

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

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on  
Thursday, 6th October, 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 C Bower, M de Whalley, A Holmes, C Hudson, B Lawton, S Squire and  
D Whitby

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor C J Crofts, C Manning,  
E Nockolds, S Patel, J Rust, A Ryves and M Storey

PC49: **WELCOME**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the Reconvened Meeting of the Planning Committee following the site visits held earlier in the day. She advised that the meeting was being recorded and streamed live on You Tube.

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

PC50: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were declared.

PC51: **DECISIONS ON SITE VISIT HELD EARLIER IN THE DAY AND MATTER DEFERRED TO THIS MEETING.**

- (i) **21/01610/F Heacham: 6 Kenwood Road: Proposed Dwelling following Sub-Division**

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

The Committee had visited the site earlier in the morning. The Planning Control Manager explained that she had re-measured the boundary of the proposed property which showed that to the front of the property it was 1m from the boundary, 0.75m mid-way and 1m to the back of the property.

The Chairman asked what type of room was behind the window at the rear of the donor house. This was not showing on the plan.

Councillor Squire commented that she considered that the property would be hemmed into a very small plot which she considered too small and unsuitable for a building of that size. She also raised concern about the loss of the trees and light in the neighbouring property.

Councillor de Whalley considered there was loss of amenity, loss of privacy, the proposal was overdevelopment of the site, it was contrary to the NPPF and it did not give a net gain for biodiversity.

The Chairman commented that she felt it was cramped development, the property was not 1m from the boundary throughout, it was detrimental to the donor property, the car parking for the two properties was too tight. She also had concern for the donor property side window and impact on the biodiversity of the site. She therefore proposed that the application be refused on those grounds.

Councillor Lawton seconded the proposal.

Councillor Hudson confirmed that she felt the plot was very small and the car parking would be very tight, with little opportunity for planting at the front of the site. She also reminded members that the proposal didn't meet the village plan aspirations.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be refused on the grounds of it being a cramped form of development by reason of the property size, car parking arrangement, and closeness to the boundary which adversely affects neighbours amenity. It was therefore contrary to the NPPF, CS0 8, and DM15 of the Local Plan, and Neighbourhood Plan policies 1&5.

(ii) **22/01044/F Terrington St Clement: Westfield Gardens: 81 Market Road: Retrospective replacement of a front fence with 6ft 6in high of wooden boarding with concrete posts and proposed replacement of front driveway entrance with fence**

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

The Committee then considered the item deferred from the previous meeting.

Councillor Squire left the meeting during its consideration.

The Planning Control Manager explained that clarification had been sought on the proposed 40mph zone for the area, the assessments had been based on 40mph and 60mph.

The Chair asked for the impact if the speed limit was reduced to 40mph was the proposed acceptable.

The Norfolk Council Highways officer stated that the impact of the change in speed limit would not change the requirements for the visibility they were seeking. He had made some suggestions to the Planning Officer that day to resolve the shortfall for the access to the field.

The Chair proposed a further deferral of the application for a month to enable discussions to continue with the Highways Department to seek

a solution to their concerns. This was seconded by Councillor de Whalley, and agreed.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be deferred for a further cycle to enable discussions to continue with the Highways Department to try to resolve the issues with the site.

**The meeting closed at 10.50 am**