

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

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 9th September, 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, T Parish, S Patel, C Rose, A Ryves, S Sandell, Mrs V Spikings, S Squire and M Storey

PC135: **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](#).

PC136: **APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies for absence.

PC137: **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 August 2020 were agreed by the Committee and would be signed at the earliest opportunity.

PC138: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- Councillor Bubb declared that he was a Member of the King's Lynn Internal Drainage Board.
- Councillor Crofts declared that he was a Member of the King's Lynn Internal Drainage Board and East of Ouse Internal Drainage Board.
- Councillor Howland declared that in relation to 8/2(b) he was related to the applicant and in relation to item 8/2(f) he sat on the Sibelco Liaison Committee where he represented the Borough Council and would take no part in either applications.
- Councillor Joyce declared that he was a member of the East of Ouse Drainage Board. In relation to item 8/1(a) he explained that he was a close neighbour to the site.  
Item 8/2(d) - Walpole Road, King's Lynn, he had a relationship with Freebridge Community Housing.

Item 8/2(e) - West Lynn he had personal friends and people who he had relationships with on both sides.

Item 8/2(g) - Shouldham – he knew the applicant, Cllr Hipperson.

- Councillor Kirk declared that he was a member of the King's Lynn Internal Drainage Board and East of Ouse and Polver Internal Drainage Board.
- Councillor Manning explained that in relation to item 8/2(f), he was appointed by the Borough Council on Sibelco Liaison Committee.
- Councillor Parish declared that in relation to item 8/2(i), he had historical connections with the agent and would not be commenting or voting on the application.
- Councillor Rose declared that he was a Member of the East of Ouse Internal Drainage Board and three others in the Upwell area.
- Councillor Spikings declared that in relation to item 8/2(e), she had had no dealings with the applicant.
- Councillor Squire explained that she was a County Councillor and was a sub for the Planning Committee and would not take part in application 8/2(f), Leziate.
- Councillor Storey explained that he was a County Councillor who sat on the Planning Committee and would take no part in application 8/2(f), Leziate. Also, in relation to item 8/2(g) – Shouldham, he knew the applicant.

PC139: **APPOINTMENT OF TEMPORARY CHAIR**

As the Chair and Vice-Chair were having technical difficulties, it was agreed that a temporary Chair should be appointed.

It was:

**RESOLVED:** That Councillor Mrs V M Spikings be appointed as a temporary Chair.

PC140: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no urgent business to report.

PC141: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Councillors addressed the Committee pursuant to Standing Order 34:

<b><i>Name</i></b>	<b><i>Item</i></b>	<b><i>Application</i></b>
A Kemp	8/1(a), 8/2(d) & 8/2(e) 20/01036/F &	20/00757/FM,  20/00876/F

M de Whalley      8/2(c) and 8/2(f)      19/01279/F, 20/01036/F

PC142: **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC143: **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.

PC144: **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) – (xii) below, where appropriate, to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chairman.

(i) **20/00757/FM**

**The Nar Ouse Regeneration Area (NORA), Morston Drift: Construction of 105 dwellings and associated infrastructure and landscaping: Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk**

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

The application sought full planning permission for the construction of 105 dwellings and associated infrastructure and landscaping for Phase 4 of the Nar Ouse Regeneration Area (NORA). Revised plans were submitted on 28 August in order to address comments raised by Norfolk Constabulary and the Case Officer.

Reserved matters approval for 94 dwellings on the site was previously granted in April 2019 (18/01750/RMM) in relation to the outline consent for the Nar Ouse Regeneration Area (NORA) granted under application ref: 09/02010/F. The reserved matters approval was

currently still extant but the time period for submission of further reserved matters applications had now expired. The current full application therefore sought amendments to the previously approved scheme and an increase in the number of units from 94 to 105.

The application site covered an area of approximately 2.5 hectares that had previously been cleared for development under outline permissions dating back to 2002 and prior to the 2019 reserved matters approval had consent for 126 residential units under application ref: 14/00997/RMM. To the north and west was existing residential development, developed under earlier NORA phases, the River Nar was located to the east and Morston Drift to the south.

The application had been referred to the Committee as it was a Borough Council application for major development.

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

- Principle of development / planning history;
- Form and character;
- Residential amenity;
- Flood risk and drainage;
- Highway safety;
- Affordable housing;
- Open space and landscaping;
- Other considerations; and
- Crime and disorder.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Lukasz Bicki (objecting), Dale Gagen (supporting) and David Jones (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor A Kemp addressed the Committee in support of the application with 6 additional conditions.

Councillor Ryves proposed an additional condition that all dwellings on the site would have electric charging points and if necessary there would be channels placed on the pavements should the owners of the properties wish to utilise the EV charging points, for the reasons of public safety and equity. This was seconded by Councillor Parish and, after having been put to the vote, was lost on the Chairman's casting vote (7 votes for 7 against).

The Chair then referred the Committee to the late correspondence and the correction and the need to amend conditions 3 and 10, which was agreed.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application with amendments to conditions 3

and 10 reported in late correspondence and, after having been put to the vote (9 votes for, 5 against), it was:

**RESOLVED:** (A) That the application be approved subject to conditions and the satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure affordable housing within 4 months of the date of the Committee meeting; together with amendments to conditions 3 and 10 as outlined in late correspondence.

(B) In the event that the Section 106 is not completed within 4 months of the date of this Committee meeting, the application be refused due to the failure to secure affordable housing.

The Committee then adjourned at 10.45 am and reconvened at 10.55 am. Upon returning, a roll call was then carried out by the Democratic Services Officer

The Chair, Councillor Crofts and Vice-Chair, Councillor Mrs Bower were now present.

**(ii) 20/00819/F**

**Brancaster: Lynnwood, Main Road: Removal or Variation of Condition 6 of Planning permission 14/01681/F: Revised design to planning permission 09/01846/F: To allow for the erection of one dwelling only in the grounds of plot 2 and 3 and increase garden land to plot 1: Beechwood Estates & Development**

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was on the southern side of the Main Road, Brancaster Staithe and comprised a detached dwelling, Lynnwood House, with associated garaging and garden land.

The site already had planning permission for a second dwelling on the site, which was the subject of this application. This application sought amendments to the approved plans for this dwelling to change fenestration to the front elevation and add a basement.

The site had been subject to several planning applications in the last decade and the planning history was material to the consideration of the application.

The site was within the village of Brancaster Staithe which was a Key Rural Service Centre. The site was also within the Coastal Zone and the AONB.

The site was surrounded by other residential properties to the east, west, south west and to the north on the opposite side of Main Road.

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

- Planning history;
- Principle of development;
- Impact upon the AONB;
- Design, character and appearance;
- Impact upon residential amenity;
- Highways issues;
- Crime and Disorder Act 1998; and
- Other material considerations.

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

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

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

**(iii) 20/01058/F**

**Downham Market: 3 Oakfield Close: Two storey front extension: Mr Stephen Moore**

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

*Councillor Howland left the meeting during consideration of this item.*

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was No.3 Oakfield Close, Downham Market located approximately 81 m south of the junction of Trafalgar Road and Oakfield Close.

The application sought to construct a two-storey front extension, towards the east of the existing dwelling.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the applicant was related to a Councillor.

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

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

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

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

*Councillor Howland re-joined the meeting.*

**(iv) 19/01279/F**

**Grimston: Lodge Farm Barn, 141 Lynn Road: Construction of a single dwelling and attached garage: Mr and Mrs Skerry**

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was located within the settlement of Grimston, which was a Key Rural Service Centre.

The site comprised a grassed open area adjoining the property Lodge Farm Barn, a grade II listed building. To the east of Lodge Farm Barn was the grade II listed farmhouse, Lodge Farm. The site was considered to be within the curtilage of the original farmyard associated with these listed buildings.

Residential properties were to the east and west of the application site, farm buildings were to the south and a triangular shaped parcel of open space was located to the north, of the opposite side of Lynn Road.

The application sought consent for the construction of a single dwelling and attached garage. Vehicle access would be through a new opening onto Chequers Road.

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

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

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

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor de Whalley addressed the Committee.

Councillor Joyce proposed that the application be deferred for a cycle to allow for a formal response to be received from Anglian Water. This was seconded by Councillor Ryves.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to defer the application for a cycle and, after having been put to the vote, it was lost by 8 votes to defer, 10 votes against).

The Principal Planner then brought to the Committee's attention the need to amend condition 12, which should refer to the previous contamination conditions (9, 10, and 11).

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application with the amendment to condition 12 and, after having been put to the vote (13 votes for, 4 against and 1 abstention), it was:

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved, as recommended subject to the amendment to condition 12.

**(v) 20/00876/F**

**King's Lynn: Change of use from a drop-in care assessment for pre-school children back to former residential dwelling / flat: Freebridge Community Housing**

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the proposal was for the change of use of an existing drop-in /care assessment for pre-school children, to a residential dwelling / flat. The site was originally constructed as part of a block of flats, each for residential use, however, was granted planning permission for change of use to office in 2006 and then to its current use in 2015.

The site was located within Flood Zones 2 & 3 of the Borough Council's SFRA (2018) and within the River Ouse Hazard Zone with a potential flood depth of 1-2m.

The application had been referred for determination at the request of Councillor A Tyler.

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

- Principle of development;
- Flood risk;
- Crime and disorder; and
- Other material considerations.

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

The Democratic Services Officer read out comments from Councillor A Tyler in support of the application.



Councillor Kemp also addressed the Committee in accordance with Standing Order 34.

Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed that the application be refused on flood risk grounds as the Environment Agency had objected to the application. This was seconded by Councillor Storey and, after having been put to the vote it was (10 votes for, 7 against and 1 abstention):

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

*The subject site is located within Flood Zones 2 & 3 and the Flood Hazard Zone as classified in the Borough Council's SFRA (2018). The submitted FRA fails to demonstrate the proposal can be made safe for its lifetime in accordance with the exceptions test outlined in Paragraph 159 of the NPPF (2019). The application is therefore considered contrary to paragraphs 159-163 of the NPPF (2019), policy CS08 of the Core Strategy (2011) and fails to meet the requirements of the Borough Council's Flood Risk Protocol.*

**(vi) 20/01036/F**

**King's Lynn: Priors Butchers, 164 St Peters Road, West Lynn: Internal alterations with a new single storey front and side extension to the existing butcher shop: Priors of West Lynn Ltd**

[Click here to view a copy of the recording for this item on YouTube.](#)

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the proposal was for the construction of a single storey front and side extension to Priors Butchers in West Lynn. The proposal would include the demolition of an existing side extension to the dwelling to the side of the existing business and the subsequent construction of a side extension to form and enlarged shop space and a walk-in fridge. An extension to the front of the building would form a covered entrance canopy space and cook room extension.

The existing site was located on St Peters Road, directly opposite the junction of Harrow Close and comprised the butchers shop and a detached two storey dwelling (within the same ownership) to the north. Existing outbuildings used for storage purposes in association with the business were located to the rear of the site. An existing village shop was located approximately 30m to the south of the application site.

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

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

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

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

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

Attention was drawn to the need to amend the drawings as listed in Condition 2, which was agreed.

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

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved, as recommended, subject to amendments to the drawings listed in condition 2.

**(vii) 20/00884/CM**

**Leziate: Sibelco Minerals and Chemicals, Station Road: County Matters Application: The extraction of industrial sand and associated works with progressive restoration to wildlife habitat, geological exposures and a lake: Sibelco UK**

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

Councillors Storey and Squire took no part in the debate or decision making as they were Norfolk County Councillors.

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application was a County Matters application for the extraction of industrial sand and associated works along with the progressive restoration of the site to wildlife habitat, geological exposures and a lake at Mintlyn South Quarry.

The planning application boundary extended to an area of 56.1 hectares. The proposed extraction area covered an area of circa. 15.3 hectares of the site.

The application site was in Leziate / Bawsey, approximately 2.5 km north-west of the centre of East Winch, and 2.1 km to the north of Middleton.

The application site extended either side of Station Road, Leziate, which ran north south through the application site. The proposed extraction area as to the west and the Leziate Plant Site was to the east.

The northern and central parts of the proposed extraction area and other parts within the application area had been previously worked for sand extraction. Those areas had been left to re-colonise naturally without any interference or formal restoration, with the exception of some smaller areas of tree planting.

The land within the south-western part of the proposed extraction area was in agricultural (grazing) use.

This application was a County Matters application whereby Norfolk County Council was the Determining Authority and the Local Planning Authority was one of a number of statutory consultees.

The application had been submitted with an accompanying Environmental Statement, which included assessments of all likely significant environmental effects.

The application had been referred to the Committee by the Assistant Director.

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

- Principle of development;
- Highways issues;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Ecology; and
- Other material considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Bramwell (objecting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor de Whalley addressed the Committee.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call and, after having been put to the vote, it was (9 votes for, 2 against and 5 abstentions)

**RESOLVED:** That the Committee raises no objection but recommends that conditions were imposed including those requested by the Council's CSNN and Environmental Quality Teams.

*The Committee adjourned at 12.55 pm and reconvened at 1.35 pm*

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call to determine those present.

Councillor Parish left the meeting.

**(viii) 20/00381/F**

**Shouldham: Melrose Hall, 10 Norwich Road: Construction of summer house: Mr G Hipperson**

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the land was situated within the Shouldham Conservation Area, along the west side of Norwich Road and approximately 50m from the T-junction of Lynn Road (to the west) and Eastgate Street (to the north).

The application sought to construct a single storey summer house to the east of the detached garage of Melrose Hall.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the applicant was a Councillor.

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

- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Impact on the Conservation Area; and
- Impact on neighbours.

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

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

Councillor Storey then left the meeting.

**(ix) 20/00346/F**

**South Wootton: Old Rectory, Hall Lane: New dwelling: Mr Azam Gabbair**

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application related to the construction of a new dwelling on garden land to the north of The Old Rectory, Hall Lane, South Wootton. The application site fell within the development boundary and within the South Wootton Neighbourhood Plan Area. Outline permission for a new dwelling had been granted three times in the past, including as

recently 2016. The 2016 application had been determined after the adoption of the South Wootton Neighbourhood Plan (2015).

The application site was situated on the east side of Hall Lane, and the application sought full permission for a new two storey dwelling.

The site was covered by a group Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The proposal involved the removal of a few trees to the front of the site to gain independent access to the site, and a few trees to the rear (east) boundary.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was at variance of the Parish Council and it had been referred by the Planning Sifting Panel.

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

- Principle of development;
- Impact on the form and character of the area;
- Impact on neighbour amenity;
- Impact on trees;
- Highway impact; and
- Other considerations.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr N Clark (objecting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed that the application be deferred for further information regarding the loss of the trees. This was seconded by Councillor Joyce, and after having been put to the vote, it was unanimously:

**RESOLVED:** That the application be deferred for further information regarding the loss of trees.

**(x) 20/00603/F**

**Stanhoe: Station Farm Cottage, Station Road: Proposed construction of a dwelling house with associated landscaping and a detached garage and retention of a garden shed: Mr David Miller**

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that full planning permission was sought for a replacement dwelling in the countryside. The existing dwelling had already been demolished and a previous consent for a replacement dwelling had been implemented. The site was in a remote location in an area where there was a handful of residential properties.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- History and form and character;
- Highway safety;
- Residential amenity;
- Crime and disorder; and
- Other material considerations.

The Democratic Services Officer read out a letter from Mrs Sparks objecting to the application.

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

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

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

**(xi) 20/00340/F  
West Winch: Glendawn, Rectory Lane: Proposed 3 no. new dwellings and the demolition of the existing bungalow: Mr A Evershed**

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that 'Glendawn' was a modest detached bungalow and to the immediate east was the recently built 'Orchard House', both properties being set within substantial grounds on the northern side of Rectory Lane, West Winch.

Full permission was sought to demolish the bungalow and utilise part of the garden of Orchard House to create three building plots and construct three detached houses.

The site was located within the village development boundary for West Winch, contained in Inset E2 of the Site Allocations & Development Management Policies Plan 2016 and also in the North Runcton & West Winch Neighbourhood Plan area.

Members might recall that outline permission for three plots was previously approved under application ref: 18/02001/O at the meeting held on 7 October 2019, on a slightly reduced site area (width now

increased by approximately 3m). Hence this was a full application rather than a reserved matters application.

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

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

- Principle of development;
- Impact upon the form and character of the locality;
- Drainage; and
- Other material considerations.

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

The Committee's attention was drawn to the need to amend conditions as outlined in the late correspondence which was agreed.

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

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

**(xii) 2/TPO/00601**

**Stradsett: Paradise Manor, Downham Road: To consider whether Tree Preservation Order 2/TPO/00601 should be confirmed, modified, or not confirmed in the light of objections**

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

The Arboricultural Officer presented the report and explained that the Group (G1) were growing along the northern edge of Downham Road, Stradsett (A1122), adjacent to the driveway to Paradise Manor. The 8 mature Oak trees provided a great visual amenity to the surrounding area and also provided excellent habitat for the local wildlife.

The report outlined:

- The reason for making the order;
- Provided an outline of objections and representations; and
- The response to objections and representations.

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

**RESOLVED:** That the order be confirmed without modification.

PC145: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

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

**The meeting closed at 2.30 pm**