

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 1st June, 2020 at 9.30 am via a Zoom meeting, available to view at WestNorfolkBC on You Tube.

PRESENT: Councillor C J Crofts (Chair)
Councillors F Bone, C Bower, A Bubb, M Howland, C Hudson, C Joyce, J Kirk, B Lawton, C Manning, T Parish, C Rose, A Ryves, S Sandell, Mrs V Spikings, S Squire, M Storey and D Tyler (sub)

An apology for absence was received from Councillor S Patel

PC95: **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the first Planning Committee being held via Zoom. He informed the Committee that the meeting was being broadcast live on You Tube.

The recording of the meeting is available to view at WestNorfolkBC on You Tube.

The Democratic Services Officer conducted a roll call to confirm attendees.

PC96: **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Patel.

The Chair thanked Councillor D Tyler for substituting at the meeting.

PC97: **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 2 March 2020, were agreed as a correct record.

PC98: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following declarations of interest were declared:

Councillors Bubb, Crofts and Kirk declared that they were members of King's Lynn Internal Drainage Board.

Councillors Joyce, Kirk and Rose declared that they were members of East of Ouse, Polver & Nar Internal Drainage Board.

Councillor Joyce also explained that his nephew, wife and their daughter had signed in support of the Starbucks application.

PC99: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no urgent business under Standing Order 7.

PC100: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Members attended for the items of business, as set out below:

P Gidney	8/1(b)	West Winch
M de Whalley	8/1(c) & 8/1(d)	Gayton
J Ratcliffe	8/2(d)	Downham Market
H Humphrey	8/2(e)	Emneth

PC101: **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC102: **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.

PC103: **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 will be published with the agenda). Any changes to the schedules will be recorded in the minutes.

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

(i) 19/01654/OM
Docking: Limagrain UK Ltd, Station Road: Outline application with some matters reserved: Residential development consisting of 30 dwellings:

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that outline consent with all matters except access reserved for future consideration was sought for residential development of the site with 30 dwellings.

The site was located almost wholly within the development boundary for Docking, a Key Rural Services Centre. The southwest corner of the site, which clearly formed part of the operational Limagrain site, had been excluded.

The site was previously developed, as defined by the NPPF, and contained a number of buildings, glasshouses and areas of hardstanding associated with its previous use.

The southeast corner of the site was located within the Conservation Area, as did the entrance.

There was one tree protected by a TPO on the site; the trees in the southeast corner would be protected by virtue of their siting within a Conservation Area.

The site was located within flood zone 1, a groundwater medium risk zone and a sand and gravel mineral resource area.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Highway safety;
- Form and character / impact on the setting of the Conservation Area;
- Residential amenity;
- Flood risk and drainage;
- Trees;
- Ecology;
- Minerals;
- S106 considerations;
- Crime and disorder; and
- Other material considerations.

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

The Committee debated the application and officers responded to questions and provided clarification on the following issues:

- In terms of this application, there was no requirement for a viability study;

- Pages 15 and 16 of the agenda dealt with the loss of employment land;
- The application had been assessed against National and Local policies, and it was a brownfield site in a Key Rural Service Centre. The loss of the employment site was considered acceptable.
- There was no requirement for the applicant to demonstrate housing demand.
- In relation to the affordable housing being pepper-potted, the plan submitted was indicative only and the location of the affordable units would be dealt with at reserved matters stage.
- With regards to the access being opposite the village shop, it was explained that County Highways had raised no objection to the application and considered that the visibility splays was acceptable. With regards to the provision of the affordable housing units, this would be secured via the Section 106 Agreement.
- CIL monies could be used to fund an education contribution.
- Condition 25 would ensure that the development would comprise of no more than 30 dwellings.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call and it was:

RESOLVED: (A) That the application be approved subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement within 4 months of the date of the resolution.

(B) That the application be refused if the Section 106 Agreement is not completed within 4 months of the date of this resolution.

- (ii) **20/00303/FM**
West Winch: Building west of Spinney House, Lynn Road, Setchey: Change of use of existing grain store barn and site to warehouse and external storage of products for sale and dispatch, new entrance to highway created. Overcladding of existing fibre cement panels, new mezzanine floor, internal offices and warehouse storage: Specialist Hygiene Solutions Ltd

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site comprised a redundant agricultural building, which was situated on the eastern side of the A10 in Setchey and related to Park Farm, Wormegay, which was a large working farm. Access to the site was currently via a farm road entrance from the A10.

The existing building was steel framed with asbestos cement cladding to the walls and roof with structural galvanised steel walling. It was previously used for the storage and drying of grain and associated food products but due to its size and layout it had been made uneconomical and was no longer appropriate for use with modern farm machinery and storage procedures.

The site was located in the settlement of Setchey, which was categorised as a Smaller Village or Hamlet in the adopted Local Plan, and was therefore within the countryside. A Grade II listed building was located to the north of the site (The Gables) and the surrounding area comprised a mix of residential, agricultural and sui generis uses. It also fell within the West Winch and North Runcton Neighbourhood Plan area.

The application sought planning permission for the change of use of the existing agricultural building for commercial/industrial equipment storage (B8 and B1c).

The site was accessed directly off the Lynn Road / A10. There was an existing access but the application sought to relocate this to secure an adequate visibility. The Local Highways Authority objected to the application on the grounds that the scheme would result in an increase in vehicle movements using the access, causing additional vehicles to slow, stop, wait, and turn without the benefit of safe provisions. Such conditions would lead to the detriment of highway safety and efficiency on the A10.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon the countryside;
- Residential amenity;
- Highway safety;
- Flood risk and drainage; and
- Other material considerations

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

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

The Chairman then invited Richard Smith from Norfolk County Council to outline the objection from the Highways Authority.

The Committee debated the application and officers responded to questions and provided clarification on the following issues:

- In response to the suggestion that there was only a left turn out of that site NCC had looked at that as it was within the applicants supporting case, however there would be an issue regarding land take; whether it whether it could be put in and whether it would be feasible. The reality of the situation was that it could only be controlled if there was a physical barrier within the road and it was likely to cause more issues than it would resolve.
- Reference was made to an appeal at Hardwick Road at Bridge Bungalow and Planning Inspector agreed that those type of measures did not work. There was restricted verge width and it was not possible to support.

Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed to approve the application as she considered that the proposal complied with Policy CS11 and weight had been put on the highways improvements, it would offer employment use and would enhance the appearance of the building. The proposal to approve the application was seconded by Councillor Mrs Bower.

The Democratic Services Officer then conducted a roll call on the proposal to approve the application, and it was:

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, contrary to recommendation, for the reasons set out below, and subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions to be agreed, following consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair.

The proposal would result in a development that enhances the visual amenities of the locality, provide an employment use with cutting edge technology and would result in an improved access which would not be detrimental to highway safety and thus complies with Policies CS08, CS10 and CS11 of the Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM15 of the SADMPP 2016.

The Committee then adjourned at 11.01 am and reconvened at 11.15 am.

(iii) 19/00694/RMM

Gayton: Manor Farm, Back Street: Reserved matters application: Residential development for 40 dwellings, associated estate road access onto Back Street and demolition of existing farm buildings: D & K Marsham

Councillor Hudson left the meeting at 11.30 am and did not take part in the debate or decision for this application.

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that reserved matters were sought for 40 dwellings following the grant of outline planning permission in August 2016 under reference 15/0188/FM.

The outline consent was for 40 dwellings on the housing allocation site for Gayton (G41.1) in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan, 2016 (SADMP).

The reserved matters application was for 40 dwellings on a slightly smaller site. A full application, that was also before the Committee today, covered the remainder of the site and was for six dwellings (19/01831/F).

If permission were granted for both of the applications, it would result in a total of 46 dwellings on the allocated site rather than the currently approved 40.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the key issues for consideration when determining the application, namely:

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Residential amenity;
- Highways safety;
- S106 contributions;
- Matters covered by condition;
- Crime and disorder; and
- Other material considerations

The Principal Planner also explained that there had been additional representations reported in late correspondence.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Sarah Renwick (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) and James Burton (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor de Whalley addressed the Committee in accordance with Standing Order 34 objecting to the application.

The Committee debated the application and the Principal Planner responded to queries/issues, a summary of which is outlined below:

- There was extant outline planning permission for 40 dwellings on the site. The issues raised by Councillor de Whalley in relation to G41.1, and reference to at least 23 dwellings, had already been considered at the outline stage and the Committee agreed to grant 40 units. The full application for the additional six dwellings needed to be considered by the Committee but the reserved matters application fully accorded with existing outline planning permission.
- There was rear access for the middle terrace units.
- The agent had confirmed in his supporting statement that the access to the agricultural land had been retained.
- There would be 9 affordable housing units in total – 8 had already been secured on the outline application and there would be one additional unit if the full application (19/01831/F) was approved. Officers and the Housing Enabling Officer were satisfied with the design and layout of them. The affordable housing units did not have garages included but some of the open market houses also did not have garages, therefore the affordable housing units would not look any different from the open market housing.
- The pond would be retained and fenced off.

- The density issues had been covered on page 49 of the report. The density was not overly high and did accord with the existing development in the area.
- Officers and the Housing Enabling Officer were satisfied with the pepper-potting of the affordable housing units. The Council's affordable housing policy did allow for clusters of 6 affordable housing units. Registered Social Landlords would come forward with a list of their requirements, which needed to be taken into account.
- The Inspector at the Local Plan Inquiry wanted 'at least' to be added in and was there to allow the Council flexibility over numbers. The layout looked to be acceptable. The Committee needed to consider the application on its merits.
- The parking provision need met our policy requirement as set out in the Development Management Plan.
- Garages was an issue which had been raised before by the Committee, but the Committee needed to consider whether this was so severe to warrant refusal of the application.

In summary the Assistant Director advised that the Committee needed to assess whether the application was acceptable on its own right, in terms of density and layout. The scheme did comprise a mix of dwellings. It was an allocated site and had outline consent for 40 dwellings.

Councillor Mrs Spikings had proposed earlier in the debate, that the application be refused on the grounds that that the affordable housing units did not match the standards of the open market housing, did not integrate into the scheme and the units were not pepper-potted across the site. This was seconded by Councillor Sandell.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call on the proposal to refuse the application, which was lost on the Chair's casting vote

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application, which was also lost.

The Assistant Director suggested that the application be deferred to address any outstanding issues, or the Committee could continue with the debate.

The Chair then proposed that the application be deferred. The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call to defer the application, which was carried.

RESOLVED: That the application be deferred for further advice.

(iv) 19/01831/F

Gayton: Manor Farm, Back Street: Construction of 2 detached dwellings and 4 semi-detached dwellings:

RESOLVED: That the application be deferred.

(v) 19/02162/RM

**Brancaster: Beersheba, Town Lane, Brancaster Staithe:
Reserved matters application: Demolition of existing dwelling
and construction of five new dwellings: Fleur Homes Ltd**

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application sought reserved matters approval for all matters: access, appearance, landscaping, scale and layout following outline approval granted under application 19/00915/O on 29 July 2019 for the demolition of existing dwelling and construction of 5 no, new dwellings.

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

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.

The Principal Planner advised that an amendment was required to condition 4 – any other access, or egress onwards was no longer required.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Parish Councillor Briony Bax (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) and Jamie Bird (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Committee debated the application and the Principal Planner / Assistant Director responded to comments / questions, a summary of which is set out below:

- In response to comments raised by the Parish Council, it was explained that in relation to the current adopted Neighbour Plan, it was considered that the application accorded with the policies within that document and weight had been placed on the adopted Plan not the one under review.
- Traffic and highways – The site had outline planning permission and Norfolk County Council were satisfied with the proposal.
- Outline planning permission had been granted for 5 dwellings not up to 5. In terms of turning, this had been assessed by County Highways who had raised no objection in relation to highway safety or turning provision within the site and in terms of parking, this was in excess of that required.

- The amenity space was considered acceptable for the site and its surrounding and the site was close to the beach.
- With regards to the issues raised by Norfolk Coast Partnership, it was confirmed that these were suitably conditioned to secure those.
- Officers were satisfied that the proposal complied with the policies of the current Brancaster Neighbourhood Plan.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application, and it was:

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, with amendments to conditions 1, 4, 7, 8 and 9 as outlined in late correspondence and amendment to condition 4 (as reported in the meeting) – ‘any other access, or egress’ onwards was no longer required.

The Committee then adjourned at 13:00 and reconvened at 13:40. Upon reconvening, the Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call of the Committee.

(vi) 19/01731/F
Burnham Market: Church Pightle, Station Road: Demolition of detached bungalow and erection of 1 x 2 storey 5 bed dwelling, 2 x 2 storey 4 bed dwelling and 1 x garage: MJS Investments (March) Ltd

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application sought the demolition of the bungalow on the site and the construction of 3 detached properties (2 no. 4 bedroom dwellings and 1 no. 5 bedroom dwelling) and a detached garage.

The full application followed the refusal of a previous application (reference 18/01525/F), and also for the demolition of the bungalow and the construction of 3 dwellings and a garage. This decision was appealed and dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate (ref: APP/V2635/W/19/3223973).

The four reasons for refusal of the previous application related to three different issues (outside settlement boundary, design and impact on the Conservation Area and highway safety). However, the appeal was only dismissed on the grounds of harm to character and appearance of the surrounding area and failure to preserve and enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area with particular regard to the design and style of the dwellings. This amended application therefore sought to address the reasons for the dismissal of the appeal.

The application site presently forms the curtilage of a detached bungalow known as Church Pightle on Station Road, Burnham Market. The site was accessed via an existing driveway that provided vehicular and pedestrian access onto Station Road.

It was explained that the site was surrounded on three sides by existing development and the fourth side bounded allotment gardens, which were sited on the southern side of the former railway line.

Whilst Burnham Market was identified as a Key Rural Service Centre, part of the site fell outside the development boundary for the village. The site was also located within the Conservation Area and the AONB.

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

- Principle of development;
- Impact on AONB;
- Design and impact on heritage assets;
- Impact on highway safety;
- Impact on neighbours; and
- Other issues

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, a letter was read out from Burnham Market Parish Council, Mr Durrant (supporting) and Mr Penn (objecting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Committee debated the application and the Principal Planner / Assistant Director responded to comments / questions, a summary of which is set out below:

- With regards to the comment from Mr Penn in relation to the Listed building, Church Close House, the Committee's attention was drawn to the appeal decision set out on page 103 of the agenda, para 29. This outlined the Inspectors views in terms of the impact on the listed building, which clearly stated that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the heritage asset or its setting, and officers took the same view with the proposed scheme.
- It was explained that in relation to the removal of pd rights from the garages it was not considered necessary to condition that as this was a full application and if conversion into a self-contained unit of accommodation then planning permission would be required to do that. In terms of conditioning it into three units, it was not considered necessary either as this was a full application, therefore if more units were proposed for the site, a separate application would be required.
- If it was felt necessary to retain the boundary treatment, it was suggested that this should be conditioned, in the event of an approval.
- In terms of highways, it was explained that had been a recent appeal decision that made determinations on a number of issues, which needed to be followed. Members were given a quote from a costs circular, where it detailed that LPAs were at risk of an award of costs if they behaved unreasonably in respect of the substance of the matter under appeal for example by unreasonably refusing or failing to determine applications or by unreasonably defending appeals, examples included persisting with objections to a scheme or elements of a scheme where the Inspector or Secretary of State had previously indicated to be acceptable. That is why County Highways had withdrawn their objection, because they felt that had no choice, as an Inspector had recently made a view on the scheme.

- Page 82 of the agenda demonstrated the separation distances from Church Close and the proposed development.
- In relation to the allotments, are to the south of the dismantled railway and this proposal would not have an impact on that.

Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed a condition to ensure the retention of the boundary vegetation, which was seconded by Councillor Lawton.

The Democratic Services Officer then conducted a roll call on the proposal to approve the application with an additional condition to ensure the retention of the boundary vegetation, and it was

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the imposition of an additional condition to ensure the retention of the boundary vegetation.

(v) 19/02216/F

Downham Market: Land at 161 Bexwell Road: Erection of Starbucks coffee shop and drive thru (class A3 use) and freestanding McDonald's restaurant with drive thru (class A3/A5). Includes car parking, landscaping and associated works including the installation of 2 no. customer order displays, goal post height restrictor and child's play frame. Works for enclosure for gas and electricity: Starbucks and MacDonald's Restaurants Ltd

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located on the north-western quadrant of the roundabout junction of Bexwell Road / A10 / A1122, on the eastern fringe of the town. It covered an area of approximately 0.8ha, and historically used as a playing field for British Sugar and had been redundant for approximately 40 years. It was contained by mature landscaping in the form of poplar trees to the north and east, with mixed hedging along with Bexwell Road frontage. It was presently served by a private maintenance access track, which would lead to land to the north – including a reservoir and telecom masts. To the west was the urban area of Downham Market, agricultural fields opposite to the south and south-east, with a mix of residential and commercial to the north-eastern quadrant of the roundabout.

The site was located in an area classed as countryside in the adopted Local Plan and in Flood Zone 1 of the Council-adopted Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Full permission was sought for the erection of a Starbucks coffee shop and drive-thru (class A3), and McDonalds restaurant and drive-thru (class A3/A5) and included car parking, landscaping and associated works. Access off Bexwell Road was shown in the south-western corner of the site with highway improvements within the highway creating a right turning lane. The site layout plan showed the Starbucks building located to the northwest of the site and the McDonalds restaurant to the south-east. The McDonalds restaurant included an outdoor eating area and play space, cycle parking was provided to the north and there was car parking for approximately 90 spaces.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Impact on town centre and the sequential test;
- Access and highway matters;
- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Health impacts; and
- Other material considerations.

The Principal Planner advised the Committee that there was late correspondence in relation to this application. There was also two amended conditions 4 & 16.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Steve Cornelius (objecting) and Paul Thomas (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Ratcliffe addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Committee debated the application and the Principal Planner / Assistant Director responded to comments / questions, a summary of which is set out below:

- Both the objector and Councillor Ratcliffe had talked about the proximity of the site to residential development, however, it was noted that on page 110 of the agenda, the Council's CSNN department had looked at this in detail, including the proximity of the Starbucks site adjacent to No.159 and the element of acoustic fencing required and raised no objection subject to conditions which included the construction traffic period, site for construction traffic workers, kitchen extraction equipment, db levels that were allowed to be emitted from the equipment and required times, as set out in condition 19.
- Highways –Cllr Ratcliffe talked about potential queueing situations and deliveries to the site, but this had been assessed by the Majors Team at County Highways who had raised no objection to the off-site highways works. They had assessed the position of the access and roundabout at 90 m away and considered that the distance was acceptable along with any associated queueing. Delivery details was set out in the supporting statement for McDonalds.
- Highways England had raised no objection.
- In terms of the location of the site, McDonalds had looked at various sites in Downham Market and this was found to be the

most suitable. There was no viability assessment required for this application.

- The distances had been set out on page 8 of the late representations and was 541m from Hillcrest school and 780 m to Downham Market Academy.
- In relation to Anglian Water's capacity, it was explained that Anglian Water had suggested a condition relating to foul and surface water drainage and were satisfied with the drainage arrangements.
- It was confirmed that there would be no condition proposed for opening hours as it would be a 24-hour operation for McDonalds.

The Democratic Services Officer then conducted a roll call, to approve the application with amended conditions 4 and 16, and it was

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to amendments to conditions 4 and 16.

(vi) 19/01416/O

Emneth: Longridge: 37 Elm High Road: Outline application with some matters reserved: proposed residential development: Mr & Mrs S Rout

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site comprised 'Longridge'/No.37 Elm High Road, which was a large detached chalet bungalow set in substantial mature landscaped grounds (0.6ha) on the eastern side of this main route into Wisbech. It was located just north of the B&Q store and the Peel Centre Retail Park, with housing and commercial opposite bungalows to the north and a recently approved residential estate (approved under reference 18/01464/RMM) to the rear.

Outline permission was sought for the residential development around the existing dwelling, which was proposed to be retained. All matters, with the exception of means of access, were reserved for future consideration. An indicative site layout plan was submitted which showed the existing access upgraded into a cul-de-sac and two private driveways serving plots to the front, rear and side of No.37.

The same access was the subject of a separate application (ref: 19/00926/F) which had recently been approved under delegated powers, for a temporary access route for construction of the adjoining estate as an alternative to accessing it via Hunters Rowe further along the road frontage to the north.

The site was located within the defined development area of Emneth and within Flood Zone 1 of the Council-adopted Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the views of the Parish Council were contrary to the officer recommendation, and at the instruction of the Sifting Panel.

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

- Principle of development;
- Impact on form and character;
- Access;
- Impact on trees;
- Affordable housing contribution; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Peter Oliver (objecting), Parish Councillor Yvonne Howard (objecting) and Councillor Samantha Hoy (objecting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor H Humphrey (objecting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Committee debated the application and the Principal Planner / Assistant Director responded to questions / queries from the Committee, a summary is outlined below:

- This was an outline application only and the plan was indicative only. If 8 dwellings could not fit on the site then a reduced number would need to be considered. The layout was not being considered as part of this application and anything else would be considered at reserved matters stage.
- A plan was displayed which showed the roundabout and A47 and it was highlighted that the improvements as part of the Wisbech Access Strategy would not impact on the application site.
- In terms of the temporary access road approved to serve the site at the rear for temporary construction traffic. If the access road had not been constructed by 2023, then the applicant would have to apply to renew it.
- Cambridgeshire County Council had not objected to the site at the rear, although they had not commented on this application.
- 9 properties could be served from a private drive.

- Although indicative, the application form did state 8 dwellings. There was no objection from Norfolk County Council.

Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed that the application be refused on the grounds of overdevelopment; the street-street needed to be retained and additional traffic was a material consideration. The proposal for refusal was seconded by Councillor Lawton.

The Democratic Services officer carried out a roll call and it was

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

1. *The proposal to introduce 8 no. additional dwellings along with the retention of the existing bungalow, would constitute an overdevelopment of the site and a layout that would be detrimental to the form and character of this locality and the street scene from Elm High Road. The proposal is therefore contrary to Paragraph 127 of the NPPF, Core Strategy Policy CS08 of the LDF (2011) and Policy DM15 of the SADMP (2016).*
2. *The traffic movements associated with this increased number of dwellings onto this already highly trafficked main arterial route serving Wisbech, would be to the detriment of the free flow of traffic and highway safety. This would be contrary to the provisions of the NPPF, Core Strategy Policy CS11 of the LDF (2011) & Policy DM15 of the SADMP (2016).*

(vii) 19/01658/F

Terrington St Clement: Chase Cottage, 12 Lynn Road: One residential dwelling with detached garage: Mrs Beryl Hornigold

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application was for full planning permission for one dwelling and detached garage. The majority of the application site was within the development boundary of Terrington St Clement and the site was accessed along an existing access that currently served another dwelling and public footpath. The application complied with policy the exception of an area of land proposed as garden to the south of the proposed dwelling. This land was bounded by existing gardens and it was not considered it would have a detrimental impact on the countryside.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was at variance with the Parish Council who objected to the application.

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

- Principle of development;
- Planning history;
- Design;
- Amenity issues;
- Highway issues;
- Flood risk;
- Biodiversity;
- Other material considerations; and
- Crime and disorder.

The Principal Planner advised that there were late representations for this application.

The Democratic Services Officer then conducted a roll call, and it was

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

PC104: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

RESOLVED: That the reports be noted.

The meeting closed at 3.58 pm