



Planning Committee
Friday, 18th November, 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 - 3)**

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

PLANNING COMMITTEE

18 November 2022

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

Item 8/2(c) Page No. 55

Planning Agent Additional Comments: The Agent provided comments relating to the archaeology conditions (conditions 12, 13 and 14). As the archaeological written scheme of investigation has been agreed for the previously approved site, the Agent queried whether these conditions were still necessary.

Historic Environment Service: The Historic Environment Service have responded to the additional comments stating that an updated WSI for archaeological monitoring is required and that it should refer to both applications.

Assistant Director's Comments: The contents of the Agents email representation are noted. However, in line with the additional HES response, the WSI agreed under 21/00546/DISC_A is not sufficient and cannot be used for this application without amendments. Conditions 12, 13 and 14 therefore remain as recommended in the Officer's report to committee. This has been discussed with the Agent and the conditions agreed.

Item 8/2(f) Page No. 92

Agent: Submitted a supporting statement on behalf of the applicant and an amended drawing has been submitted.

I have chosen to show the position of Waders as per OS Mapping (we purchased in our office) and as per our own measured survey. To be noted, OS mapping has Church Cottages some 600mm longer and 800mm narrower than they truly are, this makes significant differences.

I have accessed previous OS map extracts and the boundary to the North of Waders has changed significantly since Waders was built also. I hope you can see why sometimes exercises like this are not easy to demonstrate but I am assured that our surveying, as presented on the attached drawing is accurate.

Finally - please note that the proposal is some 300mm narrower than the existing lean-to as the client wished for slightly larger parking area. Therefore, the actual visual gap / alignment when viewed from the road between Waders and Church Cottage is more than it is at present. The first-floor gable window of Waders is therefor still allowed its full view to the West as demonstrated by the green dashed vision lines on the attached drawing. The wider angle of vision is not hindered with Waders sitting higher and with a window designed at modern, full height above a standard floor to floor height, views from this window will be able to look over part of the proposed roof slope, towards a large tree screen not affording distant views.

As previously stated, we have support of the LPA including the Conservation Team and I therefore ask for the Committee to also consider supporting this modest proposal.

Third Party: Submitted the following comments:

Thank you for pursuing the correct site plan despite earlier assurances from the planning agent that the plans were accurate.

This last minute revision appears to be an abuse of the spirit of the planning process. It is too late to include in your Agenda reports pack which is already on the website. It is too late to fully consult the parish council, consultees and wider public.

I have been making reference to this plan being incorrect since March. Satellite images from Google Maps clearly show that the plan was incorrect. The new plan shows that the property is much closer to the front of Waders as I have always maintained, hence giving much greater credibility to my objections as a neighbour and this may of course change your approval recommendation.

The proposed extension is completely overbearing. The new plan shows that there is an even greater impossibility of two cars being parked side by side. Such is the lack of space, one vehicle now appears to be moved virtually into the road, further out than my gate posts. It clearly shows the impossibility of opening car doors and accessing the new door if two cars are there. There have always been numerous concerns about parking contained in the objections, especially because of the problems with cars parking dangerously on the verge.

Please also note that the current height of the building is just 1.6m at the nearest point to Waders and this ridge runs for several metres. It is not the 3m as specified in the Agenda reports pack and it will rise to 5.2m, an increase of 3.6m. Over 3 times the previous height, it will be completely overbearing, it will obscure views from the side of Waders as well as the front gable, especially from the sitting room, and severely block out light.

I am very concerned that the conservation officer, highways officer, consultees and general public may have been misled by these incorrect plans and therefore question whether they should all be consulted again.

Whilst I fully understand that as a neighbour some of these concerns do not affect the wider community and are not central to the main theme of the objections, (the destruction of the history/character/symmetry of this iconic seventeenth century cottage), they are nevertheless important.

It may well be that this application is refused on the central objections to this application, but on no account should it be accepted based on the misleading information that has been previously given to consultees and the wider public.

The Agenda report pack is now out of date.

Please can you make sure all councillors are aware of the changes. I would be grateful if the contents of this email can be included in your report at Friday's committee meeting.

Assistant Director's comments: Whilst the Agent's comments regarding the amended plans and those of the Third Party are noted, having assessed the plans, they are material changes which in accordance with the Planning Scheme of Delegation require further consultation. As a result, it is recommended the application be **DEFERRED** to allow a further consultation with statutory consultees and neighbours and for the case officer to check amendments on site.