

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

Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 2nd October, 2023 at 9.30 am in the Assembly Room, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ

PRESENT: Councillor F Bone (Chair)
Councillors B Anota, R Blunt, F Bone, M de Whalley, P Devulapalli, S Everett, S Lintern, B Long, S Ring, C Rose, A Ryves, Mrs V Spikings, M Storey and D Tyler

PC46: **WELCOME**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. He advised that the meeting was being recorded and streamed live to You Tube.

He invited the Democratic Services Officer to conduct a roll call to determine attendees.

PC47: **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Bubb and De Winton.

PC48: **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 September 2023 (previously circulated) were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

PC49: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following declarations of interest were declared:

In relation to 9/1(a), Councillor de Whalley explained that he was the Chair of Congham Parish Council but had not taken part in any consideration of the application.

Councillor Long declared in relation to 9/1(a) that he was Chair of the Norfolk Rail Group.

PC50: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was none.

PC51: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Councillors attended under Standing Order 34:

Cllr Dickinson	9/1(c) Hunstanton
Cllr Morley	9/1(g) South Creake – comments to be read out.
Cllr Lintern	9/1(h) Wereham

PC52: **CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC53: **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.

PC54: **GLOSSARY OF TERMS**

The Committee noted the Glossary of Terms.

PC55: **INDEX OF APPLICATIONS**

The Committee noted the Index of Applications.

a **Decisions on Applications**

- (i) **23/00894/F**
Congham: Congham Bridge Midland & Great Northern Joint Railway Dismantled, St Andrew Lane: Retrospective structural infilling of former railway bridge using engineering fill and foam concrete with embankments formed on either side: Historical Railways Estate

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

The case officer presented the application and explained that the application site related to Congham Bridge which was a historic railway bridge structure built circa 1926 carrying St Andrews Lane over the former railway line. The setting of the bridge was rural in nature with open fields to the south of St Andrews Lane, Congham. To the north, a restricted byway extended northeast following the line of the former track. The restricted byway was mostly tree lined with fields and small pockets of trees beyond.

The works that the application sought consent for related to the infilling of the underside of the bridge structure described in supporting documentation as structural infill using engineering fill and foam concrete with embankments formed on either side.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination because it had been called in by Councillor de Whalley and also referred by the Assistant Director.

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, Graeme Bikerdike (objecting), Ophelia Donovan (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) and Fiona Smith (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Mrs Spikings stated that this was a shining example of architecture by William Marriott in 1926 and there was no reason to obliterate the past with this cheap infilling destroying everything that was good there. The trees had also been removed and the animals gone which left an appalling visual outlook with no thought to the past. She supported that the application be refused and proposed that an additional condition be imposed requiring enforcement action be carried out to rectify the situation.

The proposal for enforcement action was seconded by Councillor Long.

Councillor Storey agreed with the comments made by Councillor Spikings on the landscape issue and asked if there was any way of knowing where all the objections came from, were they all local or were there some regional ones.

The case officer explained the process for dealing with objection letters and that there had been a mixture of local and regional objections.

Councillor Storey added that he supported the amended recommendation for enforcement action and was concerned that this was a retrospective application. He considered that the bridge looked a lot better in the past than it did at present.

The Conservation Officer explained that the bridge had been assessed in terms of its historic and evidential significance. Its historic significance had been discussed by the Committee. It was designed to the Marriotts system although William Marriott was dead by the time the bridge was built. It had evidential significance because the bridge was still there and could still tell us something about the Marriott's system and how it was used in Norfolk. She added that the Historic Railways Estate had said that there were other examples of these sort

of bridges in Norfolk which there were, but in West Norfolk we were quite limited in our remaining railway heritage.

Councillor de Whalley explained that Congham Parish Council had not been consulted in the original permitted development process. HRE had apologised for the lack of consultation and assured that the procedures would change, so they had identified that Congham Parish Council should have been consulted in the process. This furthered the loss of confidence and he explained that he had walked past the bridge for much of his life and enjoyed the views from it. He was aware of the fly-tipping, but this was an unsympathetic low-cost solution. The long-term impact of the infilling needed more details. He did not have confidence that the process would properly conserve the bridge, which was clearly an important non-designated heritage asset to this area.

Councillor Ring added everyone found retrospective applications a challenge. He added that there was an application under permitted development rights. He added that the Committee needed to be mindful of where the objections came from because social media meant that anyone could object to anything. He considered that the only reason that the bridge had been filled in was down to costs. The cost was not an excuse for filling-in the bridge. Fly tipping had also been mentioned but this was not a valid reason for the works.

Councillor Long explained that the railway heritage was being depleted in the country. He added that the way this had been carried out was a travesty and an alternative solution was needed, all the debris needed to be removed and if it was found that the bridge was not suitable for heavy vehicles then money needed to be spent on it to make it right.

Councillor Ryves referred to the process and it was important to know where comments came from. He considered that something had been learnt by the applicants in relation to consultation. The bridge was a significant non-designated heritage asset to the area. He would like questions to be asked of the applicants in relation to costs, as he felt that the organisation had not been scrutinised very well and the public should be aware of.

The Assistant Director advised that this was a national issue, and he was sure that some of the Groups involved would be asking questions of HRE.

In response to a comment from Councillor Storey regarding what type of traffic used the bridge, the case officer advised that it was low traffic and mostly agricultural vehicles but there was not an exact assessment.

In response to a question from Councillor Devulapalli, the Assistant Director explained that the works had been carried out under emergency powers, but the procedure also said that the land had to be

returned back to its original condition after a specified period, but this had not been done.

Councillor Ryves said it was surprising that there had not been a traffic survey carried out by the applicants.

The Assistant Director clarified that the Committee could refuse the application as recommended and to authorise formal enforcement action. The enforcement notice would have to include a reasonable timeframe for the works to be carried out.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to refuse the application with enforcement action to return the land and bridge to its previous state and, after having been put to the vote, was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as recommended together with the authorisation of formal enforcement action to return the land and bridge to its previous state.

- (ii) **23/00493/F**
Downham Market: Unit 6-8 Fairfield Road: Demolition of existing buildings and replacement with 8 no. dwellings: Tower Street KL Ltd

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

The case officer presented the report and explained that the application site was an area of 0.18 ha of land, located to the west of the town of Downham Market. Access to the site was via Fairfield Road which was a private unadopted road and a Public Right of Way. The site was situated between the railway tracks to the east and the River Great Ouse to the west with Fairfield Road consisting of a mixture of residential development and employment uses. The site was previously in employment use but was currently vacant.

This application sought full permission for the construction of eight residential units comprising of two blocks of 4 no. two-storey dwellinghouses with designated parking spaces and private amenity spaces.

The site was located within the development area of the town, Flood Zone 1 of the adopted Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Environment Agency's Tidal Hazard Mapping Zone.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the views of the Town Council and Norfolk County Council Public Rights of Way Officer were contrary to the officer recommendation, and at the discretion of the Planning Sifting Panel.

The case officer recommended that condition 12 be modified to read 'Prior to groundworks'.

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, Helen Morris (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

During the debate, several Members of the Committee expressed concern in relation to the state of the un-adopted road and asked if improvements could be imposed.

It was explained that the site was a brownfield site within town. Flood risk mitigation measures had been put forward by the applicant. It would be unfair and unreasonable to expect the applicant to remedy the un-adopted road, as all manner of traffic used the road.

The Chair proposed that Condition 12 be amended to read 'prior to the groundworks' and was seconded by Councillor Mrs Spikings and agreed by the Committee.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application subject to condition 12 being amended to read 'Prior to the groundworks' and, after having been put to the vote, was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended subject to condition 12 being amended to read 'Prior to the groundworks'.

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

- (iii) **23/00348/F**
Hunstanton: 15 Lincoln Street: New residential dwelling on land east of 15 Lincoln Street: S Curtis

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application proposed the subdivision of the existing plot to the east of the main dwelling (Tower House) and the construction of a new dwelling. The application had been amended over time to seek to address concerns regarding the impact on the neighbour amenity to the north as well as the design and materials of the dwelling. The development consisted of a 1.5 storey dwelling, associated parking area and access onto Lincoln Road. The site was located within the Conservation Area.

The application had been referred to the Committee as it had been called in by former Councillor Bower and the officer recommendation was contrary to the views of the Town Council.

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, Jason Law (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Mrs Dickinson (Ward Member) addressed the Committee via Zoom and outlined her concerns to the application.

Councillor Long asked for the street-view to be shown and this was displayed on the screen to look at the other properties in that location.

Councillor Ryves proposed that the Committee carry out a site visit as he was concerned in relation to overshadowing. He then withdrew his proposal to allow the debate to continue.

Further in the debate, the Chair added that he felt that a site visit would be beneficial, and this was seconded by Councillor de Whalley and, after having been put to the vote was carried on the Chair's casting vote.

RESOLVED: That the application be adjourned, the site visited, and the application determined at the reconvened meeting of the Committee.

(iv) **23/0110/F**
Little Massingham: Little Massingham Manor, Station Road: Retrospective erection of an agricultural barn: Mr Topham

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

In presenting the report the case officer explained that the application site related to Little Massingham Manor situated on the western side of Station Road, Little Massingham.

The application sought retrospective consent for the construction of an agricultural barn within the extensive grounds of the site.

Little Massingham was classified as a Smaller Village and Hamlet within the settlement hierarchy of the Development Plan.

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

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Jon Heley (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) and Jason Law (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to comments raised, condition 2 sought to limit the use for the wider maintenance of the site. The case officer advised that this application was purely for the maintenance building. There were other applications relating to the site, but these would be dealt with separately and on their own merits.

Councillor Ring pointed out that this was a retrospective application, and this application was very well conditioned. It was a large site, and he could not see any issue with this application.

Councillor Long added that the structure would protect the vehicles from being seen and would have a positive impact on Crime and Disorder. The structure could also house CCTV cameras which would help to protect the vehicles.

Councillor Lintern added that she did not like retrospective applications but welcomed the conditions and would like to see them adhered to.

Councillor Storey considered the structure to be the right size, materials and well-designed.

Councillor Mrs Spikings added that she had no problem with the building itself but did have concerns in relation to the siting of it and the impact on the tree roots.

The Planning Control Manager added that it was a retrospective application, and the building was in place. There had been no comments from the Arboricultural Officer and there was no base to the barn and it looked that the barn had been located outside the roof protection area of the trees.

Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed that the application be deferred until comments had been received from the Arboricultural Officer and there was not enough information to make a decision. This was seconded by Councillor Lintern.

The Planning Control Manager referred the Committee to page 75 of the agenda in relation to proximity of the building to trees.

The Committee then voted on the proposal for a deferral and after a show of hands was lost 6 votes for deferral and 8 against.

In response to a comment from Councillor Devulapalli, the case officer explained that the purpose of the building was to provide shelter for the machinery.

The Planning Control Manager advised that there were large gates at the front of the site, which would be locked. The barn was more for shelter and protection of the machinery.

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 (10 votes for, 2 against and 2 abstentions).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

- (v) **23/00914/F**
Methwold: Essanjay, 14 The Avenue, Brookville:
Replacement of existing bungalow with chalet dwelling and
detached garage / annexe: Made Purple Ltd

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application sought full planning permission for a new dwelling and garage and first floor annexe at The Avenue in Brookville. The site previously contained a bungalow, which at the time of the visit had been demolished.

The application site was located between No.12 and 16 The Avenue, approximately 116m to the east of The Avenue and Main Road junction. Brookville was classified as a Smaller Village and Hamlet under the Settlement Hierarchy of Policy CS02 of the Core Strategy (2011). Smaller Villages and Hamlets did not have development boundaries and therefore from a planning policy perspective the site was located within the countryside.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was contrary to the views of the Parish Council 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 then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application and, after having been put to the vote, was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

- (vi) **23/00056/F**
Shouldham: Land east of 52 to 60 Westgate Street:
Proposed development of five houses on allocated site
G81.1: J Cribb

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the allocated site (0.3ha in size) was situated in the centre of the village of Shouldham. The site was bounded to the east by trees and to the south by hedgerows and had a public right of way cutting across the site. The site was neighboured by existing residential development to the north and east.

The application site was allocated in the adopted Local Plan for five residential units under Policy G81.1 and shown on inset map G81 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2016).

The application sought planning consent for five detached two storey four-bedroom dwellings, each with two parking spaces plus a garage and a private rear garden. Access was via a single private road off New Road and included the integration of an existing public footpath (Public Right of Way known as Shouldham FP9 and FP11) running east to west across the site.

The application had been referred to the Committee as it had been called-in by former Councillor Hipperson.

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 A Austin (objecting), Mr A Hobbs (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) and Jordan Cribb (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to a comment, the case officer explained that in relation to the footpath there had been no objection from the Public Rights of Way Officer. Officers were aware that the Parish Council had held discussions with the applicant to try to increase the site area, but the scheme was in accordance with the Local Plan and the Allocation Site had been drawn up and the boundaries were clear, and the applicant had developed a scheme within those boundaries. There was no requirement for affordable housing or open space. In terms of density, it was 16.6 dwellings per hectare and was not an unreasonable dense development.

Councillor Ring stated that the Parish Council's objection related more to the Local Plan decision rather than the development. He asked if the Local Plan did change and allowed for more development in the

field, would open space and affordable housing provision be required to be provided.

The case officer explained that it depended on the size and number of units. She understood that the Parish Council wanted a larger site area but not necessarily a larger number of units. In terms of the Local Plan review, this had been paused and it was likely that some of the village allocations would be removed from the Plan rather than allocations reviewed.

In response to a further comment from Councillor Ring, the case officer explained that there was an adopted policy in relation to phased development within the Local Plan to prevent people coming forward with smaller blocks so if the landowner wanted to come forward with more development which might include affordable housing and open space they did have the ability to that and it would be judged in accordance with the Local Plan.

Councillor Devulapalli stated that she lived in Shouldham and was a Member of the Parish Council but did not take part in any discussions in relation to the application.

She explained that she had studied the application in detail and listened to the presentations today with interest. She added that it was sad as the landowner lived in the village and everyone wanted to get along and have a good neighbourly relationship. She explained that the main problem was that this was a once in a generation opportunity to put houses at the heart of the village. This field was known as 'Rhubarb field and was well loved by local people. The right of way across the field was well used by children going to the primary school and other people. The general feeling by the Parish Council and residents was that this would not be in character and out of keeping with the neighbouring properties and village. Shouldham was a pretty village and part of its character was the open space. The village would be much better served by having smaller houses, more spread out on the whole field so that the total number remained at five and used the entire space and the right of way preserved properly. Shouldham had gone over and above the number of houses to be built in the village, as required by the Local Plan.

She proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that the application would be out of keeping, and will would not preserve the right of way.

The case officer clarified that the houses would be 4-bedroom. In terms of the public right of way, the public Right of Way Officer did not object. Also, there was the responsibility to have the best use of land which was why the boundary was not round the whole field and the rest of the field remained undeveloped. In terms of the street scene the case officer explained that there was a mixture of housing along New Road, and it was quite a way from the Conservation Area.

Councillor de Whalley added that the Planning Committee had to determine what was in front of them and the application accords with the Local Plan. If it went to appeal, there was no doubt that it would be upheld by the Planning Inspectorate.

Councillor Long added that having heard what was said by the speakers and Cllr Devulapalli in a village he could see where the Parish Council were coming from in the comments that they made. This would create a little estate, but the allocation was for that piece of land which was big enough for 5. He added that the whole field needed to be allocated or a scheme should be put forward which covered the whole field. He did not think it was the best design or utilisation of the land and a better scheme could come forward.

The case officer advised that County Highways would have considered if the road was suitable for waste collection and there was a bin collection point identified on the plans.

Councillor Lintern echoed Councillor Long's comments and added that she found it very sad that there were no requirements for green space and the opportunity had not been taken to add them, and to be more sympathetic to the surrounding area of the village. She asked if the application could be deferred or a condition added to ask them to rethink the design.

The case officer explained that in terms of open and play space the village was quite well served with play space to the north. Conditions were required for a landscaping scheme to be approved so that the planting could be at a sufficient standard and would be retained for at least 5 years. There was also a condition ensuring that the existing trees and hedgerows to be retained would be protected.

Councillor Mrs Spikings added that she had listened carefully to what had been said but this was an allocated site and there were 5 dwellings proposed. There was a density of 16 in the village. She added that she had not heard any planning reasons put forward for refusal of the application. She had great sympathy with the Parish but in 2016 the Local Plan had gone out to consultation, so the Parish had the opportunity to comment then. She added that she would have liked to have seen affordable going in for the residents but it was not a requirement but there was not a planning reason to refuse it and if it went to appeal the Council could be liable for costs.

The Assistant Director advised that it was an allocated site and the affordable housing requirements had changed nationally. It was clear that this application was in accordance with policy.

Councillor Storey stated that he hoped that the landowner and agent would work closely with the Parish Council.

Councillor Ryves added that as a Committee it could consider the design and there was an absence of a turning circle. He also had concerns that the opinion of the refuse team had not been sought.

The case officer explained that the Refuse Officer would not comment on an application for 5 dwellings, but it was something that County Highways would consider. In terms of a turning circle County Highways had considered the scheme and found it acceptable.

Councillor Devulapalli stated that the Parish Council understood that it was an allocated site. She added that the proposal was not in-keeping with the village. She also had concerns in relation to access to the road and highway safety as it cut across the right of way and impacted on safety and use and enjoyment of the right of way. She suggested that this application be refused to allow the owner and agent to discuss a scheme with the Parish Council which was more in-keeping.

The Assistant Director explained that a refusal would have to be defended at appeal. In his view it was heavily weighted for approval of the application.

The case officer advised that the applicant could still go away and discuss an alternative scheme and if a larger site area was used it would be development in the countryside.

Reference was made to condition 13 and it was suggested adding boundary treatments in that condition, which was agreed by the Committee.

Councillor Ryves proposed refusal on inadequate design. The Assistant Director advised that detailed policy reasons would need to be included and he referred to the costs circular.

Councillor Long stated that he believed that Shouldham was not covered by an Internal Drainage Board but there had been no objection from Anglian Water and referred to their comments.

The case officer advised that both Anglian Water and CSNN were both satisfied with the drainage solution. The applicant had not included that as part of the application, so it had been conditioned.

Councillor Long proposed a condition that the run-off rate was no different to that which currently existed on the land so that flood risk was not increased in the locality.

The case officer advised that condition 11 could be amended to include run-off rates. This was seconded by Councillor Lintern and agreed by the Committee.

In response to a comment from Councillor Ryves, the case officer advised that residents could ask for assistance in taking their bin to a collection point if required.

In relation to the reason for refusal from Councillor Ryves, he explained that it was poor design as there was no turning circle therefore vehicles would have to reverse down the road. This was seconded by Councillor Devulapalli.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to refuse the application put forward by Councillor Ryves and, after having been put to the vote, was lost (3 votes for refusal, 11 votes against).

The Chair then referred to the proposal for refusal made by Councillor Devulapalli on the grounds of form and character and out of keeping. This had been seconded by Councillor Lintern.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call on the proposal to refuse, and after having been put to the vote was lost 3 votes for and 11 votes against.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application, together with the amended conditions and, after having been put to the vote was carried (1 votes for and 3 against).

RESOLVED: (A) That the application be approved subject to conditions including amended conditions 11 and 13, and the satisfactory completion of a Section 106/UU Agreement to secure the GIRAMS payment within 4 months of the date of the Committee resolution.

(B) That the application be refused in the event that the Section 106/UU Agreement is not completed within 4 months of the date of the Committee resolution due to the failure to secure the GIRAMS payment.

The Committee then adjourned at 12.34 pm and reconvened at 12.50pm

Councillor Blunt left the meeting.

(vii) **23/00884/F**
South Creake: The Old Chequers, 37 Front Street:
Retrospective change of existing cart shed to games room:
Mr Ben van Rooyen

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application was for a retrospective change of existing cart shed to a games room to the north-west of the site behind the frontage of the main dwelling. This dwelling was situated within the Conservation Area and was a non-designated heritage asset.

The site was located to the middle part of the village on Front Street. South Creake was a Smaller Village and Hamlet, as defined by Policy CS02 of the Core Strategy 2011.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as it had been called in by Councillor Morley.

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

The Democratic Services Officer read out a statement from Councillor Morley (Ward Member) who could not be present at the meeting.

During the debate, several Members expressed concern in relation to the materials which they felt were not in-keeping with the Conservation Area and parking area.

Councillor Ring proposed that the application should be refused on the grounds that the design was out of keeping with the Conservation Area through the use of inappropriate materials which was contrary to Policies CS12 and DM15 in particular. This was seconded by Councillor de Whalley.

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 (9 votes for and 4 against)

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

The application, by virtue of its inappropriate design and materials, would have an adverse impact upon the appearance of the building and the conservation area, contrary to policies CS12 of the Core Strategy and DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan.

- (viii) **23/00848/F**
Wereham: Holme Oak, Stoke Road: Proposed construction of 4 residential units in existing footprint of agricultural barn benefitting with prior approval including the demolition of existing agricultural barn: Mr G Gott

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

Councillor Lintern left the meeting and addressed the Committee in accordance with Standing Order 34

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application site was 0.22 ha in size and was located to the southeast of the village of Wereham, to the south of Stoke Road / A134. Wereham was categorised as a Rural Village in the adopted Local Plan. The site was located partially within the development boundary, but the footprint of the proposed building was outside of the boundary line, as defined by Inset Map G114 in the SADMP 2016.

Members might recall an application was presented to the Committee in March 2023 for the residential development following the demolition of the existing barn complex (planning reference 22/01893/F). The application was refused by the Committee, in line with the officer's recommendation to refuse the application. The decision would be balanced against the extant fallback position established under planning permission 21/01872/PACU3, for conversion of the buildings to four dwellings.

The application sought full planning consent for the demolition of the existing barn constructed of brick and corrugated metal cladding / roofing, and the construction of four new dwellings with associated parking and amenity space on the exact footprint of the barn to be demolished. The dwellings proposed were single storey, two-bedroomed homes, identical to the proposal approved under the Prior Approval application.

The site currently accommodated a bungalow, which sat to the front of the site, and a large barn to the rear which had been most recently used for the storage of agricultural land to the south existing residential development to the east and west, and to the beyond Stoke Road / A134 to the north with agricultural land.

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

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, Sandra Calvert (objecting), Jacki Hitching (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) and Shanna Jackson (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Lintern addressed the Committee objecting to the application.

In response of comments made by the speakers, the case officer advised that most of the Parish Councils comments had been addressed within the report. In relation to archaeology, there were 3

archaeology conditions proposed. There was also a detailed condition in relation to protection of trees on site condition 10.

The case officer also advised that a contamination condition had been proposed in late correspondence.

Councillor Ryves proposed that the application be refused on the grounds of DM2 and CS06, as the application was outside the development boundary and also that the design was poor contrary to DM15. This was seconded by Councillor de Whalley.

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 (9 votes for refusal, 2 against and 1 abstention).

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

(1) The site lies outside the development boundary for Wereham where development is restricted, and the proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the countryside, contrary to policies CS06 of the Core Strategy, and policy DM2 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan.

(2) The development represents a poor form of design, contrary to policies CS08 of the Core Strategy and policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan.

PC56: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

RESOLVED: That the reports be noted.

The meeting closed at 1.39 pm