

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

Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 8th November, 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 (sub), F Bone, C Bower, A Bubb, G Hipperson, A Holmes, C Hudson, B Lawton, B Long (sub), C Manning, C Morley (sub), E Nockolds, C Rose, J Rust, S Squire, D Tyler and D Whitby

PC64: **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 Councillor Holmes to his first meeting as a Member of the Planning Committee.

PC65: **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Parish (Cllr Morley sub), Patel (Cllr Long sub) and Storey (Cllr Bambridge sub).

The Chairman thanked the substitutes for attending the meeting.

PC66: **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 October 2021 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings.

PC67: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following declarations of interest were declared:

Councillor Nockolds declared that she was a patient of St James Medical Practice, and she had attended meeting where it had been explained to patients and she had also been present at South Wootton Parish Council where it had also been discussed.

Councillor Whitby declared that he was also a patient at St James Medical Practice

Councillor Mrs Bower declared that she was a trustee of Marriott's Warehouse.

Councillor Bone declared an interest in item 8/2(b) and would speak in accordance with Standing Order 34 for this item.

Councillor Lawton added that he would speaking in accordance with Standing Order 34 for item 8/3(b) – Holme and would not take part in item 8/3(a) – Brancaster.

Councillor Bambridge added that she was a patient of St James Medical Practice and had attended one meeting with other Councillors about whether not the surgery should move.

The Legal Advisor confirmed that being a patient of a Medical Practice was not a pecuniary interest. In relation to being a Trustee this was not a pecuniary interest. The Member may declare a prejudicial interest if they felt that their position had been compromised.

Councillor Long informed the Committee that he had been recently been appointed to Stoke Ferry Internal Drainage Board, and they had made a comment on one of the applications.

PC68: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

The Planning Control Manager referred the Committee to the late correspondence, where it had been recommended to defer item 8/3(d) to allow for the full consultation period to end. The recommendation to defer the application was proposed by the Chairman and seconded by Councillor Manning and agreed by the Committee.

PC69: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

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

Councillor Bone	8/2(b)	South Wootton
Councillor Lawton	8/3(b)	Holme next the Sea
Councillor Gidney	8/3(c)	King's Lynn
Councillor Bambridge	8/3(c)	King's Lynn
Councillor Sampson	8/3(e)	Stoke Ferry

PC70: **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC71: **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.

PC72: **INDEX OF APPLICATIONS**

The Committee noted the Index of Applications.

a **Decisions on Applications**

(i) **21/01596/CU**

Walpole: Land off Church Road, Walpole St Peter: Change of use from agricultural field to private equestrian paddock:

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and reminded the Committee that this application had been deferred from the October 2021 Planning Committee meeting. The reason given was to clarify which of the plans on the file was proposed and ensure the correct plan was published in consultations.

It was explained that there were two plans on the file, one showing a larger extent of land accessed only from the rear garden of the dwelling. The plan showing a larger extent was uploaded to the file 12/8 and the latter plan was uploaded 18/8. In the recommendation, condition 2 specifically refers to the plan uploaded 18/8. Following the October Committee meeting, an amended site notice was produced and posted on site, and the Parish Council was reconsulted.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as it was called in by Councillor Blunt and it had been deferred from the October Planning Committee meeting.

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

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Stacey (objecting via Zoom) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to the comments raised by the public speaker, the Principal Planner explained that there was mention of other sites being fenced off, but that was separate from this application and could be looked at by Planning Enforcement. The site was going to be accessed predominately from the rear garden of the property so there would not

be a need to cross the land owned by the water company. There was also a shared access that they could use and had rights over. All the correct site ownership certificates and been filled in.

The Chairman asked for clarification as to whether this was agricultural land as the grass looked manicured. The Assistant Director advised that he considered the application to be acceptable. The fences would be permitted development.

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 (16 votes for, and 2 against).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

- (ii) **21/01069/O**
Downham Market: 157 and 159 Bexwell Road: Outline application: Demolition of existing properties and construction of a 72-bedroom care home (C2 use class) with associated parking and development:

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that permission was sought to demolish two detached houses (Nos. 157 & 159) set in substantial grounds on the northern side of Bexwell Road approximately 95m west of the A10 roundabout. In their place, a 72 bedroom care home with associated parking and development was sought.

This was technically an outline application however the matters of access, scale, appearance and layout were to be determined as part of this submission – only landscaping was reserved for future consideration.

The application was accompanied by a Design & Access Statement, Planning Statement, Transport Assessment, Travel Plan, Agricultural Impact Assessment, Ecology Assessment, Biodiversity Net Gain Calculation, Energy Statement and Flood Risk Assessment.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the Town Council's views were contrary to the officer recommendation and at the request of the Planning 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, Town Councillor F Daymond (objecting) and Hamish Watson (supporting via Zoom) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In relation to comments raised by the public speaker, the Senior Planner advised that most issues raised had been covered within the report. With regards to the position of the site, this was within the development area of the town. In relation to parking arrangements for visitors and staff, it was explained that the County Highways Authority had raised no objection to the application.

Councillor Bone asked what mitigation measures were in place to protect residents from the businesses nearby. The Senior Planner explained that conditions were attached to the McDonalds and Starbucks consents relating to noise and amenity, given that there was residential properties in close proximity to the businesses.

Councillor Long added that this was a useful transition and fitted in well in the location. He added that there was a need for this provision.

Councillor Rust expressed concern in relation to a lack of car parking spaces. It was explained that the provision of spaces met Norfolk County Council standards. There was also a travel plan to be implemented.

Councillor Mrs Bower added that the application was the result of a needs assessment and would provide 60 jobs. The application also provided landscaping and green energy within the design.

Councillor Morley also supported the scheme but asked for reassurance that the conditions would be complied with. The Assistant Director advised that there would not be any shortcuts with regards to conditions, as there were Discharge of Conditions Officers in place to monitor and administer discharge of conditions. He confirmed that this Authority saw conditions as an important part of the process, as they allowed consents to go ahead, which otherwise would not have been acceptable.

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 (17 votes for and 1 abstention).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

(iii) 21/00995/FM

South Wootton: Land west of The Gardens, Edward Benerfer Way: Proposed primary care centre, new access and associated facilities: St James Medical Centre

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

Councillor Bone left the meeting and later addressed the Committee in accordance with Standing Order 34.

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application was for a 2 storey multi-functional primary care facility on the northern side of Edward Benefer Way approximately 80m to the west of the junction of Hall Lane and Edward Benefer Way.

The primary care facility will replace the current St James Medical Centre practice in King's Lynn and will also act to support existing people living in South Wootton and Gaywood. It would also have capacity to accommodate the future developments in the northern half of King's Lynn.

The site formed part of the site allocation E3.1 designated for housing and associated facilities.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as it was in the wider public interest.

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 Ray (objecting), Robert Chichester (supporting) and Dr Mitra (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor Bone addressed the Committee and expressed concern in relation to the location of the site and considered that there could be a better location to make it more accessible for existing patients and to the town centre.

The Senior Planner advised that in response to comments from Mr Ray, these had been covered within the report at page 47. In terms of cycle provision, the proposal identified 21 cycle spaces and 3 mobility scooters. The maximum cycle parking standards on the site including staff requirement was 44 spaces but that was when the Primary Care Centre was operating at 100%. The LHA had confirmed that they had no objection to the provision of 21 spaces. However, the Senior Planner confirmed that the applicant was prepared to accept a condition to add more cycle spaces if Members felt that it was necessary.

With regards to comments from Councillor Bone, within the agents comments it had been stated that for those south of the town, there would be the South Lynn Primary Care development coming forward. The proposed location would also help to support the planned new developments to the north of the town.

The Chair asked for clarification with regards to the Parish Council's comments regarding the removal of the Local Highways objection and the use of the Larkfleet roundabout.

The Assistant Director advised that the Local Highways Authority preferred the use of the Larkfleet roundabout, but it might not come forward in time. A separate junction had been proposed and assessed on its own merits and met the highways standards.

Councillor Long stated that one of the biggest comments he had heard was that infrastructure was needed to support any new housing development. He considered that the proposal was very welcome, and he would be supporting it.

Councillor Bambridge added that this was a difficult application for her as she was a patient of the practice and also represented lots of other patients from St Margarets with St Nicholas and patients from South Lynn also used the surgery. She added that looking at it in planning terms it was a reasonable application, apart from the highway issues, but it had not taken into account the residents of King's Lynn by taking the surgery out of the town centre. She explained that there was not a good bus service, which needed to be considered and the engagement carried out by the CCG had been poor. It would be much more difficult for patients to get to the surgery. It would cause more traffic and pollution. She agreed with the comments from the Civic Society.

Councillor Rust added that in principle she wanted to support the application but there were issues around access and the cycle lane and considered that a roundabout would be more appropriate. She also had concerns regarding the lack of cycle spaces and would not satisfy the need of people who were able to cycle. It would add extra burden to the people who could currently access the surgery, but she acknowledged that the current surgery was not fit for purpose.

Councillor Squire added that although NCC had removed their objection they had been clear that the site should be served by the roundabout. The only reason that they had removed their objection was because they could not substantiate it at appeal. She also concurred that more cycle spaces were needed and expressed concern that the footpath and cycleway should run through the middle of the car park. She added that we should hold out for the roundabout.

The Assistant Director advised that the roundabout would be sited further along the road and had an arm would run into the site, which was what was originally proposed. However, there was no guarantee that the roundabout would come forward. The Local Highways Authority view was clear that they could not sustain that objection at appeal. In planning terms, this was a new piece of health infrastructure that was proposed, and in theory the CCG may decide to keep the surgery at St James open. It was up to the CCG how they operated and planned for growth across the town.

Councillor Bubb queried whether the proposed new centre was big enough and whether there were enough parking spaces, given the new developments in the vicinity. The Senior Planner explained that there

was provision to expand the surgery in the future. In relation to the car parking spaces, the Senior Planner also explained that there would be the provision of bus stops and also highlighted the existing bus stop.

Councillor Mrs Nockolds referred to the Travel Plan and the need to make reference to the Community Transport asset. The Senior Planner advised that the condition did refer to a travel plan and the applicant's attention could be drawn to Community Transport. The Assistant Director advised that this would also need to refer to all other sustainable modes of transport.

The Chairman asked for an additional condition that there would be additional cycle parking that would be to Norfolk County Council's standards, and also the width of car parking spaces, should meet their standards. This was agreed by the Committee.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve, together with the additional condition requiring the cycle parking to be to Norfolk County Council's standards and also the width of car parking spaces and, after having been put to the vote, was carried.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended subject to the imposition of an additional condition requiring the cycle spaces to be to Norfolk County Council's standards and also the width of car parking spaces.

The Committee then adjourned at 11.15 am and reconvened at 11.25 am.

(iv) 21/00794/FM

Northwold: The Piggeries, 49 Methwold Road, Whittington: Demolition of existing piggery buildings and construction of industrial buildings to provide additional warehousing/storage of timber-based fuel and charcoal products, with associated processing (drying and saw / splitter) buildings, an office / amenity block, weighbridge, staff and visitor car parking, log storage lanes and associated access, circulation, landscaping and drainage works: Big K Ltd

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was situated between the A134 and the B1112 Methwold Road, to the south of the settlement of Whittington, and was adjacent to the Big K Ltd site. The application site extended to approximately 3.95 hectares and comprised a range of 6 large piggery buildings, a pole barn, a slurry pit, and the adjacent fields. Access to the application site was via the B1122 to the south, with no access to the A134. The site was separated from the existing Big K site to the

east by Stone Drove, a Restricted Byway (Northwold RB10) which connected the A134 and the B1122.

The application sought full planning permission for the expansion of the existing operation onto the application site, through the provision of additional timber storage and processing facilities, consolidated office provision and parking facilities.

The site was to the east of the built extent of the village of Whittington, which was categorised as a Smaller Village or Hamlet in the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (SADMPP). The site was on land designated as countryside.

The application had been referred to the Committee by 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 adopted public speaking protocol, Mr S Wood (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to a concern raised by Councillor Hipperson in relation to noise and the impact this could have on the neighbouring properties, the Senior Planner explained the mitigation measures which were required by condition, and the measures put forward by the applicant which were above and beyond with regards to the acoustic fencing.

Several Members of the Committee commended the application.

The Chairman drew the Committee's attention to the need to delete condition 2 and add condition 17, as outlined in late correspondence, which was agreed by the Committee.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application together with amendments as outlined in late correspondence and, after having been put to the vote, was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended subject to the deletion of condition 2 and the addition of condition 17, as outlined in late correspondence.

(v) **21/00903/F**

Brancaster: 14 Roman Way: Extensions, alterations and remodelling of dwelling: Mr & Mrs Wingrove

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

Councillor Lawton took no part in the debate or decision.

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site comprised a two-storey detached dwelling situated on the north-east side of Roman Way, on the Branodumum Estate, Brancaster.

Planning permission was sought for the construction of extensions, alterations and remodelling of the existing dwelling.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request 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 adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Chamberlain (objecting) and Mr Wingrove (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to a question regarding whether the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring property, the Planning Control Manager advised that it was the view of officers that the proposal would not give rise to any dis-amenity to the neighbours.

The Planning Control Manager also advised that in relation to condition 3, it was not required to specify the depth of obscured glazing, although the condition could be amended by the Committee if required. Condition 8 also prevented the installation of further windows in the extensions without the granting of specific planning permission.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings responded to the issue raised in relation to consistency of decisions and explained that each application had to be considered on its own merits.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application which was lost (3 votes for, 9 against and 5 abstentions).

It was then proposed by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings and seconded by Councillor Bambridge that the application be refused on the grounds of scale, height of the first floor extension along with its proximity to the boundary, would cause an adverse impact on the neighbouring property in terms of overshadowing and being overbearing.

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 (15 for refusal and 2 abstentions).

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

The scale and height of the first floor extension, along with its proximity to the boundary, would cause an adverse impact on the neighbouring property in terms of overshadowing and being overbearing. This is contrary to policy CS08 of the Core Strategy and policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan, as well as the NPPF.

- (vi) 20/00737/F
Holme next the Sea: Builders Yard, Thornham Road: New building following change of use of builder's yard: Millthorne Developments Ltd**

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

Councillor Lawton left the meeting and later addressed the meeting under Standing Order 34.

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that full planning permission was sought for the erection of a new dwelling following the demolition of the existing structures on the site associated with the permitted use as a builder's yard.

The site was located within the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) adjacent to the main coast road (A149).

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 in the report.

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

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Lawton read out comments from Holme Parish Council.

In response to comments from Councillor Long, the Assistant Director advised that in relation to an untidy site, an enforcement notice or Section 215 notice could be served. The difference with this application was that a Lawful Development Certificate had been granted in 2000, which had been given considerable weight in the planning balance of the application.

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:

- (1) Approved, subject to the completion of a legal agreement within 4 months of the date of the resolution to approve the application to ensure the dwelling is used as a principal dwelling only.
- (2) Refused, if a legal agreement ensuring the dwelling is used as a principal dwelling only is not secured within 4 months of the date of a resolution to approve the application.

The Committee then adjourned at 12.30 pm and reconvened at 1.10 pm.

- (vii) 21/01654/F
King's Lynn: Marriotts Warehouse, South Quay: Glazed balustrade around seating area: The Trustees Marriotts Warehouse**

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

Councillor Bower left the meeting as she was a Trustee of the building.

Councillor Bambridge left the meeting and later addressed the Committee under Standing Order 34.

The Planning Control Manager introduced the report and explained that the application site related to the restaurant Marriotts Warehouse, which was situated on the eastern side of the South Quay, King's Lynn.

Planning permission was sought for the erection of a glazed balustrade around the outside seating area to the front of the building.

The site falls within King's Lynn Conservation Area and the building is Grade II* Listed.

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

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, Tricia Rowlands (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor Gidney addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Bambridge addressed the Committee in accordance with Standing Order 34 in support of the application.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Conservation Officer advised that all consultees accepted that some form of enclosure was acceptable

around Marriott's Warehouse, but the objection related to maintaining the character of the warehouse and riverside.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings stated that the palettes did not enhance the street scene in anyway and the sooner they were removed the better. She considered that the proposal would enhance the visitor experience. She referred to the Corn Exchange and the balustrade at the front of the building, which she considered was not as good as this proposal. She therefore proposed that the application be approved on the grounds that it added to the street scene, enhanced the visitor experience and did not cause any dis-amenity.

The proposal to approve the application was seconded by Councillor Long.

Councillor Hipperson added that to vote for it he had to go against Historic England, Civic Society and Conservation Officer. He felt that improvements to the scheme could be made.

In response to a query from Councillor Nockolds, it was explained that an informative note would be added to decision notice requiring no notices or banners to be displayed on the enclosure.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application with conditions to be agreed with the Chair and Vice-Chair and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (14 votes for and 1 against).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, contrary to recommendation for the following reasons and including the imposition of appropriate conditions following consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair.

The proposed barriers would enhance the appearance of the building, supports a local business as well as the visitor experience.

(viii) 21/00716/F

Snettisham: Ingol Falls House, Mill Gardens: Proposed detached home study: C Singh

It was noted that this application had been deferred earlier in the meeting.

(ix) 21/01720/F

Stoke Ferry: Flint Farm, Oxborough Road: Three holiday lets, visitor centre, access and car parking:

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application sought full planning consent for the construction of three

holiday cabins and a visitor office / store for holiday use only with associated open space and the creation of a new access and parking area. The access would be via Oxborough Road.

The application site was 1.1ha in size and currently utilised as a private garden area for the adjacent donor dwelling Hanks Ranch (formally known as Flint Farm) within the blue land.

The site was approximately 1km to the northeast of the built extent of the village of Stoke Ferry.

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 Sampson addressed the Committee in support of the application.

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.

(x) 2/TPO/00609

West Rudham: Within the garden of Dewberry Low, Low Road: To consider whether Tree Preservation Order 2/TPO/00609 should be confirmed, modified or not confirmed in light of objections

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

The Arboricultural Officer presented the report which asked the Committee to consider whether Tree Preservation Order 2/TPO/00609 should be confirmed, modified or not confirmed in light of objections. The mature Oak (T1) was situated in the rear garden of Dewberry Low, Lynn Road, West Rudham. The tree could be seen from Lynn Road and contributed greatly to the setting of the area and to the wider landscape of the approach to West Rudham.

The Arboricultural Officer explained:

- The reason for making the Tree Preservation Officer
- An outline of objections and representations; and
- The response to the objections and representations

It was reported that the tree did have a cavity in the stem with decaying timber, but the Arboricultural Officer was of the opinion that a 4-5 m overall crown reduction would remove a large amount of weight from the crown whilst allowing the resource of the tree to remain.

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Dan Yeomans (objecting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to a question, the Arboricultural Officer advised that the tree remained the responsibility of the tree and landowner. With works prescribed, the Arboricultural Officer was confident that the tree would remain in place and on site. He also explained that he did manage trees with varying states of decay around the Borough.

The Assistant Director explained that if the TPO was confirmed, then the owner could apply to fell the tree and they would have the right to appeal against that decision to the Planning Inspectorate who would look at it independently.

Some Members of the Committee expressed concern in relation to the confirmation of the Order.

Councillor Morley explained that he had seen the tree and the decay was excessive. He stated that the tree was dangerous and the strain and stress put on the residents of the two bungalows was excessive. He therefore proposed that the TPO was not confirmed, and this was seconded by Councillor Rust.

The Democratic Services then carried out a roll call on the proposal to not confirm the order and, after having been out to the vote was carried (9 votes for, 3 against and 4 abstentions)

RESOLVED: That the TPO was not confirmed.

- (xi) 2/TPO/00613**
West Walton: Rosedene, 29 St Pauls Road North, Walton Highway: To consider whether Tree Preservation Order 2/TPO/00609 should be confirmed, modified or not confirmed in the light of objections

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

The Arboricultural Officer presented the report and explained that the area of mixed age trees was situated in the rear garden of Rosedene, 29 St Pauls Road, North, Walton Highway. The tree species included Poplar, Sycamore and Pine. The treed could be seen from St Pauls Road and the A47 to the east of the site. The trees formed an attractive feature in the immediate area and added to the wider landscape in general.

The Committee noted:

- The reasons for making the Tree Preservation Order;
- The outline of objections and representations
- The response to the objections and representations.

The Democratic Services then carried out a roll call on the proposal to confirm the order without modification and, after having been out to the vote was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the Order be confirmed without modification.

73: **DIRECT ACTION REPORT - LAND AT MARLIAN HOUSE, CHURCH ROAD, TERRINGTON ST JOHN**

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

The Enforcement Team Leader presented the report to the Committee so that Members could note the continuing breach of planning control and for a resolution to remedy the breach of planning control following non-compliance with a Section 215 Notice.

The Assistant Director updated the Committee that the owners had booked some landscapers to carry out work on 4 December 2021.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the update in respect of the continuing breach of Planning Control be noted.
- (b) That authority be granted to the Executive Director for Environment and Planning for the implementation and execution of direct action under Section 219 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to comply with requirements set out in paragraph 3 of the Section 215 Notice.

PC74: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

The meeting closed at 2.20 pm