

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 27th July, 2026 at 9.30 am in the Assembly Room, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs V Spikings (Chair)
Councillors B Anota, M de Whalley, P Devulapalli, S Everett, J Fry,
B Long (sub), C Rose and A Ryves

PC21: APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor de Winton (Councillor Long substitute).

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

PC22: MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 July 2026 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

PC23: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following declarations of interest were made:

Councillors Bone and Bubb stated that in relation to 9/1(a), they were Members of the Regeneration and Development Panel but felt able to take part in the debate and decision for the item.

Councillor Lintern declared an interest item 9/3(c), as she was the applicant and would leave the meeting during consideration of the item.

Councillor Everett advised that he had called-in application 9/3(b) to the KLAC Planning Sub-Group but would be taking part in the debate and decision.

In relation to item 9/3(e), Wiggshall St Germans, Councillor Long stated that he was the Ward Member and had discussed the application with officers but did not call it in.

PC24: URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7

There was none.

PC25: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Councillors attended the meeting and addressed the Committee in accordance with Standing Order 34:

Councillor Moore	9/3(b)	King's Lynn
Councillor Kunes	9/3(d)	Terrington St Clement

PC26: **CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC27: **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.

PC28: **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 change 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) **25/01783/FM**

King's Lynn: Development site west of Nar Ouse Way: Application for the phased development comprising the change of use of the land to an Active Travel Hub, alongside the construction of a single storey hub building, surface car park, pedestrian infrastructure, access, landscaping and ancillary works: The Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk

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

The case officer introduced the report and reminded the Committee that the application had been deferred from 1 June meeting in order for the proposed development to be further reviewed by the Regeneration and Development Panel and for some further operational detail to be provided.

The proposed development was to be considered at the Regeneration and Development Panel meeting due to take place on 22nd July 2026, after the date of the publication of this report. The outcome of the meeting will therefore be reported to Members in late correspondence.

In the meantime, the Applicant had submitted a 'Project Delivery Report' providing further detail on several points raised at Planning Committee on 1st June 2026, particularly the key objectives of the proposed development, the operational model and financial viability of the scheme and the likely representative user groups.

The Applicant had provided clarification on the key objectives of the proposed development, which are set out in the Project Delivery Report as:

- Enhance connectivity – Establish a clear and highly visible link between the King's Lynn Enterprise Park (KLEP), residential communities, and the town centre;
- Congestion relief – Reduce peak-hour traffic pressures along the Nar Ouse Way corridor;
- Public Health and decarbonisation – Encourage a shift towards active travel and public transport, supporting a cleaner, healthier, and more sustainable town; and
- Economic growth and regeneration – Deliver enabling infrastructure, including the western access road, to support the continued development of the KLEP and the wider Nar Ouse Regeneration Area.

The case officer explained that the application site related to a parcel of land measuring approx. 1.45 Ha at the King's Lynn Enterprise Park, located on the western side of Nar Ouse Way, King's Lynn.

Full planning permission was sought for the phased development involving the change of use of the land to an Active Travel Hub, including the construction of a single storey hub building, surface car park, pedestrian infrastructure, access, landscaping and ancillary works.

The cycle 'hub' building comprised covered and secure cycle parking for 48 regular bicycles, six cycle hoops for adapted cycles and one long cycle hoop for longer cycles. Lockers and a cycle repair stand would also be available within the hub. There were a further four-cycle hoops proposed outside. Toilets, showers and changing facilities would be included within the hub.

The car park would include 236 car parking spaces including 201 standard bays, 11 accessible bays, 20 standard electric car charging bays, 4 accessible electric car charging bays and 12 motorcycle bays.

Two new bus-stops were proposed on Nar Ouse Way for the 'EXCEL' bus services to and from the town centre, plus an internal bus drop-off area and landscaped public courtyard.

The development was proposed to be delivered through two phases.

The case officer described the strategic and local cycle routes connecting the site to King's Lynn town centre, highlighting predominantly traffic-free paths and the integration of pedestrian and cycle access; the site layout complies with LTN1/2020 standards, and visuals were provided to address previous questions about connectivity and practical use.

The case officer informed the Committee that the comments from the Regeneration and Development Panel had been reported in the correspondence received after the publication of the agenda; an operational management plan in relation to planning issues had been recommended and correspondence received from Mr Rae (KLWNBUG) had been addressed within the report.

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, Kerry Heathcote (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Members debated the planning merits, policy compliance, and operational concerns, with some expressing reservations about demand and location.

Councillor Long raised concerns about drainage and car park permeability, which the case officer addressed by confirming extensive consultation had taken place with flood authorities resulting in a satisfactory drainage strategy.

The Committee debated the safety of the access road and crossroads layout, with the local highway authority deeming the arrangement safe, although some Members remained concerned about the private road and mini roundabout preference.

Councillor Long queried provision for accessible parking and mobility scooters, noting the importance of location for disabled users. The case officer confirmed accessible bays and electric charge points had been provided but acknowledged locality concerns and explained the County Council policy on road adoption.

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 (9 votes for, 1 vote against and 3 abstentions)

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

The Committee adjourned for a comfort break at 10.18 am and reconvened at 10.30 am.

(ii) 26/00366/OM

Snettisham: Land to the rear of 50 to 54 Common Road: Outline application for residential development comprising up to 31 dwellings, with all matters reserved except access:

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application sought outline planning consent with access only for the construction of up to 31 dwellings. Scale, appearance, layout and landscaping would be agreed as part of a reserved matters application.

The application site was located to the west of the village of Snettisham. It was enclosed by existing residential and commercial development off Common Road South, Beach Road to the south and the A149 to the east. Towards the south of the site was an existing Public Right of Way known as Snettisham Footpath 33, which went from east to west.

The site was outside of the development boundary for Snettisham but was directly adjacent to it on two sides. It was also outside of the Norfolk Coast National Landscape and Snettisham Common County Wildlife Site but was approximately 55m away at the closest point. Snettisham was categorised as a Key Rural Service Centre (Tier 4) in Policy LP01 of the Local Plan.

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

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, Stuart Dark (objecting), Julie Smith (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) and Kimberley Kaddish (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Committee discussed policy LP02's dwelling threshold, environmental sensitivity, flood risk, drainage, and highway safety; concerns about exceeding the 25-dwelling limit, proximity to the Norfolk Coast National Landscape, and historical flooding were raised, with technical responses from officers and references to mitigation fees and consultee positions.

Councillor Storey proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that the dwelling threshold outside the development boundary

based on conflict with policy LP02, form and character of were contrary to policies NP09 and LP19.

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 (12 votes for refusal and 1 abstention).

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

1. *The application seeks planning consent for the development of up to 31 dwellings, on land outside of the development boundary for the village of Snettisham. As such, the proposal represents a departure from the policy and is contrary to Policy LP02 of the Local Plan.*
2. *The proposal for the development of up to 31 dwellings in this rural location would extend residential built form into the countryside. It is considered that development of this scale, in this location would be out of keeping and have a detrimental impact on the form and character of the rural locality. Furthermore, the development would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the National Landscape. The development is contrary to the provisions of the NPPF, Local Plan Policy LP19 and Neighbourhood Plan Policy NP09.*

(iii) 26/00508/F

**Hockwold cum Wilton: The Orchard, 20 Nursery Lane:
Proposed barn style eco-friendly self-build dwelling: c/o
Agent Paul Softley**

[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 a parcel of land measuring approx. 0.24Ha along Nursery Lane, Hockwold-cum-Wilton. The land was currently laid largely to grass, with a number of trees to the southern side. The site was previously in an agricultural use, with a number of store buildings which have since been removed.

The proposal was for the erection of self-build barn style eco-friendly dwelling. Associated landscaping works and a cart shed were also proposed as part of this application.

The site was outside of, but adjacent to, the development boundary for Hockwold-cum-Wilton. The dwelling immediately north of the site was No.16 and to the south was No.22.

The site was largely located outside of the Hockwold-cum-Wilton Conservation Area, the boundary of which ran along, and partly within, the site's northern boundary. The Conservation Area boundary was

also located to the rear (west) of the site, separated from the site by a field.

Planning history showed that the site was previously within the ownership of No.16 Nursery Lane but appeared to have been separated. The proposal would utilise the same highway access as No.16.

The proposal had been revised during the application following the receipt of comments made by the Conservation Officer in objection to the proposal, resulting in a reduction in scale and a more traditional appearance. Re-consultation had been undertaken on the amended plans.

The case officer referred the Committee to the clarification and correction detailed in the correspondence received after the publication of the agenda.

The case officer also advised that if the Committee were minded to approve the application, then it would need to be subject to a Section 106 Agreement to ensure the dwelling was self-build and the recommendation amended accordingly.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of the Planning Sifting Panel.

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 approve the application and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (11 votes for, 1 vote against and 1 abstention).

RESOLVED: That:

A The application be **Approved**, subject to conditions, and subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to ensure that the dwelling was self-build. If the agreement was 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.

B If in the opinion of the Assistant Director / Planning Control Manager no reasonable progress is made to complete the agreement within 4 months of the date of the Committee resolution, the application is **Refused** on the failure to provide the custom and self-build dwelling in line with Policy LP31 of the Local Plan.

- (iv) **26/00850/F**
King's Lynn: 1st Self Storage Ltd, Edward Benefer Way:
Siting of micro business units for Class E (excluding (a))
and B8 plus sui generis and retention of toilet block and
parking area (retrospective): 1st Self Storage Limited

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

The case officer advised that unfortunately the Planning Agent for the application had died recently and he wanted to take the opportunity to send condolences to his family.

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application site lies on the eastern side of Edward Benefer Way opposite the docks; comprised the road frontage strip of a previously approved self-storage facility plus a further strip of land to the north – part of an area associated with the former fuel storage and distribution depot.

The remainder of the applicant's owned land to the north was not part of the proposal and there was housing beyond on St Edmundsbury Road. St Nicholas Retail Park lies to the south, and to the east there was an embankment and Bawsey Drain (IDB maintained) with residential development beyond (Turbus Road).

This application sought retrospective permission for the siting of micro business units for Class E (excluding (a)) and B8 plus Sui Generis uses and retention of toilet block and parking area.

These 19 no. 'micro-business units' (MBUs) comprise modified shipping containers clad in grey composite boarding with dark grey powder-coated aluminium doors, windows and fascias. Each individual unit had a floorspace of 2.2m x 5.8m which would be some 241.3m² in total. Some units had been linked/conjoined to form larger floorspace to meet end user needs but were reversible. There was an existing toilet block/portable building situated at the northern end of the row of units of similar appearance as the MBUs (6.7m x 3.2m).

The 35no. space car park was surfaced with gravel grid and now partially bounded to the north by a 1.2m close-boarded high timber fence.

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

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

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

The Chair invited Richard Smith from the Local Highway Authority to outline the concerns about traffic flow and safety, noting the need for a right-hand turn lane and the impact of increased usage.

Councillors debated the adequacy of the existing access and historical approvals.

The case officer explained the exemption from biodiversity net gain due to retrospective status but noted the duty to provide measurable net gain under the NPPF; suggestions for habitat enhancement were made (which could be conditioned), and flood risk was addressed with conditions for unit anchoring and alert systems.

The Committee highlighted the importance of micro units for local entrepreneurs, and the role of the site as a stepping stone for small businesses.

The Committee also expressed support for economic growth and improvement of a long-standing industrial site.

Councillor Long proposed that the application be approved, on the grounds that it complied with policy LP07 of the Local Plan and weight be given to the previous site approvals and existing access and the need for business incubation units. This was seconded by Councillor Bone.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application, subject to conditions to be imposed following consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair including biodiversity enhancement, time-limited implementation, and accessibility improvements and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (11 votes for, 2 votes against).

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

The development complied with Policy LP07 of the Local Plan and weight was given to the previous site approvals, existing access and the need for business incubation units which outweighed the highways concerns.

The Committee adjourned at 12.28 pm and reconvened at 1.05 pm.

Councillor Ryves left the meeting.

- (v) **2600943/F**
Stoke Ferry: The Old Bull Bridge: Replace boundary wall and hedgerow with planter, trellis and metal railing fence: S Lintern

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

Councillor Lintern left the meeting during consideration of the item.

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application was for a replacement boundary treatment to the northwest boundary, adjacent to Bridge Road in Stoke Ferry.

The site, The Old Bull, Bridge Street, Stoke Ferry was within Stoke Ferry's Conservation Area and Neighbourhood Plan area

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the applicant is Councillor Lintern.

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

The Committee voted on the recommendation to approve the application by a show of hands and, after having been put to the vote, was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

(vi) 26/00559/O

**Terrington St Clement: Land west of 74 and south of 79 to
83 Hay Green Road South: Lesley Lewis**

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the proposal was for outline planning permission (all matters reserved other than access) for the erection of up to 4 no. self-build/custom build dwellings, on land on the NW edge of the hamlet of Hay Green in the parish of Terrington St Clement, and approx. 450m south of the A17. The site lies outside the development area defined in the Local Plan and is therefore classed as 'countryside'.

The site consisted of a 0.45ha parcel of grassland which was bounded by a land drainage ditch plus some scattered trees to the western, southern and eastern boundaries. The northern boundary fronted onto Hay Green Road South. There was agricultural land to the south and west, a detached house and associated commercial yard and buildings (DG Scales Plant Hire Ltd) to the east and ribbon residential development opposite/north.

In terms of constraints, the site lies in Flood Zones 2 & 3A plus Tidal Hazard Mapping Zone of EA's mapping; was classed as Grade 1 agricultural land; and within an impact zone of a SSSI.

The application was accompanied by a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment, Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment, Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Highways

Statement, Contaminated Land Screening Assessment Form and Planning & Sustainability Statement.

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

The case officer made reference to the correspondence received after the publication of the agenda, and the need to remove Reasons for Refusal 3 and 4, if the Committee were minded to refuse the application.

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 nearly three hours, it was agreed to continue the meeting for a further period of one hour.

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

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

The Committee discussed the principle of development in tier 6 settlements, referencing LP02 and LP01 policies, five-year land supply, and the lack of neighbourhood plan; sustainability and access to services.

Some Members emphasised the unmet self-build demand on the council's register, statutory requirements, and the likelihood of small developments being built.

The Assistant Director explained that this application was very different to the Snettisham application recommended for approval earlier in the meeting, which was a Key Rural Service Centre, whereas this application was in Tier 6, where development outside the development boundary would not normally be supported.

Councillor Lintern added that the application was outside the development boundary and Tier 6.

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 (6 votes for, 5 votes against and 1 abstention).

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as recommended subject to reasons for refusal 3 and 4 being removed.

Councillor Long left the meeting.

- (vii) **25/02010/CU**
Wiggenhall St Germans: The Workshop at 159 Fitton Road:
Retention and continued use of existing workshops: Mr
Mario Daloia

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application was the retention and continued use of a workshop at 159 Fitton Road in the parish of Wiggenhall St Germans. No building operations were proposed as part of the application.

The application site was approximately 0.21ha in size, located to the east side of Fitton Road, and approximately 441m from the junction of Fitton Road and The Granary which was located to the south. The site lies within the Parish of Wiggenhall St Germans but was closer in proximity to Wiggenhall St Mary Magdalen.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of 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, Tim Morris (objecting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The case officer advised that the hours in condition 3 should be amended to read 0800 to 1700 Monday to Friday, 0900 – 12 noon on a Saturday and no time on a Sunday or Bank Holiday.

The Planning Control Manager advised that she had spotted some errors within the wording of the conditions that also needed amending.

In view of this, the Chair suggested that determination of the application should be deferred to allow for an amended report to be presented. This was seconded by the Vice-Chair and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: That the application be deferred.

PC29: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received reports relating to the above.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

The meeting closed at 1.50 pm

