

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

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 2nd December, 2024 at 9.30 am in the Assembly Room, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ**

**PRESENT:** Councillor T Parish (Chair)  
Councillors B Anota, T Barclay, R Blunt, A Bubb, R Coates, M de Whalley, T de Winton, S Everett, S Lintern, C Rose, Mrs V Spikings, M Storey and D Tyler

**PC71: APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Devulapalli (Cllr Ryves sub) and Councillor Ring.

The Chair thanked Councillor Ryves for being a substitute at the meeting.

**PC72: MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 November 2024 (previously circulated) were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendments proposed by Councillor Everett:

Amendment 1

PC60: Appointment of Vice-Chair

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

Change to:

PC60: Appointment of Vice-Chair

RESOLVED: Councillor Mrs Spikings was appointed as Vice-Chair, however Councillor Mrs Spikings withdrew as Vice-Chair before the first agenda item and was replaced by Councillor Ring.

Amendment 2

Councillor Ring proposed that Standing Order 34 be suspended for the purposes of the item (i below), which was seconded by Councillor de Whalley.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to suspend the wording in Standing Order 34 and, after having been put to the vote was carried thereby allowing Councillor Parish to speak on application (i).

Councillor Mrs Spikings stated that in view of this she no longer wished to be Vice-Chair and withdrew from the position.

Change to:

Councillor Ring proposed that Standing Order 34 be suspended for the purposes of the item (i below), which was seconded by Councillor de Whalley.

This vote was proposed by the Chair to be carried out by show of hands. Councillor Everett requested a formal recorded vote to be carried out in regards to the suspension of Standing Orders.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to suspend the wording in Standing Order 34 and, after having been put to the vote was carried [insert number of votes for and against] thereby allowing Councillor Parish to speak on application (i).

Councillor Mrs Spikings stated that in view of this decision she no longer wished to be Vice-Chair and withdrew from the position.

PC73: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor de Winton advised that he did not have a declaration of interest but wished to inform the Committee that applications 24/00143/F and 24/01121/F were within his ward.

PC74: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no urgent business to consider under Standing Order 7.

PC75: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

Statement to be read out from Councillor Moriarty in relation to 9/1(a) - Crimplesham

PC76: **CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC77: **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.

**PC78: DECISION ON APPLICATIONS**

The Committee considered schedules of applications for planning permission submitted by the Assistant 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) – (iv) below, where appropriate, to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chair.

- (i) **24/01869/F**  
**Crimplesham: SJC Trailers Ltd, 6 New Road: Removal of Condition number 3 attached to planning permission 24/00476/F: Proposed industrial unit to provide covered storage for existing trailers incorporating new landscaping and enlargement of existing vehicular access**

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

The Case Officer introduced the report and advised that the planning application sought the removal of condition no.3 attached to planning consent 24/00476/F which granted consent for a proposed industrial unit to provide covered storage for existing trailers incorporating new landscaping and enlargement of existing vehicular access at SJC Trailers Ltd, 6 New Road, Crimbleham. Condition 3 stated that the development should at all times be used in association with the site and it should at no time be sold/let/used for any other business or commercial purposes.

The application site was within an established commercial area off New Road, to the north of the A1122 (Downham Road). The site was within the settlement of Crimbleham which was categorised as a Smaller Village or Hamlet in the adopted Local Plan. As such the site was on land designated as countryside.

The site had been operated by SJC Trailers Ltd who stored trailers and trailer parts for repairs/upgrades and supply. The applicant hoped to build and occupy the building recently granted consent, but to also subdivide the site to allow the existing building to be occupied by another operator (a similar type of business) within the approved land use.

The Case Officer referred the Committee to the late correspondence and advised there was a comment from Crimbleham Parish Council supporting the application.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination by Councillor Moriarty.

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, Kathy Collins (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Democratic Support Officer read out a statement from Councillor Moriarty in relation to the application.

The County Highways Officer provided the Committee with some history in relation to the site and explained that in 2010, there was a fatal accident in the area and that County Highways always had concerns with the junction on the main road leading to the site. The County Highways Officer explained they had suggested having a right-hand turn lane as vehicles passed at speed on that road and vehicles wishing to turn right onto the junction were detrimental to highway safety.

It was explained when the subsequent planning application came in, County Highways recommended condition no.3 be put on for the reasons of the previous accident history on the site.

In response to points which had been raised, the County Highways Officer felt that they had been consistent in their recommendation with other historical sites along that road and that they had always been considered in relation to their current class uses and what potential traffic they could generate. The County Highways view for this site was that it was no longer a VOSA centre, and as stated within the report, this application would allow to subdivide the site and have two independent operations which would generate more traffic than at present and on that basis, were recommending refusal.

Councillor Ryves asked for clarification around the number of vehicle movements per day associated with the business which he understood was seven and commented that if the site was going to be used for storage, it would not generate much of an increase in vehicle movements and that it seemed to have an access point with suitable visibility.

Councillor de Whalley asked that if County Highways were concerned about right-hand turns for traffic on the Downham Road going west, what was the possibility or the practicality of having a no right-hand turn sign for that manoeuvre would be.

Councillor Barclay agreed with the comments made by Councillor Ryves and stated that County Highways could reduce the speed limit on that road if they had great concerns.

Councillor de Winton stated this it was very important to encourage work for the people in the Borough and felt that the Borough Council

should be encouraging this business to expand and was in favour of the application.

Councillor Mrs Spikings made comments in relation to encouraging new businesses and proposed that the application be approved on the grounds that it accorded with CS06 development in rural areas and CS10 boosted the economy and also it was sustainable development.

Councillor Storey agreed with comments which had been made by other Committee Members and was in favour of approving the application. Councillor Storey added that the entrance, vehicle movements and use of the development was acceptable and that it would improve the safety of the entrance due to there being less vehicles on the road.

Councillor Everett also agreed with comments which had been made by other Committee Members and stated it was important to advertise and encourage new jobs in West Norfolk and added that if County Highways had great concerns about the junction, why they had not introduced any relevant Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs). Councillor Everett added that he would be in support of approving the application.

Councillor Bubb asked if there was currently a restriction on the number of vehicle movements on the site in any one day and the Case Officer confirmed there wasn't.

The County Highways Officer responded to comments raised by Committee Members and confirmed a right-hand turn lane would not work as there were more junctions along the road which people would use. In terms of the safety of the road, the County Highways Officer explained that County Highways try to control development on those types of roads where there was a 60mph limit and advised that development would not be suitable on that road. In relation to the speed limit on the road, it was explained the speed limit had to fit the conditions of the road and that it was unlikely they would be able to reduce the 60mph limit but advised it was something that they could potentially look at. The County Highways Officer added that there wasn't an accident history on the site currently and that this was reflective of the fact that there were fewer turning movements on the road.

In response to a question from Councillor Storey, the County Highways Officer confirmed that it was general practice to retain five years of accident records.

The Planning Control Manager then clarified the reasons for approval from what she had heard from the Committee as *'the use was acceptable, that it was a low-key employment use and not a high traffic generator as per the previous VOSA use and that weight was attached to the applicant's transport note that demonstrates the use was consistent with the existing use, and therefore in highways safety terms*

*there was little harm and therefore the proposal complied with CS10, CS11, DM15 and NPPF paragraph 115 and there was also the point on CS06 in terms of rural employment generated.*

The Assistant Director highlighted it was important to refer to highway safety issues in any reason for refusal.

Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed that the application be approved for the reasons given above, which was seconded by Councillor Tyler.

The Democratic Support Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application and after having been put to the vote it was carried unanimously.

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

*The use was acceptable, that it was a low-key employment use and not a high traffic generator as per the previous VOSA use and that weight was attached to the applicant's transport note that demonstrates the use was consistent with the existing use, and therefore in highways safety terms there was little harm and therefore the proposal complied with CS10, CS11, DM15 and NPPF paragraph 115 and there was also the point on CS06 in terms of rural employment generated.*

- (ii) **24/01692/F**  
**North Runcton: Land Behind 32 Winch Road, West Winch:**  
**The erection of a cottage and garage on a former brown field site**

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

The Case Officer introduced the report and explained the proposal was for the erection of a cottage and garage on land immediately west of No 32 Winch Road, West Winch, PE33 0ND.

The access was to and from the A10 which was a principle travelling route and Policy E2.2 directly related to development within the development boundary of West Winch and the case officer highlighted to the Committee that this was quoted in full on page 22 of the officers report.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the discretion of the Assistant Director.

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

The case officer referred the Committee to the late correspondence and explained that within the document, it referred to the access road

width rather than the access junction to the A10, nevertheless, the proposal was considered to result in Highways safety issues.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Peter Gidney (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to a question from Councillor Parish, the case officer confirmed that the land was amenity land. The case officer added that they had not received a lawful development certificate to advise the land had changed into a brownfield site and that if it was considered brownfield, it would not necessarily be considered suitable.

Councillor de Whalley asked for clarification in relation to whether the land was within the West Winch development boundary. The case officer confirmed that it was within the development boundary.

The County Highways Officer commented that this application was similar to the previous application considered. The County Highways Officer referred the Committee to the Planning Appeal which concluded that the proposed development would have significant adverse effect on the free flow of traffic and highway safety and that it would conflict with Policy CS11 and Policies E2.2 and DM12 of the SADMPP and County Highways did not want to go against the Planning Inspectorate's decision and had taken a consistent approach in recommending refusal.

Councillor Coates asked for clarification in relation to the Planning Inspectorate's Appeal Decision on what the difference was between a severe adverse effect on the free flow of traffic and highways safety, compared to a significant adverse effect. The Planning Control Manager advised that significant and severe were similar terms. She added that the Planning Inspectorate had considered the evidence which was put forward was similar to what had been put forward as part of the application and to go against that without sufficient evidence would be going against the NPPF and the Inspectorate's decision.

Several Members of the Committee commented that they could not see how one dwelling could generate significant traffic.

Councillor Ryves added that it was a sensible proposal and felt they should be encouraging this application and challenge the Planning Inspectorate's decision.

Councillor Barclay supported the comments made by Councillor Ryves and was in favour of supporting the application.

The Assistant Director strongly advised the Committee to not go against Highways safety issues and raised the concern that there was an Appeal Decision which had supported the highway safety argument, and advised that had to be given significant weight when making the planning decision.

The Democratic Support Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to refuse the application and after having been put to the vote, it was carried (7 votes for, 7 votes against and 1 abstention which meant the Chair had the casting vote and supported his previous decision for refusal).

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

*The Committee then adjourned for a comfort break at 10.40 am and reconvened at 11.00 am.*

(iii) **24/00143/F**  
**Old Hunstanton: White Cottage, 19 Wodehouse Road: Variation of Conditions 1 and 4 of planning permission 23/00598/F: Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of replacement dwelling**

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

The Case Officer introduced the report and explained the application was seeking retrospective consent under Section 73A of the Town and Country Planning 1990 (as amended) to vary approved plans for the development approved under: 23/00598/F for a replacement dwelling following the demolition of the existing building at 19 Wodehouse Road, Old Hunstanton.

The application was seeking to vary Condition 1 and 4 of a previous variation conditions application. It was explained Condition 1 related to approved plans and Condition 4 related to retaining the existing trees and hedges.

The Case Officer highlighted to the Committee the changes between the proposed application to the previous application 23/00598/F which was approved.

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

The case officer referred the Committee to the late correspondence and explained there was an incorrect date which had been amended and clarified with the Parish Council. There was now a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on a tree within the north of the site and the Case Officer clarified the Eucalyptus tree on the north of the site would be removed and that was as previously approved and shown on the landscaping plan and was considered acceptable by the Arboricultural Officer.

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



In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Patricia Eckersall (objecting) and Henry Middleton (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor de Winton stated this application was within his Ward and that it had been an unpleasant planning application. He raised concerns that it was a retrospective application. Councillor de Winton explained he and officers had received objector's correspondence which initially had been helpful but then became unacceptable in volume and in tone and felt strongly that this was unacceptable and felt officers were being bullied. In respect of planning issues, Councillor de Winton raised concerns in relation to the privacy of the neighbouring property 19a.

Councillor Parish reassured the Committee that neither the neighbour or the speaker had been a part of what Councillor de Winton was referring to.

Councillor de Whalley asked Councillor de Winton to withdraw the comments and accusations of bullying which he had made as this was inappropriate.

Several Members of the Committee asked for clarification in relation to the changes between the proposed application to the previous application and the Case Officer outlined the changes.

Councillor Parish commented that the impact on the neighbour to the west adjacent to the fence would need to be considered and proposed a site visit.

The Assistant Director agreed with the Chair and recommended that the Committee visit the site to make a clear judgement and see what the differences were.

Councillor de Whalley wished to second the proposal for a site visit.

In response to a question from Councillor Mrs Spikings, the Principal Planner explained there were a set of plans submitted under the current application which reflected a scheme which had not been built on the site but confirmed they now had a set of drawings which reflected what had been built on the site.

Councillor Mrs Spikings made a proposal to refuse the application and referred to the application being retrospective and did not understand

how someone could come along and build and alter everything when they had received professional advice and felt they run a risk. Councillor Mrs Spikings added the disamenity to the neighbour by the overlooking, a fence and landscaping would not remedy the privacy of the neighbouring property.

This was seconded by Councillor Everett.

Councillor Storey commented that he was in favour of a site visit but was also in agreement with what Councillor Spikings had proposed.

The Planning Control Manager clarified the reasons for refusal from what she had heard was put forward, namely that the application caused unacceptable overlooking and disamenity to the neighbours and to remedy with a 2.5m hedge is poor planning and cannot be rectified by virtue of planning conditions and as a result the scheme would be contrary to DM15.

The Principal Planner highlighted to the Committee that if the application was refused, there would be the need for an enforcement notice.

The Democratic Support Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to refuse the application and after having been put to the vote, it was carried (11 votes for and 4 against).

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

*The application was overlooking and the disamenity to the neighbours and to remedy with a 2.5m hedge is poor planning and cannot be rectified by virtue of planning conditions and as a result would be contrary to DM15.*

*The Committee then adjourned for a comfort break at 12.10 pm and reconvened at 12.16 pm.*

- (iv) **24/01121/F**  
**Thornham: Land to the East of West End Cottages, High Street: Construction of new holiday let and car park to serve holiday lets**

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

The Case Officer introduced the report and explained the application was seeking full planning consent for the construction of a one-bedroom holiday let on land to the east of West End Cottages, Thornham. The application site currently comprised of an area of cleared land/hardstanding with parking bays provided immediately

adjacent to High Street which served the existing terrace of dwellings known as West End Cottages.

The application site was within the Thornham Conservation Area boundary and West End Cottages was marked as important unlisted buildings within the Conservation Area Character Statement.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the Parish Council object over fears of overdevelopment and inappropriate parking but the officer's recommendation was to approve.

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, William Thompson (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Democratic Support Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application and after having been put to the vote, it was carried unanimously.

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

PC79: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

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

PC80: **TREE UPDATE REPORT**

The Committee received the tree update report.

Councillor Parish thanked the Officer for the detailed observations which they made on many planning applications.

Councillor de Whalley referred to the Downham Market Lidl development and explained he had received concerns in relation to the removal of a hedge that was originally retained within the planning application but as part of discharge planning conditions, it had been moved and replaced and asked how that was evaluated to make sure that they got equity and whether there was any consideration that a replaced hedge did not have the value of the original hedge.

The Officer advised the application was determined before his time at the Borough Council but explained that during the build period, the entrance on the Highway required site lines which required the removal of the trees and hedges and added that there was also an issue with drainage where they needed to construct the new drainage at the front

of the store. The landscaping was agreed and amended later on. The Officer stated the new landscaping was acceptable and would as it matured, acceptably replace the hedge which was originally there.

In response to a question from Councillor Coates, the Officer outlined the procedure for TPOs. In response to a further comment from Councillor Coates, the Officer confirmed that when a TPO is made, they were publicised immediately onto the Borough Council's website but advised he was not aware what the current arrangements were for notifying Ward Members and saw no reason why they couldn't notify Members of the Committee of any new TPOs in their Wards and confirmed they would look into it.

The Case Officer responded to further questions from Committee Members in relation to TPOs.

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

**The meeting closed at 12.41 pm**