

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

Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 7th November, 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, B Lawton, C Manning, E Nockolds, T Parish, C Rose, J Rust,
S Squire, M Storey, D Tyler and D Whitby

PC52: **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Patel (Councillor Rose substitute).

PC53: **WELCOME**

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

She invited the Democratic Services Officer to carry out a roll call to determine attendees.

PC54: **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meetings held on 3 October 2022 and the Reconvened meeting held on 6 October were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings.

PC55: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest declared.

PC56: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

The Planning Control Manager suggested that application 9/2(e) should be deferred, to allow for further investigation into the ownership and the future use of the hotel complex. This was proposed by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings and agreed by the Committee.

PC57: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Councillors attended under Standing Order 34:

Councillor A Kemp	-	Item 8
Cllr M de Whalley	-	Item 8
Cllr R Blunt	-	Item 8
Cllr S Dark	-	Item 8
Cllr C Sampson	-	8/2(b)
Cllr S Sandell	-	8/2(c) (her letter would be read out to the Committee)
Cllr J Kirk	-	8/2(g)
Cllr J Moriarty	-	8/2(h)

PC58: **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC59: **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.

PC60: **MEDWORTH MVV ENERGY FROM WASTE COMBINED HEAT AND POWER FACILITY - PINS RELEVANT REPRESENTATIONS RESPONSE - REPORT TO FOLLOW**

Plans to develop a new Energy from Waste (EfW) Combined Heat and Power (CHP) facility generating electricity and steam, (and associated grid connections) on land at Algores Way, Wisbech: Medworth CHP Ltd

[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.

The Committee was reminded that at the Council meeting on 25 February 2021, a motion was passed to OBJECT to the principle of the proposal for an energy from waste facility in Wisbech. It was explained that the remained in place and was unaffected by this specific technical consultation response.

The Principal Planner explained that this was a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP), so it was considered by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) and ultimately determined by the Secretary of State. The applicants were seeking what was known as a

Development Consent Order (DCO) which was effectively the equivalent of planning permission.

The Planning Inspectorate (PINS) had invited the Council to submit a Relevant Representations Response (RR), to the submission of the Medworth EfW, CHP Facility and associated grid connections application. This was a specific stage in the Development Consent process.

The deadline for comments to PINS is Tuesday 15 November 2022. In order for comments to be taken into account, those making representations would need to register as an interested party.

PINS would consider comments it received from the RR stage, which would help to inform the topics and questions to be dealt with at the Examination stage.

The Committee was informed that the Borough Council was one of four host authorities, as the plant and infrastructure were sited within each council area. The other authorities were Fenland District Council (FDC), Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and Norfolk County Council (NCC). The main plant and infrastructure was located within FDC and CCC's area, with the underground cabling connecting to a substation in Walsoken in West Norfolk.

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

In accordance with Standing Order 34, the following Councillors attended and outlined their concerns to the application:

Councillor A Kemp stated that incinerators emitted a number of harmful substances such as PCBs and PAHs. She explained the effect of exposure to PCBs and exposure to small amounts of these could cause developmental and neurological problems in children. PCBs could also build up in sediment in coastal areas and rivers and the fatty tissue of fish, which could then be transmitted through the food chain. PAHs were a class of widespread environmental carcinogens and there was no legal limit to the emissions which came out of incinerators from pcbs and pahs however much modelling or monitoring there was. She added that the dispersion modelling was uncertain. It did not account for whether the weather was static and whether there was going to be fast and strong winds. The direction of the winds would be south-west prevailing over West Norfolk. There had been no health damage costs included within the papers put forward by Medworth. She also had concerns over the diesel generator back-up system which could emit harmful diesel.

There had been no consideration of the fact that the area downwind of the incinerator was the 30% most vulnerable and most deprived population area in the whole country. We as a Council had to

safeguard the area. There was no need for the incinerator, it was outdated technology and once it was there it would be very difficult to get it stopped if anything went wrong. It was known that breaches did occur and that the deprived population did look for the Council to safeguard them. The Council should continue to tell the Government that this was not acceptable and must not happen.

Councillor de Whalley stated that there was significant public interest in this proposal and was over an extended area and would suggest that pressing the necessity to hold the examination process in public in its entirety. PM 2.5 had been mentioned, they were seldom properly monitored because it was expensive, and done by mass rather than particle numbers, which was a far more informative indicator of the harm that they were causing. There was no need for waste incineration and there was over capacity in this country for waste incinerators and did not want to be in the position of burning other people's waste. It would also harm recycling and the more incinerators would make it harder to reach recycling targets. Co2 capture was unproven technology and was expensive and inefficient.

Councillor Blunt addressed the Committee and outlined his concerns. Firstly, why this site on the edge of Wisbech. If I was considering an Energy from waste site

I would consider firstly is their sufficient waste to feed the plant, located close to the proposed site. Secondly is their sufficient demand to use the Energy being generated. On the first point, by the need to transport several lorry loads of waste to the site every day, there is clearly not enough waste generated locally to need the site in Wisbech. Therefore, look for sites where sufficient waste is generated to feed the demand now and in the future.

On the second point is their enough demand locally for the energy generated either steam or power. This area has a limited demand for the steam to be used in local factories and the power generated will be fed into the National Grid and be used anywhere the need arises. Therefore, there is no real reason why the plant needs to be built here, build it where the demand for steam is high.

Next have alternative sites been considered by the applicant. Based on the lack of need for the site in Wisbech, has the applicant considered sites where there is a local need for incinerating waste. Has the applicant considered any sites where the demand for the steam generated by the plant is high either now or in the future?

Thirdly the impact on people of the surrounding area including Wisbech and West Norfolk.

The fact that the A47 that will be used to bring waste to the site is currently heavily congested seems have been ignored. When travelling north the traffic on the stretch of the A47 from the Tesco roundabout to the Elme House roundabout is regularly at a complete

standstill. This the main southern entrance into Norfolk from the Midlands. It is a route for business traffic and visitors supporting the economy of Norfolk.

Has any consideration be given that within 1 mile there are several schools. The Thomas Clarkson Academy, Meadowgate Academy, Elm road Primary School, Ramnoth Road Junior, Wisbech Grammar School, Peckover Primary School Orchard Church of England School. That is where the majority of the children of Wisbech are educated. All these schools are north of the proposed site and in the direction of the prevailing winds from the proposed site.

Finally, I think we should be looking at methods that encourage solutions that reduce the production of waste and encourage the use of renewables and therefore reduce the need for such a plant to be built.

Councillor Dark addressed the Committee and stated that there was a sad irony that COP27 was being held that day. He added that the Secretary of State was the decision-maker and the Council was not the determining body. However, Officers would put in a technical response. The Council had put a motion forward that it opposed this. Norfolk County Council had also taken a similar stance and other Councils in the surrounding area were doing the same. There was significant community concern regarding this application and concerns of the Parish Councils regarding the narrowness of the consultation which was supported by this Committee. The Council had widely promoted how people could have their say.

He added that he felt that the proposal was not needed and was too large. He was not against business or development. However, with regards to this particular site Norfolk County Council and the Borough Council had sufficiency in the disposal chain. There were also ambitious targets on how to reduce waste and how to increase recycling so the demand for this type of project should be reduced. He asked if the facility was needed and whose waste it would burn, why this location. He felt that there was an insufficiency of data.

The Principal Planner advised that with regards to the A47, National Highways would be commenting separately. Norfolk County Council would also be commenting separately on health grounds and the issue of need. With regards to schools, Cambridgeshire County Council would respond on that together with need.

The Assistant Director explained that technical issues would be dealt with at the Examination which would be held in public. This was an important part of the process which would help to inform the Inspector to set the topics for discussion at the Examination. He advised that anyone wishing to participate had to register their interest to do that. He added that the Council would be working closely with the other host authorities on both the Statement of Common Ground and Local

Impact Report as it would enable the Councils to pool resources and use the technical expertise that the Council's had.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings expressed concern relating to the impact of traffic on the Elm High Road, which was congested at the present time. She also made reference to Bottom Ash and whether this had been taken into account. She added that the report also made reference to an emergency generator and asked for clarification regarding that.

With regards to if there was a major accident or emergency on site, the Principal Planner advised that Norfolk County Council would be responsible and would comment on this.

The Environmental Health Manager advised that bottom ash would not be processed on the site and would be transported off site, however the location was not known but would likely be in the locality. Also transported off-site in sealed units would be the residue from the air handling plants which would collect the particles and other types of chemicals and would be taken off site and disposed of as land fill.

With regards to the back-up generator and disasters, this would be covered by the Environmental Permit, the back-up generator had been modelled and tested. The back-up generator was there if the site lost electrical power and the site had to do an emergency shutdown. The details would be covered by the Environmental Permit.

Councillor Rust stated that it was clear in the documents that the Borough Council's role was to provide local technical knowledge. Many of the people that lived downwind of the site were the 30% most disadvantaged in the country. She added that whilst Norfolk County Council and Health might be putting forward reports or information about the health in general, it was important that the Council made the case for the residents in the area. She added that it would be significant as hazardous waste and bottom ash would be exported off the site and anything that had to be moved out and transported would present more danger. The health, air quality and highways issues would all impact on the health of the Borough's residents, and it was up to the Committee and Members to make the strongest possible case for the residents.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings referred to page 23 of the report where it referred to cumulative impacts.

Councillor Parish added people got very emotive over the health hazards that the proposal might generate, quite rightly, but explained that West Norfolk's waste was burnt in Suffolk, and what about the health hazards of those people in Suffolk. He made reference to COP27 taking place today, which would be talking about reparation, and this was a similar instance.

Councillor Squire explained that everyone in the room had their waste burnt somewhere else and lorries of waste were sent somewhere else, however with regard to this application it was not just the A47 which was affected but also the A1101. The traffic impact would be significant, and the Council needed to comment on this and not leave it to Norfolk County Council. She added that the traffic was worse in the summer particularly on a Friday. She also explained that the A47 would be at a standstill from the Tesco roundabout to the Elm Hall roundabout. She also had concerns about digging up the verge and how this would affect the traffic. The whole road system needed to be redesigned around there and would not cope with lorries going into the site and bottom ash being removed from the site.

In response to a question from Councillor Holmes, the Principal Planner advised that, as a host authority, it should submit a representation, otherwise it might be difficult to be involved at the Examination stage. It was also important for individual Members to comment and register through the Planning Inspectorate website.

The Assistant Director explained that officers could attach an extra appendix of Members individual comments so that the Inspector would be aware of issues that had been raised. Given the timescales for submission this should be by then end of day on 11th November. He added that if Members wished to speak at the Examination, then they would need to register to do so themselves. Details on how to do so had been provided to Members.

Councillor Storey added that the proposal was in the wrong place and was the wrong project at the wrong time.

RESOLVED: (1) Officers considered the comments in Appendix 3 should be submitted to PINS as part of the Relevant Representations consultation: It was recommended that:

- (a) To note the views expressed about compliance with these statutory duties would not prejudice the Council's objection in principle to the application, or any future views; and
- (b) To endorse the technical Relevant Representations in Appendix 3 for submission to PINS, with the exception of NCC comments as these would be submitted separately by NCC, and with the addition of the Air Quality comments, as set out in late correspondence.
- (c) That individual Councillors comments would be added as Appendix 4 and should be submitted to officers by end of day on 11 November 2022.

PC61: **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 and Environment (copies of the schedules were published with the agenda). Any changes to the schedules were 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) **22/00704/FM**
Sedgeford/Snettisham: Land at Sedgeford Hall Estate, Fring Road: Construction and operation of a solar farm comprising an array of ground- mounted solar photovoltaic (“PV”) panels and containerised batteries and associated infrastructure: Regener8 Power Ltd

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

Members were reminded that the application had been deferred from the previous meeting to enable the applicant to investigate comments from the RSPB (informed by the Wash Wader Research Group) relating to curlews recorded on the site. This issue has now been given full consideration.

Other issues raised in late correspondence had also been covered as well as some amendments sought by the applicant in relation to conditions.

The Senior Planner explained that full planning permission was sought for a 21 megawatt (MW) solar farm with battery storage capacity of 10 MW hours (MWh) comprising approximately 31,800 ground mounted solar photovoltaic panels and associated infrastructure.

The site comprised approximately 44.6ha of Grade 3b agricultural land north of Fring Road within the parishes of Sedgeford and Snettisham. The site was located approximately 1.2km west of Fring, 1.65 km south of Sedgeford and 2.6km to the east of Snettisham.

The current land-use was mainly crop cultivation whilst the south-western field contained free ranged pigs.

A separate parcel of land within the applicant's ownership to the west of the northern field was proposed to be field managed for farmland birds.

Access to the site would be taken via a new junction off Fring Road which formed the southern boundary of the site. Vehicles would approach the site from the south-east from the A148 via Great Bircham.

The site fell within both the parishes of Sedgeford and Snettisham, both of which have Neighbourhood Plans, and incorporated three medium sized fields which were predominantly enclosed by hedges with occasional hedgerow trees. Agricultural fields surrounded the site on all sides with very few buildings outside of the nearby settlements of Sedgeford, Snettisham, Shernbourne and Fring.

The construction phase of the development would be approximately 6 months, with the lifetime of the development expected to be 40 years from the first export of electricity.

The site was not subject to any landscape designations. However, the site was located 215m southeast of the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) at its nearest point and 1.1 km northwest of a scheduled monument.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the operational area exceeded 1ha and it had been called in by Councillor Parish.

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

In accordance with the adopted public speaking protocol, Cherie Gregorie (supporting) addressed the Committee.

The Chairman Councillor Mrs Spikings raised the issue that the report said that the solar farm would heat 3,500 homes and queried how much food would the land provide.

Councillor Mrs Bower responded that a lot of solar farms did have sheep grazing underneath the panels. In addition, if wild flowers were planted this would attract bees insects and pollination.

Councillor de Whalley welcomed the comment of the Norfolk Fire & Rescue Service. He had concerns regarding Condition 12 and noted that Norfolk Coast Partnership comments, which suggested that there would be no lighting on the site only during the construction phase. He asked for clarification with regards to this. He also questioned Condition 18 and asked that the site should be returned to greenfield, once the solar farm was decommissioned.

In response, the Senior Planner explained that it was the intention that the site should be returned to agricultural, but the condition could be amended and made more precise with the removal of the word or and the following words. This was agreed by the Committee.

With regards to lighting, the Senior Planner advised that this was for when the site became operational, so at the moment in time there were no details of any proposed lighting. Details would need to be submitted if the applicant wished for any lighting during the operation of the solar

farm. The lighting during the construction stage was known and considered acceptable.

Councillor Parish outlined his concerns to the application, in particular the loss of agricultural land which was Grade 3b and food production. Food security was needed as well as energy security. He also had concerns that the electricity produced from this solar farm would be sold abroad. He added that the best sites for solar panels were on the roofs of buildings which would benefit members of the public and local businesses and would take away the need for land. The refusal of solar farms had increased significantly and was becoming common practice because of the loss of land and food production. He also made comments regarding carbon neutrality and pollution.

Councillor Parish then proposed that the application be refused on the grounds of loss of agricultural land and food production. This was seconded by Councillor Lawton.

Councillor Hudson left meeting during the debate and therefore took no part in the discussion or voted on the matter.

The Assistant Director advised that Government policy had not changed, and there was no policy change which had been outlined in late correspondence. The Local Plan policy did not preclude the use of Grade 3b land for solar developments.

Councillor Squire stated that she was pleased with the increase in biodiversity although the area set aside for birds was small. She added that it was a very narrow access road. Condition 8 was for a construction management plan and asked if this included the repair of damaged roads and verges.

The Assistant Director advised that in principle the condition could include the repair of verges and the road although this would be difficult to prove and tractors, etc also used the road.

Councillor Crofts added that he had some sympathy with the Parish Council's point of view. He stated that he felt that it was acceptable to use the Grade 3b land, but he would be against if it was Grade 1 land.

Councillor Nockolds stated that this was a beautiful area and she was pleased with Condition 13. She felt that it was important to have renewable energy for the future. She asked for clarification in relation to the status of Grade 3b agricultural land.

Councillor Storey explained that Grade 3b land could still produce high yield crops with irrigation. He added that the loss of productive land was always going to be controversial. There was an option for an alternative to a solar farm.

The Senior Planner advised that the recommendation was in accordance with planning policy.

The Assistant Director advised that this was a finely balanced application. There were clearly things in favour of it and against the application. In terms of the definition of agricultural land, Grade 1-3a was the highest grade of land. The policy referred to a significant loss of agricultural land, this was 44 hectares, and the Committee needed to decide if they considered it to be a significant loss.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings added that she considered it to be a significant loss. The agricultural land could not be replaced but solar panels could be added to roofs. She added that the food chain needed to be maintained as it was an uncertain future.

Councillor Bubb stated that more details were needed on battery storage. He felt that the land would be much better used for food production.

Councillor Lawton stated that the application had been pre-determined as it had appeared in the local paper. The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings advised that the recommendation to approve was reported, but this was not pre-determined.

Councillor Holmes stated that the grass would be of great benefit to wildlife and biodiversity. He considered that the construction traffic would do less harm to the lanes and verges than the existing farm traffic.

Councillor Bone welcomed the fact that the scheme would introduce new hedgerows. He also felt that it would improve biodiversity. On balance, he supported the application, as he felt that there were not many alternatives at the present time.

Councillor de Whalley stated that there was a climate emergency and experiencing climate change now. Climate change would see sea level rise. There was a need to decarbonise power urgently and the power generation outweighed the dis-amenity and loss of Grade 3b agricultural land.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to refuse the application on the grounds that the loss of a significant amount of agricultural land outweighs the benefits of the solar farm contrary to Policy DM20 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan, and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (10 for refusal, 6 against and 1 abstention).

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

That the loss of a significant amount of agricultural land outweighs the benefits of the solar farm contrary to Policy DM20 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan.

The Committee then adjourned at 11.05 am and reconvened at 11.20 am.

- (ii) 22/01430/F**
Brancaster: The Ship Hotel, Main Road: Variation of Condition 2 of planning permission 21/01108/F: Demolition of walls and garden structure and the erection of hotel accommodation with associated hard and soft landscaping: The Ship Hotel Brancaster Ltd

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

The Senior Planner introduced the report and explained that the application was for the variation of a permitted and extant scheme at The Ship Hotel in Brancaster. The Hotel was located in the Norfolk Coast AONB and Brancaster Conservation Area.

The Senior Planner advised that Brancaster did have a Neighbourhood Plan and this had been taken into consideration when producing the report.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Lawton and the officer recommendation was contrary to views of the Parish Council.

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 Chris Borrman (supporting) addressed the Committee.

The Planning Control Manager advised that Condition 18 needed to be amended to read 'in outside areas'.

Councillor Lawton stated that he had called in the application at the request of the Parish Council who were concerned about the noise emanating from the hot tubs.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve with Condition 18 being amended, and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (17 for and 1 abstention).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended subject to Condition 18 being amended to read 'in outside areas'.

- (iii) 22/01092/F**

**Boughton: Land west of Woodstock, Mill Hill Road:
Proposed new residential dwelling: Mr C Bond**

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

The Principal Planner introduced the report and explained that the application was for the construction of a new dwelling on land to the west of Woodstock. Mill Hill Road, Boughton.

The application site was located on the west side of Mill Hill Road, west of Woodstock. The site was approximately 300m from Boughton's village centre and was 0.14ha in size. Boughton was classified as a Smaller Village and Hamlet and as such did not have a development boundary. Therefore the site was categorised as countryside in the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016.

The application site was outside Boughton's Conservation Area, which ended along the east boundary of the application site.

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

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 Simon Lemmon (supporting) addressed the Committee.

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 refuse the application and, after having been put to the vote was carried (16 for and 2 against).

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as recommended.

(iv) 22/00892/F

Burnham Norton: Denning, 7 Marsh Lane: Extension of three bedroomed, two storey cottage involving modest modifications to single storey lean-to at west end of cottage, minor internal alterations and enhancements, removal of existing timber shed and oil tank, and modest localised adaptations to hard landscape. The gardens remain almost entirely untouched. Construction of two storey extension providing family rooms and additional bedrooms connecting to existing cottage's west end at ground and first. New extension predominately timber clad under a pantiles roof, with timber windows throughout: Mr Gerard Nieuwenhuys

[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 related to a two storey dwelling known as Denning No.7, situated on the southern side of Marsh Lane, Burnham Norton.

The site was located within Burnham Norton's Conservation Area and AONB.

Burnham Norton was classified as a Smaller Village and Hamlet within the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy.

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

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

In accordance with Standing Order 34, a letter was read out from Councillor Sandell supporting the application.

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 carried (17 votes for, 1 against)

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as recommended.

The Committee then adjourned at 12.25 pm and reconvened at 1.00 pm

Councillor Hudson left the meeting at 1.00 pm

- (v) **22/01484/F**
Downham Market: Vacant unit, 9 Fairfield Road: Variation of condition 1 of planning permission 21/01105/RM: Reserved matters: Construction of 8 dwellings with access: Mr Mark Attridge

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

The Principal Planner presented the report and explained that the application site was an area of 0.12 ha of land, located to the west of the town of Downham Market. Access to the site was via Fairfield Road, which was a private unadopted road and a Public Right of Way. The site was situated between the railway tracks to the east and the River Great Ouse to the west with Fairfield Road consisting of a mixture of residential development and employment uses. The site was previously in employment use but had been cleared and was vacant.

The application sought full permission for the construction of eight residential units comprising of two-storey dwelling houses with designated parking spaces and private amenity space.

The application site already had planning consent for the construction of 8 dwellings and this application sought to vary condition 1 of the reserved matters application to amend the approved site layout.

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

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.

- (vi) **22/01014/F**
Emneth: Elme High Hotel, 69 Elm High Road: Change of use from Hotel (C1) to large HMP (Sui Generis): Mr D Cornetta

It was noted that this application had been deferred.

- (vii) **22/00982/F**
Ingoldisthorpe: Aldorcar, Coaly Lane: Construction of one and a half storey dwelling: Mr Gerald King

[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 construction of a 1.5 storey dwelling. The application site measured approximately 0.043 hectares which situated south of Coaly Lane, which was located north of the village of Ingoldisthorpe.

The site had recently been subject of a dismissed appeal for the same development. The appeal Inspector outlined that the location of the development despite being contrary to Policy DM2 was acceptable.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the officer recommendation was contrary to a dismissed appeal and had been referred 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, Samantha Anthony (supporting) addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Councillor Bubb outlined his concerns to the application and proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that the proposal was overdevelopment of the site, however there was no seconder for the proposal.

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 and 1 abstention).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended.

(viii) **22/01496/O**
Walpole: Land adjacent Roseville, Chalk Road, Walpole St Peter: Outline application for a new residential development: Mr J Heavey

[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 a strip of land on the western side of Chalk Road comprising 0.35ha of mostly paddock land. The site was located outside the village development area for Walpole St Peter and was in Flood Zone 3a of the Council adopted Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Members were reminded that the same development being proposed under application ref: 21/02490/O was refused at the 4 April 2022 Planning Committee.

The application had been referred to the Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Kirk.

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 Lemmon (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Kirk addressed the Committee in support of the application via Zoom.

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 carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as recommended.

(ix) **22/00910/F**

West Acre: Abbey Farm, River Road: Retrospective External Tap area adjacent to brewery (temporary): Duration Brewery

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

The Planning Control Manager presented the report and explained that temporary planning permission (2 years) was sought for the change of use of an existing hardstanding outside of Duration Brewery Co in West Acre to use as an external Tap Area. Proposed plans indicated the siting of tables and a bar area, as well as space for a food truck on an existing courtyard hardstanding central to the existing business use at Abbey Farm, known as the Westacre Estate.

The use was proposed as an outdoor extension to the brewery's existing Tap Room and was proposed for a temporary period of 2 years whilst the building operations were completed on the south section of the existing barn building (approved under 17/01212/F). The application had been amended since its original submission to respond to comments from neighbours and CSNN.

Abbey Farm and the surrounding land were designated as a Scheduled Monument by Historic England. The main barn on site was Grade II* Listed, and Abbey House further to the east of the application site was a Grade II Listed Building.

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

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, Miranda Hudson (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Moriarty addressed the Committee in relation to the application. He asked the Committee to consider adding conditions relating to lighting, parking and the generator.

Whilst speaking in support of the application, Councillor Mrs Spiking proposed that additional conditions be added further details of the proposed lighting and parking arrangements, to be submitted to, and agreed by the council. This was seconded by Councillor Squire and agreed by the Committee.

Councillor de Whalley proposed an additional condition regarding the use of generators, and this was agreed by the Committee.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application together with the additional conditions regarding lighting, parking and generator and, having been put to the vote was carried (15 votes for, 1 against and 1 abstention).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, as recommended, subject to the addition of additional conditions relating to lighting, parking and the use of generators.

PC62: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received reports relating to the above.

RESOLVED: That the delegated decision report be noted.

The meeting closed at 1.55 pm