

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

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 3rd November, 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 T Barclay, R Blunt, A Bubb, M de Whalley, T de Winton,  
P Devulapalli, S Everett, J Fry, S Lintern, C Rose, Mrs V Spikings and M Storey

**PC58: APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Ryves.

**PC59: MINUTES**

The minutes of the previous meetings held on 6 and 9 October 2025 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**PC60: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor de Winton advised that he would withdraw from the Committee and speak under Standing Order 34 for application 9/1(a) – Brancaster, as he was Chair of the Parish Council.

Councillor de Whalley advised that he would withdraw from the Committee and speak under Standing Order 34 for application 9/3(b) as he was acquainted with the applicant.

**PC61: URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no urgent business under Standing Order 7.

**PC62: MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

|                       |        |                       |
|-----------------------|--------|-----------------------|
| Councillor de Winton  | 9/1(a) | Brancaster            |
| Councillor A Beales   | 9/3(a) | Castle Acre           |
| Councillor de Whalley | 9/3(b) | East Winch            |
| Councillor S Squire   | 9/3(c) | Terrington St Clement |

**PC63: CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC64: **RECEIPT OF CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED AFTER THE PUBLICATION OF THE AGENDA**

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

PC65: **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) – (vi) below, where appropriate to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chair.

*This item was moved to the first item on the agenda.*

**(i) 25/01186/F**

**Terrington St Clement: Owl Barn, Green Marsh Road: New self-build single storey house utilising footprint, volume and structure of part demolished barn: Mr Stephen Clarkson**

[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 new self-build single storey house, utilising footprint, volume and structure of a part demolished barn along Green Marsh Road in the parish of Terrington St Clement.

The application site approximately 0.22 ha in size, located within the countryside, approximately 870 m (straight line distance) north of the development boundary of Terrington St Clement. Terrington St Clement was classified as a Tier 4 settlement, under the settlement hierarchy of LP01 of the Local Plan 2021 – 2040.

The site had recent planning history which was material to the determination of the application. The site had consent under Class Q to convert a barn on the site to a dwellinghouse. However, it was discovered during a site visit that a large part of the former agricultural barn on the site had collapsed. Therefore, the permitted development right granted under 22/01019/PACU3 had fallen away and could no longer be carried out. The development was therefore for a new dwellinghouse.

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

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

In accordance with the adopted speaking protocol, Mr Leonard Appleby (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Squire addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The Committee made reference to the planning history, noting previous Class Q consent for two dwellings on the site and the subsequent collapse of the barn due to structural issues. Members debated the difference in policy considerations between Class Q and the current application, with several Councillors highlighting the inconsistency in flood risk acceptance between the two routes.

Several Members expressed support for the application, citing the precedent set by previous approvals, the lack of objections from statutory consultees, and the benefits of self-build.

It was proposed by Councillor de Winton and seconded by Councillor de Whalley that the application should be approved on the grounds that significant weight had been given to the previous Class Q approval, and it met the need of self-build.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application, with conditions to be imposed following consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair and, having been put to the vote was carried unanimously.

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

*Significant weight is given to the planning history of the site along with the provision of custom and self-build which together outweigh the policy objections to the proposal.*

- (ii) **25/00865/F**  
**Brancaster: 3 Saw Mill Road: Variation of condition 2 and removal of condition 7 attached to planning permission 24/01167/F: Extensions, alterations and remodelling of dwelling and proposed outbuilding: N Barley**

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

*Councillor de Winton withdrew and addressed the Committee under Standing Order 34. He took no part in the debate or decision.*

The case officer reminded the Committee that the application had been deferred from the 6<sup>th</sup> October Planning Committee in order to reassess the officer report for accurate consideration of the application under the s73A procedure. The report had been updated to take into account those amendments.

The application sought consent for a variation of condition 2 (approved plans) and removal of condition 7 (foundation design and construction methodology) through s73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in relation to planning permission 24/01167/F for 'extensions, alterations & remodelling of dwelling and proposed outbuilding'.

Brancaster was classified as a Key Rural Service Centre within the Settlement Hierarchy of the Core Strategy and Tier 4 (Key Rural Service Centre) under the new Local Plan.

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

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

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

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

Several Members of the Committee outlined their concerns about developers not adhering to conditions and the limitations of the planning system regarding retrospective applications. Members discussed the inability to penalise developers for such breaches under current law.

Members sought clarification on whether 'bad behaviour' could be a material consideration and whether structural integrity concerns were a planning or building control matter. Officers confirmed that retrospective applications were permitted in law and that foundation issues were for building control.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application and, having been put to the vote was carried (10 votes for, 1 against and 1 abstention).

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

*The Committee adjourned at 10.21 am and reconvened at 10.32 am.*

**(iii) 24/01275/FM**

**Walpole: Land E548887 N317051 NE of White House Farm, Frenchs Road, Walpole St Andrew: Construction of a battery energy storage system and ancillary development: STP Green Limited**

[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 installation of a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) at White House Farm on two sites, both sides of French's Road, approximately 300m to the west of Walpole Bank. The larger / northern site (Parcel A) comprised approximately 3.5ha of agricultural land and the smaller / southern site (Parcel B) approximately 0.35 ha which was proposed to accommodate the associated transformers and telecommunications mast.

Primary access to Parcel A would be off French's Road to the east of White House Farm and a second / emergency access to the west of White House Lodge. Access to Parcel B was again off French's Road opposite White House Farm.

The BESS would store excess electricity at times of low demand and then release it back into the grid when required at peak times. It would be rated at up to 200MW and would therefore be capable of serving the needs of between 200,000 – 400,000 homes for one hour if required.

An operational period of thirty (30) years was sought by the applicants.

The sites were located outside of the development boundary for Walpole St Andrew / Walpole St Peter / Walpole Marsh and was therefore in an area classed as 'countryside'. The locality was dominated by Walpole Substation and its associated infrastructure including pylons and overhead cabling plus other energy related development. French's Road comprised a mix of sporadic residential properties and agricultural buildings on the northern frontage.

The sites were arable and grass land respectively, classed as grade 2 agricultural land. Parcel A was located mostly in Flood Zone 1, and Parcel B in Flood Zone 2 of EA mapping but both fell within the Tidal Hazard Mapping Zone. There was significant apparatus associated with National Grid in the vicinity of the site.

The BESS was considered to be 'associated infrastructure' in relation to the management and use of energy and the National commitment to carbon neutrality by 2050. It should therefore be mainly considered in the context of Policy LP24 of the Local Plan accordingly.

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

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

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Thistleton (objecting) and Mr John Simkin (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Blunt (Ward Member) agreed with the comments made by the objector in relation to the siting of the BESS near homes, citing industrialisation of the area and potential for the facility to be located further from residences.

Several Committee Members echoed concerns about residential amenity, noise, and visual impact.

The Committee also questioned the adequacy of landscaping, noise mitigation, fire safety, and flood risk measures. Officers confirmed that conditions would require robust landscaping with mature trees, acoustic fencing, and a battery safety management plan reviewed in consultation with the fire service.

Councillor Lintern proposed that Conditions 5 and 6 be amended to include a requirement for mature evergreen planting and the retention of the landscaping for the lifetime of the development. This was seconded by Councillor Mrs Spikings and agreed by the Committee.

Councillor Lintern also proposed that Condition 23 should be amended to include a mechanism and timeframe for reviewing the fire safety management plan (5 years, 7 years and 10 years from the commencement of use and thereafter every 5 years), seconded by Councillor Spikings and agreed by the Committee.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application subject to amendments to conditions, including requirements for mature evergreen planting, a mechanism and timeframe for reviewing the fire safety management plan (5 years, 7 years and 10 years from the commencement of use and thereafter every 5 years), and retention of landscaping for the lifetime of the development and, after having been put to the vote was carried (10 votes for, 2 votes against and 1 abstention).

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved as recommended, subject to amendments to conditions, including requirements for mature evergreen planting, a mechanism and timeframe for reviewing the fire safety management plan, and retention of landscaping for the lifetime of the development.

*The Committee adjourned at 11.35 am and reconvened at 11.45 am.*

**(iv) 25/01297/F**

**Castle Acre: Ran Revir, Bailey Street: Self-build and part retrospective: Erection of replacement dwelling (part retrospective) and detached garage: Mr M Green**

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the proposal was a part retrospective application for a self-build dwelling house and detached garage at Ran Revir, Bailey Street, Castle Acre.

The site was approximately 0.11ha in size comprising residential garden land with the remains of a recently demolished detached bungalow and foundations of the replacement dwelling to the north of the plot.

The site was within Castle Acre's Neighbourhood Plan area (adopted in February 2022), development boundary identified within the Local Plan 2021-2040, and Conservation Area. The site was the last dwelling on the southern edge of Castle Acre along Bailey Street. The vehicular access to the site was opposite the junction of Blind Lane with Bailey Street.

Planning permission under reference 24/00256/F was refused in December 2024 for the same development due to an inadequate flood risk assessment set out in paragraph 20 and 21 of the PPG and impact of the proposal to the loss of the flood plain storage. This application sought to address the reason for refusal for a new dwelling on the site.

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

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

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Hazel Fenner (objecting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Beales addressed the Committee.

In response to comments raised, the case officer explained the flood risk assessment, compensatory floodplain storage proposals, and the Environment Agency's acceptance of the revised scheme.

Committee Members asked for reassurance that the measures would adequately protect neighbouring properties and the road. The case officer advised that the Environment Agency considered the proposal acceptable and that it would be betterment for the site and surrounding neighbours.

Councillor Lintern proposed the need for pre-commencement implementation of mitigation measures, and the potential for ongoing monitoring. This was seconded by Councillor Spikings and agreed by the Committee to strengthen condition 6 to require flood storage to be in place before any further development.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application subject to Condition 6 being amended to require flood storage to be in place before further development and, after having been put to the vote was carried (7 votes for, 3 votes against and 3 abstentions).

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved, subject to the amendment of condition 6 to require flood storage be in place before any further development took place.

*As the Committee had been nearly sitting for three hours, it was agreed to continue to sit for a further one hour.*

- (v) **25/00590/O**  
**East Winch: Braemore, Lynn Road: Outline application with some matters reserved for the construction of 5 new self / custom build sustainable homes within a site off the A47 at East Winch: Mr Jasbir Singh Anota**

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

*Councillor de Whalley withdrew and addressed the Committee under Standing Order 34. He took no part in the debate or decision.*

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application sought outline planning consent with access, layout and scale. The appearance and landscaping would be determined as part of a reserved matters application.

The proposed development was for five custom and self-build dwellings with associated detached garages and driveways, and private gardens. Access was proposed via a shared single access onto the A47. The site was currently in the form of grassland.

The application site was approximately 0.4ha in size and lies to the north of the A47, in the village of East Winch. East Winch was classified as a Rural Village in the adopted Local Plan. The site was located outside of the development boundary as designated on the Planning Policies Map.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the applicant was related to Councillor Anota.



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

The case officer referred to the correspondence received after the publication of the agenda and advised that two further emails had been received from the applicant. She referred to the objection from National Highways and explained the requirement to refer the application to the Secretary of State for Transport should the Committee propose to grant approval for the application contrary to their advice.

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

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor de Whalley addressed the Committee in support of the application.

In response to comments raised by the speakers, the case officer highlighted the fundamental objections from National Highways regarding direct access onto the A47, as well as local plan policies restricting such development.

Members debated whether the issues were insurmountable, with some suggesting the application was incomplete and required further work.

Councillor de Winton proposed that the application should be deferred for three months to allow the applicant additional time to address highways and noise concerns. The proposal to defer the application was seconded by Councillor Everett.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call on the proposal to defer the application and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (8 votes for and 4 votes against).

**RESOLVED:** That the application be deferred for three months.

**(vi) 25/01308/F**

**Upwell: The Old Barn, 71 School Road and The Stables,  
71A School Road: Retrospective application for external  
cladding to building façade: Ms Caroline Parsons**

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

The application sought retrospective full planning permission for external cladding to properties Old Barn, 71 School Road, and The Stables, 71A School Road, under section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

The site accommodated two semi-detached, two storey dwellings, The Old Barn (71 School Road) and The Stables (71A School Road) and

was located within the Upwell Conservation Area. The properties were identified as important unlisted (non-designated) heritage assets.

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

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, Holly Wilkin (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Members discussed the prevalence of varied finishes in the area, the lack of listed buildings, and the balance between conservation and tenant wellbeing.

Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed that the application be approved on the grounds that the cladding did not demonstrably harm the conservation area. This was seconded by Councillor Storey.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application and, after having been put to the vote was carried (11 votes for and 2 votes against).

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

*Given the varied materials used in the area, the proposed cladding and associated benefits preserved the conservation area.*

PC66: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

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

**The meeting closed at 1.14 pm**