

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

KING'S LYNN AREA CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
- PLANNING SUB-GROUP

Minutes from the Meeting of the King's Lynn Area Consultative Committee - Planning Sub-Group held on Tuesday, 15th August, 2023 at 4.30 pm in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ

PRESENT:

Councillors S Collop (Chair), D Heneghan and B Jones

Polly Harris-Gorf - Principal Planner
Natacha Osler - Senior Planner
Olivia Luckhurst - Planner

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3 URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

4 MEMBERS PRESENT PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 34

There were no Members present pursuant to Standing Order 34.

5 CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE

There was no Chair's correspondence.

6 ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

- (i) **23/01237/FM**
Proposed demolition of ancillary infrastructure buildings, construction of a 2-Storey (ground and first floor) discharge lounge building with link extension to the main hospital with additional connecting covered walkway link and construction of a 2-storey (ground and first floor) hospital office building, with associated access, infrastructure and landscaping works (use Class C2) at Queen Elizabeth

**Hospital, Gayton Road, Queen Elizabeth Hospital Site,
King's Lynn, Norfolk, PE30 4ET**

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

The Senior Planner outlined the application to the Group and explained the location of the buildings. She advised that the site was within Flood Zone 1, there were no ecological value to the site, modest landscaping was proposed and there had been no objections from statutory consultees. There would be some parking displaced and relocated.

In response to a question, the Senior Planner advised that there was nothing to say that the buildings were temporary, and no conditions had been proposed for its removal. However, she anticipated that the buildings would be removed as they were more modular and quicker to put up. However, even if they were not temporary, they were considered to be acceptable in that location in planning terms.

The Senior Planner also advised that three trees were to be removed; one silver birch and two smaller trees but they would be replaced. There would also be shrubs and plants included.

In relation to its location with Springwood, the Senior Planner advised that there should not be any noise associated with the building as it would be used for office accommodation and a discharge lounge, and it was located behind the existing ambulance building.

RESOLVED: That the Sub-Group had no objection to the application.

- (ii) **23/00735/FM**
Construction of a new building/offices for the blending of existing products with increased capacity at Omex Agriculture Ltd, Estuary Road, King's Lynn, Norfolk, PE30 2HH

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

The Planner explained the proposal to the Sub-Group. She advised that there were residential properties to the west of the site and an objection had been received from one of those properties.

The case officer advised that she had been on site and taken measurements as follows:

From the property to the boundary of the site measured around 12 m and 36 m from the property to the proposed building was 36 m. There was already an existing earth bund on the western side of the site which measured 1.2 m at the moment. Part of the proposal would be to raise that to 2m. Consultation had taken place with the Council's CSNN team who came back requesting amendments which had been provided by the agent. Re-consultation had taken place with CSNN

who considered the application to be acceptable subject to further clarification over the working hours. No objections had been received from County Highways, EA or Anglian Water. Comments were still awaited from the LLFA following the recent amendments.

The site was within Flood Zone 3 and was subject to flooding. A lagoon had been proposed to help alleviate the situation.

Councillor Heneghan asked if chemicals or waste would be discharged into the nearby waterways. The case officer stated that as far as she was aware there would not be any discharge into the waterways. She also confirmed that the Council's Environmental Quality Team had raised no objection, the only thing that was requested was a 'just control management plan which had been provided and agreed by them as well. The Principal Planner advised that there would be an Environmental Agency licensing regime that would be needed to put in place. Any discharge to the IDB would have to be licensed a well and by Anglian Water. All of those elements would be controlled slightly outside of the planning system.

With regards to the neighbouring property's objection on the grounds of noise, smell, lighting and visual intrusion, it was explained that there would not be any additional noise given its existing use and surrounding uses as well. It would be viewable slightly, but the extra earth bund would be erected as well. It was not considered intrusive enough to warrant a refusal. It was confirmed that the earth bund would partially block the view but not completely. The earth bund was primarily there to protect against noise.

The Chair asked whether the bund could be put in place before any piling work started? The Principal Planner advised that this could be part of a Construction Management Plan to look at how the elements were phased. She added that she would like to know from CSNN whether the physical bund would actually stop the noise from piling. The Construction Management Plan could also cover the hours of operation and also getting the developer to stay in contact with neighbours regarding piling works.

Councillor Heneghan asked whether landscaping to soften the structure once it was built could be included. The case officer advised that she would raise the issue with the agent or add it as a condition.

The case officer also advised that it was not expected to be a 24-hour operation, but she would check this with the agent.

The case officer advised that currently the application would not be referred to the Planning Committee and would be dealt with under the scheme of delegation. With regards to whether the application could be referred to the Planning Committee, it was explained that it was outside the timescales for call-in, but this would be checked by the case officer.

RESOLVED: That the Sub-Group raised the following concerns:

- Clarification was required in relation to the working hours of the operation.
- The earth bund should be constructed prior to any piling works commencing.
- Whether landscaping could be provided to soften the earth bund

7 **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was none.

8 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Thursday 28 September 2023 at 4.30 pm in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, if required.

The meeting closed at 4.57 pm