

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 11th October, 2021 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 Miss L Bambridge, R Blunt, C Bower, A Bubb, G Hipperson,
C Hudson, C Joyce, B Lawton, E Nockolds, T Parish, J Rust, C Sampson,
S Squire, D Tyler and D Whitby

PC54: **WELCOME**

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings welcomed everyone to the meeting. She advised that the meeting was being recorded and streamed live on You Tube.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call to determine attendees.

The Chairman also welcomed Lorna Gilbert, Principal Planner to her first Planning Committee meeting.

PC55: **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bone, Manning (Cllr Blunt sub), Patel (Cllr Bambridge sub) and Storey (Cllr Sampson sub).

The Chairman thanked the substitutes for attending the meeting.

PC56: **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 September 2021 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings.

PC57: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following declarations of interest were declared:

Councillors Mrs Spikings and Rose declared a prejudicial interest in item 8/1(b) – Upwell, and left the meeting during consideration of the item.

Councillor Blunt declared a prejudicial interest in item 8/2(e) – Old Hunstanton and left the meeting during consideration of the item.

PC58: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no urgent business to report under Standing Order 7.

PC59: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Members attended under Standing Order 34:

Cllr M de Whalley 8/1(a) & 8/2(d) Grimston & Gayton

PC60: **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings reported that any correspondence received had been read and passed to the appropriate officer.

PC61: **RECEIPT OF LATE CORRESPONDENCE ON APPLICATIONS**

A copy of the late correspondence received after the publication of the agenda, which had been previously circulated, was tabled. A copy of the agenda would be held for public inspection with a list of background papers.

PC62: **INDEX OF APPLICATIONS**

The Committee noted the Index of Applications.

a **Decisions on Applications**

The Committee considered schedules of applications for planning permission submitted by the Executive Director for Planning & Environment (copies of the schedules are published with the agenda. Any changes to the schedules are recorded in the minutes.

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

- (i) **20/01422/O**
Gayton: Willow Dale, Winch Road: Outline application:
Proposed residential development for 1 unit: Mr D Garrard

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and reminded the Committee that the application had been deferred in March 2021. The reason given was 'that the application be deferred, in order to obtain further information on the drainage issues that had been raised at the site.'

The applicant had subsequently submitted full drainage arrangements for the site, which had been considered by Anglian Water, the Environment Agency and CSNN. Updated comments had been included within the report.

The Principal Planner advised that the application sought outline planning consent with all matters reserved bar access for one residential unit.

The application site was located to the east of Winch Road, to the west of the village of Gayton. The site was currently garden land to the donor dwelling Willow Dale. Willow Dale was a detached bungalow situated within a substantial plot. The proposed dwelling was on land to the south of the existing dwelling with a new access created to the front of the proposed site off Winch Road.

The application site was located within the development boundary for Gayton. Gayton was categorised as a joint Key Rural Service Centre with Grimston and Pott Row in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (SADMPP) (2016).

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer view was contrary to the recommendation of the Parish Council and was called-in by Councillor de Whalley.

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

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor de Whalley addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In relation to comments from Councillor de Whalley, the Planning Control Manager referred the Committee to page 69 of the agenda and confirmed that there had been no objection from Anglian Water, the Environment Agency, IDB and the Council's CSNN raised no objection to the application. In relation to foul and surface water system it was confirmed that there was a fault at the Anglian Water pumping station which was in the process of being resolved and they had raised no objection to the application.

With regard to the highways issues raised, the Planning Control Manager advised that there had been no objection from the Local Highway Authority.

She also confirmed that the plans to be considered were those on the presentation and that no amended plans had been submitted.

Councillor Parish raised concern in relation to the drainage matters and considered that the issues had not been resolved and he considered that when there was heavy rain this would overcome any permeable system because there was nowhere for the water to drain if the ground was

saturated. The Planning Control Manager advised that the Statutory Consultees for drainage matters had raised no objection to the application.

Councillor Mrs Bower referred to condition 9 and felt that this would deal with the drainage issues.

The Assistant Director confirmed that there was a high water table, but Anglian Water was working with the Parish Council to look at solutions in the village.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings drew the Committee's attention to the need to amend Condition 9, as outlined in the late correspondence, which was agreed.

The Democratic Services then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application, subject to the amendment of Condition 9 as outlined in late correspondence and, after having been put to the vote, was carried 13 votes for, 1 against and 2 abstentions).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended, subject to the amendment of Condition 9 as detailed in late correspondence.

- (ii) **21/00127/CU**
Upwell: Five Bells Inn, 1 New Road: Retrospective change if use to holiday let: Mr Robinson and Mr Brighty

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

Councillors Rose and Mrs Spikings declared an interest in the application and left the meeting during consideration of the item. The Vice-Chair took the Chair for this item of business.

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application was deferred at the Planning Committee meeting in August 2021. An application had been made to register the public house as an Asset of Community Value, and a query was raised as to whether the determination of the planning application would affect the ACV application. The application was deferred to enable the Council to fully assess the legislation and seek clarification / legal advice. Updated comments were included in the report.

The application sought retrospective planning consent for a change of use for the Five Bells Inn public house to a large holiday let. The Five Bells Inn was situated centrally within the village of Upwell, on the junction of New Road and Small Lode in a prominent location next to St Peters Church and the River Nene.

Upwell was categorised as a joint Key Rural Service Centre in the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan, recognising its role as a service centre to the wider locality.

The application was for a change of use only and did not propose any physical changes to the building or site.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination by the Assistant Director given the level of public interest.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Heather Uttridge (objecting) and Tim Slater (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Rust stated that the Committee needed to consider the impact on the community and the weight given to it as an Asset of Community Value. She asked if there was anything to stop the holiday let reverting back into a public house.

The Senior Planner explained that it could revert back into public house if required as there were no physical changes to the building. It was later confirmed that this would require planning permission.

In response to a comment from Councillor Blunt, the Senior Planner explained that the application was change of use from a public house to a holiday let and if approved would have appropriate conditions attached.

Councillor Squire expressed concern that the business was not viable. She referred to page 33 of the agenda and made reference to the licencing objectives.

The Senior Planner advised that it was her understanding that this would not be a stocked bar, although people staying at the holiday let could bring in their own alcohol. The Senior Planner advised that the Licensing Team had been consulted and had raised no objection.

Councillor Sampson also expressed concern that he could not see a clean break from the public house to a holiday let.

The Assistant Director advised that this was planning application to be determined and not a licensing matter.

Councillor Parish agreed with the concerns raised by Councillor Squire. In relation to the ACV, he considered that if the change of use was granted then the ACV would collapse. He added that it would not be difficult to turn a holiday let into residential accommodation and he considered that this would be what would happen in 2 or 3 years' time. He considered that all support should be given to the group that would like the public house retained. He also referred to the conclusion in the officer's report where it referred to the fact that the Parish Council did not object to the application but the Parish Council had stated that they were unable to find material grounds for refusal. The Parish Council had expanded their comments further.

He also considered that the public house had not been given long enough to demonstrate its viability, given the past couple of years.

Councillor Bambridge added that although she hated the idea of a pub closing down the Committee needed to think of the building and keep it in a good state of repair.

Councillor Nockolds also referred to the tourism that the holiday let would bring to the area.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application and, after having been put to the vote, carried 9 votes for and 5 against.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, as recommended.

The Committee then adjourned for a comfort break at 10.30 am and reconvened at 10.40 am

(iii) **21/00543/F**
Burnham Market: 7 Mill Yard, Overy Road: Proposed garden office: Mrs Lucy Gordon Clark

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the land was situated on the north side of Mill Yard, Overy Road, Burnham Market within the village boundary, Conservation Area and the designated Norfolk Coast AONB.

The application was for the construction of a detached, single storey office / garage building on garden land at 7 Mill Yard, Burnham Market.

The application had been referred to the Planning Committee at the discretion of the Assistant Director.

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

In accordance with the public speaking protocol, Mr G Owens (objecting via Zoom) and Mr Clark (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Bubb raised concern in relation to condition 3 in relation to working from home. He felt that the condition should be strengthened. The Planning Control Manager advised that people were allowed to work from home without planning permission, but the condition was designed to stop people from visiting the office.

The Planning Control Manager suggested that the condition 3 should be amended to read: *The use of a garden office / garage building hereby approved shall be limited to purposes incidental to the needs and personal enjoyment of the occupants of the dwelling (7 Mill Yard), which was agreed.*

Councillor Hudson referred to the height of the replacement building and asked whether the height needed to be increased. The Planning Control Manager explained that the new building was designed in traditional fashion with a pantile roof. At 4m high and 2.4m to the eaves it was still not a large building and was still consistent with the other dwellings in the locality and there was no objection to the design and scale of the building.

Councillor Bower felt that the application was not detrimental to the Conservation Area.

In response to a question from Councillor Parish the Planning Control Manager referred the Committee to Condition 5 and outlined the materials and form of construction to be used.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application subject to the amendment of condition 3 and, after having been put to the vote which was carried (13 votes for, 2 against and 1 abstention).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

(iv) **21/01496/O**

Clenchwarton: 149 Main Road: Outline application with some matters reserved: Demolition of the existing dwelling and garage and the construction of up to 3 no. dwellings and a new access along with parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure: C/o CLC Limited

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application was outline with access to be considered and all other matters reserved for the erection of up to 3 dwellings. The site lies within the development boundary of Clenchwarton on the north side of Main Road. The site was also located within Flood Zones 2 and 3a.

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

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 Alex Prowse (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Whitby (Ward Member) and Parish Councillor stated that the site was untidy, and some form of development would be ideal as was in the centre of the village and close to the school and shops, etc. On the opposite side of the road was a park where any children could play. Reference had been made to the small size of the gardens, but he added that not everyone wanted a large garden. He reminded the Committee that the application was in outline form and layout and size of the dwellings could be determined at a later stage.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings added that in relation to the untidy nature of the site, there was no premium on neglect. She considered that the site did have value but questioned whether 3 dwellings would be too many.

Councillor Mrs Bower considered that 3 dwellings would be overdevelopment however 2 dwellings could be accommodated better on the site.

Councillor Bambridge queried whether the size of the gardens mattered and questioned whether it was overdevelopment.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings added that the plans were indicative only.

Councillor Rust added that she agreed that the site was suitable for development, however she felt that plot 3 would cause detriment to the neighbour.

Councillor Parish supported the officer recommendation and referred to the comments on page 62. He also referred to flood risk. He added that there had been 3 applications already for the site, which had all been refused, one of which had been to appeal, but the applicant had not altered the application in order to address any of the concerns.

Councillor Sampson stated that he considered that 3 dwellings would be acceptable, however he did have concerns in relation to the layout in front of the Committee.

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 lost (7 votes for, 8 against and 1 abstention).

As the recommendation for refusal was lost, it was proposed by Councillor Whitby and seconded by Councillor Tyler that the application be approved on the grounds that the site could accommodate 3 dwellings, with conditions to be agreed with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

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 carried 11 votes for, 3 against and 2 abstentions).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, contrary to recommendation, as it was considered that the site could accommodate 3 dwellings. Approval of the application was subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions to be agreed with the Chairman and Vice-Chair.

(v) **21/01373/F**
East Rudham: Land adjacent to 54 Bagthorpe Road:
Proposed new residential dwelling: The Property and
Land Company Ltd

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that full planning permission was sought for the erection of a 1.5 storey chalet detached dwelling with parking. Located on the eastern side of Bagthorpe Road the site was accessed via a gravel drive that also

served ex-authority semi-detached properties within a cul-de-sac setting.

The application site was contained within the development boundary of East Rudham which was a Key Rural Service Centre.

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

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 T Tilbrook (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Democratic Services Officer then read out a letter from Councillor Morley as he could not be present at the meeting.

Councillor Hudson referred to the objections and stated that most of them would go away once the house had been built.

Councillor Parish made reference to the reasons for refusal in particular the second reason for refusal. The Planning Control Manager explained the reasoning behind that reason for refusal.

Councillor Rust added that she had consistently stated that planning permission should not be granted for anything that was detrimental to existing residents and whilst the site might be right for development, she felt that anything that would cast shadows into the rooms of No.54 should not be approved.

The Democratic Services Officer then conducted a roll call on the recommendation to refuse the application and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (12 votes for, 2 against and 2 abstentions).

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as recommended.

(vi) **21/01275/F**
Grimston: Land at Five-Bar-Gate, Cliffe En Howe Road,
Pott Row: Side and porch extension & insulated render
cladding: Steve and Julie Gent

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site comprised a single storey detached dwelling situated to the south of Cliffe En Howe Road, Pott Row.

The application had been referred to the Committee at the request of Councillor de Whalley.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor de Whalley addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Assistant Director outlined the history to the application. He advised the Committee that they needed to consider the proposed extension to the dwelling located in the countryside on its merits. He advised that permitted development rights had been removed however this did not stop an application for an extension.

Councillor Hudson stated that she could not see any windows or any form of habitation. They had received planning permission for an extension but had not carried out any works.

The Assistant Director advised that there was a fall-back position if the Committee was not happy with the proposed extension, as permission had already been granted for a smaller extension.

Councillor Rust considered that by granting permission it would undermine the reasons for imposing those conditions of the 2019 consent.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings also considered that DM5 needed to be taken into account in terms of a high-quality design and whether it would preserve the character and appearance of the area.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed that a condition be imposed regarding materials, which was agreed by the Committee.

The Assistant Director advised the Committee that they were considering an extension to the building only.

Councillor Lawton considered that the proposal was overdevelopment in the countryside.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application with the additional condition regarding materials and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (10 votes for, 5 against and 1 abstention).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to an additional condition regarding materials, as recommended.

- (vii) **21/00566/LB**
Old Hunstanton: Dairy Cottage, Church Road:
Amendments to position of proposed connecting door to
link existing landing with consented loft conversion: Mr E
Newling

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

Councillor Blunt declared an interest and left the meeting during consideration of the item.

The Conservation Officer advised that the description of the application had been amended, as outlined in late correspondence.

The Conservation Officer presented the report and explained that the listed building application proposed amendments to the consent granted in 2014 to convert the roof space to the Grade II listed building. Dairy Cottage, originally a barn, was converted into a dwelling some time ago.

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

The Committee noted the key issue for consideration when determining the application namely the impact upon the fabric and internal appearance of the listed building.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol Mark Roberts (objecting via Zoom), Nick Eastwell (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council via Zoom) and Mr Newling (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to comments from Old Hunstanton Parish Council, the Conservation Officer advised that the comments from Old Hunstanton Parish Council had been sent to Borough Planning in July and responded to. The only thing that could not be verified was where the site notice had been posted in 2014, as there was a different Conservation Officer in post then. In terms of whether planning permission was required, a Senior Planning Officer confirmed that planning permission was not required for the roof lights.

Councillor Rose stated that he had concerns in relation to potential structural problems. The Conservation Officer advised that a condition had been imposed asking for structural information to be submitted before any works started.

Councillor Bambridge asked if the covenant had been breached. The Conservation Officer advised that it was not something that could be taken into account when dealing with the listed building application.

Councillor Parish referred to parking for the dwelling. The Assistant Director advised that the Committee could only comment on the impact to the Listed Building.

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 carried (11 votes for, 2 against and two abstentions).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

The Committee then adjourned at 12.30 pm and reconvened at 1.05 pm

- (viii) **21/00999/F**
Terrington St Clement: 51 Alma Avenue: Proposed residential development of 5 dwellings including demolition of bungalow and garage: Dene Homes Ltd

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that full permission was sought for the demolition of an existing bungalow and garage at 51 Alma Avenue, Terrington St Clement and construction of 5 detached dwellings and garages.

The site covered 0.26 ha and was bounded on three sides by existing residential development – bungalows to the south and east; and houses on Herbert Ward Way to the west.

The site was located within the defined development area of the village and Flood Zone 3 of the Council adopted Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, plus the Environment Agency's Tidal Hazard Mapping Zone.

The application initially sought 9 dwellings, however the number of units was negotiated down and to 5 dwellings.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the views of the Parish Council were contrary to the officer recommendation and 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 Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings drew the Committee's attention to the need to amend conditions 2 and 3 as outlined in late correspondence, which was agreed.

Councillor Parish referred to the comments of the Parish Council who had stated that they had no objection to 4 houses on the site in August 2019, but since then in March 2021, 44 houses had been granted permission close to the site. In the agenda, officers had stated that no further houses were required to meet the needs of the Local Plan. He sympathised with the Parish Council and residents regarding the need for 5 houses in addition to those already granted. The site was also in Flood Zone 3. He asked why it was essential for the additional 5 houses in addition to those already granted permission.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings responded that although permissions were being granted, the dwellings were not being

delivered. She referred to the size of the site and density which was low.

The Assistant Director advised that the Council regularly granted windfall sites and was a good site for housing.

Councillor Lawton added that there was a need for housing in certain areas.

Councillor Sampson stated that he was in favour of the proposal and was particularly pleased to see Condition 6, which requested planting, bird nesting boxes and bat boxes.

Councillor Blunt referred back to the comments from Councillor Parish and explained that the Local Plan was a minimum requirement. He added that houses were not being built out on sites which had been allocated.

Councillor Squire stated that this was her ward and whilst she understood the concerns of the Parish Council about the access through Bens Lane and she did not necessarily agree with the granting of permission for 40 houses this would tidy up a messy corner. She did have concerns however that the estate was mainly bungalows and semi-detached houses and the new dwellings might look slightly out of character being detached.

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 (15 votes for, 1 against).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, as recommended, subject to amendments to conditions 2 and 3 as outlined in late correspondence.

(ix) **21/00981/F**

**Walsoken: Land east of Tarrazona, 16 S-Bend, Lynn Road:
2-storey 4-bed dwelling with attached double garage: Mr L
Boswell**

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that full planning permission was sought for the erection of a two storey 4 bedroom detached dwelling. The site was located to the east of the dwelling known as Tarrazona and to the west of Wellington House. A commercial livery owned and operated in connection with Tarrazona was to the south of the site. The site was on the south side of Lynn Road, on the original S Bend section and was located outside any development boundary and was therefore considered to be within the wider countryside.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was contrary to the views of the Parish Council and 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, Mr Liam Lunn-Towler (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Blunt stated that the site was within his Ward. He added that planning permission had been granted recently for another dwelling. He considered that the site was in a sustainable location and therefore proposed that the application should be approved. This was seconded by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings.

The Assistant Director advised that the site was 1 km away from the development boundary and there was no infill policy.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings added that this was a stand-alone site – all up and down the road was houses and commercial development. She considered that the site was a natural infill and would be a larger house on a larger plot.

Councillor Parish supported the officer recommendation and could not see any reason why the Committee should go against that.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (15 votes for and 1 vote against).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, contrary to recommendation, as it was considered to be sustainable development. Approval of the application subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, including an ecology condition, following agreement with the Chairman and Vice-Chair.

(x) **21/01536/F**
Walsoken: Rosalie Farm, Lynn Road: Proposed
conversion and extension of silos to form dwelling: Mr
Clark

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that full planning permission was sought for the conversion of 4 silos to a single dwelling at Rosalie Farm, Lynn Road, Walsoken. Plans showed the conversion of 4 existing silos which were proposed to be linked via the construction of a rear extension measuring approximately 15 x 4.5 m

from the rear of the existing silos. The extension provided the majority of the residential floor space proposed.

The site was outside of any defined development boundary on land which was therefore considered to be within the wider countryside for the purposes of the Local Plan.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was contrary to the views of the Parish Council and at the request of the Planning Sifting Panel.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Tim Slater (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Planning Control Manager advised that it was the officer view that the application did not comply with paragraph 80 of the NPPF and Policy CS06.

Councillor Squire stated that she quite liked the proposal. She queried whether the barn next to it would be able to be converted.

The Planning Control Manager advised that any conversion would need to make a positive contribution to the landscape. However, there was a fallback position with regards to agricultural buildings and there was PD rights for the conversion of agricultural buildings subject to certain conditions being met.

Councillor Blunt stated that the issue he had with the application was that there were no boundaries for the conversion and if approved would turn a large area into a huge garden. He would like to see better definition of the boundaries.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings agreed with the comments made by Councillor Blunt.

Councillor Hudson queried the lifespan of the silos.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call on the recommendation to refuse the application and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (13 votes for and 3 abstentions).

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as recommended.

- (xi) **21/01596/CU**
Walpole: Land off Church Road, Walpole St Peter:
Change of use from agricultural field to private equestrian
paddock: Miss Katie McCoo

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the site was located in the countryside on the south side of Church Road, Walpole St Peter to the rear of a row of dwellings recently permitted under 18/01472/RMM. The proposal was for the change of use of approximately 1.24 hectares of agricultural land to an equestrian paddock for private use. No operational development was involved in the planning application.

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

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 Paul Cotton (objecting against the process that had taken place) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Planning Control Manager responded to comments from the speaker that matters about the conduct of the Parish Council needed to be a matter addressed by the Monitoring Officer. The Planning Control Manager also addressed issues of landownership and the reduction of the size of the site.

Councillor Blunt stated that the land was originally agricultural land and the whole piece had been grassed. He had concerns about access to the land and pointed out that there was a bridle path at the rear.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings suggested that a condition should be imposed regarding the storage of waste.

The Assistant Director advised that the plan numbers needed to be clarified.

In view of some of the comments made it was proposed that the application be deferred to ensure that the plan numbers were correct.

Councillor Squire stated that she was bemused that a change of use from agricultural to equestrian had been referred to the Committee for determination given it was a rural village.

RESOLVED: That the application be deferred.

PC63: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

RESOLVED: That the reports be noted.

The meeting closed at 2.10 pm