

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 12th January, 2026 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, R Blunt, A Bubb, R Coates (sub), M de Whalley,
T de Winton, S Everett, J Fry, S Lintern, J Moriarty (sub), C Rose, A Ryves,
Mrs V Spikings and M Storey

PC77: APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Barclay (Cllr Coates sub) and Councillor Devulapalli (Cllr Moriarty sub).

The Chair thanked the subs for attending the meeting.

PC78: MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 1 December 2025 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

PC79: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor de Winton declared a pecuniary interest in relation to application 9/2(a) – Brancaster, as he was the applicant.

Councillor Mrs V M Spikings declared an interest in relation to application 9/2(f) – Walsoken, as she knew the applicant personally and would leave the meeting during consideration of the item.

PC80: URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7

There was no urgent business under Standing Order 7.

PC81: MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34

The following Councillors attended and addressed the Committee under Standing Order 34:

Cllr T Parish	9/1(a)	Sedgeford
Cllr S Ring	9/2(d)	North Wootton
Cllr J Kirk	9/2(f)	Walsoken

PC82: **CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC83: **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.

PC84: **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 applications 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) 25/00641/FM

Sedgeford: Sedgeford First School, Ringstead Road: Change of use of former School from education (Class F1a) to residential use (Class C3), subdivision of headteachers cottage, alongside demolition of ancillary structures, erection of new dwellings, creation of new access, cycle parking, car parking, hard and soft landscaping, plant and associated works: c/o Agent

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application sought full planning permission for the conversion of the Sedgeford First School (and associated Headmasters House) to 8 flats and the construction of 12 new build houses within the surrounding site. Two on-site affordable units were proposed.

The site was wholly within the development boundary within the Policies Plan and in a position where residential development was supported by Policy LP02. The site was also within the Sedgeford Conservation Area which there was a duty to preserve or enhance.

The existing school building which had been unused since 2020 was designated as a community facility under Policy C1 of the Sedgeford Neighbourhood Plan.

The Sedgeford Neighbourhood Plan had a principal residency requirement which applied to the application.

The case officer pointed out a correction in the report in relation to GIRAMS tariff. The current fee was £304.17 per dwelling.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Parish and the officer recommendation was at variance with the views of the Parish Council.

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 B Clark on behalf of Sedgeford Parish Council and Claire Galilee (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

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

Committee members debated the adequacy of parking enforcement, the need for glazing restrictions to protect dark skies, the provision of public open space, biodiversity net gain (BNG) and tree replacement, and the implications of Anglian Water's concerns about sewage capacity.

After clarification from the Council's Legal Advisor in relation to the applicant being Norfolk County Council, Councillors Storey and Moriarty declared an interest in the application as Norfolk County Councillors and took no part in the debate or decision.

Councillor Lintern proposed that an additional condition be imposed to require glazing restrictions to protect dark skies. This was seconded by Councillor Fry.

In response to a question from Councillor Lintern, it was confirmed that Condition 16 could be amended to require the use of semi-mature tree planting rather than saplings.

Officers also clarified that amendments to conditions would be assessed on their merits if submitted in the future.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application subject to the following, and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (10 votes for and 2 abstentions).

- the imposition of an additional condition to require glazing restrictions to protect dark skies;
- Condition 16 being amended to require the use of semi-mature tree planting rather than saplings; and
- Condition 29 being amended, as set out in the Correspondence received after the publication of the agenda

RESOLVED: That the application be:

- (A) **APPROVE** – subject to the completion of a Section 106 to secure affordable housing, GIRAMS tariff, principal residency and any associated monitoring fees. If the agreement is not completed within 4 months of the Committee resolution, but reasonable progress had been made, delegated authority is granted to the Assistant Director / Planning Control Manager to continue negotiation and complete the agreement and issue the decision and:
- the imposition of an additional condition to require glazing restrictions to protect dark skies;
 - Condition 16 being amended to require the use of semi-mature tree planting rather than saplings; and
 - Condition 29 being amended, as set out in the Correspondence received after the publication of the agenda
- (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.

Councillor Anota joined the meeting.

- (ii) **25/00118/F**
Brancaster: Land east of 1 Saxon Field, Main Road:
Change of use from agricultural land to commercial with
installation of 5 no. holiday lodges and 3 no. camping pods:
Mr Tom de-Winton

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

Councillor de Winton declared a pecuniary interest in the application and addressed the Committee as a member of the public and left the meeting during consideration of the item.

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application sought full planning permission for the change of use of

land from agricultural land to commercial tourism use and the installation of 5 no. holiday lodges and 3 no. camping pods on land east of Saxon Field, Main Road, Brancaster.

Various works of operational development were proposed, including the construction of a relocated access, private driveway / parking spaces, and the construction of an acoustic bund / fence.

The site formed part of a Scheduled Ancient Monument known as Branodunum.

The business plan was amended during the course of the application to set out that the holiday use would be for temporary / short stay purposes and the lodges / pods would not be owner-occupied second homes.

The site was located outside of the development boundary within the countryside. The site was within the Norfolk Coast National Landscape and within the Brancaster Neighbourhood Plan (covering the villages of Brancaster, Brancaster Staithe and Burnham Deepdale).

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the applicant was Councillor de Winton.

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 T de Winton (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, subject to an amendment to condition 20 and reason, as set out in the Correspondence received after the publication of the agenda and, after having been put to the vote, was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended subject to the amended condition and reason, set out below:

20 Condition: Vehicular / pedestrian / cyclists to and egress from the adjoining highway shall be limited to the proposed access shown on Drawing No. DEW02.01.04 only. The existing boundary wall shall be made good in accordance with a detailed scheme to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority prior to the bringing into use of the new access, or otherwise in accordance with a timeframe to be agreed in writing.

20 Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with the NPPF and Policy LP13 of the Local Plan and to ensure a

satisfactory external appearance in the interests of the locality in line with Policy LP21 of the Local Plan.

The Committee then adjourned for a comfort break at 10.30 am and reconvened at 10.45 am.

- (iii) **25/01595/LB**
Middleton: Middleton Castle, Station Road, Tower End:
Listed Building consent application for installation of 2.025
m timber fencing: MT Heritage Enterprises Ltd

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

The Conservation Officer introduced the report and explained that the applicant was seeking listed building consent to retain a close panel boarded fence attached to the curtilage listed wall, outside of a grade I listed building.

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

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

Members discussed the visual and structural impact of the fence, the lack of prior consultation with the conservation officer, and possible alternatives such as raising the wall or using a hedge. The applicant's reasons for privacy were acknowledged, but the Committee emphasised the importance of heritage protection.

Councillor Blunt proposed that the application be deferred for 2 months to allow the opportunity for the applicant to work with officers to find a better solution. This was seconded by Councillor Coates.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call on the proposal to defer the application for 2 months and, after having been put to the vote, was lost (3 votes for, 11 votes against and 1 abstention).

As the proposal was lost, 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 vote against and 4 abstentions).

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as recommended.

- (iv) **25/01728/F**
Middleton: Tower Farm, Station Road, Tower End:
Retrospective construction of timber boundary fence 2.770
m high: Mr & Mrs T Barclay

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that retrospective planning permission was sought for a timber boundary fence, erected above an existing brick and carstone wall, 0.90m over the height of the existing wall, bringing the total height to 2.77m at the highest point (some variation exists due to the sloping land levels). Timber mountings were present on the rear of the wall and were affixed to the wall itself. The site was located along Station Road, Middleton at Tower Farm. Tower Farm itself was approximately 750m northeast from the development boundary for Middleton and was considered to be within the countryside.

The boundary wall was originally permitted under application 16/00906/F at a height of 1.35m, then modified under application 17/0104/F to a height of 2.08 m.

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

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 refuse the application and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (10 votes for, 3 against and 2 abstentions).

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as recommended.

- (v) **25/01495/F**
North Wootton: Linnymead, Manor Road: Change of use of domestic garden building to Pilates Studio with the sale of refreshments (Class E): Mr B Smith

[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 retrospective change of use of a domestic garden building to a Pilates Studio and the change of use of a small area at the rear of the existing domestic garage to a servery ancillary to and used in association with the Pilates Studio.

The site was located within the development boundary of North Wootton, which was designated as a 'Settlement adjacent to King's Lynn and the Main Towns' (Tier 3) by Development Plan Policy LP01.

If approved, the permission would result in a mixed-use site comprising residential (Use Class C3) and Pilates Studio and ancillary servery (Use Class E(d) indoor sport, recreation or fitness excluding motorised vehicles, firearms, swimming and skating).

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 B Smith (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Ring addressed the Committee in support of the application highlighting the need for a trial period and the importance of strict conditions, especially regarding hours and parking.

In response to a comment from Councillor Coates, the case officer confirmed that the reference to am and pm could be removed from Condition 5 to make the condition clearer.

Members discussed the parking arrangements, noise concerns, and the need to protect a prominent oak tree. Councillor Mrs Spikings asked if an informative regarding tree protection for the Oak tree could be added to the consent. This was agreed by the Committee.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application with an informative regarding protection for the Oak tree be added to the consent and, after having been put to the vote, was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

Councillor Fry left the meeting.

(vi) **25/01697/F**

Upwell: Barns at Old Farm, Horsehead Drove, Lott's Bridge, Three Holes: Self Build: Proposed barn conversion and extensions and continued temporary occupation of a mobile home / caravan plus shed and decking: Mr Oliver Hartley

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application site was located in open fenland approximately 3km from Three Holes, 2.4km from Lakes End and 3.6 km from Nordelph. It was accessed via an agricultural track (approximately 800m long) leading off the junction of Horsehead Drove, Cock Fen and Flint House Drove – all single width carriageways, some considerable distance from classified roads.

It was located within an area classed as countryside and within Flood Zone 2 and mostly within Flood Zone 3a of the Council adopted

Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. It contained a traditional brick-built barn with some rustic character / merit, and a more contemporary corrugated sheet metal open fronted machinery building with a curved roofline.

The proposal sought to demolish the open store, convert the existing traditional barn and construct additional accommodation in the form of mostly single storey extensions.

Retrospective permission was also sought for the continued temporary occupation of a 3-bedroom caravan, plus shed and decking sited to the south of the pond.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Mrs Spikings due to issues of wider concern.

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 Penney (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Committee Members discussed the application, citing the need for self-build, the positive reuse of the barn, and the lack of harm to the countryside.

Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed that the application be approved, stating that weight had been given to the fact that it would be a self-build and the re-use of a redundant building. This was seconded by Councillor Rose.

The Planning Control Manager clarified that what she was hearing from the Committee was that the applicant was in control of the barn adjacent to the site, they were giving weight to the re-use of the redundant barn, there was no harm regarding design and the fact that it would be a custom and self-build project would therefore be acceptable with policies LP18, LP21, LP35 and LP31 of the Local Plan. She further advised that if the Committee were minded approving the application then a Section 106 Agreement would be required to ensure that the proposal was a self-build development.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application subject to conditions to be agreed following consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair and a Section 106 Agreement to secure the custom and self-build development and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (12 votes for, 1 against and 1 abstention).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, contrary to recommendation, subject to conditions to be agreed following consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair and completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure the self-build development, for the following reasons:

The applicant was in control of the barn adjacent to the site, and weight was attached to the re-use of the redundant barn, there was no harm regarding design and the fact that it would be a custom and self-build project would therefore be acceptable in accordance with the NPPF and policies LP18, LP21, LP35 and LP31 of the Local Plan.

(vii) **25/01675/O**

Walsoken: Land to rear of 1 to 3 Griffin Close: Outline Application Self Build: Proposed Custom / Self-Build Dwelling: Mr & Mrs P Griffin

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

Councillor Mrs Spikings declared an interest and left the meeting during consideration of the application as she was acquainted with the applicant.

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application site was located to the south of Griffin Close, a fairly newly established enclave of development east of Green Lane close to its junction with Broadend Road where it meets Burrettgate Road in the parish of Walsoken.

The site was located within an area classed as countryside and within Flood Zone 1 of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Outline permission was sought for a proposed custom / self-build dwelling with only access for consideration at this stage and all other matters reserved for future consideration.

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.

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

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Fred Leach (supporting 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 Kirk addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Committee members discussed the site's context, the need for self-build housing, that the proposal would complete the development of the area and the minor nature of policy conflicts.

Councillor Storey proposed that the application be approved as he considered that the proposal would enhance the form and character of the area. This was seconded by Councillor Blunt.

The Planning Control Manager clarified that what she had heard from the debate was that Members considered that the proposal would enhance the form and character of the area and that weight should be given to fact that this was a custom and self-build project which outweighed the minor conflict with the Local Plan in terms of its location.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application subject to conditions to be agreed with the Chair and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure the custom and self-build development and, after having been put to the vote, was carried 12 votes for and 1 against.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, contrary to recommendation, subject to conditions to be agreed with the Chair and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure the custom and self-build development.

The proposal enhanced the form and character of the area and the need for custom and self-build housing outweighs the minor conflict with the development plan in terms of its location and as a result complies with Policy LP31.

PC85: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

RESOLVED: That the reports be noted.

The meeting closed at 1.00 pm