey Yard and the remainder were rented out to the general public or other estate businesses, this changed the emphasis on the need for the containers in this location.

The previous report to Committee was a balanced recommendation based on the fact that the containers were enabling development which supported the newly approved small businesses at Abbey Yard. Now it had been clarified that this was not the case and it was apparent that the storage containers formed a business use in their own right for self-storage, together with the fact that they were located within a highly sensitive location (within the setting of Listed Buildings and Scheduled

Ancient Monuments) the recommendation had been changed to one of refusal.

The application site was situated within the Abbey Farm Barns complex on the eastern side of River Road, West Acre. The containers were located within the courtyard of the converted barns behind Abbey Barn (Grade II* Listed) and within the setting of two Scheduled Ancient Monuments.

The application sought retrospective consent for the siting of 15 storage containers; 6 containers were sited behind the northern section of Abbey Barn, 6 were sited behind the main Abbey Barn building and 3 were currently sited to the front of Abbey Barn which would be moved to the rear.

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

- Principle of development;
- Visual amenities;
- Heritage issues;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material considerations.

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

Councillor Moriarty explained that the application was within his ward. He had sympathy with the applicant and was conscious of rural crime and the work which had been carried out at the farmyard. If the application was to be refused, he hoped that the applicant could relocate the containers, taking on board the comments from the Conservation Officer and Parish Council. He explained that there was a local demand for the storage containers.

The Assistant Director confirmed that officers would be willing to talk to the applicant to find a more suitable location for the containers, if the application were to be refused.

In response to a query, the Senior Planner confirmed that if permission were to be granted, then the 3 containers at the front would be moved into the courtyard area. There were some views of the containers from Narborough Road. It was considered that the containers affected the setting of the Grade II* Listed Building.

Councillor Hudson acknowledged the proximity of the containers to the Listed Building but added that there was a need to increase the number of people living in the countryside. She added that the containers were metal and would need to be kept in good condition.

The Chairman, Councillor Crofts added that he had concerns that the containers were not being used for what they were intended for.

Councillor Lawton asked whether any of the other barns could be used for storage purposes.

Councillor Bubb suggested that it could be conditioned that they were painted green or grey in colour.

Councillor Joyce asked whether they could be approved on a temporary basis to encourage the businesses to find a more permanent solution. He acknowledged the need to enhance rural businesses but also the impact on the Listed Building and its setting.

The Assistant Director advised that the Committee needed to consider whether this was the right location for a general storage business, and if the application were to be refused, officers would enter discussions with the estate to find a more suitable location.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as recommended.

The Committee adjourned at 12.50 pm and reconvened at 1.25 pm

(iii) **19/00765/O**

West Winch: Land N 34 E or 32 and S of 28 Hall Lane: Outline application with some matters reserved for proposed residential development of five properties: Mr P Burt

The Principal Planner reminded the Committee that the application had been referred to the previous meeting of the Planning Committee on 4 November 2019. In response to queries raised, it was resolved that the application be deferred to enable further discussions to be held with the applicant regarding amending the application site.

Amended plans had been submitted increasing the site area to incorporate the yard and agricultural buildings.

Ivy Farm was located between The Common and Hall Lane, West Winch with vehicular access onto Hall Lane approximately 70m south of its junction with Long Lane.

Residential development was located immediately 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 initially sought on approximately two thirds of the overall farm site to demolish the existing agricultural buildings and create five building plots. The site area had now been increased to 0.36 ha to include the agriculture yard, office and buildings adjoining the farmhouse / No.32. 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 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, Mr Ian Bix (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Chairman, Councillor Crofts welcomed Suzi Pimlott from the Council's CSNN department to the meeting, to answer questions from the Committee.

Councillor Joyce pointed out that the only objection had been received from CSNN but he could not see how the CSNN objection could be sustained. He added that there had not been any recorded complaints in 10 years. He asked how far from the cattle shed a house could be sited. He added that there was other legislation to deal with the concerns raised by CSNN.

The CSNN representative explained the role of CSNN and that so far no recorded complaints had been received. However, the proposal would bring new people into the area. Although it had been said that the cows would only be housed during the winter months, the site had an all-year round use and the farmer could change his working practices.

With regards to how far away a dwelling should be from the cattle shed, she explained that there was a recommended separation distance of 30 m.

Councillor Joyce proposed that the application be approved. He also asked how many houses had been built in West Winch since the adoption of the Local Plan. The Principal Planner explained that the West Winch development would consist of 4,000 houses eventually. In addition, the site was classed as greenfield rather than brownfield.

Councillor Parish stated that he supported the comments made by CSNN and had concerns that new occupiers of the dwellings could complain about the noise and smell.

The CSNN Officer explained that she had attended a site meeting with the agent and Planning Officer and advised that they would be too close where they were situated. She added that some other form of development might be more appropriate.

The Principal Planner referred to the layout and explained that although this was an outline application, permission was sought for five dwellings, and to achieve this, Plot 5 would be in close proximity to the cattle shed. She added that development might be acceptable for a lesser number of units and a different layout.

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

Councillor Joyce left the meeting at 1.45 pm

(iv) 19/01287/RMM

Clenchwarton: The Grange, 262 Main Road: Reserved matters: Construction of 16 dwellings: Buildwise Ltd

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application sought reserved matters approval for the construction of 16 dwellings following outline permission granted under application ref: 16/00305/OM (all matters were reserved for future consideration).

The site comprised a strip of field frontage approximately 0.9ha in size on the southern side of Main Road (to the west of No.262 and opposite the Victory Public House). Clenchwarton was defined as a Key Rural Service Centre in the settlement hierarchy contained in the Core Strategy of the Local Development Framework. The site was part of one of three allocated sites identified for housing development within the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan for Clenchwarton, and Policy G25.3 related specifically to development of this allocation together with a strip of land to the east of No.262 – an application for that parcel of land had been reported elsewhere in the agenda.

The principle of development had already been established; this application addressed the matters of scale, appearance, layout and landscaping.

The application had been referred to the Committee at the discretion of the Executive Director of Environment & Planning, as similar issues had been raised with application 19/01288/RM, and the application had been called in by Councillor Whitby.

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

- Impact upon character and appearance of the locality;
- Access and highway implications;
- Impact upon neighbouring properties; and
- Any other material considerations.

In response to a comment from Councillor Bubb, the Principal Planner advised that DDA was something that needed to be considered but the scheme was for private dwellings.

Councillor Moriarty referred to pepper-potting of the affordable housing. The Principal Planner highlighted this on the plan and explained that the split and mix was acceptable to the Council's Housing Development Officer.

The Principal Planner also advised that charging points for electric cars was not policy at the moment.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

(v) **19/00859/FM**

Feltwell: Land at or south of 6-10 Lodge Road: Erection of 18 dwellings with associated garages and highway works: Feltwell Developments

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application sought full permission for the construction of 18 dwellings (including 4 affordable units) with associated garages/parking and access road off Lodge Road, Feltwell, which was classified as a Key Rural Service Centre in the settlement hierarchy. The application covered approximately 0.77ha of the overall allocated site of 1.78ha under Policy G35.1 of the adopted Site Allocations & Development Management Policies Plan (SADMPP).

The site was located on the southern side of Lodge Road to the east of the village, and was within the built extent of the village. It was surrounded by residential development to the east, south and west.

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;
- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Highway issues;
- Affordable housing provision;
- Flood risk and drainage;

- Impact upon ecology; and
- Other material planning considerations.

RESOLVED: (A) That, the application be approved subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement covering affordable housing provision and Habitat Mitigation Fees.

(B) That in the absence of a completed Section 106 Agreement within 4 months of the date of this resolution, the application shall be refused on the grounds of a lack of a mechanism to secure the provisions of affordable housing, SUDs management and road maintenance, plus Habitat Mitigation Fees.

(vi) 19/01288/RM

Clenchwarton: Land east of The Grange, Main Road: Reserved matters application for four detached houses: Buildwise Ltd

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application sought reserved matters approval for the construction of 4 dwellings following outline permission granted under application ref: 15/02008/O (all matters were reserved for future consideration).

The site comprised a strip of field frontage approximately 0.3ha in size on the southern side of Main Road (to the east of No.262 and west of Wildfields Close estate which constituted the edge of the village development area). Clenchwarton was defined as a Key Rural Service Centre in the settlement hierarchy contained in the Core Strategy of the Local Development Framework. The site was part of one of three allocated sites identified for housing development within the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan for Clenchwarton, and Policy G25.3 related specifically to development of this allocation together with a strip of land to the east of No.262 – an application for that parcel of land had been reported elsewhere in the agenda.

The principle of development had already been established; this application addressed the matters of scale, appearance, layout and landscaping.

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

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

- Impact upon character and appearance of the locality;
- Access and highway implications;
- Impact upon neighbouring properties; and
- Any other material considerations.

Councillor Whitby (Ward Member) explained that the neighbours were concerned that proposal would be overbearing and there was no plan showing the relationship of Plot 4 to their property. He considered that the design, form, character and materials were not in-keeping with the village. He added that no consent had been sought for drainage ad referred to the IDB's easement strip. He also queried when the Section 106 money would be available.

In response to the comments made the Principal Planner explained that the trigger point for release of contribution was contained within the Section 106 agreement. She also explained the distances between Plot 5 and the neighbour's property. She acknowledged that the proposed units were modern but added that Clenchwarton was made up of a mixture of styles.

Councillor Whitby added that The Grange was white render. He considered that that was too much boarding included in the scheme.

Councillor Parish agreed with the comments raised by Councillor Whitby and referred to the large windows included and explained that internal light would come out into the neighbouring property. He queried whether an ecology survey had been prepared and he considered that the design was not very good.

The Principal Planner advised that the Committee had approved a similar style of units in the other scheme in Clenchwarton.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

(vii) 19/01657/O

Docking: St Vincent, Station Road: Outline application: Demolition of existing bungalow and replacement with a row of 3 dwellings: Mr Mark Hansell

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that outline permission with all matters except access and layout reserved for future consideration was sought for the erection of a terrace of 3 dwellings following the demolition of an existing bungalow.

The site was located within the development boundary for Docking (a Key Rural Service Centre) and within Docking Conservation Area. The site was location within Flood Zone 1.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as it had been referred by the Sifting Panel and 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;

- Form and character / impact on Conservation Area;
- Residential amenity;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material considerations.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

(viii) 19/00774/F

Feltwell: Edmund De Moundeford School, The Beck: Construction of meeting hall: Sir Edmund Moundeford Charity

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site (0.29ha of playing field land) was located within the built extent of the village of Feltwell. It was situated to the south of Munsons Lane and bounded by the school playing to the south and east of the site, and residential development to the north and west.

The application sought full permission for the construction of a meeting hall with associated access, parking area and hardstanding play-space for use by Feltwell Playgroup, Feltwell Women's Institute and Sir Edmund de Moundeford Charity Trust. The scheme shows a singular vehicular access point off Munsons Lane.

The site was located within the development boundary for Feltwell, which was categorised as a Key Rural Service Centre in the adopted Local Plan.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as an objection had been received from Sport England.

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

- Principle of development;
- Loss of open space;
- Community facilities;
- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenity; and
- Highways / access;
- Archaeology; and
- Other material considerations.

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

RESOLVED: That, the application be approved subject to the necessary consultation with the Secretary of State.

(ix) 19/01339/F

Hilgay: Cronins Cottage, Steels Drove: Use of property for part residential and part dog day care and home boarding business: Miss Hanna Cronin

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the proposal was for the retrospective change of use of a residential property and outbuilding to form a dog day care and home boarding business. The site was located outside the development boundary for Hilgay on land which was therefore considered as countryside.

The application sought consent for up to 10 day care dogs on site at any one time, with 5 dogs boarding in the adjacent dwelling overnight.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Noise and disturbance of neighbours;
- Highway safety and access; and
- Form and character

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

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Holmes addressed the Committee in support of the application. Councillor Holmes stated that it was a small-scale business, which would be of use to the local community. The location of the site was within a very peaceful part of the village and he considered that the concerns of County Highways had been exaggerated. In relation to noise, he explained that he had visited the site and was impressed with the applicant how they went about their business. He explained that Fen View was sandwiched between the site and the A10, which was noisy. He added that he lived the other end of the village and most days he could hear dogs barking and no traffic. He further explained that very few people walked past the site. He added that the exercise area could be moved and conditions could be imposed to alleviate noise.

The CSNN Officer explained that their comments had been outlined on pages 88 and 89 of the agenda. She added that there had been no historic complaints and there was a new owner of Fen View.

Councillor Hudson stated that the applicant must be able to make the business pay and stated that the applicants should be allowed to operate 7 days a week, from 9.00 am to 6.00 pm.

Councillor Crofts suggested that temporary consent might be acceptable in this instance, and a good way of assessing the actual impact of the development.

The CSNN Officer explained that the timings had been based on what the applicant had provided.

The Assistant Director advised that temporary consent for 12 months could be granted to assess a full year's operation. If there were serious noise issues then any complaints could still be made to CSNN, who would investigate under the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

The Chair, Councillor Crofts then proposed that the application should be approved on a temporary basis for 12 months, subject to the inclusion of conditions relating to a noise management plan, the timings as indicated by the applicant and no more than 10 dogs on site at any time. This was seconded by the Vice-Chair, Councillor Bower and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: That permission be granted on a temporary basis for 12 months subject to the inclusion of conditions relating to a noise management plan, the timings as indicated by the applicant and no more than 10 dogs on site at any time.

(x) **19/01060/F**

Nordelph: White Barn Farm, Silt Road: Change of use of existing agricultural building to a workshop and store (B2 General Industrial) use, and an extension to the building to provide additional storage: Anglia Growers

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located on the south side of Silt Road to the west of Nordelph, which was designated as a smaller village or hamlet under Policy CS02 of the Core Strategy 2011. Nordelph did not have a development boundary, but in any case the site did not strictly lie within Nordelph and it was therefore classed as countryside, where the development was more limited to that as identified as suitable by other policies in the plan. There were two residential dwellings that adjoined the site to the west, which were not related to the site.

Part of the application involved the erection of an extension to the commercial unit in the form of a new building for B8 Storage and Distribution and B2 General Industrial purposes. The new building would be constructed to match the existing units, with metal sheeting in grey on the elevations and roof. Also, the whole unit was proposed to be changed in use from agricultural storage to the repair and maintenance of farm machinery and food processing machinery, and for the storage and distribution of food processing machinery.

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

- Principal of development;
- Impact on character and appearance of area;
- Impact on residential amenity; and
- Other material impacts

The Chairman, Councillor Crofts drew the Committee's attention to the need to add the additional conditions, as outlined in late correspondence, which was agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended subject to the imposition of additional conditions, as outlined in late correspondence.

(xi) **19/01498/F**

Terrington St Clement: The Post Office, 69-75 Churchgate Way: Change of use from post office/sorting office/vehicular garage/store to butchers shop including a temporary 7 m² walk in refrigerator unit: Mr Jack Slingsby

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was located on the west side of Churchgate Way, opposite the Terrington St Clement Community School and Nursery. It was located within the development boundary for Terrington St Clement, which was designated as a Key Rural Service Centre in Policy CS02 of the Core Strategy 2011. To the south was located a row of terraced houses, and further to the south east was the Terrington St Clement Grade 1 Listed Church.

The application was for a change of use of the existing post-office and shop into a butchers and hot food takeaway, with the erection of a walk-in fridge to the front for the cold storage of the produce. The development also involved the replacement of all windows and doors on the building, and cladding of the exterior with horizontal timber boards. The application was part retrospective because the development had commenced but not completed.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Impact on character and appearance;
- Impact on neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material considerations.

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

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Kunes addressed the Committee in support of the application. Councillor Kunes explained that he had lived in the village for 47 years and the area around the post office and sorting office was always busy. He added that there would be parking issues between 8.30 am – 9.00 am and 3.00 pm – 3.30 pm as there were two schools in close proximity. Everyone in the village knew that the road was busy during those times and would avoid them. When the sorting office was in operation the post office vans would be coming and going and parking outside it. He added that the village would welcome the shop.

Councillor Squire explained that she had called-in the application as she had received two objections to the scheme. She added that 99.9% of the village were thrilled to be having a butcher's shop within walking distance she felt that she had to be fair to all residents. She agreed that parking was bad during school times but felt that the proposal would be a great asset to the village.

Councillor Bubb suggested a condition be imposed requesting that litter bins be provided, which was agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended subject to an additional condition requiring the provision of a litter bin.

PC64: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

RESOLVED: That, the reports be noted.

PC65: **UPDATE ON TREE MATTERS**

The Committee considered a report which updated them on recent Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's) that had been served between 1st May 2019 – 31st October 2019, along with a summary on some of the other aspects of work in relation to trees.

RESOLVED: That, the report be noted.

The meeting closed at 3.20 pm