

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

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 5th October, 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 Bower (Vice-Chair in the Chair)  
Councillors R Blunt, F Bone, C Bower, A Bubb, M Howland, C Hudson, C Joyce, J Kirk, B Lawton, C Manning, T Parish, S Patel, A Ryves, S Sandell, S Squire, M Storey and D Whitby (sub)

PC146: **APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIR**

**RESOLVED:** That Councillor S Sandell be appointed as Vice-Chair for the meeting.

PC147: **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from the Chair Councillor C Crofts, Councillors C Rose and Mrs V M Spikings.

The Chair thanked Councillors R Blunt and D Whitby for attending the meeting as a substitute.

PC148: **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the Committee and explained that the meeting was being broadcast live on You Tube.

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

PC149: **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2020 were agreed as a correct record.

PC150: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

PC151: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no urgent business to report.

PC152: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

Councillor J Moriarty attended and addressed the Committee in relation to 8/1(c) – Little Massingham.

PC153: **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

The Chair reported that there was no Chair's correspondence.

PC154: **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.

PC155: **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) – (v) below, where appropriate, to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chair.

(i) **20/00945/O**

**Boughton: Woodstock, Mill Hill Road: Outline application: site for construction of one dwelling: Mr & Mrs P Osler**

[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 outline planning permission with all matters reserved bar access, for the construction of a dwelling on land to the west of Woodstock, an existing detached bungalow on Mill Hill Road, Boughton.

The site currently comprised paddock land on the bend of Mill Hill Road as it turned northwards from the village. The site was bordered to the northeast by existing hedgerows and to the west and south by agricultural land. The existing bungalow was to the east of the site and

new dwellings, approved under planning reference 16/0753/O and 16/01891/RM were currently under construction to the north. Existing stables on site will be demolished as part of this proposal.

Boughton was classified as a Smaller Village and Hamlet in CS02 of the Core Strategy (2011) and the infill policy therefore applies in accordance with DM3 of the SADMP (2016). The site is also adjacent to Boughton Conservation Area.

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, as set out in the report.

The Principal Planner responded to the comments raised by the Parish Council. She explained that by the reason of existing frontage development to both the north and east of the site the proposal was considered to constitute infill development and complied with Policy DM3.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application and it was (13 votes for, 1 against and 2 abstentions):

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

**(ii) 20/00420/F**

**Clenchwarton: 94 Hall Road: Replacement dwelling: PCD Builder**

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that No.94 was a dilapidated bungalow contained within overgrown grounds situated on the western side of Hall Road, Clenchwarton. To the immediate south were two fairly recently built chalets with bungalows beyond, semi-detached houses opposite to the east, and land with planning permission for 10 houses to the immediate north on the junction with Wildfields Road. Full permission was sought for the construction of a replacement dwelling demolishing the existing single storey unit and building a chalet in its place with a double carport at the rear.

The site was located within the defined development area of the village as defined by Inset Map G25 of the SADMPP (2016) and was within Flood Zone 3a and Tidal Hazard Mapping Zone of the Council adopted Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2018).

The access driveway of the site was sought to serve an application (ref: 16/00300/F) for construction of two chalets on the area to the rear

of Nos. 82, 84 and 94 Hall Road. That proposal was refused and dismissed on appeal.

The application had been referred to the Committee as the views of the Parish Council were contrary to the officer recommendation and the Sifting Panel required the application to be determined by the Planning Committee.

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, as set out in the report.

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:

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

**(iii) 20/01083/F**

**Little Massingham: Land north of Electrical Sub Station and north west of Red Roofs, Station Road: Proposed access to enclosed field: Mr James Buckman**

[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 an enclosed field north of the electrical sub-station on the west side of Station Road. The site was approximately 334 m north of Church Lane and 520m to the south of Lower Lynn Road.

At present the site was an enclosed field in the countryside, with trees and hedges on the north, east, south and west boundary. On the north east corner of the site, there was one tree with a Tree Preservation Order on it.

The application sought retrospective planning permission, for a proposed access to the enclosed field, along the east of the site, 9.6m from the electrical sub-station.

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

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, as set out in the report.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, the Democratic Services Officer read out comments from Mr Nick Fulford (objecting) and Mr Robert Fox (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor J Moriarty addressed the Committee objecting to the application. He added that there had

been strong objections from the neighbours and officers appeared to have not engaged with the objections and not summarised them within the report. He suggested that additional conditions should be imposed if the application were to be approved: that there needed to be sight of the agreement; that the trees / woodland was replanted; that the container should be removed and that if a further application was submitted to build houses that any permission for this entrance was withdrawn.

The Principal Planner responded to the points raised by Councillor Moriarty.

Councillor Parish proposed that the application be refused, seconded by Councillor Lawton on the grounds that this was a gateway to something which was yet to be carried out, the gateway should be removed and then the applicant should reapply for a new gateway. The gateway could then be considered whether it was appropriate or not but proof was needed that the trees would be replanted.

Councillor Ryves proposed that the application be deferred as he was concerned about the process had not been carried out properly and that proper information should be made available. This was seconded by Councillor Bone.

With regards to the reasons for refusal put forward by Councillor Parish, the Assistant Director advised that these should relate to highway safety as the application did not meet the standards of visibility splay and impact and appearance on the countryside. This was accepted by Councillor Parish.

Councillor Joyce referred to highway issues and that it had been advised by County Highways that it would put a car around 8 inches into the carriageway. It had been advised that it was a busy road with buses using it. He considered that the applicant and tenant's rental restriction could be amended, which would negate the need for the entrance.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to refuse the application and, after having been put to the vote (15 for refusal, 2 abstentions), it was:

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

*1. The site is located along the west side of Station Road, a 40mph minor road, connecting Great Massingham to A148. The retrospective access fails to provide an acceptable level of visibility and therefore does not result in safe access to the road, to the detriment of highway safety. The retrospective proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of the NPPF (2018), policies CS08 and CS11 of the*

*Council's Core Strategy (2011) and policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2016).*

*2. The retrospective access fails to maintain the character and appearance of this countryside location particularly through the installation of metal rail gates along the eastern boundary of the site which, due to their width and appearance, are considered inappropriate to this rural location. The retrospective proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of the NPPF (2018), policies CS06 and CS08 of the Council's Core Strategy (2011) and policies DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2016).*

*The Committee then adjourned at 10.41 am and reconvened at 10.55 am*

**(iv) 20/00852/F**

**Northwold: Wellington Lodge Farm, Thetford Road: Change of use of land to outdoor wedding venue, to include siting of tipis, tents, shepherd's huts, mobile toilets and car parking: Plumridge, Moss and Moss**

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application sought full planning consent for the use of land at Wellington Lodge Farm from agriculture (in the form of pastureland) to an outdoor wedding venue to include the siting of tipis, tents shepherds' huts, mobile toilets and car parking.

The site was located in the countryside approximately 1.25 miles to the south west of the village of Northwold, and south of the A134.

The site had been utilised for a limited number of weddings to date.

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

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, as set out in the report.

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

Councillor Ryves, whilst supporting the application, proposed an additional condition regarding additional signage at the entrance of site requiring traffic to exit from the left. This was seconded by Councillor Storey and agreed by the Committee.

The Principal Planner explained that this would be appropriate condition but also informed the Committee that County Highways had

recently provided additional signage to highlight the approach to the relevant junctions and that the speed limit had been reduced to 50 mph.

Councillor Ryves asked if a letter could be sent to Norfolk County Council from the Planning Committee regarding highway issues in the area. The Principal Planner advised that a letter could be sent from the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee expressing concerns, which was agreed. The County Councillor could also feedback the Committee's concerns to County Highways.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application with the additional condition for a signage scheme to be provided and, after having been put to the vote it was unanimously:

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved as recommended, subject to the imposition of an additional condition relating to signage.

**(v) 20/00913/F**

**Walpole Cross Keys: Bimbos Ark, 13 Station Road:  
Retrospective application for detached garage and change of  
use of agricultural land to garden: Mr P Ward**

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application was for the retrospective construction of a detached garage and the change of use of land to garden to the rear of Bimbos Ark, an existing bungalow, on Station Road, Walpole Cross Keys.

The site was bordered to the north by existing residential dwellings and to the south, there was extant planning permission for the construction of two dwellings, the rear boundary to which extended to a similar point as the proposed change of use of land under this application. The application site was in Walpole Cross Keys Neighbourhood Plan area and the land in question was shown within the development guideline illustrated on Map 1 on Page 13 of the Neighbourhood Plan document.

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

The Committee noted the key issues for consideration when determining the application, as set out in the report.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application and, after having been put to the vote (11 votes for, 2 against and 3 abstentions), was carried.

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

PC156: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

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

The Committee received schedules relating to the above

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

**The meeting closed at 11.35 am**