

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 2nd March, 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 T Barclay, R Blunt, A Bubb, M de Whalley, T de Winton,
P Devulapalli, S Everett, J Fry, S Lintern, J Moriarty (sub), C Rose, A Ryves,
Mrs V Spikings and M Storey

PC95: APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Anota (Cllr Moriarty sub).

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

PC96: MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 February 2026 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

PC97: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Lintern declared that she had called in application 9/2(d) – Wretton / Stoke Ferry and would speak under Standing Order 34 but would not take part in the debate or vote on the item.

Councillor de Winton declared that he had called in applications 9/2(b) and 9/2(c) – Ringstead and would speak under Standing Order 34 but would not take part in the debate or vote on the items.

PC98: URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7

There was no urgent business under Standing Order 7.

The Planning Control Manager reminded the Committee that application 9/1(b) – East Winch had been withdrawn from the agenda at the applicant's request.

PC99: MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34

There were no Members present under Standing Order 34.

PC100: **CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC101: **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.

PC102: **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) – (vi) below, where appropriate to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chair.

- (i) **25/01391/FM**
Docking: Land east of Bennet Mews, south and west of Sandy Lane: Full planning application: Erection of 5 no. single storey dwellings, garages, vehicular / pedestrian access, landscaping, and associated infrastructure; together with change of use of parts of site to residential curtilages (for existing dwellings): Vello Ltd

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

The case officer reminded the Committee that this application had been deferred from the Planning Committee on 2 February 2026 in order to seek further information in relation to Anglian Water's objection relating to foul water drainage capacity at Heacham Water Recycling Centre, and whether alternative options for foul drainage would be appropriate. The report had been updated and included the comments in the 'Receipt of correspondence received after the publication of the agenda.'

The case officer advised that full planning permission was sought for the erection of five single storey dwellings together with change of use of parts of the site to residential curtilages (for existing dwellings) at land adjacent to, but outside of the development boundary of Docking.

It was explained that the development would see four open market dwellings and one affordable dwelling constructed.

The proposal had been amended since its original submission from 6 dwellings to 5 dwellings. This would now result in a total of 9 dwellings using the existing private access, which was the maximum allowed under NCC Highways policy.

Foul water drainage would be to the public sewer.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination originally by the Planning Sifting Panel and it had been deferred from the previous meeting.

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

The case officer explained that since the deferral of the application, officers had consulted the applicant and Environment Agency, who advised that due to proximity to the public sewer, package treatment plants were unlikely to be permitted, recommending connection to the public system.

The case officer drew the Committee's attention to the late correspondence in which explained that Anglian Water indicated dry weather flow rates already exceeded permitted levels, but officers had been unable to clarify the meaning or context of these figures, as the information had been received late in the process prompting the recommendation to defer for further investigation.

Councillor de Whalley raised questions about the Environment Act 2021 and the precautionary principle, with officers confirming the need for more information to ensure prevention of environmental harm and proper decision-making.

After extensive discussion, including concerns about Anglian Water's responsiveness and the broader impact on planning across the Borough, it was proposed by the Chair and seconded by the Vice-Chair that the application be deferred until technical information could be clarified. This was agreed by the Committee with a show of hands.

RESOLVED: That the application be deferred.

(ii) 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: Mr Jasbir Singh Anota

This application had been withdrawn from the agenda.

(iii) 25/01782/F

King's Lynn: Car Park at Granary Court, Baker Lane: Re-development of the Baker Lane car park comprising the refurbishment of the single storey toilet block and the erection of a new single storey building to form a Travel Hub comprising cycle parking, storage, repair and changing facilities. Development to include the re-organisation of the existing car park to provide new external vehicle and cycle parking facilities alongside hard and soft landscaping:

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application site related to the northern of the two Baker Lane car parks within King's Lynn Town Centre. The car park currently provided 35 operational uncovered car parking spaces, three of which were disabled bays. The building accommodating public toilets to the southern side of the car park, whilst outside of the red line was connected to the proposed development.

Full planning permission was sought for the redevelopment / re-organisation of the Baker Lane car park in connection with the refurbishment of the single storey toilet block and the erection of a new single storey building to form a Travel Hub, comprising cycle parking, storage, repair and changing facilities, alongside hard and soft landscaping.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as it was a Borough Council application.

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, M J Ray (objecting) and Matthew Blythin (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the design of the scheme.

In response to comments raised by the objector, the Planning Control Manager advised that the Local Highway Authority raised no objection to the application.

Some Members questioned whether the internal layout of the travel hub met manufacturer specifications and debated the adequacy of proposed conditions to address these concerns.

The Planning Control Manager advised that Condition 12 could be amended to include full details of the cycle racks. This was proposed by Councillor Moriarty and seconded by Councillor Storey.

Councillor Blunt raised concerns about the reduction in car parking spaces and its effect on town centre accessibility and revenue.

The Assistant Director clarified the overall parking numbers and emphasised the policy support for sustainable transport.

Several Councillors argued that the hub's location was unsuitable, citing lack of direct links to cycle routes, potential conflicts between cars and cyclists, and the impact on accessibility for local users.

Councillor Ryves proposed that the application should be refused on the grounds that the application was poor design, safety concerns, and unsuitable location. This was seconded by Councillor Fry.

The Assistant Director advised that there were no technical objections to the application.

The Council's Legal Advisor reminded the Committee that the application was in-line with policy. In terms of the cycle racks, condition 12 could be amended to mitigate this issue and in terms of land use the application was acceptable.

In terms of the advice given, Councillor Ryves advised that he still considered that the development was in the wrong location, and that was his reason for refusal. Councillor Fry added that there was no direct link to a cycle route.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to refuse the application and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (10 votes for refusal and 5 votes against).

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

The development would be in an unsuitable location creating potential conflict between cyclists and users, and the facilities would therefore constitute poor design contrary to LP13 of the Local Plan, and the NPPF.

The Committee adjourned at 11.00 am for a comfort break and reconvened at 11.15 am.

(iv) 25/01758/F

**Wretton: Chalk Pit Farm, Lynn Road, Stoke Ferry:
Retention of existing structures for agricultural use and
retention of earth bund: Country Contractors (Norfolk) Ltd**

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

Councillor Lintern withdrew from the meeting and addressed the Committee under Standing Order 34.

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application sought retrospective planning consent for the 'retention of existing structures for agricultural use and retention of earth bund' at Chalk Pit Farm on Lynn Road. The site was located within the parish of Wretton but was located on the approach to the village of Stoke Ferry. Access was via an existing vehicular access off Lynn Road.

The site was located approximately 300m from the development boundary of Stoke Ferry on land designated as open countryside in the adopted Local Plan. Stoke Ferry (the closest) settlement was categorised as a Key Rural Service Centre in Policy LP01 of the Local Plan.

The site was located between a former quarry to the northeast and a former landfill site to the northwest.

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

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

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

The case officer explained that concerns about biodiversity loss had been addressed through amended planning conditions requiring ecological enhancements, including hedgerow planting and habitat management, with input from the ecology officer.

The case officer explained the historic landfill and contamination risks, with environmental quality teams having investigated and found the site acceptable, and conditions ensuring ongoing suitability for animal keeping.

Councillor Spikings requested tighter wording for condition 6 to specify implementation timelines. The case officer referred to Condition 6 and advised that this could be amended '... carried out in full in accordance with the approved details within 3 months ...' This was proposed by Councillor Spikings and seconded by Councillor Bone and agreed by the Committee.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application with amendments to conditions 6 and 7 as detailed in the correspondence received after the publication of the agenda and the further amendment to condition 6 agreed by the Committee, and after having been put to the vote, was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, as recommended, subject to amendments to conditions 6 and 7, as detailed in the correspondence received after the publication of the agenda, and the further amendment to condition 6 agreed by the Committee.

(v) **25/01678/F**

Ringstead: April Cottage, 2 Chapel Lane: Single storey extension to replace existing: Mr & Mrs Skinner

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

Councillor de Winton withdrew from the meeting and addressed the Committee under Standing Order 34.

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application was for a single storey extension to replace an existing extension / porch.

The application site was located within Ringstead development boundary as seen within the policies map as defined by the Local Plan 2021-2040 and Figure 13 of Ringstead Neighbourhood Plan. Ringstead was classified as a Tier 6: Smaller Villages and Hamlets under Policy LP01 of the Local Plan.

The surrounding area was residential, with a designated local green space, allocated by Policy 8 of Ringstead Neighbourhood Plan, to the south of the site. The site accommodated a white painted clunch two-storey dwelling, with brick and timber extension / porch to the west. On site there was a detached mono-pitched outbuilding to the north-west corner. The site and surroundings fell within Ringstead Conservation Area and the Norfolk Coast National Landscape.

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

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

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor de Winton 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: That the application be approved as recommended.

(vi) **25/02119/F**

Ringstead: Mary-Lyn, 9 Burnham Road: Variation of conditions 2, 3 and 10 attached to planning permission 24/01813/F: Self Build: Demolition of existing bungalow

and replacement with a new 1.5 storey property: Mr R Hutchinson

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

Councillor de Winton withdrew from the meeting and addressed the Committee under Standing Order 34.

The case officer introduced the report and explained that planning permission was granted on 4 March 2026 for the demolition of an existing bungalow that stood on site and its replacement with a new 1.5 storey dwelling (24/01813/F).

The application sought to vary the design of the proposed dwelling (Condition 2). The applicant had discharged Conditions 3 (materials) and 10 (foul and surface water drainage) of the original planning consent (24/01831/F) and wished for these conditions to be amended in line with the details which had already been agreed within the discharge of conditions applications.

The application site was within the development boundary of Ringstead, approximately 0.08 ha in size, and located along the north side of Burham Road. The site was approximately 51.6m to the east of Ringstead's Conservation Area and within the National Landscape.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor de Winton, and it was noted that the Parish Council objected to the proposal which was at variance with the officer recommendation.

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

In response to Councillor De Winton's comment regarding the removal of permitted development rights, the Planning Control Manager explained that Condition 10 took away any alterations to the roof of the dwelling and guidance was clear regarding the removal of permitted development rights which should only be done in exceptional circumstances. The main issues were to keep the height low and was the main reason for Condition 10.

Councillor Moriarty drew the Committee's attention to the conservation team's arguments which were strong.

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 (12 votes for and 2 against).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

PC103: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

RESOLVED: That the reports be noted.

The meeting closed at 11.45 am