

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

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 13th September, 2021 at 9.30 am in the Assembly Room, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Mrs V Spikings (Chair)  
Councillors F Bone, A Bubb, G Hipperson, A Holmes (sub), C Hudson, B Lawton, E Nockolds, C Rose, J Rust, A Ryves (sub), C Sampson (sub), S Sandell (sub), M Storey, D Tyler and D Whitby

PC44: **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs Bower, Joyce, Manning (Cllr Sandell sub), Parish (Cllr Holmes sub), Patel (Cllr Sampson sub) and Squire (Cllr Ryves sub).

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings thanked the subs for attending the meeting.

PC45: **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings welcomed everyone to the meeting. She advised that the meeting was being recorded and streamed live on You Tube.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call to confirm attendees.

PC46: **MINUTES**

The minutes of the Special Meeting held on 13 August 2021 (previously circulated) and the meeting held on 16 August 2021 (previously circulated) were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings.

PC47: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Holmes declared an interest in relation to item 8/1(a) and left the meeting. He addressed the Committee in accordance with Standing Order 34 and took no part in the debate or decision.

Councillor Storey declared an interest in relation to item 8/1(b) and left the meeting and took no part in the debate or decision.

PC48: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

The Assistant Director advised that item 8/1(e) – Stow Bardolph had been withdrawn from the agenda.

In relation to item 8/1(c) – Holme next the Sea, the Assistant Director drew the Committee's attention to the late correspondence where it was recommended that the application be deferred, which was agreed by the Committee.

PC49: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Councillor attended under Standing Order 34:

Councillor A Holmes          8/1(a) Hilgay

In relation to 8/1(e) – Terrington St Clement, as Councillor Squire was unable to attend the meeting due to illness, her comments were read out to the Committee.

PC50: **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings advised that any correspondence received had been read and passed to the relevant officer.

PC51: **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.

PC52: **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 scheduled are published with the agenda). Any changes to the schedules are recorded in the minutes.

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

- (i) 21/01060F**  
**Hilgay: 25 Foresters Avenue: Demolition of existing dwelling and replacement for four new detached dwellings: Mrs S Dennis**

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

Councillor Holmes left the room and addressed the Committee under Standing Order 34.

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application was for the construction of 4 new dwellings, replacing an existing bungalow on land in the south west corner of Foresters Avenue, Hilgay.

Hilgay was categorised as a Rural Village in CS02 of Core Strategy (2011) and therefore benefitted from a development boundary to guide development to the most suitable locations. The application site was wholly within the development boundary shown on the inset map G.48 of the SADMPP (2016).

The application site comprised 0.4ha of open land, partially residential curtilage, associated with No.25 Foresters Avenue.

The application had been referred to the Committee at the request of Councillor Holmes.

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

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Holmes addressed the Committee and expressed concerns in relation to the application.

The Principal Planner advised that there was no objection to the application from the Local Highway Authority. In relation to private drives and bins, people would bring their bins to the end of the drive. The proposal was within the development boundary and was an effective use of land.

Councillor Ryves expressed concern in relation to the absence of a turning area on the site and added that there had been a big increase in the number of home deliveries.

Councillor Storey concurred with the previous comments, and added that parking was always an issue with visitors and the Local Highways Authority should factor this in. He suggested that the numbers of planning permissions for each village granted should be added into future reports.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings added that the density was 10 dwellings per hectare which was low, and the proposal was for 3 new houses as one was a replacement dwelling. She further added that every village had a mixture of houses with different bedroom numbers. She did understand the Parish Council comments and the issue of parking on the road, but she did agree with the recommendation.

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 carried (13 votes for, 1 against and 1 abstention).

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

- (ii) **21/00434/F**  
**Hockwold cum Wilton: Twelve Acre Farm, Moor Drove (East): Retrospective change of use of land for the siting of 8 storage containers: Mr Brian Ruterford**

*Councillor Storey left the meeting during consideration of the item.*

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application, was part retrospective as four of the proposed eight storage containers were on site. The application site was located around 500m from the development boundary of Hockwold cum Wilton, and was accessed from Moor Drive (East), which was located to the west of the site and to the south was Moor Drive. The surrounding area was characterised by equestrian and agricultural uses.

Hockwold Parish Council had objected to the proposal on the grounds that the proposal was out of character, the design and the appearance, highway safety, and also question permitted development. However, the scheme had been found to be consistent with relevant planning policies. Consequently, the proposal was recommended for approval.

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

Councillor Bubb noted that the containers were to be painted green but asked if they could be on a level base.

The Principal Planner advised that the containers should be in the layout shown on the approved plan and highlighted this to the Committee. Councillor Bubb added that it was not the height in question but the fact that they were not level.

In response to a further comment about the alignment of the containers, the Assistant Director asked the Committee to consider whether they would refuse the application without that condition, which was the test that had to be applied.

Councillor Holmes compared this application to one that was considered previously by the Committee which had been refused. He referred to consistency. The Assistant Director advised that whilst he understood the sentiment, the application that Councillor Holmes was referring to was for 30 plus storage containers where this application was for 8, so there was a difference in scale. There was also an issue with regard to heritage assets in relation to the other application.

Councillor Hipperson asked whether a condition could be imposed requiring all the bases to be horizontal and the tops to be level.

The Assistant Director advised that all conditions had to be fair and reasonable.

Councillor Sampson referred to the photograph of the existing containers and stated that to him it looked as if the ground was sloping and with the flash floods that were experienced these days a concrete base for all of them would stop the containers from flooding and would allow for the containers to be well sighted and in line and look neat and tidy. He formally proposed this as a condition which was seconded by Councillor Bubb.

The Assistant Director advised that he did not think that a condition of that nature was necessary but ultimately it was up to the Committee to decide.

The Committee then voted on the proposed additional condition and, after having been put to the vote was carried (7 votes for, 3 against and 5 abstentions).

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

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved, subject to the imposition of the additional condition requiring a level concrete base for the containers.

*Councillor Storey re-joined the meeting.*

**(iii) 21/00457/F**

**Holme next the Sea: Westfield, 27 Peddars Way: Demolition of existing bungalow, construction of detached two-storey dwelling with garage and garden room: Mr & Mrs Thorogood**

**RESOLVED:** That the application be deferred.

- (iv) **20/02015/RM**  
**Pentney: Reserved matters application for the construction of 3 dwelling houses following demolition of existing dwelling: AMR Electrical Services Ltd**

[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 reserved matters to the outline planning application 18/00828/O, which granted consent to construct three detached dwellings following demolition of the existing bungalow on site. The outline application was approved at Planning Committee on 30 July 2018. The proposal was immediately adjacent to St Mary Magdalene Church and associated graveyard which was a Grade I Listed Building and therefore the impact of the proposal on the setting of the Listed Church must be considered.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was at variance with the Parish Council who objected to the proposal and was also referred 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 Chairman drew the Committee's attention to the need to amend condition 9, as detailed in the late correspondence, which was agreed.

The Democratic Services Officer then conducted a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application subject to the amended condition 9, and, after having been put to the vote, was agreed unanimously.

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

- (v) **21/00833/F**  
**Stow Bardolph: Hybrid Farm, 246 The Drove, Barroway Drove: Demolition of existing buildings and construction of dwelling and cattery and pet hotel business: Client of Holt Architectural Ltd**

The Committee noted that this application had been withdrawn from the agenda.

- (vi) **20/01559/RM**  
**Terrington St Clement: Adjacent 40 Marshland Street: Reserved matters application for three dwellings: Warnes & Edwards**

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site comprised a former retail nursery (PJ Brown Nurseries) on 0.23 ha of land to the rear of the south-eastern frontage of Marshland Street and western side of Churchgate Way within the heart of Terrington St Clement (designated a Key Rural Service Centre). It was located within the development area of the village and mostly adjoined the Conservation Area along Marshland Street, with only the existing point of access falling within it. The site was therefore mainly enclosed by residential properties.

This application sought reserved matters approval for three dwellings following outline planning permission being granted under ref: 19/01788/O.

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 consideration at the request of Councillor Squire.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Dr Carol Parker (objecting) and Gareth Edwards (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, the Democratic Services Officer read out a letter from Councillor Squire, who could not be present at the meeting.

During the debate, several Members of the Committee expressed concern that the proposed outbuilding was too close to the boundary with No.48 Marshland Street.

Councillor Rust proposed that the application should be refused on the grounds that the proposed outbuilding resulted in a loss of amenity for No.48 Marshland Street. This was seconded by Councillor Bubb and, after having been put to vote, was carried (11 votes for refusal, 1 against and 4 abstentions).

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

*That the proposed garage/summer house, by virtue of its height and siting in close proximity to the neighbouring property at number 48 Marshland St, would create an acceptable loss of amenity to that property, contrary to DM15 of the SADMPP, and the relevant provisions of the NPPF.*

PC53: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

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

**The meeting closed at 10.40 am**