



**Planning Committee**  
**Wednesday, 15th June, 2022 at 9.30 am**  
**in the Assembly Room, Town Hall, Saturday Market**  
**Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ**

**Reports marked to follow on the Agenda and/or Supplementary Documents**

1. **Receipt of Late Correspondence on Applications (Pages 2 - 5)**

To receive the Schedule of Late Correspondence received since the publication of the agenda.

**Contact**

Democratic Services  
Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk  
King's Court  
Chapel Street  
King's Lynn  
Norfolk  
PE30 1EX  
Tel: 01553 616394  
Email: [democratic.services@west-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@west-norfolk.gov.uk)

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**15 June 2022**

**SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED SINCE THE  
PUBLICATION OF THE AGENDA AND ERRATA**

**Item 8/2(a)**

**Page No. 23**

**Applicant:** The applicant has informed the LPA that they no longer own or have an interest in the site to the south (the original allocation.) An amended version of the Illustrative Development Framework Plan (drawing no. Df-01a) has therefore been submitted removing this land from 'blue land' (i.e. land outside of the site but within the same ownership.)

In addition, the following Supporting Statement has been submitted by the applicant:

*"We welcome the comprehensive analysis contained within the Report that Officers have presented to you, and we welcome the recommendation that planning permission be granted subject to conditions and planning obligations.*

*Heyford Developments has been promoting the site for allocation in the emerging Local Plan since early 2018 and this application for planning permission was lodged in May 2018. Members will note that the site is proposed to be allocated for a housing development of up to 76 dwellings in the Submitted version of the Local Plan and that the proposed allocation has been the subject of only one objection (from the Local Highway Authority) which has been addressed by this planning application. Given the advanced stage reached in the preparation of the Local Plan, and the absence of unresolved objections to the proposed allocation, this aspect of the emerging Plan may be afforded significant weight in the determination of this planning application in accordance with NPPF paragraph 48.*

*Notwithstanding this, we agree with Officers that the merits of the proposals are such that planning permission should be granted irrespective of the proposed allocation. The development will bring a vacant, brownfield site back into use, in a sustainable location that is close to local amenities and services (as supported by paragraphs 69 and 120 of the NPPF). It will deliver a policy compliant level of affordable housing and more than a policy compliant level of public open space. And it will do so without giving rise to adverse effects.*

*The application is supported by a comprehensive range of technical reports, surveys and assessments prepared following a period of pre-application engagement with officers and consultees. Some of these have been updated post-submission, in the light of feedback received and in order to address questions that have arisen as a consequence of the passage of time. The information that has been supplied with the application confirms that the proposals fully accord with the provisions of emerging Policy TSC1 and the requirements of all technical consultees. Where there are technical matters that can only be addressed at the detailed design stage, these are the subject of proposed conditions or obligations. In particular, the technical consultees are fully satisfied in respect of matters such as highways, flood risk and drainage, heritage, and local infrastructure provision.*

*We note Officers' observations relating to the proposed pedestrian, cycle and vehicle link to the adjacent allocation to the south, as well as the pedestrian and cycle link through to Churchgate Way. Indicative rather than detailed links are shown on the Illustrative Masterplan submitted with the application and have been subject to assessment by the Local Highway Authority. In the absence of a fully worked up set of drawings for these links (which will necessarily need to follow when the layout is designed), we agree with Officers that the details of such links can be secured by way of appropriate pre-commencement planning conditions.*

*This is a proposal that will deliver new homes and supporting infrastructure in a sustainable location and in a manner that will not give rise to adverse effects. Moreover, it proposes development on a site that the Council itself has concluded through the preparation of its new Local Plan that should be developed with housing. Accordingly, we respectfully request that Members resolve to grant planning permission for the application in line with the recommendation of your Officers.”*

**Third Party Comments:** Three additional Third-Party objections have been received as summarised below:

- highway safety due to increased vehicular activity on both Northgate Way and Benns Lane
- impact on service and facilities that are already over stretched
- loss of agricultural land
- additional houses are not needed in Terrington St Clement
- visual impact
- impact on neighbouring properties
- attempts to get HGV restriction and ‘bend-in-the-road’ signs along Benns Lane have been declined by the Council

**CORRECTION p. 32** Remove paragraph 7 as duplication of paragraph 6.

**Assistant Director’s comments:** The change in ownership of the adjacent site does not have any implications in relation to the development proposed under the current application or the proposed conditions other than the reference needs to be updated as suggested in the amended conditions above.

Other than the last bullet point, which would have been dealt with by the Local Highway Authority and not the Local Planning Authority, all of the issues raised above are already covered in the committee report.

**Amended conditions:** As a result of the Applicant’s comments above, Conditions 6 and 7, listing the previous version of this plan (Rev.I), have been amended to list the amended plan (Rev.J.) The reasons remain unchanged.

**6 Condition:** In relation to Conditions 1 and 7 any layout submitted under reserved matters application(s) shall make provision for a link road to the southern boundary of the site where it abuts housing allocation G93.3 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan, 2016, and a pedestrian / cycle link to Churchgate Way as indicatively shown on the Illustrative Development Framework Plan (DF-01a Rev.J) and Illustrative Masterplan (IMW-01 Rev.K).

**7 Condition:** Prior to the commencement of any development hereby permitted, full details (detailed plans including foul and surface water drainage) of a link road to the southern boundary of the site where it abuts housing allocation G93.3 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan, 2016, and a pedestrian / cycle link to Churchgate Way as indicatively shown on the Illustrative Development Framework Plan (DF-01a Rev.J) and Illustrative Masterplan (IMW-01 Rev.K) shall be submitted to any agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The said link road and pedestrian / cycle link shall be constructed and made freely available for use by pedestrian, cycle and vehicular traffic no later than the construction of 50% of the dwellings on the site in accordance with the approved details to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

**Item 8/3(b)**

**Page No. 65**

**CORRECTIONS:** In the second sentence of the Case Summary on page 67; as well as in the third sentence in The Application section on page 68, should read as ‘The site *is surrounded by* a series of paddocks bound by post and wire fencing with some sporadic native hedges and trees.’

In the first reason for refusal on page 75, the last sentence should read as 'In particular, the existing building is not considered to make a positive contribution to the landscape, no evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that a non-residential use would be unviable and the building has poor accessibility to existing housing, employment and services.'

**Assistant Director's comments:** The corrections raise no additional issues.

**Item 8/3(g)**

**Page No. 112**

**Agent:** Additional information has been submitted confirming that the existing dog grooming business is still capable of operation within the curtilage of Thrifffields. i.e. the land outlined in blue on the application.

**Third Party:** Raised concerns with Council but did not receive any response from Case Officer. Some aspects of the committee report appear to be misleading; where is the information from? Especially in the case of drainage. Furthermore, ground floor heights of the proposed dwellings is not clear as is their eave levels. Until these are clarified it is not possible to determine their effect on adjacent properties.

**Arboricultural Officer:** I went to have a look at the trees on site. None of the trees down for removal are significant and would not be worthy of TPO. Please could you condition for tree retention and protection please. Please could we also have some replacement tree planting.

**CSNN:** No objection. It is recommended a condition is applied to mitigate any potential noise from ongoing business at Thrifffields in the interests of the amenities of future occupiers of the development.

**Assistant Director's comments:** The supporting information provided above was pursuant to the requirements of Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy 2011, regarding the retention of employment generating uses. Since the business could still be capable of operation within the remaining curtilage of Thrifffields, it is considered the proposed development would not result in loss of the employment generating use. In addition to dog grooming, the site is known for kennelling with a license for up to 6 dogs; while no planning permission exists, the business has operated in excess of 10 years and is therefore lawful. The agent has stated that the dog grooming business could continue in the curtilage of Thrifffields. It is also possible that the kennel business could continue within Thrifffields, though this is less likely. The proposed new dwellings would be situated in close proximity to any ongoing grooming or kennelling business. The CSNN response has indicated that two new dwellings could be accommodated without detriment to the established business and without significant adverse impact on the future occupiers. A condition is recommended below.

With regards to the comments of the Third Party, officers have explained that written comments are considered when an application is assessed. Our website also sets out that due to the volume of comments received (across all applications), we are usually unable to acknowledge or respond to individual comments but they are taken into account when considering the application.

Regarding the issue of drainage, the committee report acknowledges that no information has yet been submitted and therefore conditions to require submission and approval of such details are recommended.

Finished floor levels are specified in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment. Eaves height of dwellings would not be considered at this stage as it would constitute scale and appearance which are reserved matters.

With regard to the trees, it is estimated approximately 5 smaller trees and a number of shrubs would need to be removed to facilitate the siting of the proposed dwellings. The Arboricultural Officer considers these trees are not significant and would not be worthy of TPO. The submitted site plan shows 4 trees to be retained along the north of the site, 4 trees to be retained towards the rear of the site, and all the trees along the rear boundary are also shown as retained. Tree protection fencing is indicated on the plan. The report already recommends a tree retention and protection condition so that those trees to be retained are protected in accordance with the plan prior to development taking place. The Arboricultural Officer also recommends a replacement tree planting scheme, which can be sought via additional condition as shown below.

### **Additional conditions**

17 Condition: No development or other operations shall commence on site until a replacement tree planting scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation or use of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or plants that within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species as those originally planted, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written approval to any variation.

17 Reason: To ensure replacement planting is provided in the interests of the amenities of the area and to ensure that the work is carried out within a reasonable period in accordance with the NPPF.

18 Condition: Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, full details of acoustic fencing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The fencing shall be provided along the south boundary of the site with Thriftfields and shall demonstrate that any noise impacts that may arise from the continued operation of kennels / dog grooming can be sufficiently mitigated. The fence shall be completed before occupation of the development in accordance with the approved details and retain in perpetuity.

18 Reason: To ensure that the amenities of future occupants are safeguarded in accordance with the NPPF.