

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 7th September, 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 F Bone, C J Crofts (sub), T de Winton, P Devulapalli, S Everett,
J Fry, S Lintern, C Rose, A Ryves and M Storey

PC30: APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence had been received from:

Councillor Bubb (Councillor Crofts substitute), Councillor Anota and Councillor de Whalley.

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

PC31: MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 July 2026 were agreed as a correct record, subject to Councillor Bubb's name added to those present, and signed by the Chair.

PC32: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

PC33: URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7

There was none.

PC34: MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34

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

Councillor A Beales 9/2(a) Little Massingham

PC35: CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE

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

PC36: **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.

PC37: **DECISION ON APPLICATIONS**

The Committee considered schedule of applications for planning permission submitted by the Assistant Director for Planning and Environment (copies of the schedules were published with agenda). Any change to the schedules will be recorded in the minutes.

RESOLVED: That the applications be determined as set out at (i) – (iv) below, where appropriate to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chair.

- (i) **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 reminded the Committee that the application had been referred from the previous meeting in order for further information to be sought on the existing use of the building and clarification on the wording of conditions 2, 3 and 5 relating to operational hours, submission of a management scheme and flood evacuation plan.

The report had also been updated to reflect changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The case officer reminded the Committee that the application was for 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 was 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 as it had been deferred from the 27 July 2026 Planning Committee meeting and had originally been referred 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 Tim Morris (objecting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillors Ryves and Lintern asked how policy DM8 should be applied where unauthorised development appeared intentional and therefore attracted substantial weight. Officers explained that DM8 must be read alongside the development plan and the NPPF as a whole. Although intentional unauthorised development was a material consideration, the small-scale carpentry use was considered acceptable near residential properties and capable of being controlled through conditions; officers therefore balanced the enforcement concern against the planning benefits.

Councillor Ryves asked whether approval could allow the operation to expand into a broader industrial use. Officers confirmed that condition 4 restricted the premises to a carpenters' workshop within use class E(g)(3), and any change of use would require a further planning application.

Councillors discussed the limited scale of the operation, its likely effect on neighbours and the support for rural business activity.

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.

(ii) 26/01054/F

Little Massingham: Little Massingham Manor, Station Road: Retrospective application for one shepherd's hut with associated parking and well-being facilities (sauna and hot tub) to be used as a holiday let: Little Massingham Manor

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application sought retrospective planning consent for one shepherd's hut with associated parking and well-being facilities (sauna and hot tub) to be used as a holiday let.

The application site was located to the south of the Little Massingham Manor site and formed part of the much wider mixed-use enterprise. The site was accessed via the existing shared access off Station Road.

The application site was located on land designated as countryside in the adopted Local Plan. The closest settlement was Little Massingham to the south however this did not have a development boundary.

The case officer drew the Committee's attention to the late correspondence, which clarified the status of Little Massingham Manor, and advised that the map on page 40 had the incorrect application reference number which should read 26/01054/F.

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

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 John Heley (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Beales outlined his concerns regarding the application to the Committee.

During Councillor Beales' address, the Committee adjourned as the fire alarm sounded.

Upon reconvening, the Chair asked for the presentation and speakers to start again.

At this point, Councillor Devulapalli joined the meeting.

In response to issues raised by the speakers, Officers clarified that the application had to be assessed as one additional unit, although Norfolk County Council Highways had considered the proposal cumulatively with the wider site and had not substantiated a highway objection.

Officers considered the hut acceptable on its own merits, whilst acknowledging that DM8 required the Committee to give substantial weight to intentional unauthorised development and balance that against support for rural tourism and rural businesses.

Councillors questioned the site's sustainability because the nearest bus stop was approximately 800 metres away and services were sporadic, creating reliance on private vehicles. Officers explained that highways had identified sustainability as an issue but that the Committee had to balance it against the benefits of rural tourism.

Councillor Fry asked whether the lighting condition could assess the existing lighting as well as the new hut. Officers confirmed that a cumulative assessment could be included so that the impact of the additional lighting was considered in context.

Councillors differed on whether the retrospective nature constituted a sufficient planning reason for refusal.

It was proposed by Councillor Storey and seconded by the Chair, that the unauthorised development was intentional and carried substantial weight under DM8, outweighing the policy support for the rural business.

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 (8 votes for, 3 votes against).

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

On the basis of the available evidence, the unauthorised development was intentional, and in accordance with NPPF Policy DM8 this is given substantial weight in the planning balance. This outweighs the NPPF and development plan policies in support of the expansion of the rural business.

(iii) 26/01089/F

Stow Bardolph: Land south of 201 The Drove, Barroway Drove: Self-Build: Proposed self-build dwelling house:

[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 full planning permission for one self-build two storey dwelling with a detached four-bay garage with storage above on land to the south-east of The Drove in Barroway Drove. The site was located approximately 0.5km outside the development boundary of Barroway Drove as defined within the Local Plan and was therefore classed as 'countryside'.

The site consisted of a 0.21-hectare parcel of agricultural land which was bounded by drainage ditches with two agricultural fields either side. The north-western boundary fronted onto The Drove with some single storey dwellings to the north (almost opposite) and residential development further south-west and north-east beyond the adjacent agricultural land.

In terms of constraints the site was located within Flood Zone 3a plus a reservoir flooding and tidal hazard mapping zone where the site could flood to between 1.0m and 2.0m. The site was also on Grade 1 agricultural land.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Spikings. The Parish Council also supported the application which was contrary to the officer recommendation.

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 Daniel Garner (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillors asked whether the proposal could be treated as a rural workers' dwelling under LP36 rather than solely as a self-build house. Officers explained that the application had been submitted and assessed as a self-build dwelling, with no evidence or properly developed case demonstrating an essential rural-business need for that location. A rural workers' dwelling would require assessment against the relevant criteria, including evidence of an established rural enterprise. Officers advised that this could not be added informally as a condition without reassessing the application.

The Chair outlined the reasons why she had called-in the application. She added that this was a unique application which needed to be determined on its own merits. The Parish Council also supported the application. She therefore proposed that the application be approved as she considered that it was in accordance with LP36 and Policy E4 2. This was seconded by Councillor Lintern.

The Planning Control Manager added that the evidence had not been put forward or a properly developed case demonstrating an essential rural-business need for that location.

Councillors Ryves proposed deferral of the application, so the applicant could submit evidence addressing the rural-business case. This was seconded by Councillor Fry but having been put to the vote was lost.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application subject to conditions being imposed following consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair, and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (7 votes for, 4 votes against).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, contrary to recommendation, subject to conditions being imposed following consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair for the following reason:

The provision of the self-build dwelling supported a rural worker and associated business in accordance with LP36 and Policy E4 2.

(iv) **26/00780/F**

Walpole: Holme Farm, King John Bank, Walpole St Andrew: Erection of 2 no. self-build dwellings including demolition of existing agricultural building with Class Q approval: Mr Wayne Codona

[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 to the south-east of King John Bank approximately 100 m from its junction with Goose's Lane and 1.4km from the A17, in the parish of Walpole St Andrew. The site was currently redundant agricultural land and contained two detached agricultural buildings. The surrounding area was predominately countryside with sporadic detached dwellings, some with associated agricultural buildings.

Walpole St Andrew, combined with Walpole St Peter and Walpole Marsh was designated as a Key Rural Service Centre (Tier 4) within the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy. However, the application site was located well outside of the development boundary and within the countryside.

Full planning permission was sought for the erection of 2 no. self-build dwellings, including demolition of the larger existing agricultural building which had the benefit of a current Class Q approval for conversion into 3 no. dwellings.

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, Liam Lunn-Towler (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to comments made, Officers identified the site as remote, approximately 1.7 kilometres by road from Walpole and isolated from day-to-day services. They considered that the proposal failed the relevant flood-risk exception test, conflicted with policy H011 on isolated homes in the countryside, was not infill between existing clusters and lacked the legal agreement expected to secure the self-build purpose.

Officers cautioned that the H011 provision cited by supporters set a very high threshold for exceptional design and that a neglected existing building should not, by itself, justify new dwellings in the countryside.

Councillor Devulapalli proposed that the application should be approved on the grounds of the claimed improvement to the existing buildings, the fallback position and that it would be a custom and self-build scheme. This was seconded by Councillor Ryves.

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 lost (4 votes for, 7 votes against).

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 (7 votes for, 4 votes against).

RESOLVED: That the application be refused, as recommended.

PC38: **QUARTERLY ENFORCEMENT REPORT**

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

The Committee received a report which provided an update on service performance for planning enforcement during the period from 19 March 2026 to 11 August 2026.

The Committee noted that 237 cases had been received; 205 cases had been closed; with 322 current live cases pending.

Also, during the period a total of 9 notices had been served. The Committee also noted the staff update.

Councillors sought clearer information on case outcomes, proactive action on unauthorised traveller-site works and the age of unresolved cases. Officers explained the reporting figures and agreed to assess a newly reported breach.

RESOLVED:(1) That the report be noted.

(2) That a breakdown of enforcement cases showing their start dates be circulated so Members could identify and address the oldest outstanding cases.

PC39: **DELEGATED DECISIONS AND QUALITY OF DECISIONS**

The Committee received Schedules relating to the above,

RESOLVED: That the reports be noted.

The meeting closed at 11.40 am