

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

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on  
Monday, 4th March, 2024 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, T Barclay (sub), R Blunt, A Bubb, M de Whalley,  
P Devulapalli, S Everett, B Long, S Ring, C Rose, A Ryves, Mrs V Spikings,  
M Storey and D Tyler

PC118: **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 carry out a roll call to determine attendees.

PC119: **APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIR**

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

PC120: **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Lintern and de Winton (Cllr Barclay sub).

The Chair thanked Cllr Barclay for being a sub at the meeting.

PC121: **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on Monday 5 February 2024 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

PC122: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Everett declared that in relation to item 9/3(a) - Hillington Square, King's Lynn as the applicant was his landlord and the application was where he lived. He had not pre-determined the application and did not have a pecuniary interest. He advised that he would withdraw from the meeting when the item was discussed.

Councillor Spikings declared a prejudicial interest in item 9/4(c) – Upwell, as she was related to the agent.

Councillor de Whalley declared an interest in item 9/4(a) – Grimston as he was known to the applicant in a land dispute.

Councillor Moriarty, a member of the Council and member of the audience declared an interest in the Enforcement report and he had been involved with meetings with the residents.

PC123: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no urgent business.

PC124: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Councillors attended under Standing Order 34:

Councillor Coates 9/4(b) North Wootton

A statement was read out from Councillor Kirk in relation to item 9/4(d)

PC125: **CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC126: **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.

PC127: **GLOSSARY OF TERMS**

The Committee noted the Glossary of Terms.

PC128: **INDEX AND DECISIONS ON APPLICATIONS**

The Committee considered schedules of applications for planning permission submitted by the Executive Director for Planning and Environment (copies of the schedules were published with the agenda). Any changes to the schedules will be recorded in the minutes.

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

- (i) **22/00267/F**  
**Sedgeford: Conifer Lodge, Ringstead Road: Construction of 2 residential dwellings on land adjacent Conifer Lodge: Norfolk Flint Ltd**

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

The case officer presented the report and explained that full planning permission was sought for the erection of 2 no. dwellings on land adjacent to Conifer Lodge in Sedgeford.

The site was located within the development boundary for Sedgeford, which was designated as a rural village in the settlement hierarchy of the Development Plan (CS02).

The site was largely overgrown and once benefitted from planning permission for the erection of two dwellings. That permission, granted under application 15/00913/F had since expired.

The site was located within the North Norfolk Coast Landscape Designation (formerly Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) and located within Flood Zone 1. The site was within 30 metres of the Conservation Area.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was contrary to the views of the Parish Council.

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.

Councillor Devulapalli joined the meeting.

- (ii) **23/01743/F**  
**Walsoken: The Barn, 3 Burrettgate Road: Erection of 2 dwellings involving demolition of existing barns: Mr S McCurry**

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that this was an irregular shaped site, covering approximately 0.3 ha of land to the east

of the frontage development on Burrettgate Road and south of that onto Sparrowgate Road in Walsoken.

There was an existing access off Burrettgate Road between Nos. 1 & 5 serving the site. It presently contained a sizeable (247 m<sup>2</sup>) brick and slate single storey barn on Plot 1 (southern-most) and a smaller (96.5 m<sup>2</sup>) timber barn on Plot 2 (northern-most).

The access to the site was located within the defined development area of the village, however the majority of the site was located within countryside.

Permission had historically been granted (initially under the prior notification procedure for permitted development) for change of use of two barns into dwellings (19/01979/PACU3) and subsequently the 'fall-back' position justifying the development of two new dwellings (21/02377/F) with footprints of 247m<sup>2</sup> and 94.6m<sup>2</sup> respectively.

The application sought to change the design of the proposed dwelling on plot 1.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor 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 Duncan Ford (objecting) and Shanna Jackson (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to comments made the case officer explained the history to the application.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call on the recommendation to refuse and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (14 votes for and 1 against).

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

- (iii) **23/00739/F**  
**Brancaster: Marsh Farm, Main Road, Burnham Deepdale:**  
**Conservation project including change of use of existing aviary,**  
**new aviaries and associated dwelling for warden / conservation**  
**officer: Mr Andrew Crean**

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application was deferred from 16 November Planning Committee to enable discussions to take place with the Local Highway Authority and the applicant in regard to the safety of the access and required visibility

splays, and to clarify the justification for the new dwelling under Policy DM6.

The applicant had provided an amended plan which showed improvements to the visibility splays and access point.

The agent had also provided an additional document outlining further justification for the proposed dwelling. Updated sections of the report were in bold.

The application sought full planning permission for the construction of a permanent bungalow and the creation of aviaries in connection with a Conservation Project at Marsh Farm, Burnham Deepdale. The application related to a conservation project to re-introduce Ruff, a wading bird, which was otherwise practically extinct in the UK. The application comprised a change of use of existing aviary and provision of new aviaries together with residential accommodation for a warden / conservation officer, which were noted by the agent to be integral to the project.

The site was located to the north of Main Road, Burnham Deepdale and within the Norfolk Coast National Landscape.

The application was bounded to the north and east by the North Norfolk Coast SSSI and the Holkham National Nature Reserve (NNRS) and Scolt Head National Nature Reserve (NNR) to the north.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as it had been deferred from the meeting held on 16 November 2024.

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, Andrew Crean (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In debating the application, several Members of the Committee spoke in support of the application and considered that the application was needed to protect the species of birds.

The Planning Control Manager advised that she had listened to the debate carefully and if the Committee were minded to approve the application, there was evidence that the proposal formed part of an existing rural enterprise and that additional weight could be given to ensuring the continued conservation status of the protected species and conservation project as a whole and was therefore in accordance with paragraph 84 of the NPPF, DM6 and CS12. In addition, the highways issues had been resolved.

Councillor Long proposed that the application be approved, which was seconded by Councillor Mrs Spikings with conditions to be agreed with the Chair and Vice-Chair including a condition to tie the accommodation to the use being proposed in perpetuity. The planning reasons were that justification for the need had been demonstrated and it therefore complied with paragraph 84 of the NPPF and Policy DM6. In addition, the Highways objection had been removed.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application with conditions to be agreed with Chair and Vice-Chair including a condition to tie the new dwelling to the use in perpetuity and, after having been put to the vote, was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved, contrary to recommendation and subject to conditions to be agreed with Chair and Vice-Chair including a condition to tie the new dwelling to the use in perpetuity.

*The proposal formed part of an existing rural enterprise and additional weight is given to ensuring the continued conservation status of the protected species and conservation project as a whole. The need for the dwelling is therefore justified and in accordance with paragraph 84 of the NPPF, DM6 and CS12 of the Development Plan.*

*The Committee then adjourned at 10.35 am and reconvened at 10.50 am.*

- (iv) **23/01023/FM**  
**King's Lynn: Chestnut House, Hillington Square: Demolition and redevelopment of Providence Street Community Centre and Hillington Square flatted blocks known as Aitken House, Norris House, and Chestnut House excluding electrical substation. Development of 65 new dwellings and 1,106 square metres of commercial and community floorspace (Class E and F2) and associated soft landscaping, vehicle and cycle parking, refuse store and associated infrastructure: Freebridge Community Housing**

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

*Councillor Everett left the meeting during consideration of the application and took no part in the debate or decision.*

The case officer introduced the report and explained that full planning permission was sought for a mixed-use development comprising residential comprising residential (65 units) and 1106 m<sup>2</sup> of Class E (commercial business and service) and Class F2 (local community) within six blocks (A-F) ranging in height between three and four storeys following the demolition of four main blocks of flats and Providence Street Community Centre. The site measures c.1.3ha at Hillington Square, King's Lynn.

The site was located within the development boundary for King's Lynn, the Borough's main town and administrative centre. The site was not within a Conservation Area but had St Margaret's Conservation Area to the immediate north, the Walks Conservation Area to the northeast and the Friars Conservation Area to the immediate east and south. There were several listed buildings in the immediate locality most notably the Grade II\* All Saints Church which the site surrounded on three sides if its four compass points.

The development would result in the net loss of two dwellings (existing 67; proposed 65) and 179 m<sup>2</sup> of community facilities (existing 1285 m<sup>2</sup>; proposed 1106m<sup>2</sup> comprising Class E and Class F2) contained with Providence Street Community Centre and Chestnut House.

All the units would be affordable.

Most of the site was located within Flood Zone 1 with the fringes of the site being within Flood Zones 2 and 3 as depicted on the Local Authority's Strategic Flood Risk Maps. However, the site was at risk in a breach event and was in a critical drainage catchment area, although the south-eastern corner (where Block F was proposed) would flood to a lesser extent.

The development was stated to represent the final phase (phase 6) of the redevelopment of Hillington Square, a housing estate that was built in the 1960s and comprised of predominately five-storey blocks of flats.

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

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, Anita Carnell (objecting), Graham Robinson-Hodges (supporting) and Laura Handford (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to comments raised by the public speakers, the case officer advised that:

- Page 70 of the report explained why an Environmental Impact Screening Assessment was not required.
- Conditions attached to a permission were acceptable and normal.
- In relation to the types of units put forward by Freebridge Community Housing, the Housing Team had no objection.
- 172 m<sup>2</sup> of community space would be lost.
- It was considered that there would be betterment in relation to flood risk.

- Historic England considered that there would be a small improvement in relation to the impact on the Church.

In response to a comment from Councillor Mrs Spikings in relation to disabled living spaces, the case officer advised that the new units would have to be Building Regulations compliant but there were not any specifically set aside for people with a disability.

The case officer also advised that trees and landscaping had been conditioned. Trees would be replaced on 1:3 ratio. The open space would be managed by Freebridge Community Housing.

In relation to materials, Councillor Bubb asked that a lighter brick colour be used to give a lighter look. In response, the case officer explained that materials were conditioned and so a sample would be provided. The materials needed to blend in with the existing bricks and the Conservation team would pay close attention to the proposed materials.

Councillor de Whalley advised that he had concerns in relation to the setting of the Church and the loss of the community centre and community café.

The case officer explained that the proposed commercial units could be used for a café and other commercial uses.

Councillor Devulapalli asked how many family rooms were being lost? The case officer referred to page 54 of the officer's report.

Councillor Devulapalli added that she had concerns in relation to the lack of disabled units and loss of community uses. The case officer advised that it was not considered that the loss of community uses was significant. The proposal was to meet Freebridge Community Housing's needs.

Councillor Bone added that the proposal would be an improvement for the area and would provide more one bedroom accommodation. However, he did have concerns in relation to Block F on Valingers Place and Freestone Court.

The case officer advised that officers had taken into account the distances and angles involved and considered that it would not cause overlooking.

The Chair then proposed that a site visit be undertaken so that the Committee could see for themselves, which was seconded by Councillor de Whalley and, after having been put to the vote was carried.



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

*Councillor Long asked for it to be recorded that in the event that he would not be able to attend the site visit and reconvened meeting, he would be at a disadvantage not being able to vote on the application.*

- (v) **23/00177/RMM**  
**Stoke Ferry: Land on the southwest side of Lynn Road:**  
**Reserved matters application for 62 dwellings including layout,**  
**external appearance, scale and landscaping: Amber REI Ltd**

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

*Following legal advice Councillor Storey declared an interest in the application and left the meeting during consideration of the item. He did not take part in the debate or vote on the matter.*

The case officer explained that the application site measured approximately 2.3ha in area and was located in the centre of the village of Stoke Ferry, a Key Rural Service Centre (KRSC). The site was to be accessed via Buckenham Drive to the south and Lynn Road to the north. The site had residential development to the south, a playing field to the west, and Lynn Road formed the northern and eastern boundaries. The site was partially within and adjacent to Stoke Ferry Conservation Area and was directly adjacent to four Listed Buildings (one of which was Grade II\*). The current use of the land was in two parts. To the west was an area of privately owned greenfield land, and to the east was the site of Stoke Ferry Mill consisting of a number of a number of large-scale buildings and an area of hardstanding which was currently still in operation.

Outline planning with access only was granted 19/00274/OM 'Outline application with some matters reserved for the erection of up to 70 residential dwellings and access and this consent included a Section 106 Agreement to secure affordable housing, open space, habitat monitoring and mitigation, and also phasing of the development of the application site with Furlong Road site (applications 19/00272/OM and 23/00178/RMM).

The application sought reserved matters consent for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the construction of up to 70 residential dwellings, incorporating affordable housing and open space contributions in line with the adopted Local Plan policy requirements, and associated development to include drainage features, roads, pedestrian paths and other works.

The applicant had submitted a further application for the redevelopment of the Furlong Drove storage and distribution site (23/00177/RMM).

The case officer drew the Committee's attention to late correspondence and the need to add an additional condition to secure the final / top surfacing of private drives prior to occupation of the penultimate dwelling (Condition 15).

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination 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 David Onions (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Devulapalli proposed an additional condition to secure an additional footpath for the scheme.

Councillor Mrs Spikings added that she objected to the proposed condition and referred the Committee to page 115, third paragraph of the officer's report where the point had been addressed.

The case officer added that the existing Public Right of Way did run across the site and there were clear routes through the site. It was also considered important to maintain the street frontage. Also, the Parish Council did not want any more linkages. There were bus stops along Lynn Road.

The Planning Control Manager added that it had been designed to NCC Standards.

Councillor Ryves seconded the proposal for an additional condition regarding an additional cycleway.

The Legal Advisor reminded the Committee that any condition had to be reasonable and necessary.

Councillor Devulapalli then withdrew her proposal for an additional condition.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application subject to the imposition of additional condition 15 (as detailed in late correspondence) and, after having been put to the vote, was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved as recommended subject to the imposition of condition 15 (as detailed in late correspondence).

*The Committee then adjourned at 12.30 pm and reconvened at 1.10 pm.*

*Councillor Mrs Spikings left the meeting.*

*Councillor Blunt left the meeting.*

- (vi) **23/00178/RMM**  
**Stoke Ferry: Furlong Store, Furlong Road: Reserved Matters**  
**Application for 30 dwellings including layout, external**  
**appearance, scale and landscaping: Amber REI Ltd**

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

*Following legal advice Councillor Storey declared an interest in the application and left the meeting during consideration of the item. He did not take part in the debate or vote on the matter.*

The case officer presented the report and explained that the application site measured approximately 1ha in area, and was located within the village of Stoke Ferry, a Key Rural Service Centre (KRSC). The site was accessed via Furlong Drove. The site was rectangular in shape and had residential development to the south and agricultural land to the north-east and south-east. The site was adjacent to, but not within, Stoke Ferry Conservation Area. The current use of the site was a storage facility associated with Stoke Ferry Mill and consisted of a large storage building and associated hardstanding.

Outline planning consent 19/00272/O with some matters reserved (access only) was granted and this consent included a Section 106 Agreement to secure open space, affordable housing, etc.

This application sought reserved matters consent for appearance, landscaping, layout and the scale for the construction of 30 residential dwellings, incorporating affordable housing and open space contributions in line with the adopted Local Plan policy requirements, and associated development to include drainage features, roads, pedestrian paths and other works.

The applicant had submitted a further application for the redevelopment of the Stoke Ferry Mill (23/00177/RMM).

The case officer drew the Committee's attention to late correspondence and the need to add an additional condition to secure the final / top surfacing of private drives prior to occupation of the penultimate dwelling (Condition 9).

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination 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 David Onions (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

With regards to a comment regarding pepper-potting of the affordable housing, the Assistant Director advised that it was in accordance with the Council's Pepper-Potting Policy.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application subject to the imposition of additional condition 9 (as detailed in late correspondence) and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (11 votes for and 1 against)

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved as recommended, subject to the imposition of additional condition 9 (as detailed in late correspondence).

- (vii) **23/00234/F**  
**Grimston: Middle Farm, 15 Chequers Road: Self build bungalow for owner: Mrs Linda Taylor**

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

Councillors de Whalley and Ring declared an interest in the application. Councillor de Whalley addressed the Committee in accordance with Standing Order 34.

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application sought full planning permission for the construction of a new single storey bungalow on garden land between existing dwellings at Middle Farm, Chequers Road, Pott Row.

The application was submitted alongside a separate application for the subdivision of the existing dwelling known as Middle Farm however this application had since been withdrawn by the agent (application ref: 23/00235/F).

Pott Row was categorised as a Joint Key Rural Service Centre (alongside Gayton and Grimston) as defined in the Settlement Hierarchy within Policy CS02 and the development boundary policy therefore applies. The application site was within the development boundary shown on inset map G41 of the SADMPP (2016) and the principle of development is therefore acceptable in line with Policy DM2.

The application site was situated between the donor dwelling and a group of three dwellings granted consent under 15/01999/F at a time when the Borough Council could not demonstrate a 5-year supply of land.

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

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 Jerry Stone (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor de Whalley addressed the Committee and outlined his concerns in relation to the application.

Councillor Ryves outlined the reasons why he considered the application to be acceptable.

The Planning Control Manager advised that having visited the site a couple of times, and with the addition of another plot it was considered a cramped form of development. In addition, the NPPF had changed its stance since the original approval for the three dwellings at the rear of Middle Farm.

She also explained that the agent had been notified of the concerns regarding the application back in November, when the application had been identified to be determined by the Committee.

The Planning Control Manager also clarified the measurements of the plot.

Councillor Ryves proposed that the application be approved on the grounds that weight had been given to the fact that it was a self-build bungalow and that it was within the development boundary. This was seconded by Councillor Devulapalli.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application, and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (6 votes for, 3 against and 2 abstentions).

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved, contrary to recommendation with conditions to be agreed with the Chair and Vice-Chair for the following reasons:

*The development would be for a self-build dwelling, to which significant weight is attached and would be within the development boundary in accordance with Policy DM2.*

Councillor Blunt re-joined the meeting.

- (viii) **23/02202/CU**  
**North Wootton: 24 Ford Avenue: Change of use from domestic converted garage to tattoo studio: Mr D Wells**

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was a four-bedroom detached house on the southern side of Ford Avenue. The arm of Ford Avenue on which the property was set was a cul-de-sac.

Planning permission was sought for a change of part of the house to a tattoo studio.

The site was located within the development boundary of North Wootton. North Wootton was covered under the part of the SADMPP dealing with King's Lynn and Surrounding Areas. Paragraph E.5.3 of the SADMPP stated that North Wootton was classified as a settlement adjacent to King's Lynn rather than a Key Rural Service Centre.

The Principal Planner drew the Committee's attention to the late correspondence and the need to amend condition 3 and remove condition 5.

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

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 Gordon Jackson Hopps (objecting) and Mr Daniel Wells (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

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

Councillor Bubb stated that he understood the concerns raised by the objectors but felt that the proposal would not create any noise. He therefore proposed that permission be granted for a 12-month period. This was seconded by Councillor Storey.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application for a 12-month period; to amend condition 3 and remove condition 5 (as detailed in late correspondence) and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (12 votes for and 2 abstentions).

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved for a 12-month period, subject to condition 3 being amended and condition 5 being removed as outlined in late correspondence.

The Committee adjourned at 3.30 pm and reconvened at 3.35 pm.

- (ix) **23/01843/F**  
**Upwell: Last bungalow, Squires Drove: Retrospective change of use of land for the siting of 4 glamping pods and wc / shower unit for holiday let accommodation: Mr B Cook**

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

The case officer presented the application and explained that the application was retrospective for the change of use of agricultural land to create a glamping site with 4 pods, toilet/shower block and 2.5m fence to the north and east of the site. Access was proposed to be taken from Squires Drove and was laid to gravel. The site was located in the countryside where development was more restricted and limited to that identified as suitable in rural areas. Squires Drove was a narrow single track with the proposed site access immediately adjacent to a bend in the road. The site was on designated Grade 1 agricultural land.

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

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, Nick Seaton (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Devulapalli proposed that the application be approved, seconded by Councillor Barclay on the grounds that the application promoted tourism and rural diversification.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application with conditions to be agreed following consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair and, after having been put to the vote, was lost (4 votes for and 10 against).

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, was carried (10 votes for, 1 against and 3 abstentions).

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

- (x) **23/01860/O**  
**Walsoken: Little Eastfield Barn, Lynn Road: Outline application with all matters reserved: for up to 2 dwellings: Mr M Lambert**

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

The case officer presented the report and explained that the application was in outline with all matters reserved for the erection of two detached dwellings on land to the front of Little Eastfield Barn. The site was located on Lynn Road, near S-Bend and near the built-up edge of Wisbech. However, the site did not lie within a development boundary, and therefore was considered to be a countryside location from a planning policy perspective. In such locations development was more restricted and limited to that identified as suitable in rural areas, as set out in other policies of the Development Plan.

The site was bounded by relatively mature trees to the south and west and benefitted from an existing access point onto Lynn Road. The site access was shared with the donor dwelling. To the west of the site was a sports field used in association with Wisbech Football Club, to the south of the site was an undeveloped field, which created a distinct gap between the built-up edge of Wisbech and the more sporadic development further to the north along Lynn Road. Permission for 2 dwellings had been refused outline planning permission under delegated powers on this site under reference: 22/02221/O (28 April 2023).

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

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, Shanna Jackson (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Planning Control Manager read out a statement from Councillor Kirk.

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, was carried.

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

PC129: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

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

PC130: **EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

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



**RESOLVED:** That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act”.

PC131: **PLANNING ENFORCEMENT REPORT**

The Committee received a report which updated them on the continuing breach of planning control and the options that were available to the Council to remedy the situation.

**RESOLVED:** (1) That the report be noted.

(2) That authority be granted to the Executive Director of Environment and Planning for the implementation and execution of direct action under Section 178 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended to comply with the requirements set out in the planning enforcement notice dated 7 July 2023).

**The meeting closed at 4.03 pm**