

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 2nd November, 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 (Chair)

Councillors Miss L Bambridge, R Blunt, 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 and S Squire

PC157: APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIR

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

PC158: WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

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

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

PC159: APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Crofts and Councillor Storey.

The Chair thanked Councillors Blunt and Bambridge for being a substitute at the meeting.

PC160: MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 5 October 2020 were agreed as a correct record.

PC161: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Bone declared that in relation to item 8/2(l) – West Walton, he would not be taking part in the debate or decision as he was a friend of the applicant.

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

PC162: URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7

There was no urgent business to report.

PC163: MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34

The following Councillor attended for the items listed below:

C Hudson 8/2(b) *King's Lynn*
As a Member of the Planning Committee, Cllr Hudson confirmed that she would not take part in the debate and would not vote on the matter.

B Long 8/2 (c), 8/2(d) *Marshland St James*

R Blunt 8/2(j) *Walpole St Peter*
As a member of the Planning Committee, Councillor Blunt confirmed that he would not be taking part in the debate and would not vote on the matter.

PC164: CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE

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

PC165: 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.

PC166: INDEX OF APPLICATIONS

The Committee noted the Index of Applications.

PC167: 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 Chair.

(i) 20/00962/FM

Hunstanton: 19-21 Church Street: Amendments to planning permission 18/01142/FM to increase flat numbers from 16 to 18: Waterfield Dudley (Hunstanton 1) Ltd

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was located on the western side of Church Street, Hunstanton and comprised 0.185ha and contained workshops and stores including hardstanding. The site was occupied by Whitleys Stationers Press but was now disused.

The site was located within the town centre and Hunstanton's Conservation Area.

Members might recall that planning permission was approved last year for the demolition of the redundant printing works and for the construction of 16 no. flats on the site.

The current application also sought permission for the demolition of the building and redevelopment of the site for residential units. Essentially, this proposal sought changes to the previously approved scheme to provide 2 additional one bedroom flats, increasing the flat numbers from 16 to 18.

The proposed changes showed amendments to the previously approved floor plans, modest changes to some of the door and window arrangements and an additional sun room.

Parking was still proposed to be provided to the rear of the site, utilising the existing access arrangements to the side of the existing building. Cycle parking was contained within the main building.

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

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the Town Council response was at variance with the recommendation and it had been referred by the Planning Sifting Panel.

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

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application and it was (14 for, 4 against):

RESOLVED: (A) That the application be approved subject to conditions and the payment of the affordable housing financial contribution within two months of the date of the Committee meeting; and

(B) That the application be refused in the event that the affordable housing financial contribution is not paid within two months of the date of this Committee meeting.

(ii) 20/00779/F

Clenchwarton: Meadow View, Black Horse Road: Removal of condition 6 of planning permission 19/00989/F: Proposed dwelling and retention of part of existing bungalow as annexe – to remove occupancy restriction: Supreme Surfacing Ltd

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that Meadow View was a detached bungalow set in substantial mature landscaped grounds on the south-eastern side of Black Horse Road, Clenchwarton approximately 320m south-west of the defined village development area (defined by Inset Map G25 of the SADMPP 2016).

Previously planning permission had been granted for a farmhouse style replacement dwelling and retention/alteration of the bungalow to create a linked annexe. That permission (19/00989/F) was subject to a restrictive condition (Condition 6) tying the occupancy of the dwelling to a commercial use (Supreme Surfacing Ltd) adjoining the site to the immediate south and within the same ownership / control of the applicants.

Prior to that permission, approval was granted for a similar scaled dwelling of barn-like appearance, with the bungalow retained and used as offices and staff facilities associated with the business (ref: 16/01478/F). That also had a restrictive condition attached which was appealed and dismissed in April 2017.

This application sought to remove the occupancy restriction attached to the most recent approval (ie. Condition 6 attached to planning permission granted under application ref: 19/00989/F) and was accompanied by a Noise Assessment Report and a draft Unilateral Undertaking to restrict the hours of operation of the commercial yard and buildings on the adjoining site, which was currently unrestricted.

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

The application had been referred to the Planning Committee for determination at the instruction of the Planning Sifting Panel.

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

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to refuse the application and it was (10 votes for and 8 votes against):

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as recommended.

(iii) 20/00634/F

King's Lynn: Mars Food Ltd, Hansa Road, Hardwick Industrial Estate: The culverting of approximately 34 metres of a riparian watercourse using a 900 mm diameter pipe on the northern boundary of the site: Mars Foods Ltd

[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 situated on the south side of King's Avenue, King's Lynn and comprised a drainage ditch and part of the compound of an industrial building.

The application sought full planning permission to culvert a 34m stretch of ditch which ran along part of the northern boundary of land owned by Mars Food (UK) Limited. The proposed culverting was required because settlement of the north bank of the ditch was causing the neighbouring residential property immediately to the north (No. 48 King's Avenue) to experience settlement of its external hard and soft landscape.

The application site was within the development boundary of King's Lynn.

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

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

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

Councillor Hudson addressed the Committee under Standing Order 34 and expressed her concerns in relation to the application.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

(iv) 20/01231/O

Marshland St James: Land north of 36 School Road: Outline application with some matters reserved: Proposed residential development: C/o Agent

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application involved a 0.5ha parcel of paddock land on the north-eastern side of Scholl Road approximately 330m from the Hickathrift crossroad junction with Walton Road and Smeeth Road. It had a road frontage of some 69m and depth of 70-74m. Outline permission was sought for residential development with all matters reserved bar access. An indicative plan had been submitted showing the provision of 4 dwellings.

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

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

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

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

Councillor Long addressed the Committee in accordance with Standing Order 34. He outlined his support for the application.

Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed that the application should be approved on the grounds that the proposal would increase highway safety and the 40 mph speed limit had been extended, the site was within Flood Zone 1, and it had good access to the school. This was seconded by Councillor Patel.

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 was lost (5 votes for, 9 against and 3 abstentions).

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to refuse the application and, after having been put to the vote it was (10 votes for, 3 against and 2 abstentions):

RESOLVED: That the application be refused, as recommended.

The Committee adjourned at 11.19 am and reconvened at 11.35 am

(v) **20/01256/O**

**Marshland St James: Land NW of 47 School Road:
Outline application: residential development: Mr S
Riddick**

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application involved approximately 0.4ha parcel of agricultural land on the north-eastern side of School Road. The site wrapped around the former pub 'The Marshland Arms' from School Road and fronted onto Hope Lane. Outline permission was sought for residential development with all matters reserved bar access. An indicative plan had been submitted showing the provision of 4 dwellings.

The site was located outside the defined village development boundary and within Flood one 1 of the Council adopted Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

A similar application (19/01906/O) was considered at Planning Committee in June 2020 and was refused. The application sought to address the reasons for refusal.

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

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

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

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor B Long addressed the Committee in relation to the application. He outlined his support for the application and the benefits of the application.

Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed that the application be approved on the grounds that this site was an asset, it was a former drayfield and it would help to sustain the village. This was seconded by Councillor Patel.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application which was lost (3 votes for, 14 votes against and 1 abstention).

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to refuse the application, which was carried (14 votes, 3 against and 1 abstention):

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as recommended.

(vi) 20/00871/F

Thornham: Quavers, High Street: Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of three replacement dwellings: Postland Developments

[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 permission for the demolition of the existing dwelling and construction of 3 replacement dwellings on land at Quavers, High Street, Thornham.

The site was accessed from the southern side of High Street, but the main application site was set behind properties fronting the High Street. The site had residential development on all 4 sides and was within the settlement of Thornham.

To the east of the site was garden land associated with The Oak House on the High Street, to the north were a mix of properties backing onto the site and to the west was a pair of residential properties currently under construction.

To the south were properties accessed from Hall Lane to the west.

The site itself was currently side garden associated with the property known as Quavers which was one and a half storey detached dwelling.

The whole village was within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The access to the site and the High Street properties were within the Thornham Conservation Area, however, the main application site was outside.

Planning permission had previously been approved for redevelopment of the site for two dwellings.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination by the Planning Sifting Panel that the view of the Parish Council was at variance with 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, Mr P Hardy addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

It was proposed by Councillor Parish and seconded by Councillor Lawton an additional conditional should be imposed to remove permitted development rights to maintain the openness, and after having been put to the vote, was carried (13 votes for and 4 abstentions).

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application with the additional condition to remove permitted development rights and, after having been put to the vote, it was (15 votes for, 1 against and 1 abstention):

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

(vii) 20/01071/F

Titchwell: 1 Gorleston Cottages, Main Road: The construction of two new semi-detached cottages: Mrs Gemma Smith

[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 a parcel of former garden land measuring approximately 304 square metres to the western side of N.1 Gorleston Cottages and was situated on the southern side of Main Road, Titchwell.

The site was located within Titchwell's designated Conservation Area and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Full planning permission was sought for the construction of a pair of semi-detached two storey 3 bedroomed dwellings.

Titchwell was classed as a Smaller Village and Hamlet within the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy.

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, as set out in the report.

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

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 was lost (15 votes against, and 3 abstentions).

Councillor Spikings proposed that the application be refused, which was seconded by Councillor Sandell on the grounds that the proposal was over-intensification of the site, and would result in further vehicle movements using the access which could potentially lead to parking on the road.

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

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

1. *The proposed development for the construction of a pair of semi-detached dwellings would result in an over-intensification of the site, creating a cramped appearance within the street scene, which would in turn, cause harm to the character of the Conservation Area and inherent quality of the AONB. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CS08 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2011); Policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2016); and the provisions of the NPPF.*
2. *The proposed residential development would result in additional vehicular movements at the point of the new access onto the A149 and could lead to additional parking on the road, to the detriment of highway safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2016) and the provisions of the NPPF.*

The Committee adjourned at 12.52 pm and reconvened at 1.30 pm when a roll call was completed.

(viii) 20/01250/F

Walpole Cross Keys: Old Farm, Market Lane, Walpole St Andrew: Proposed new agricultural access: Mr Ben Human

[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 on the northern side of Market Lane, in the parish of Walpole Cross Keys, between the A17 and Walpole St Andrew. It was approximately 70m west of Samuels Farm Shop.

The application sought the creation of a new vehicular access with gates to gain access to the agricultural land to the north, behind the existing apple tree orchard. The land was bounded by a row of Popular trees and hedgerow to the south adjoining a wide grassed

verge to Market Lane. The existing shared access with the neighbour would be retained.

Members might be aware that this land had been the subject of a previous Committee, enforcement and planning appeals which had been dismissed.

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 request of the Planning Sifting Panel.

The Committee noted the key issues to be considered when determining the application, as set out in the report.

Councillor Parish asked for it to be recorded that he shared the Parish Council's concerns.

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, was lost (7 votes for and 10 against).

Councillor Mrs Bower proposed that the application be refused, seconded by Councillor Squire on the grounds of the loss of trees which would impact on the street-scene and the creation of an additional access on a road that had been deemed dangerous by County Highways, as a lower speed limit had been imposed.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to refuse the application which was (12 votes for, 2 against and 3 abstentions):

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

1. *The site is located along the north side of Market Lane, a 60mph minor road, connecting Walpole St Andrew to the A17. There are currently four accesses along the north side of Market Lane within a 50m radius of the proposed access. The proposed access would result in the intensification of the number of access points in this locality to the detriment of highway safety, particularly as the existing shared access will be retained. The 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 proposed access results in the loss of two mature trees along the north of Market Lane which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the locality. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of the NPPF (2018), policies*

CS06 and CS08 of the Council's Core Strategy (2011) and policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2016).

(ix) 20/01164/F

Walpole: Cedar View, Walnut Road, Walpole St Peter: Retention of detached machine store (with storage above) and retention of external bar with an associated change of use to residential garden: Mr Darren Boyle

[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 retrospective planning permission for the erection of a machine store (with storage above) to serve the land to rear of the application site, which was also in the ownership of the applicant (blue land). This application was to regularise a building which had planning permission granted in 2019 but had been built in the wrong position. The application was also for the change of use of part of the application site to garden land, upon which was sited an external bar for use by the occupants of Cedar View, the dwelling to the front of the application site and also within blue land.

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 request of the Planning Sifting Panel.

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, Mr Russell Swann (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Bubb asked if a condition could be imposed restricting the use of the bar up from a certain time to protect neighbouring properties. The Assistant Director advised that it was an incidental use not a commercial use.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application and, having been put to the vote was lost (15 votes against, 2 abstentions).

It was then proposed to refuse the application by Councillor Bubb, seconded by Councillor Parish on the grounds that the barn had been sited closer to the neighbouring property and loss of countryside. The bar encroached outside the development boundary.

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, was carried (16 votes for, 1 abstention) and it was:

RESOLVED: That the application be refused, contrary to recommendation, on the following grounds:

- 1 *Section 12 of the NPPF states that decisions should ensure that development has a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. This is reiterated within Policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016 which states that development must protect and enhance the amenity of the wider environment and proposals will be assessed against their impact on neighbouring uses and their occupants. The proposed machine store due to its height and proximity to the neighbouring boundary, would result in an overbearing and unneighbourly impact on the occupants of the dwelling known as Cranny Hill and as such is contrary to Section 12 of the NPPF, Policy CS08 of the Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016.*
2. *Paragraph 170 of the NPPF recognises the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and this is reiterated within Policy CS06 of the Core Strategy 2011 where the strategy is to protect the countryside and development of greenfield land will be resisted unless essential for agricultural or forestry needs. The application site is outside the development boundary of Walpole St Peter and the proposed change of use of the agricultural land to garden land along with the provision of an external bar for residential purposes which stands upon it, is considered encroachment upon the countryside. This encroachment is contrary to Para 170 of the NPPF, Policy CS06 of the Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM2 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016.*

(x) **20/01240/F**

Walpole: Land adj. Eastleigh, Chalk Road, Walpole St Peter: Proposed detached dwelling: Mr Henry Amps

[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 erection of a detached two-storey 4 bedrooomed dwelling. The site was located to the south of the property known as Eastleigh, on the east side of Mill Road on the southern edge of Walpole St Peter. The site was located outside the Walpole St Peter development boundary, so it was deemed as being in the countryside. The site was also located in Flood Zones 2 and 3a.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the views of the Parish Council were contrary to the officer recommendation and also at the request of Councillor R Blunt.

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, Mr H Amps (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

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

It was proposed by Councillor Joyce, seconded by Councillor Bone that the application be approved on the grounds that the site was next to the development boundary and represented sustainable development.

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, was carried (15 votes for, 1 against) and it was:

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

The site is next to the development boundary and represents sustainable development in accordance with Paragraph 78 of the NPPF.

(xi) **20/01122/F**

Walsoken: Land south of Bartonview and north of Numbers 17 S-Bend, Lynn Road: Mr Ian A.N & Owen R Green

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the development was for the erection of a two storey 4 bedroomed detached dwelling. The site was located to the south of the property known as Bartonview and to the north of a commercial yard occupied by FNR Machinery Ltd. The site was on the south east side of Lynn Road, on the original S-bend section. The site was located outside any development boundary, so it was deemed as being in the countryside.

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

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr I Bix addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

It was proposed by Councillor Kirk and seconded by Councillor Mrs Spikings that the application be approved on the grounds that the development was infill, it was a built-up area, would not experience significant noise and was not detrimental to the adjacent business.

Councillor Parish proposed that the application should be deferred until CSNN had the opportunity to carry out a noise survey. This was seconded by Councillor Ryves.

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 was carried (10 votes for, 5 against and 1 abstention), and it was:

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, contrary to recommendation and subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions to be agreed following consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair, on the following grounds:

The development was infill, it was a built-up area, would not experience significant noise and was not detrimental to the adjacent business.

(xii) 20/01112/O

West Walton: 5 Trafford Estate: Outline application with all matters reserved: Proposed plot: Mr Crockford

[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 outline planning permission with all matters reserved for one dwelling within a plot of land currently used as garden land to No.5 Trafford Estate. The application site was currently within the development boundary where the principle of residential development was acceptable.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the views of the Parish Council were at variance with the officer recommendation and at the request of 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 then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application, and it was (14 votes for and 1 abstention):

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, as recommended.

PC168: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received Schedules relating to the above.

RESOLVED: That the reports be noted.

The meeting closed at 3.20 pm