

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

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 10th August, 2020 at 9.30 am in the Remote Meeting on Zoom and available for the public to view on WestNorfolkBC on You Tube - Zoom and 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, C Morley, S Patel, C Rose, A Ryves, S Sandell,  
Mrs V Spikings, S Squire and M Storey

**PC125: WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Chair informed the Committee that the meeting was being broadcast live on You Tube.

The recording of the meeting is available at [WestNorfolkBC on You Tube](#).

**PC126: APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Parish and Councillor Morley was present as his substitute.

**PC127: MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 June 2020 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**PC128: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors Crofts, Bubb and Kirk declared that they were the Council's appointed members to the King's Lynn Internal Drainage Board.

**PC129: URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no urgent business to report.

**PC130: MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

There were no members present pursuant to Standing Order 34.

PC131: **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

He advised the Committee that he had received correspondence from Councillor de Whalley asking him to read out his comments in relation to item 8/1(a) Grimston, which he would do at the relevant point in the meeting.

PC132: **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.

PC133: **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) – (vii) below, where appropriate, to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chairman.

- (i) **19/01112/RMM**  
**Grimston: White House Farmhouse, 1 White House Farm, 28 Chapel Road, Pott Row: Reserved matters application: Residential development of 18 dwellings: A P and K A Skerry and E A & L M Chenery**

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube.](#)

The Senior Planner explained that outline planning permission had been approved on the site in 2016, when the Borough Council did not have a 5-year housing supply (reference: 15/01838/OM). Outline consent was granted for up to 18 dwellings, with access being the only matter determined at this stage. The approved access was off Chapel Road at the western end of the site.

All other matters, including layout, appearance, scale and landscaping were reserved for later consideration and formed the subject of this reserved matters application.

Pott Row, combined with Grimston and Gayton, was classified as a Key Rural Service Centre according to Policy CS02 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

The application site was located on the eastern side of Chapel Road, Pott Row and was approximately 0.96 hectares in area.

The outline application was subject to a Section 106 Agreement to secure an affordable housing contribution and SUDS management and maintenance.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Appearance, layout and scale;
- Landscaping;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Ecology;
- Highway safety;
- Affordable housing;
- Heritage assets;
- Flood risk and drainage; and
- Other matters.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, comments were read out on behalf of Mrs Balmforth (objecting), Philippa Sewell (objecting on behalf of Grimston Parish Council) and Scott Brown (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Chair read out a statement from Councillor de Whalley as follows:

*Chair & fellow councillors thank for allowing me to make representation this morning.*

*I regularly pass White House Farm. There is a manhole cover where the proposed access for the proposed development opens onto Chapel Road. It is the weakest point of the local sewerage network. In February, when the rain rained, it became a geyser spilling out onto the road for a week. This is not an infrequent occurrence; several years of discussions with Anglian Water, including intervention from Henry Bellingham, our then MP, have seen some improvements made by Anglian Water but capacity remains insufficient.*

*I draw your attention to the correspondence from Anglian Water during determination of the outline permission [15/01838/OM] dated 17 February 2016.*

*“There is limited capacity in the foul sewer system to accommodate growth so that if all recent planning applications were to come forward network upgrades would be required. If you are minded to grant permission to more than one of these applications, we would recommend a drainage condition is applied to ensure a drainage solution is identified and agreed before commencement on site and implemented before connection of dwellings to the sewerage system is made “*

*All the outline applications mentioned were granted (N.B. Manor Farm was refused at reserved matters stage but remains in the local plan and subject to appeal). There has been some significant additional development in the catchment area since 2016.*

*If this application is approved, then the drainage condition is something that is simply undeliverable because there is not the capacity nor the ability to implement the condition within the time limitation of the reserved matters consent.*

Officers responded to questions from the Committee, a summary of which is set out below:

- It was explained that detailed conditions had been imposed on the outline permission relating to surface water drainage and these conditions needed to be met. The scheme could not be built until the condition had been discharged.
- It was explained that condition 23 of the outline consent related to the bus stop and shelter being moved, the details of which needed to be agreed with County Highways prior to the occupation of the development.
- Retention of the hedgerow could be secured if the Committee wished via a condition.
- Reference had been made by the Parish Council and Councillor Joyce to units 6 and 12 where the plans showed that 3 cars would have to park in a line. The Senior Planner explained that there was adequate space for the cars, and if they were from the same household, to manoeuvre.
- Reference had been made to garages, which were actually car ports and were open fronted so that people could drive in and out of them. They did count as part of the car parking provision. In addition, the gardens did have plenty of space within them for sheds for secure parking or equipment should be occupants wish to do that.
- Where statutory consultees advised that they had no comments, it was explained that they had been consulted and had confirmed that there was nothing extra to add.
- There was under-croft parking for unit 16 with gates so access could be gained to the rear through the parking area.

- The affordable housing units reflected the need in the area. Originally there had been some larger units put forward by the applicant but the Housing Enabling Officer had sought a reduction in scale to reflect what was required locally.
- Natural England comments and the test of derogation – the terminology of the legislation had been used.
- This application needed to be determined on its own merits and should not be compared to other applications.

Councillor Squire proposed that the hedgerow should be retained, and this was seconded by Councillor Bone.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal for a condition to retain the hedgerow and, after having been put to the vote, was carried unanimously.

The Democratic Services then carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application with the additional condition to retain the hedgerow and, after having been put to the vote, it was approved (16 votes for and 2 against):

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved as recommended, together with the imposition of an additional condition to retain the hedgerow.

*The Committee then adjourned at 10.40 am and reconvened at 10.50 am.*

**(ii) 19/01558/FM**

**Hunstanton: Land south of Seagate: Mixed use development comprising of retail at ground floor with residential accommodation at first to fifth floor: Greater Manchester Prop 1 Ltd**

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube.](#)

The Senior Planner introduced the report and explained that full planning permission was sought for a mixed-use development comprising 3 no. retail units at ground floor level and 16 no. residential units over five additional floors above. The site was located at the end of Seagate in Hunstanton and was previously the location of the Kit Kat Club, which had long since been demolished and the site cleared. Currently the site was vacant and devoid of buildings.

The proposed building graduated in height from between three storeys to the south and six storeys on the northwest corner.

A previous permission, now expired, was approved under application 10/01908/FM for one large commercial unit at ground floor with 12 no. residential units over an additional four floors above.

In planning policy terms, the site constituted previously developed land within development boundary of one of the Borough's three towns.

The vast majority of the site was located on flood zone 1 with the northeast corner at higher risk of flooding.

The site was located approximately 110m to the west of the Conservation Area but was on a prominent site which would be very visible along the seafront.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Design and impact on the Conservation Area;
- Impact upon neighbouring occupiers;
- Affordable housing;
- Highway implications;
- Flood risk and drainage;
- Crime and disorder; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, the Democratic Services Officer read out comments from Mr Brakes (objecting), Mr Murray (objecting on behalf of Hunstanton Civic Society) and Ian Reilly (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Senior Planner responded to comments raised, as follows:

- The overshadowing diagram was explained.
- The proposed car parking spaces were in accordance with the Council's policy in relation to parking provision. The Planning Inspector for the McCarthy and Stone appeal felt that 20 spaces for 31 units was appropriate. Whilst each application needed to be considered on its own merits, it was the proximity of the development to other car parking spaces, and the location of the site to other services which was also the case with this proposal.
- Cladding - consultation had taken place with the Fire Service, and they had the opportunity to comment, but in any case, this would be covered by Building Regulations under separate legislation.
- A viability assessment submitted by the applicant had been scrutinised by the Housing Team and resulted in one affordable

unit being provided. The previous scheme offered no affordable housing.

- Crime and disorder issues had been covered within the report. There was a lot more natural surveillance because of the amount of people who would be living there.
- Height and scale of the proposed building.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the proposed additional condition No.30, as outlined in late correspondence, regarding screening on the roof terrace and after having been put to the vote via a roll call by the Democratic Services Officer, it was unanimously agreed.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application together with the additional condition (No.30) as outlined in late correspondence and, after having been put to the vote, it was approved (11 votes for, 6 against and 1 abstention):

**RESOLVED:** (A) That the application be approved subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement within four months of the date of the resolution to approve; including an additional condition regarding screening to the roof terrace (as outlined in late correspondence).

(B) That the application be refused if the Section 106 Agreement is not signed within four months of the date of the resolution to approve.

**(iii) 20/00754/O**

**Crimpleham: Land to the rear of Dovedale, Main Road:  
Outline application: Site for one detached dwelling and  
garage: Mr & Mrs Neil Houghton**

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube.](#)

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located to the rear of Dovedale, Main Road, Crimpleham and to the north of the built extent of the settlement. It was 0.12ha and triangular in shape (approximately 31m x 31m). Crimpleham was categorised as a Smaller Village and Hamlet in the adopted Local Plan.

The application sought outline planning consent with all matters reserved bar access, for the construction of one detached dwelling and garage. The access was proposed via an existing track between the dwellings Dovedale and Mole End on Main Road.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Highways / access;
- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenity; and
- Other material considerations.

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

Councillor Howland proposed that the application be approved, which was seconded by Councillor Ryves on the grounds that the development was in accordance with Policy DM3.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application with appropriate conditions to be agreed following consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair, and after having been put to the vote (16 votes for, 2 abstentions), it was:

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions following consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair, for the following reasons:

*On the grounds that the development was in accordance with Policy DM3, as it was sensitive infill development.*

**(iv) 20/00662/O**

**East Rudham: Land north west of St Patricks Villa, Back Lane: Outline application: Pair of detached self-build dwellings and garages: Mr Aaron & Ryan Daly**

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube.](#)

The Senior Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site comprised a rectangular parcel of land measuring approximately 1671 square metres. It was situated on the northern side of Back Lane, East Rudham. The land was currently unused and overgrown but was historically used for agricultural / paddock purposes.

Outline planning consent was sought for construction of two detached two storey dwellings and garages. All matters were reserved at this stage, but indicative plans had been submitted showing layout, footprint and access.

East Rudham was classified as a Key Rural Service Centre, however, the application site was located outside of the development boundary and within the countryside.



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

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

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

The County Highways Representative addressed the Committee and outlined their concerns in relation to the application.

Councillor Bubb in supporting the application proposed that it be approved, which was seconded by Councillor Storey on the grounds that it was sustainable, infill development in the countryside, and accorded with the NPPF paragraph 78,

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions following consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair and, after having been put to the vote, it was approved (16 votes for, 2 against):

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

*That it was sustainable, infill development, and accorded with paragraph 78 of the NPPF.*

***The Committee adjourned at 1.05 pm and reconvened at 1.45 pm***

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call to check attendees. Councillor Patel was absent and therefore did not take part in consideration of the next item of business.

- (v) **20/00519/F**  
**North Runcton: Tall Trees, 32 Rectory Lane: Demolition of existing dwelling house with inclusive self-contained annex and garage along with associated landscape works incidental to the development: Mr & Mrs Yallop**

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube.](#)

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site comprised an existing detached bungalow and its

curtilage and was bordered to the west and south by existing mature trees and hedgerows. The site was accessed via a small section of private track directly off Rectory Lane, North Runcton. Existing dwellings were located to both the east and west, with agricultural fields to the rear.

The proposal was for the construction of a replacement dwelling with integral annex and garage.

North Runcton was categorised as a smaller village and hamlet in Policy CS02 of the Core Strategy (2011).

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination by the Planning Sifting Panel.

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

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Impact on neighbours;
- Impact on trees;
- Highway safety; and
- Other material impacts.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application and, after having been put to the vote, it was agreed unanimously:

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

Councillor Patel re-joined the meeting.

**(vi) 19/02140/F**

**Old Hunstanton: The Bungalow, Waterworks Road:  
Construction of 2 dwellings following demolition of existing  
bungalow: Mr D Lloyd**

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube.](#)

In presenting the report, the Senior Planner explained that the application site related to a parcel of land measuring approximately 0.23 of a hectare and currently comprised a vacant bungalow and garden land. It was situated on the eastern side of Waterworks Road, Old Hunstanton.

Full planning permission was sought for the construction of two detached dwellings following demolition of the bungalow.

Old Hunstanton was classified as a Rural Village as identified in the Core Strategy's Settlement Hierarchy.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination by the Planning Sifting Panel.

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

- Principle of development;
- Planning history;
- Form and character;
- Impact on AONB;
- Impact on neighbour amenities;
- Impact on highway safety;
- Flood risk; and
- Other material considerations.

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

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application and, after having been put to the vote, it was unanimously carried:

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

**(vii) 19/02020/RM**

**Upwell: Land south east of 5 New Road: Reserved matters application: Construction of a dwelling on plot 4 only: Mr D Johnson**

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube.](#)

The Principal Planner explained that the application site was located on New Road, Upwell, to the east of the village. Upwell was categorised as a Key Rural Service Centre in the adopted Local Plan.

The application site was part of a larger allocation in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan, policy G104.1. The site also had planning consent for five dwellings with all matters reserved bar access (ref: 18/01980/O).

The application sought consent for a single detached five bedroom two storey dwelling and garage, on land identified as plot 4 of the outline planning consent. The access from New Road was in line with the outline consent.

The application site was also adjacent to Upwell Conservation Area.

The application had been referred to the Planning 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 / impact on the Conservation Area;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Highways / access;
- Drainage; and
- Other material considerations.

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

Councillor Mrs Spikings in supporting the application, proposed that the application should be approved on the grounds that the design would enhance the area and would not have a negative impact on the conservation area. This was seconded by Councillor Patel.

The Principal Planner highlighted the listed buildings and other buildings along the road on google earth.

The Assistant Director explained that the application had been recommended for refusal as it was about setting design standards for this important site, as the policy talked about careful design and the impact on the conservation area. As this was the first plot to come forward it would set the standard for the design for the other plots.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application, with conditions to be agreed following consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair and, after having been put to the vote, it was approved (11 for, six against and 1 abstention).

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

*That the design would enhance the area and would not have a negative impact on Upwell Conservation Area.*

a **Decisions on Applications**

PC134: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received Schedules relating to the above.

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

**The meeting closed at 2.38 pm**