

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

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday,
20th July, 2022 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 Bower, A Bubb, C J Crofts, M de Whalley, A Holmes,
C Hudson, J Kirk, B Lawton, C Manning, E Nockolds, T Parish, C Rose (sub),
C Sampson, S Squire, M Storey and D Tyler

An apology for absence was received from Councillor S Patel, J Rust and
D Whitby

PC17: **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.

PC18: **APOLOGIES**

An apology for absence was received from Councillors Lawton, Patel and Whitby.

PC19: **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Meetings held on 15 and 21 June 2022 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings.

PC20: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following declarations of interest were declared:

In relation to item 8, Councillor de Whalley declared an interest in the Medworth item and addressed the Committee in accordance with Standing Order 34. He took no part in the debate.

In relation to item 8/2(b) Dersingham, Councillor Bubb declared a non-pecuniary interest in the application.

PC21: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

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

PC22: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Councillors attended and addressed the Committee in relation to Standing Order 34:

S Dark	Item 8	Land at Algores Way, Wisbech
M de Whalley	Item 8	Land at Algores Way, Wisbech
A Kemp	Item 8	Land at Algores Way, Wisbech
J Collingham	8/2(b)	Dersingham
S Dark	8/2(b)	Dersingham

PC23: **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC24: **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.

PC25: **MEDWORTH ENERGY FROM WASTE COMBINED HEAT AND POWER FACILITY - ADEQUACY OF CONSULTATION REQUEST - REPORT TO FOLLOW**

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

Councillor de Whalley left the meeting and addressed the Committee in accordance with Standing Order 34.

Members were reminded that at the Council meeting on 25 February 2021, Council passed a motion to object to the principle of the proposal for an energy from waste facility in Wisbech.

It is important to note that this remains in place and is unaffected by this very specific, and limited consultation response.

The Planning Inspectorate (PINS) had invited the Council to submit an Adequacy of Consultation (AoC) representation, in response to the submission of the Medworth EfW, CHP facility and associated grid

connections application. The Council had 14 days to respond to this specific consultation. The deadline for comments to PINS was Thursday 21 July 2022. PINS would consider comments it received from host and neighbouring authorities in deciding whether or not to accept the application as submitted.

As this was a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) it was considered by PINS and ultimately determined by the Secretary of State.

At this stage PINS are only looking for comments on the consultation carried out pre-submission. PINS have made it clear that this is not the stage to consider the merits of the case, that will be later, and the council will have much longer to provide their response. The timetable will be set out by PINS in due course, if they decide to accept the application. A copy of the flow diagram showing the role of local authorities in this process, was attached to this report.

Comments were made on the AoC by officers in the specific terms of the request received.

The report detailed the consultation carried out by the applicant.

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

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Dr Little (objecting) addressed the Committee in relation to the item.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Dark addressed the Committee. Councillor Dark, Leader of the Council and Administration stated that he wished to make it clear that this was a technical matter that was being considered, and the Council had taken a decision some time ago that the Council was in principle opposed to this incinerator at this location citing reasons that it was too large, too near and sufficient in the supply chain to actually need more. That was the position of the administration and was a similar position taken by every other Council in the area around this matter including Norfolk County Council. That position would remain.

In terms of the matter being considered, Members were being asked about the adequacy of consultation and as had been explained what needed to be considered was whether the applicant had done what they said they were going to do which was the minimum legal requirement or in the prevailing circumstances that we know in West Norfolk, given the history of concern around incineration and given the actual issues around where the plume might go, the size of the site, drawing in the consultation of 3.5 miles (5 km) was that adequate consultation as there were numerous groups and Parish Councils that had said that they would want to get involved with this and would want to be consulted but the reality was that they were outside the

framework of this. From a technical point of view, officers were right – had Medworth done what they said they were going to do and did that meet the legal requirement? The reality was yes but the additional question the Committee needed to answer was given all the local concern over incineration, given all of the people who were interested in this including the other parish councils and the wider impact, was 5km wide enough on a site of that size and the concerns that had been raised. He hoped that the Committee would agree that they could have done more.

Councillor de Whalley addressed the Committee in accordance with Standing Order 34. He outlined his concerns to add to those of Councillor Dark and Dr Martin Little, which included when the Council had its own battle with the proposed incinerator at the Willows, which was half the size, it was deemed appropriate by this Council to run a poll across the whole district. The developer left some papers which showed that they were unhappy with the poll and results. This begged the question of whether the consultation should be left with the developer of 5km. Waste would be pulled in from a 2-hour radius along roads which were not adequate. There was Cambridgeshire County Council, Fenland District Council, Wisbech Town Council, Norfolk County Council and this Council all lodging ‘in principle’ objections. The Willows Incinerator took into account objections from 9 MPs across Norfolk and neighbouring counties, therefore, to restrict to 5 km for a site twice the size seemed inappropriate. A number of Parish Councils had written to Cambridgeshire County Council stating that they felt that the consultation was inadequate.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Kemp addressed the Committee and explained that as a local Councillor, she was asking the Planning Inspectorate to refuse MVV’s application for an incinerator in Wisbech on the West Norfolk border. She would ask the Planning Committee to send a letter to the Planning Inspectorate regarding the inadequacy of consultation with residents of West Norfolk.

- She explained that she had asked MVV both, before and during, the Pre-Application Consultation last July to August, to consult with residents, including in the community centres, but MVV refused. MVV held no consultation in South and West Lynn or in the parishes of West Winch or Clenchwarton.
- When MVV’s hired consultants spoke to the Borough’s Environment Committee about the incinerator, shortly before the pandemic, I told them they should consult with Lynn and surrounding villages. They refused.
- MVV didn’t consult properly with West Norfolk residents, and they set too narrow a circle for the area of consultation, of up to 5 km.
- But 15 km area was still too narrow an area, as it extends only to the Pullover Roundabout in West Lynn and stops short of King’s Lynn and surrounding villages and took no proper account of the velocity of the winds around the Wash as a

carrier of particulates, or of the impact on the tourist area of the North Norfolk Coast.

- There is an open and flat Fen landscape between Wisbech and King's Lynn, across which particulate matter and secondary particulate matter could easily travel.
- All Parliamentary Group on Air Pollution in December called for an immediate moratorium on all new incinerators, as research shows that eggs, 10 km away from incinerators, have been found to contain dioxins from incinerators. Incinerator matter has been found in children's toenails and associated with childhood leukemia.
- South and West Lynn are deprived areas, living in the indices of deprivation and suffered from a long battle against an incinerator 8 years ago that Cory Wheelabrator wanted to build in the ward. The prospect of another incinerator is causing anxiety. Public Health, and Mental Health, is a material planning consideration.

The Assistant Director advised that this is about the adequacy of the consultation. If it was accepted by the Planning Inspector, there would be the opportunity to talk about the merits in more detail at the pre-examination and examination stages.

Councillor Bone stated that he was disappointed at the lack of consultation. He added that there would be transportation of other authority's waste to the site. He felt that it would be of detriment to the town. He felt that residents should have had the opportunity to do this.

Councillor Rust added that this was a Major National Infrastructure Project and would not be determined by a local Planning Committee but by the Secretary of State. It was clear that a 5 km radius was not adequate. She stated that the Committee must add its weight to the fact that the consultation was not adequate.

Several other members of the Committee agreed with Councillor Rust.

Councillor Parish added that West Norfolk's rubbish went to Suffolk for burning and there were two proposed nuclear power stations in Suffolk and should all of England have been consulted, it was a question of balance. He asked whether people of Suffolk had been consulted to see if they wanted West Norfolk's rubbish.

Councillor Storey added that as elected Members they were there to look after the residents within their wards. With regards to the distance of consultation, 5km was not very far and not adequate. He could not see why the people of King's Lynn and West Norfolk had not been consulted on the project and felt that they should have been. He added that this was the wrong project, in the wrong place at the wrong time.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings expressed her concerns and added that 5km was nothing especially with prevailing winds. This was a local issue, and everyone should rally together and be counted. It was noted that the Council still opposed the project.

It was proposed by Councillor Storey and seconded by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings that the whole of West Norfolk should have been consulted and that the following recommendation be sent to the Planning Inspectorate.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call on the recommendation, and after having been put to the vote was carried unanimously:

Recommendation:

- (1) Notwithstanding the fact that the applicants have undertaken consultation in accordance with their own Statement of Consultation (SoC), the Committee is very concerned that the 5km consultation area is entirely inadequate given the size of the plant and therefore OBJECT as it is considered that the whole of the Borough should have been subject to consultation.
- (2) Members note that the 'in principle' opposition to the proposal for an energy from waste facility in Wisbech remains as agreed by the notice of motion at the Council meeting on 25 February 2021 and was unaffected by this specific technical consultation response.

PC26: **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) – (ix) below, where appropriate, to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chairman.

- (i) **21/02066/OM**
Gayton: Former works adjacent Gayton Mill, Litcham Road:
Outline application: Erection of up to 33 dwellings, works to the existing access, estate roads, driveways, parking areas, open space, external lighting, pumping station and associated infrastructure: Rannerlow Ltd

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

The Planning Control Manager presented the report and advised that the application was in outline for residential development on a site adjacent to Gayton Mill, which was at the eastern end of Gayton Village. All matters were reserved for future consideration except for access, which was to be fully considered. An indicative layout had been submitted, which showed a development of 33 dwellings.

The site was brownfield and within the village envelope.

The application had been referred 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, Mr E Clarke (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

A query was raised as to when the affordable housing would be provided. It was explained that the delivery of affordable housing would form part of the reserved matters application. In terms of the spread of affordable housing across the site, the Planning Control Manager advised that this was also be considered at reserved matters stage but did meet the affordable housing policy.

Councillor Rust raised concern in relation to the comment from Strategic Housing regarding requiring smaller units, ie. 2 bed 4 person units. She felt that this was inappropriate given that children at a certain age had to have separate bedrooms.

Councillor Crofts expressed concern in relation to a Management Company maintaining the LEAP and public open space and asked for reassurance that this would work. In response the Planning Control Manager advised that consultation would take place with appropriate consultees / internal departments to ensure that an appropriate management scheme came forward.

Councillor De Whalley (Ward Member) expressed concerns regarding the pedestrian access to the village, as stated by Gayton Parish Council. He also had concerns in relation to flooding and that Anglian Water had raised no objection to the application, but the report had not included Anglian Water's statement that development may lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. Gayton did suffer from flooding.

The Planning Control Manager explained to the Committee the suggested off-site highway works but this would be subject to condition.

Councillor De Whalley proposed that a site visit be undertaken which was seconded by Councillor Manning and, after having been put to the vote, was lost.

In response to a comment from Councillor Parish, the Planning Control Manager explained that the concerns raised by Gayton Parish Council had been addressed within the main body of the report. In terms of surface water drainage and foul water drainage condition, work could not start on site until a suitable drainage strategy had been agreed, which had to go through a vigorous testing process where the IDB, Anglian Water and CSNN would be consulted.

Councillor Manning (Ward Member) stated that Gayton Parish Council did support redevelopment of the site. He appreciated that this was an outline permission, but his concerns related to highway safety and that the flooding issues needed to be resolved as soon as possible.

The Planning Control Manager suggested that if the Committee were minded to approve the application, then the foul and surface water drainage strategy (Condition 5) could be submitted as part of the reserved matters application. This was agreed by the Committee.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings drew the Committee's attention to the need to add an additional condition 26 (as set out in late correspondence), which was agreed.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application and, after having been to the vote, was carried (14 votes for and 1 abstention).

RESOLVED:(A) That the application be approved subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement within 4 months of the date of this decision and the imposition of an additional condition 26 (as reported in late correspondence) and amendment to condition 5 requiring the foul and surface water drainage strategy to be submitted with the reserved matters application.

The Section 106 Agreement would secure the following:

- A Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) to be provided – proposed to be maintained by a management company;
- Public open space to be provided and to be maintain by a management company;
- Highway improvements for the junction of Lynn Road / Gayton Road junction.
- 20% affordable housing; and
- Habitat mitigation fee payable on each dwelling.

(B) That the application be refused, in the event that a Section 106 referred to in (A) above is not completed within 4 months of the date of the permission.

The Committee then adjourned at 12 noon and reconvened at 12.05 pm.

(ii) 21/01944/RMM

South Wootton: Land west and south-west of 55 to 65 Nursery Lane: Reserved matters: Residential development for up to 125 dwellings together with associated works: Bowbridge Land Ltd

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

The Planning Control Manager presented the report and explained that the site was located to the south-west of Nursery Lane with Bracken and Meadow Way adjacent to the eastern boundary of the application site.

The site was not within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the nearest boundary was just over 500 m to the north-west. The site was located within proximity of Roydon Common and Dersingham Bog SAC and Roydon Common Ramsar site, which were approximately 5 km and 9.2km away respectively.

The site was currently arable agricultural land and extended to circa 6.09 hectares. The site was part of a wider housing allocation for South Wootton under Policy E3.1 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016, with the policy requiring at least 300 dwellings on 40 ha.

There were hedge boundaries and trees around part of the site with a number of established trees to the northern part of the site and along the central part of the boundary which were protected by TPOs. Two further groups of protected trees were located on the western boundary. To the south the site was bounded by an area occupied by the South Wootton Parish Council offices, village hall and a cemetery, beyond which was development off Church Lane which was mainly residential but also included St Mary's Church, a Grade II* Listed building.

To the east the site was bounded by a public footpath beyond which lies existing residential development off Meadow Road and Bracken Road with frontage residential development onto Nursery Lane. An existing gated access into the site was located at the western end of Meadow Road.

There was a change in level across the site in a northly direction with a fall from 10 m AOD in the south-east corner to 3 m AOD in the north-west corner which represented the lowest part of the site area.

The application was for the approval of reserved matters for the construction of 125 dwellings with associated infrastructure. The matters to be considered under this application were landscaping, appearance, layout and scale. The application followed the decision for outline consent with access considered that was issued on 3 April 2019 under reference 17/01106/OM.

The proposal maintained the spine road which ran from the recently approved development for 450 dwellings south-west of the site towards the north-east where it joined with Nursery Lane. The layout had subsequently changed from the indicative plans submitted under the outline application where it was proposed to form eight principal residential blocks with a central open space area adjacent to the spine road.

The site was extensively landscaped to the north allowing for the area to be used for attenuation and surface water run-off. The landscaping narrowed along the western boundary to continue around to the south of the site which incorporated the land option for transfer to the Parish or Borough Council to extend the cemetery. The proposed built form ran adjacent with the eastern boundary. There were also protected trees on the site, subject to a Tree Preservation Order.

The Planning Control Manager drew the Committee's attention to the late representations and the need to amend condition 1.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination 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, Katie Dowling (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Mrs Nockolds (Ward Member) stated that she hoped that the footpath would be screened between the new development and edge of footpath. She added that she was a little disappointed with the housing mix and would have preferred it if there had been more bungalows included, as there were no bungalows to purchase in the area. She also had concern in relation to the spine road onto Nursery Lane and hoped that NCC had taken this into consideration to ensure it was safer for pedestrians and cyclists to come out of that area.

The Planning Control Manager advised that the Local Highway Authority had been involved throughout the process with the Urban Designer and had raised no objection. The access arrangements had been included under the outline consent. In terms of the footpath, the plans were showing additional planting although the footpath itself was outside the application site.

Councillor Bone stated that there were many things that he liked about the application but was disappointed with the lack of bungalows included within the application. He also considered that there was an impact on the town.

Councillor Rust referred to page 46 of the officer's report regarding the comments around the NPPF. She stated that she felt that the designs of the houses were ugly and bland and did not add anything to South Wootton. She also had concerns in relation to the use of gas boilers. She felt that it was important to have more street trees, but she could not tell which were shrubs and trees. She also had concerns over the density of the scheme. She also referred to page 49 of the agenda, Effect on amenity and raised concern.

The Planning Control Manager explained the proposed landscaping and replacement planting to the Committee. In relation to the use of gas boilers, it was explained that this would be covered by Building Regulations.

Councillor Squires agreed that the design of the houses was ugly and did not see how they improved the area of South Wootton. She also considered that more bungalows should have been provided. She was pleased with the open space, but the density was quite high and added that people needed private space as well as open space. She added that the scheme could have been a lot better.

The Planning Control Manager advised that in relation to the footpath having checked the outline planning consent, it was very detailed and there were conditions that affected the public right of way and detailed improvements to the right of way itself. She felt that it was adequately covered by conditions on the outline permission consent.

Councillor Bubbs added that the footpath was litter free at moment and he would like to see something to maintain that status and at the minimum some chicken wire at the bottom of the fence.

The Planning Control Manager advised that the footpath would be covered by the discharge of conditions.

With regards to the housing mix and inclusion of more bungalows, the Assistant Director advised that if the application went to appeal, there was no policy requirements for bungalows, and it would be difficult to defend that at appeal.

Councillor Parish expressed concern in relation to the housing mix and appearance. He also asked about ecology and stated that bird boxes or insect high vernacular or hedgehog highways had not been included within the scheme.

The Planning Control Manager referred to Condition 30 of the outline consent. Every house would have a swift box and the development would have to be constructed in accordance with Condition 30 of the outline consent.

Councillor Parish stated that he did not think that the reserved matters application was good enough and therefore proposed that it should be refused on the grounds that the housing mix did not meet the requirements of the area; the appearance does not reflect the vernacular or enhance the local environment and the biodiversity enhancement was insufficient. This was seconded by Councillor de Whalley.

Councillor de Whalley expressed concern in relation to Active Travel Routes, the footpath along the eastern boundary and there seemed to be a lot of private or unadopted roads which could become problematic for the owners / occupiers of the houses.

The Assistant Director advised that he considered that the scheme was good enough to approve.

The Planning Control Manager outlined the range of depths of the gardens to the Committee.

Councillor Mrs Bower stated that a lot of enhancement measures had been included within the development.

Councillor Nockolds referred back to the public footpath and added that the edge of it needed to be screened and it would be loss if people were looking into people's gardens and driveways.

The Planning Control Manager advised that the footpath was outside the site, was protected and conditioned on the outline planning consent and looking at the photographs there was stock fencing, and it was important not to enclose the footpath.

Councillor Bubb asked to see illustrations of the bungalows.

The Chairman then adjourned the meeting at 12.50 pm for lunch and the meeting reconvened at 1.30 pm.

Upon reconvening the Planning Control Manager displayed the designs of the bungalows.

Councillors Bubb and Bone expressed concern over the design of the bungalows.

The Assistant Director advised that the windows would have to meet Building Regulations and the designs shown were semi-detached units.

In relation to biodiversity the Principal Planner advised that hedgehog highways were included as standard within the applicant's schemes.

The Assistant Director then clarified the reasons for refusal of the application to the Committee.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to refuse the application and, having been put to the vote, was lost (6 votes for the refusal, 7 votes against).

The Chairman drew the Committee's attention to the need to amend condition 1 (as outlined in late correspondence).

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 (8 votes for, 6 votes against and 1 abstention).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended, subject to the amendment to condition 1, as outlined in late correspondence.

(iii) 20/02132/F

Brancaster: Land east of 1 Saxon Field, Main Road: Change of use from agricultural land to commercial with construction of new build: Mr T De Winton

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

The Planning Control Manager presented the report and explained that full planning permission was sought for a commercial building comprising 12 individual Class E units including café / restaurant (x2), retail (x4), office (x3) and artisanal (workshop / crafts units x 3), access car parking, outside seating areas and associated works were also proposed.

A new vehicular access was proposed to the east of the site with the existing field access being reduced to a pedestrian access with a pedestrian crossing proposed to link with existing footpaths to the north of the A149.

The building was single storey and of horseshoe configuration constructed from a mixture of brick, timber and flint or chalk panels under an unspecified roof covering.

The site was located outside of the development boundary in countryside with an agricultural grade of 2. The site was within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and was located within the scheduled ancient monument of Brancaster Roman Fort (Branodunum).

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

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 de Winton (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Parish reported that Councillor Lawton had called-in the application as he wanted to see employment opportunities. Councillor Parish added that the only objection to the application had been received from Historic England. He added there had been a housing development allowed next to it. He added that he considered that the public benefit would be to seek the employment, which the proposal would bring.

Councillor Rust added that this was the type of development that she would like to support as it provided employment in the area. She therefore proposed that the application should be approved, which was seconded by Councillor Tyler on the grounds that the employment use would cause less than substantial harm.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application, which was carried (14 votes for, 1 against).

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

The benefits of the job and tourism provision would outweigh the less than substantial harm identified and therefore would be in accordance with the NPPF.

(iv) 22/00534/F

Dersingham: Ashdene House Bed and Breakfast, 60 Hunstanton Road: Retrospective change of use from Hotel to Funeral Directors at ground floor and residential flat at first floor: Thornalley Funeral Services

This item was taken first.

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

The Planning Control Manager introduced the report and explained that the application site consisted of Ashdene House and the associated plot, a former Bed and Breakfast in the centre of Dersingham. This was a prominent corner plot in the centre of the village at the junction with Chapel Road, Hunstanton Road and Station Road. The site was outside but on the edge of the Conservation Area. The site was

located within the development boundary of Dersingham, which was a Key Rural Service Centre, as defined by Policy CS02 of the Core Strategy 2011.

The proposal sought retrospect permission for a Funeral Directors at ground floor, residential apartment at first floor and minor alterations and additions to the fabric of the building and associated parking areas and landscaping.

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

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, Kate Hathaway (objecting), Coral Shepherd (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) and Ray Thornalley (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillors J Collingham and S Dark addressed the Committee outlining their concerns to the application.

It was proposed by the Chairman and seconded by Councillor Squires that an additional condition be imposed regarding the need for additional screening, which was agreed.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve with the additional condition regarding additional screening and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (14 votes for and 1 vote against).

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

The Committee adjourned at 10.40 am and reconvened at 10.50 am.

(v) 21/02431/F

Stanhoe: High Barn, Burnham Road: The partial demolition of an existing dwelling house and the construction of a new private dwelling: Mr & Mrs Medhurst

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

The Planning Control Manager presented the report and explained that full planning permission was sought for the partial demolition of an existing dwelling and substantial extensions and alterations to provide a new dwelling, swimming pool and garage. The dwelling is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset.

The site was located within the countryside in a relatively isolated location between Stanhoe and Burnham Market.

The access road to the site also accommodated a PROW (Stanhoe RB1).

The site was not in an area at risk of flooding or a known critical drainage area but was adjacent to the newly designated nutrient neutrality area.

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

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Mr Ross Thain (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to 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 (14 votes for and 1 vote against).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

(vi) 21/02417/F

Terrington St John: Gambles Shop, School Road, St John's Fen End: Proposed extension and internal alterations to commercial shop and residential unit: Mr K Modhvadiya

[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 located in the development boundary of St John's Fen End and it was proposed to extend an existing commercial shop and residential unit which would involve internal alterations to increase the shop floor area and extensions to provide storage for the commercial use and an extension to the residential accommodation to allow for the change in internal layout.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the Parish Council recommendation was at variance to the officer recommendation. It was also referred by the Planning Sifting Panel.

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

Councillor Squire outlined her concerns to the application which included that fact that it was a nasty junction and there was more traffic now than when it was a post office. She understood the concerns raised by the Parish Council. There was also a tiny lay-by that was often filled up with a post office van. She added that a hairdressing

saloon could be changed into a general store without planning permission but there would be more people parking outside, and it would only be a matter of time before there was an accident.

Councillor Parish highlighted that there was a Neighbourhood Plan challenge in relation to parking. The Principal Planner explained the relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies and highlighted that Highways did not object. The Assistant Director explained the interpretation of the Neighbourhood Plan policy. Pages 110-111 of the agenda set out officer's response to the policy.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (13 votes for and 2 abstentions).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

(vii) 22/00301/O

Terrington St John: Land opposite 162 and north of 1 & 2 Gambles Terrace, School Road: Outline application with all matters reserved: Proposed self-build development: Mr & Mrs Fitzpatrick

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

The Principal Planner presented the report explained that the outline planning permission with all matters reserved was sought for residential development at School Road, Terrington St John. The indicative plans show three detached dwellings with an associated shared access drive.

The site was located outside the development boundary of both the Local Plan and also the Terrington St John Neighbourhood Plan which was brought into effect on 12 October 2021.

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

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, Shanna Jackson (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Assistant Director explained that the application site was outside the Neighbourhood Plan boundary and within Flood Zone 3.

Councillor Squire stated that she had called-in this application. She added that she drove past the application site several times a day. She referred to the map and stated that the site could not be classed

as countryside, in fact it was more infill, as there was development on both sides of the road. The site was currently paddocks. She also expressed concern in relation to the Parish Council response.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to refuse the application which was carried (14 votes for and 1 vote against).

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as recommended.

Councillor Squire left the meeting at 2.55 pm.

(viii) 20/00615/F

West Acre: Abbey Farm, River Road: Change of use from B2 to F1 with associated alterations at The Pickling Shed and change of use from agricultural to B2 to the Forestry Building: Westacre Estate Management

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

The Planning Control Manager drew the Committee's attention to the late correspondence and the need to amend the description of the application.

The Planning Control Manager introduced the report and explained that the application site comprised part of the listed barn complex at Abbey Farm, situated on the eastern side of River Road, West Acre.

A series of historic agricultural outbuildings were sited to the rear of Abbey Farm (now Duration Brewery), which was Grade II* listed and was within a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM). The barns to the rear were listed by virtue of being sited within the complex of the main barn and formed part of the SAM.

This application related to two of the outbuildings; The Pickling Shed located to the north-west of the complex and The Forestry Building located to the east of that, to the northern end of the site.

The Forestry Building was curtilage listed, whereas the Pickling Shed was not listed as a curtilage building as it post-dated 1948.

Retrospective change of use was sought for the Pickling Shed from B2 Paving Slab Workshop to F1 Cookery School / Workshop; and the Forestry Building from Agricultural Use to B2, a printing and framing workshop.

The printing and framing workshop within the Forestry Building was currently operational but there had been no external alterations to the building.

West Acre was classified as a Smaller Village / Hamlet within the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination 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 Tom Woolford (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application which was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, as recommended.

(ix) 21/02158/F

West Walton: Clark's Paddock, 154 Salts Road: Retrospective application for regularisation of use of land to residential, associated with lawful use of residential mobile, boundary walling and gates along site frontage, and erection of domestic store: Hereward Services 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 retrospective for the change of use of agricultural land to residential garden in association with mobile home. Also, for the erection of 2 m access gates and brick piers, and erection of domestic storage building to the rear. The site was located in the countryside on the east side of Salts Road. The mobile home had the benefit of a Lawful Development Certificate granted in 2002.

The Principal Planner also suggested amending the conditions listed in late correspondence to clarify that the existing fence would be removed.

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

The Chairman drew the Committee's attention to the need to amend conditions and to add in Condition 5 which was included in late representations, which was agreed.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (9 votes for, 2 against and 3 abstentions).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended subject to amendment to conditions and the additional Condition 5 as detailed in late correspondence.

PC27: **PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - DIRECT ACTION REPORT**

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

The Enforcement Team Leader presented the report which updated Members in respect of a continuing breach of planning control and to seek a resolution in respect of further enforcement action to remedy the breach of Planning Control at land at 2 Kemps Close, Salters Lode.

RESOLVED: (a) That the update in respect of the continuing breach of planning control was noted.

(b) That authority be granted to the Executive Director of Environment & 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.

PC28: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

RESOLVED: That the reports be noted.

The meeting closed at 3.30 pm