



PC109: **CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC110: **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.

PC111: **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) – (iii) 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 Members that the application had been deferred from the Planning Committee held on 2 February 2026 and then again on 2 March 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.

It was reported that from 1 April 2026, Anglian Water would be changing their methodology for calculating capacity at their Water Recycling Centres. This had resulted in a change in position for Heacham Water Recycling Centre. The latest correspondence received stated that Heacham Water Recycling Centre was operating within the accepted parameters and could accommodate the flows arising from the proposed development.

Members were informed that for ease of use, amendments had been made to the March report (in bold) which also included 'Receipt of correspondence received after publication of the agenda.

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.

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

Councillor Ryves and the Assistant Director debated the legal right to connect to the sewer, referencing both a KC's legal opinion and Supreme Court case law. The Assistant Director confirmed that case law established an absolute right to connect, which overrode environmental objections.

Councillor de Winton proposed that the Committee should go to the vote and approve the application. This was seconded by Councillor Bubb.

Following legal advice it was agreed to continue with the debate.

Councillor Ryves raised concerns about access arrangements, particularly for refuse collection and delivery vehicles, questioning whether the road layout allowed safe turning and access. The case officer responded that the local highway authority had no objections and confirmed turning areas existed for delivery vehicles.

The Legal Advisor advised that the Committee should now go to the vote.

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 3 against).

**RESOLVED:A:** That the application be **approved**, subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure Affordable Housing. 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 be **refused** on the failure to secure Affordable Housing in line with Policy LP28 of the Local Plan.

**(ii) 25/00627/FM**  
**King's Lynn: Former North Lynn Community Centre, Lawrence Road: Proposed residential development of 22 affordable dwellings following demolition of former community centre building: Freebridge Community Housing**

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

*Councillor Everitt withdrew from the meeting and took no part in the debate or decision, as the applicant was his landlord.*

The case officer introduced the report and explained that full planning permission was sought by Freebridge Community Housing for the construction of 22 Affordable Dwellings on land at Lawrence Road, King's Lynn on land at Lawrence Road, King's Lynn on land which was the former North Lynn Community Centre.

The site area totalled approximately 0.39ha and was an oval shaped parcel of land with boundaries formed by Lawrence Road and St Edmundsbury Road. To the north-west of the site was an estate of dwellings managed by Freebridge Housing, comprising a mix of heights up to 4 storeys in total.

The application site was in Flood Zone 3.

Plans had been amended during the course of the application to ensure that the Environment Agency's requirements were met in regard to flood risk and to provide for parking and visibility in line with the Local Highway Authority's requirements.

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

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, Charlotte Pursey (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

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

The Committee questioned the adequacy of replacement community facilities, noting the Discovery Centre's distance and the lack of robust assessment for the loss of the community centre, with officers explaining that prior approval for demolition and nearby facilities (including replacement facilities run by the applicant) was considered sufficient.

Concerns were raised about the lack of on-site play provision, the distance to Edma Street Recreation Ground, and whether policy LP22 requirements were met. Officers clarified the flexible approach allowed by policy which included the enhancement of existing play areas through financial contributions.

Committee members discussed flood risk mitigation, raised floor levels, and compliance with LP30 for accessible homes, with officers explaining that rear garden access and building regulations addressed accessibility, and the Environment Agency had no objections.

Several Councillors expressed concerns about the scheme's density, lack of green space, and potential for anti-social behaviour due to design features like archways and rear parking courtyards.

It was proposed by Councillor Bubb and seconded by Councillor Storey that the application be refused on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site and failure to respect local character, which was contrary to Policies LP18, 21 and 22.

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 (12 votes for refusal and 2 votes against).

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

*The application be refused on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site and failure to respect local character, which was contrary to Policies LP18, 21 and 22.*

***The Committee adjourned at 10.45 am and reconvened at 10.58 am***

**(iii) 26/00048/F**

**Northwold: Land at E575146 N297997, Inghams Lane: Retrospective application (Section 73A) to retain agricultural building and hardstanding: Mr Robert Storey**

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

The case officer presented the report and explained that the application related to an agricultural storage barn situated at the northern end of Inghams Lane, a Public Right of Way in Northwold.

Retrospective planning permission (S73A) was sought for the retention of the building and hardstanding.

The building measured approximately 45.2m x 15m (678 m<sup>2</sup> total floor area) by 7.8m in height (to the ridge). It was used for general purpose agricultural storage, mainly for hay and straw, feedstuffs, tractors and agricultural implements.

Whilst Northwold was classified as a Key Rural Service Centre (Tier 4 Settlement) with Methwold, the site was located of the development boundary and in the open countryside.

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

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

Councillor Storey advised that the applicant was not related to him.

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.

PC112: **PLANNING ENFORCEMENT REPORT**

The Enforcement Team Leader introduced the report and explained that the report provided Members with an update on service performance for planning enforcement during the financial year 2025 – 2026 (April 2025 to March 2026).

The report detailed that the total number of live cases received was 568 and 557 cases had been closed with the total number of current live cases pending was 289. The reasons for the closure had been outlined in the report. Also, during that period 19 Notices had been served. It was also noted that three interim injunctions had been authorised by the Court.

The report also outlined the staffing structure within the Enforcement Team.

Councillor Spikings raised concerns about fairness in enforcement when one party submits a retrospective application and another does not. It was explained that enforcement decisions were based on

expediency, compliance with local plan policies, and proportionality, as outlined in national guidance.

Councillor Blunt and others queried the meaning of 'pending consideration' and the lack of visible progress on longstanding cases; officers clarified that background work may not be reflected in the public system and offered to provide updates directly to councillors.

Committee members requested improved communication regarding enforcement case outcomes, especially when cases dropped off the list or notices were issued, with officers agreeing to explore ways to notify ward councillors and parish councils.

Officers explained the practical consequences of various enforcement notices, including enforcement, planning contravention, requisition for information, and breach of condition notices, detailing potential prosecution and council actions.

Councillors requested updates on specific cases with officers agreeing to provide follow-up information and ensure relevant Councillors were kept informed.

**RESOLVED:** (1) That the report be noted.

(2) That officers give consideration to the most efficient and effective way to keep ward councillors informed about enforcement decisions in their wards without taking up excessive officer time.

PC113: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received the delegated report.

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

**The meeting closed at 11.19 am**