BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 30th June, 2025 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, R Blunt, A Bubb, C J Crofts, M de Whalley, T de Winton, P Devulapalli, S Everett, A Kemp, S Lintern, A Ryves and M Storey

An apology for absence was received from Councillor C Rose and Mrs V Spikings

PC13: **APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIR**

RESOLVED: That Councillor C J Crofts be appointed as Vice-Chair for the meeting.

PC14: **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Mrs Spikings (Cllr Crofts sub) and Councillor Rose (Cllr Kemp sub).

PC15: **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 2nd June 2025 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

PC16: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Kemp declared that she had objected to application 9/2(a) – Clenchwarton and would leave the meeting during its consideration.

Councillor Lintern advised that she would be speaking under Standing Order 34 in relation to application 9/2(e) – Wereham and would not take part in the debate or decision.

Councillor Storey advised that in relation to 9/2 (e) – Wereham, he was acquainted with the applicant through the farming community. He did not have a pecuniary interest.

PC17: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was none.

PC18: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Members attended / had statements read out:

Councillor Bearshaw	9/2(a)	Clenchwarton
Councillor Sandell	9/2(b)	Docking – statement to be read out
Councillor Kirk	9/2(f)	West Walton – statement to be read out

PC19: **CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE**

The Chair reported that he had not received any other than from Councillor Kemp.

PC20: **RECEIPT OF LATE CORRESPONDENCE ON APPLICATIONS**

A copy of the late correspondence received after the publication of the agenda, which had previously been previously circulated, was received. A copy of the agenda would be held for public inspection with a list of background papers.

PC21: **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) – (vii) below, where appropriate to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chair.

(i) 24/01996/FM
South Wootton: Land at E563781, N322363 and west of St James Medical Centre, Edward Benefer Way, King's Lynn: Extra care development of 77 independent one and two-bedroom flats, with secured landscaped communal gardens, associated visitor and staff car and cycle parking and external stores: Medcentres Plc

Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube

The case officer introduced the report and explained that full planning permission was sought for the construction of 77 Independent Living (Extra Care) apartments on land north of Edward Benefer Way, South Wootton. The site was positioned on land between extant consents 21/00995/FM and 20/01954/RMM for a medical centre (St James

Medical Practice) and housing respectively, and within the area for housing allocation E3.1 within the Local Plan.

The proposal would provide 56 one-bedroom and 21 two-bedroom apartments for over 55s.

Access was proposed via the shared access point constructed alongside the medical centre consent to the east.

The application site was partially within Flood Zones 2 & 3 and within the South Wootton Neighbourhood Plan Area. A tree, protected by virtue of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO T220 of 2/TPO/00514), was immediately adjacent to the site's north-east corner.

Plans were amended during the course of the application to set the proposed building away from the TPO tree, as well as to resolve previous drainage concerns raised by the LLFA.

The case officer pointed out that the Section 106 Agreement also covered the GIRAMS payment.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination by the Planning Sifting Panel.

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

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

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: (A) That the application be **approved,** subject to the completion of a Section 106 to secure Affordable Housing and the associated monitoring fee. If the agreement is not completed within 4 months of the Committee resolution, but reasonable progress has been made, delegated authority is granted to the Assistant Director / Planning Control Manager to continue negotiation and complete the agreement and issue the decision.

(B) If, in the opinion of the Assistant Director / Planning Control Manager no reasonable progress is made to complete the legal agreement within 4 months of the date of the Committee resolution, the application is **refused** on the failure to secure Affordable Housing in line with LP29.

(ii) 25/00451/F
Clenchwarton: The Barn, Station Road: Proposed Condenser Unit: Mr M Means

Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube

Councillor Kemp left the meeting for this item and did not take part in the debate or decision.

The case officer introduced the report and explained that planning permission was sought for a proposed condenser unit at The Barn, Station Road, Clenchwarton.

Clenchwarton was classified as a Tier 4 Settlement (Key Rural Service Centres) under Policy LP01 of the Local Plan 2021-2040. The application site was located to the west of Station Road and approximately 307m from the A17.

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

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

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr M Means (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

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

The Council's CSNN representative outlined how the noise assessment had been carried out.
The Chair proposed that the application be deferred due to the late technical evidence provided, and there was concern that not all of the information regarding noise levels had been included within the report. This was seconded by Councillor Crofts and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: That the application be deferred for a cycle.

Councillor Lintern left the meeting at 11.55 am.

(iii) 22/00678/O
Docking: Dunroming, Bircham Road, Stanhoe: Self Build: Outline application with all matters reserved for the erection of a proposed single storey dwellings and associated works: Mr Mark Dunn

Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application sought planning permission with all matters reserved for the construction of a single storey self-build dwelling on land associated with a dwelling known as Dunroming, Bircham Road, Stanhoe.

The application site was some 1.7 km outside of the development boundary for Stanhoe as per the policies plan under Policy LP022 of the Local Plan 2021-2040 and was within the Nutrient Neutrality Catchment Zone outlined by Natural England.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as it had originally been called in by Cllr Sandell and at the request of the Assistant Director.

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

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Mark Shirley (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

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

Councillor de Winton stated that this was a busy site, and the proposed building would make little difference to the area. He considered that the application had fallen between two policies, and it felt wrong to refuse it.

The Assistant Director advised the Committee that the policy was clear for this application, and it was difficult to find material planning considerations to put weight on.

Councillor Ryves added that the site had grown into a hamlet in its own right and this was an infill within the hamlet. He considered the fact that it would be custom and self-build was a material consideration. He considered that it would not cause harm and County Highways had no objection to it.

The Assistant Director pointed out the need for consistency in applying in principle policy issues and pointed out the Wereham decision earlier on in the meeting on a site on the edge of but outside of the settlement boundary. He advised that this site was well outside of the development boundary for Stanhoe or Docking, there were no footpaths available, and it was in a remote location. The Local Plan had recently looked at the boundaries and as stated this was well outside of the settlement boundaries.

Councillor de Winton proposed that the application be approved.

The Council's Legal Advisor advised that the law stated that planning applications had to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicated otherwise. In this case there were no material considerations that would warrant going against the strong policy objection. If the Committee went against the development plan this would cause a precedent and that needed to be avoided. She stressed again that applications needed to be determined in accordance with the development plan.

The proposal for approval was seconded by Councillor Ryves on the grounds that it would be a self-build property.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out roll call on the proposal to approve the application and, after having been put to the vote (7 votes for, 7 votes against) was lost on the Chair's casting vote.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out roll call on the recommendation to refuse the application and, after having been put to the vote (7 votes for, 7 votes against) was carried on the Chair's casting vote.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as recommended.

The Committee then adjourned at 12.29 pm for lunch and reconvened at 1.00 pm.

The Chair and Councillor Devulapalli left the meeting at 12.29 pm. The Vice-Chair took the Chair.

(iv) 25/00611/CU
Harpley: Rowan House, Back Street: Change of use of an existing dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to a residential care home for up to four children aged 8-18 (Use Class C2): Juventus Services

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 the change of use of a dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to a residential care home (Use Class C2) to care for up to four children between the age of 8 – 18 at Rowan House, Back Street, Harpley – a five-bedroom property.

The application site was approximately 0.08ha in size, located on the northeast side of Back Street, which was approximately 760 m from the centre of Harpley Village.

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

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

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Adam Case (objecting) and Simon Bailey (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to comments raised by the public speakers, the case officer made reference to LP29 which referred to housing for the elderly and specialist care and advised that it was relevant in relation to this application. In relation to Highways, there was no objection from the Highway's Authority and the site could accommodate 3 parking spaces and this was considered to be acceptable. The site would remain a residential site, C2 was still a residential use not occupied not by a single household.

Councillor Barclay drew attention to the fact that it was a remote village and agricultural with tractors, teleporters driving around. There were no pavements and was single carriageway. He said that there were no facilities in the village, no primary school, pub or shop. The Parish Council were against and not enough space for parking and a turning facility. He did not feel that this was a suitable location for the proposal.

Councillor Kemp added that there was a need for this type of proposal around Norfolk. She added that the young people would be supervised. She stated that this was a pleasant environment. She asked whether play equipment would be installed along with other things for them to do and try to engage with the community.

The case officer advised that play equipment could be installed within the site area if required.

The Planning Control Manager advised that the use effectively was being used as a home where people interacted as a home whilst being provided with specialist care. This was fundamentally different to a larger scale institutional use where there were all sorts of different facilities. This was a home provision specifically as such and was made provision for within the use classes order.

Councillor Kemp added that engagement with the community was important.

Councillor de Winton asked whether Harpley was an appropriate place for the proposal. It was a very quiet village and not much there for children to do.

Councillor Bubb also queried whether this was the right location. He added that Back Street was quite away from the Main Street in Harpley. He added that there was a bus route occasionally through Harpley.

Councillor Ryves referred back to a previous application which had been refused by the Committee due to lack of facilities for the children. The Planning Control Manager advised that from her recollection it was the changes to the house that required planning permission. Councillor Ryves added that it was a rural location with a lack of facilities and no pavements or streetlights. He added that he could not see that it was a safe place for children.

The Planning Control Manager added that within villages rural or otherwise there were lot of families and children. This facility would be used as a family home for a number of children and would operate like that. It was not a large institutional use and an appropriate use for the locality, and there were lots of different families within the village.

The case officer referred the Committee to page 57 of the agenda where the criteria under LP29 was considered and Harpley did have a village hall, a primary school and facilities considered appropriate for the residents of this intended home and on that basis, it was considered that Harpley was an appropriate location.

Councillor Blunt reminded the Committee of the similar application at Walpole St Andrew which had been refused by the Committee. In relation to this application, he stated that there was nothing in the conditions regarding limiting the use and he felt that this should be included within the conditions.

The Planning Control Manager advised that a condition could be imposed regarding the number of children to be cared for at the property to define the consent.

Councillor de Whalley stated that he grew up the country. He saw a beautiful house and excellent proposal and considered Harpley to be a wonderful location. He therefore supported the application.

Councillor Ryves referred to the fact that the officer had stated that there was a primary school in the village but pointed out that the application was for children aged between 8-18, so he could not see how this point supported the application.

The Planning Control Manager advised that she had heard from the debate that there had been concerns relating to parking and an additional condition could be imposed requiring full details of the parking and turning area to be submitted and agreed and implemented prior to the first occupation of the development. The other condition suggested related to the number of children to be cared for at the site limiting it to 4, in accordance with the details submitted by the applicant.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out roll call on the recommendation to approve the application subject to the additional

conditions detailed above and, after having been put to the vote was lost (5 votes for, 6 votes against and 1 abstention).

The Committee then carried on with the debate.

Councillor Bubb proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that Harpley was considered to be an inappropriate location for the proposed scheme due to the lack of community facilities and lack of public transport, outweighing the benefits of the scheme, contrary to LP29.

The proposal for refusal was seconded by Councillor Everett.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out roll call on the proposal to refuse the application and, after having been put to the vote was carried (6 votes for, 5 votes against and 1 abstention).

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

Harpley was considered to be an inappropriate location for the proposed scheme due to the lack of community facilities and lack of public transport, outweighing the benefits of the scheme, contrary to LP29.

(v) 25/00720/F
Methwold: 12 The Avenue: Self-build – Demolition of No.12's garage for the erection of a self-build bungalow: 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 was for a self-build bungalow, following the demolition of No. 12's detached garage at 112 The Avenue, Brookville, IP26 4RF.

Brookville was classified as a Tier 6 settlement (Smaller Village and Hamlet) in LP01 of the Local Plan 2021 – 2040. The application site was approximately 0.09ha in size, located within the development boundary of Brookville.

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

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

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out roll call on the recommendation to approve the application and, after having been put to the vote was carried (9 votes for and 1 abstention).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, as recommended.

(Item (vi) was taken first in the meeting)

(vi) 25/00561/F
Wereham: Barn at E568308, N301300, Stoke Road: Proposed residential development involving the demolition of existing barn complex: 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. She did not take part in the debate or decision.

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application site was 0.20 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 the Planning Policies Map.

The application sought full planning consent for the demolition of the existing barn and the construction of four new dwellings with associated parking, turning and amenity space, with the building on the footprint of the barn to be demolished. The dwellings proposed were single storey, two-bedroom homes, which was as the scheme approved under the Prior Approval application.

Members will recall previous applications had been presented to Planning Committee in 2023 and 2024 for the residential development following the demolition of the existing barn complex (planning references 22/01893/F and 23/00848/F). In both cases the applications were refused by Planning Committee. This decision should be balanced against the extant fallback position established under planning permission 24/02033/PACU3, for the conversion of the building to four dwellings and the Inspectors decision to the appeal for 23/00848/F (appeal reference: APP/V2635/W/23/3334048).

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

The Committee noted the key issues to be considered whilst determining the application, as set out in the report.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Sandra Calvert (objecting), Cllr Gail Koopowitz (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) and Shanna Penney (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Lintern addressed the Committee and outlined her concerns to the application.

In response to comments raised by the public speakers, the case officer drew the Committee's attention to Condition 12 relating to boundary treatments which needed to be submitted and agreed, conditions 9 and 10 were very detailed tree protection conditions and conditions 6-8 were archaeological conditions. She also advised the Committee that there were no objections from statutory consultees.

In relation to highways, the Local Highway Authority had no objections and condition 6 had been imposed to secure the visibility splay. She also drew attention to the Appeal Statement and fall-back position.

In response to a comment from Councillor Bubb, the case officer advised that soundproofing would have to be to Building Control Standards.

Councillor de Whalley made reference to paragraph 27 of the Inspector's Appeal Statement which stated that the location of the proposed dwellings would conflict with the development plan regarding the distribution of housing outside of settlement boundaries. The conflict was with the development plan as a whole. It then went on to say that in light of the limited weight given to the fallback scheme as well as the stated benefits, these material considerations did not outweigh the conflict with the development plan …. He stated that he was in a difficult situation as this was an inditement of the Part Q regulations and should be something of a conversion rather than redevelopment and the Planning Inspector had stated that this was in conflict with the Development Plan as a whole. The argument from the officers was that the fallback scheme was better than the appeal that we should now change the balance of weight and approve it.

The Planning Control Manager stated that it was fundamentally changed in so far as there was effectively no conflict now and there was a legitimate fallback position which had 3 years to be developed and completed, the Inspectors report saying that the design and layout of the scheme, which was very similar to that in front of the Committee today, was acceptable in planning terms and there was no conflict with the development plan in so far as those particular aspects, so the balance had shifted in favour of the development as a whole given that it was adjacent to a development boundary and complied with the criteria of LP02. In terms of sustainability of the village, there were villages that was reliant on the car given that it was a rural area. There were bus routes within Wereham and the scheme would also be built to modern standards. The balance had shifted and was acceptable in planning terms.

Councillor Ryves asked whether an applicant could apply under Class Q repetitively and indefinitely? Councillor Ryves added that he did not

agree that an applicant could submit another application under Class Q if they had already failed to meet the timelines of a previous application.

The case officer explained that as long as the application met the legal requirements, as out in the regulations they could keep applying.

When looking at the building it seemed to be cramming in 4 residential units. He asked why 4 residential units would be acceptable. He added the site was not sustainable and a point was very well made by the speakers regarding highways. The Local Highway Authority actually did not say that they approved the application. It also considered that there would be lots of traffic going in and out of the site onto a strategic road A134. He also considered that this was not a high-quality design.

The case officer advised that the regulations allowed for that many units and from the officer's point of view it met with the requirements.

The Assistant Director advised that if the Committee ignored the Inspectors decision, then there would be a risk of costs if it went to appeal.

The Planning Control Manager referred to pages 85 and 86 of the agenda which went into detail about the policy context and fallback position.

The Legal Advisor explained the background and requirements of Class Q to the Committee.

The Democratic Services Officer then conducted a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application and, after having been put to the vote was lost (6 votes for, 8 votes against).

Because the recommendation was lost, the debate continued. It was proposed by Councillor de Winton, seconded by Councillor Ryves that the application be refused as set out in reason for refusal 1 on page 84 of the agenda, subject to it being amended to reflect the current local plan.

The Democratic Services Officer then conducted a roll call on the proposal to refuse the application and, after having been put to the vote was carried (6 votes for, 3 votes against and 3 abstentions).

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

The site lies outside of the development boundary for Wereham where development is restricted to that identified as sustainable in rural areas. The proposal constitutes the inappropriate development of land in the countryside without justification and while there is a fallback position as

a result of the extant consent 24/02033/PACU3, this does not outweigh the policy stance. As a result, the scheme is contrary to the overarching aims of policy LP02 of the Local Plan (2021 – 2040).

.

The Committee then adjourned at 10.48 am and reconvened at 11.02 am

(vii) 25/00664/F
West Walton: Clark's Paddock, 154 Salts Road: Self-build – Proposed replacement dwelling and part change of use of land: Mr and Mrs J Clark

Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube

The case officer introduced the report and explained that planning permission was sought for a proposed self-build replacement dwelling and part change of use of the land to residential at Clark's Paddock, 154 Salts Road, West Walton.

West Walton was classified as a Tier 4 Settlement (Key Rural Service Centre) under Policy LP01 of the Local Plan 2021-2040. The application site was located outside of the development boundary of West Walton and was not an allocated site in the Local Plan.

The case officer drew the Committee's attention to the need to add an additional condition to ensure the removal of the mobile home within one month of the completion of the replacement dwelling.

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

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

The Democratic Services Office read out a statement from Councillor Kirk who could not be present at the meeting.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out roll call on the recommendation to approve the application with the additional condition referred to above and, after having been put to the vote was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended subject to an additional condition requiring the removal of the mobile home within one month after completion of the replacement dwelling.

PC22: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

The meeting closed at 1.58 pm