

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

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 3rd April, 2023 at 9.30 am in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Mrs V Spikings (Chair)  
Councillors F Bone, C Bower, A Bubb, M de Whalley, A Holmes, M Howland, C Hudson, C Manning, C Morley (sub), E Nockolds, T Parish, C Rose (sub), J Rust, M Storey, D Tyler and D Whitby

**PC118: 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.

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

**Lorna Gilbert**

She also informed the Committee that this would be Lorna's last meeting working for the Council. She thanked Lorna for her hard work and wished her well in her new role.

**PC119: APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Crofts, Lawton (Cllr Morley sub) and Patel (Cllr Rose sub).

**PC120: MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 March 2023 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings.

**PC121: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**PC122: URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no urgent business under Standing Order 7.

The Assistant Director took the opportunity to refer the Committee to the late correspondence in relation to 8/2(d) – Holme next the Sea where it was recommended that in light of the inaccuracy of plans and that some late correspondence had not been reported, the application be deferred. This was proposed by the Chairman and agreed by the Committee.

PC123: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Councillors attended under Standing Order 34:

S Dark	8/1(a)	Heacham
C Sampson	8/2(g)	Wereham

PC124: **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC125: **RECEIPT OF LATE CORRESPONDENCE ON APPLICATIONS**

A copy of 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.

PC126: **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 were published with the agenda). Any changes to the schedules were recorded in the minutes.

**RESOLVED:** That the applications be determined, as set out in the schedules signed by the Chairman.

- (i) **22/01648/FM**  
**Heacham and Snettisham: Heacham Bottom Farm, Lynn Road: Change of use of existing buildings and new buildings to provide – new visitor centre, café, event and retail space, indoor play building, bike hire service, change of use of land to play facilities and creation of new bike tracks, woodland edge glamping units, car parking, new landscaping and off-road path: Wild Ken Hill**

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

The Principal Planner presented the application and explained that full planning permission was sought for a new destination day visitor attraction including a small 10 yurt glamping site.

The site that measured c.38ha comprised an area of existing built form in the farmyard, areas of agricultural fields and rough pasture, and a small part of Ken Hill Wood.

Part of the site fell within the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The northern part of the site fell within the parish of Heacham, while the southern part fell within the parish of Snettisham.

The site was located outside the development boundary of both villages.

It was suggested that the proposed development would generate 16.25 full time equivalent jobs.

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

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, Paul Rawlinson (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council), James Ellis (supporting), Dominic Buscall (supporting) and Mr B Carrick (objecting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor S Dark addressed the Committee in relation to the application. He explained that Ken Hill was a popular and thriving local business and at the forefront of many environmental initiatives including rewilding, reintroduction of rare species and regenerative crop planting. It had been seen nationally and internationally recently on the BBC and was a credit to the area. It was the centre of green tourism and other businesses and educational establishments not regionally but national and international interest in this area. Whilst this could be seen as tourism and business development in an area which was already stretched it was a bit more nuanced and was not more caravans, but an area not catered for locally and something different. As well as that, there was also green infrastructure improvements which was encouraging such as the route from Snettisham to Heacham away from the busy A149 which then linked to Hunstanton and the area of coast beyond, for the benefit of local residents. He considered that there were a lot of positives to the proposals however there was genuine concern from residents about the increase in traffic at the Lamsey Lane junction. He explained that he and the other County Councillors for the area had campaigned for safety improvements along that stretch of road. Also, the County Council were carrying out feasibility work at the junction. He was therefore hopeful that with the feasibility work and the agreement safeguarding the land around the junction for 15 years was a positive step. On the balance of this new offer, new jobs, new green route and highways support he therefore supported the recommendation on that basis.

The Chairman then invited Liz Poole from Norfolk County Council Highways to address the Committee. She confirmed that the work that had been carried out by the applicant and consultant with regards to the traffic survey and traffic survey data was appropriate with regards to the transport assessment. She explained she had had a meeting prior to this with the Asset Team who were looking at the feasibility report and what could be done at the A149 Lamsey Lane junction. Officers were aware of the issues with the Lamsey Lane junction, and understood the community's concerns including buses, and the accident record. A feasibility study for improvement works either a roundabout or traffic signals was being carried out and once a scheme had been finalised, funding opportunities would be looked at. The applicant had donated the land, which would significantly help with the delivery of any

scheme. NCC had in fact gone back to the applicants and asked for a bit more land if a roundabout was to be constructed,

In response to a comment, the Principal Planner highlighted the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty on the plans.

The Chairman then invited the Committee to ask questions to Liz Poole, Norfolk County Council.

Councillor Holmes asked how long it would take to know the results of the feasibility study and if the junction needed to be changed as a result of the study, how long would that take to complete.

Liz Poole explained that it would take approximately 6 months and then funding sources would be looked at including Norfolk County Council budgets and external funding. Following successful funding, it would the construction of a scheme would take 6 months to a year to complete any works.

The Assistant Director advised that CIL funding might be available to go towards any highway improvements.

Councillor Bubb suggested that consideration should be given to an underpass as an alternative to a roundabout or traffic lights.

With regards to the Snettisham crossing, Liz Poole advised that the schemes had been put through the Safety Audit Team and they were happy with the proposals. She outlined potential funding opportunities where bids could be made. Again, the schemes that had been submitted for pedestrian crossings were considered to be satisfactory from the Safety Audit Team.

Councillor Parish added that Norfolk County Council were putting forward a case for improving the Lamsey Lane junction because it had been recognised that it was dangerous but were saying that having 80,907 visitors per year, there was no adverse impact or extra burden on the junction.

Liz Poole advised that officers were well aware of the junction, both professionally and personally, site visits were undertaken and issues along the A149. They had considered the information submitted, the applicant had undertaken traffic surveys, although it was acknowledged that this was undertaken during Covid, but they were factored up to include baseline information from before Covid and the traffic results had been looked at. In terms of the queues and junction and capacity, the analysis that the applicant had undertaken concluded that there was capacity at the junction for the additional traffic. The Highway Officer who had undertaken the review considered that would not be a severe residual impact as there were already queues of traffic there.

In response to a comment from Councillor Storey, Liz Poole explained that if the application were to be approved, the land would be taken via a legal agreement and as soon as the feasibility was concluded and funding available then a scheme would be delivered.

Councillor Morley added that when the A149 was congested, then there was a lot more traffic than estimated which was often displaced.

The Assistant Director added that reference had been made to severe and that was the test in the NPPF.

Councillor Bone stated that looking at the application it looked an amazing proposal, but he questioned whether it was sustainable for the area and what impact it would have on the seaside towns. He had concerns that it would put a burden on the traffic system.

The Assistant Director explained that this application should not be made to solve the existing problems with the junction. It would, however, add to the tourism offer.

Councillor Hudson felt that the proposal would over-commercialise the area and compared the proposals to Centre Parcs. This was an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. County Highways did need to investigate more, as there would be an additional 320 cars in the area.

The Assistant Director advised that Centre Parcs was a wholly different scale and was not comparable. As well as the highway issues, the Committee needed to consider the impact on the landscape against the tourism benefit.

Councillor Parish advised the Committee that the applicants had engaged with him regularly over the months. However, the applicant was aware that the application and following one did not meet the full approval of Heacham residents and Parish Councils on highway grounds. This application had been made as Government funding for the scheme ended in 2028. Some 81,907 people were predicted to visit the site. Traffic would be displaced and would have an impact on local residents, as the traffic would flow through the village. There would be an unacceptable impact on infrastructure. County Highways had not raised any objection on highway safety grounds. Given that it had been recognised that this was a dangerous junction and that improvement works might be carried out in the future and that there was some land available he proposed that the application should be deferred until all the information was available.

The Assistant Director advised that the application could not be deferred indefinitely. If the Committee required further clarity on the information provided, then this could be accommodated. However, the applicant could appeal against non-determination of the application after 6 months and he did not think that any highway improvement works would be completed by then.

Having heard the advice given by the Assistant Director, Councillor Parish stated that he still wished to propose that the application be deferred until the situation regarding highways had been clarified and investigations made into funding opportunities so that the Committee had more certainty over improvements to what had been recognised as a dangerous junction and 80,000 visitors a year would be visiting the site and the implications this would have on the traffic.

The Chairman added that fairness had to be given to the applicant as well.

Councillor Parish then proposed that the application be deferred for 3 months. The Assistant Director reminded Councillor Parish that there had to be a good reason to defer the application.

Councillor Rust added that it could be based on the Parish Council's comments regarding the transport assessment and correct data set is re-evaluated and mitigation measures considered.

Liz Poole reminded the Committee that Norfolk County Council were happy with the data supplied by the applicant. If further surveys were required during the peak months, then this would push it back to July / August for the surveys to be carried out with the application not being determined until approximately September / October.

Councillor Parish then proposed that the application be deferred until 5 June Planning Committee meeting.

The Chairman proposed that the Committee had a comfort break so that further information could be obtained from the applicant.

*The Committee then adjourned for a comfort break at 10.45 am and reconvened at 10.55 am.*

Upon returning the Assistant Director outlined to the Committee that the application could be deferred until 5 June to allow the report to be updated with the late correspondence and any additional information from County Highways or the application could be determined as presented if Members felt that they had enough information.

The proposal to defer the application was seconded by Councillor Rust.

The Chairman, Councillor Mrs Spikings added that she considered that she had enough information to be able to determine the application. She reminded the Committee of the advice given by Norfolk County Council and that there would be a habitat net gain. The applicant had given the land to the County Council to allow for any highway improvement works. She considered that it would be a wonderful proposal adding to the tourism offer.

Councillor Rust added that she felt strongly that the Committee needed to take its time to get the application right. She had significant concerns about the traffic and displaced traffic. She added that she wanted to vote for it but could not at the present time.

Councillor Morley added that he wanted a comment from the bus companies using the junction.

Councillor Nockolds stated that she did not agree with deferring the application and added that people had to live with traffic. She considered this to be an excellent application.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to defer the application and, after having been put to the vote, was carried 8 votes for, 7 against and 2 abstentions.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be deferred until 5 June Planning Committee meeting.

- (ii) **22/1650/FM**  
**Heacham: Mount Pleasant Farm, 25 Lamsey Lane, Heacham:**  
**Change of use of land to provide 20 touring caravan pitches with**

**hard standing; change of use of land to create areas for camping and grass touring caravan pitches; change of use of existing buildings and new building to provide – visitor utility building, reception/retail area and storage area, creation of parking area (temporary parking / drop off) new landscaping and off road path: Wild Ken Hill**

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

**RESOLVED:** That the application be deferred until 5 June Planning Committee meeting.

**(iii) 21/01607/O**

**Brancaster: West Lee, 19 Town Lane, Brancaster Staithe:**  
**Outline application: The erection of one additional dwelling (in addition to that granted under permission 20/00055/O with associated garaging, parking and turning areas and other associated works: HD Planning Ltd**

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

The Planning Control Manager introduced the report and explained that the site was located down a private access, Town Lane, Brancaster and formed part of the residential curtilage of No.19 Town Lane, a large, detached dwelling.

Outline permission was sought for the erection of one additional dwelling (in addition to that already granted permission under the ref: 20/00055/O with associated garaging, parking and turning areas and other associated works). In this case it was only the acceptability of the access arrangement for the site was being sought with all other matters reserved. If approved, a total of 3 houses would be within the red line boundary of the site. The original house (no.19) and two new dwellings (including the aforementioned dwelling which already had outline permission).

Indicative plans showed a tandem residential development with the original dwelling fronting the road on Town Lane and two 1.5m storey dwellings located to the rear.

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

Councillor Morley asked how the refuse bins would be collected.

As this information was not to hand, the Chairman proposed that the application be deferred until later in the meeting when the information could be obtained. This was agreed by the Committee.

*Later in the meeting, it was confirmed that the bin lorry collections took place along Town Lane.*

The Chairman referred the Committee to the late correspondence and the need to remove Condition 8, which was agreed.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved as recommended subject to the removal of Condition 8 as outlined in late correspondence.

- (iv) **22/02256/F**  
**Castle Rising: Flintstones, Lynn Road: Demolition of existing house and construction of 2 pairs of semi-detached cottages: Castle Rising Estate**

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that full planning permission was sought for the construction of two pairs of semi-detached dwellings following the demolition of the existing dwelling known as Flintstones, Lynn Road, Castle Rising. The application site was immediately north of Castle Rising Castle and the associated 11<sup>th</sup> century church remains which were designated as a scheduled monument and also Grade I listed. The site was also within the Castle Rising Conservation Area.

The application site was within the development boundary for Castle Rising shown on inset map G23 of the SADMPP (2016) and residential development on site was therefore considered acceptable.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the applicant was Councillor Lord Howard.

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

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved as recommended.

- (v) **22/01774/F**  
**Heacham: Heacham Holidays Ltd, Long Acres Holiday Home Park, South Beach Road: Retention of the raised platform and drainage system to support the discharge of fluids following the installation of a wash pad within the storage yard as permitted under Class J of Part 7 of Schedule 2 of the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO):**

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

The case officer presented the report and advised that retrospective consent was sought for the construction of a raised platform and installation of associated klargester, associated with a wash pad installed under permitted development rights on a site known as Heacham Holidays Ltd, to the rear / south of Long Acres Holiday Home Park, South Beach Road, Heacham.

An enforcement appeal was on-going on site, under ref: 21/00133/UNAUTU which related to the unauthorised use of a track from the edge of the application site to Fenway to the east. The area for that enforcement appeal did not include this application site and was unrelated to it.

The application site was granted consent for the construction of a storage building in 2007, followed in 2012 by an application for an extension to the building associated with caravan storage and maintenance.

The land in question was part of a fenced compound located at the rear of Long Acres holiday caravan site.

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

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, Daniel Philips on Zoom (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Parish outlined the reasons why he had called-in the application for determination.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved as recommended.

**(vi) 22/02113/F**  
**Holme next the Sea: Terns, 49 Peddars Way: Variation of Condition 2 of planning consent 21/01394/F: Extensions and alterations to dwelling: Mr & Mrs Howitt**

This application had been deferred earlier in the meeting.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be deferred as outlined in the late correspondence.

**(vii) 22/01886/O**  
**King's Lynn: 58 Wootton Road, Gaywood: Outline application: 2 no. new dwellings: Mr D Ward**

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

The case officer explained that the application sought outline planning permission with all matters reserved for the construction of two dwellings on land to the rear of existing semi-detached properties fronting Wootton Road, Gaywood.

The site comprised approximately 0.15ha of residential garden land with existing trees and hedgerows, split in ownership between the two semi-detached dwellings to the west. Residential properties and their curtilage surrounded the site on all sides, with a rear laneway serving terraced dwellings at Rosebery Avenue to the north.

A historic access point was proposed to be re-opened to form the access to both dwellings. The existing access to the semi-detached donor properties will be retained in-situ.

The application site was wholly within the development boundary shown on inset map E1 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (SADMPP) (2016).

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Rust and involved a member of staff involved in the planning process.

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

Councillor Rust outlined to the Committee her reasons for calling-in the application.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved as recommended.

**(viii) 22/01329/F**  
**Sedgeford: School House, Ringstead Road, Hunstanton:**  
**Erection of detached cottage following demolition of existing**  
**garage: Mr Andrew & Martin Johnson**

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

The case officer explained that the application site was located within Sedgeford, which was classified as a Rural Village within Policy CS02 of the Core Strategy 2011. The plot was positioned within the defined settlement boundary for the village which contained a mixture of traditional development built of carrstone, redbrick and clunch materials, and a modern development which generally took a linear form from along the B1454. The village had an enclosed character which resulted from its sheltered setting in the vale of the Heacham River.

The site comprised amenity land and a garage building positioned to the south of the host dwelling (School House). The plot was located within the Sedgeford Conservation Area and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and fronted Ringstead Road.

The proposal sought permission for the erection of a two storey, three-bedroom, detached cottage, following the demolition of the existing garage.

Amended plans had been provided showing a new footpath positioned to the east of the site. The path would lead from the amenity land serving School House, down to the parking area at the south of the site. The path would be screened by a 1.8 m high close boarded fence.

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

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, Mrs Frost (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Following comments from the public speaker, the Assistant Director advised that the criticisms and comments regarding the pre-application advice and process, would need to be dealt with separately.

Councillor Parish outlined his reasons why he had called-in the application.

Councillor Morley added that he supported the application and proposed that it be approved on the grounds that it complied with planning policy DM2, the overlooking could be designed out and the site was suitable for development. This was seconded by Councillor Hudson.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the proposal to approve the application and then after having been put to the vote was carried (16 votes for and 1 abstention). Conditions were to be agreed with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved, contrary to recommendation, for the following reason:

*The proposed development was a suitable site for development, overlooking could be suitably dealt with, and it was in accordance with policy DM2 of the Site Allocations and Development Policies Plan.*

**(ix) 22/01893/F**

**Wereham: Holme Oak, Stoke Road: Residential development involving the demolition of existing barn complex: Mr G Gott**

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

The Senior Planner introduced the report and explained that the application site was 0.24ha in size and was located to the southeast of the village of Wereham to the south of Stoke Road/A134. Wereham was categorised as a Rural Village in the adopted Local Plan. The site was partially located within the development boundary, but the footprint of the dwellings was outside of the boundary line as defined by Inset Map G114.

The application south full planning consent for the demolition of the existing barn constructed of brick and corrugated metal cladding/roofing, and the construction of three new dwellings with associated parking and amenity space. The dwellings proposed were substantial two storey, three-bedroom homes with large first floor balconies.

The site currently accommodated a bungalow, which sat to the front of the site, and a large barn to the rear which had been most recently used for the storage of agricultural machinery. The buildings were set back into the site with a concrete driveway to the front accessed directly from Stoke Road/A134. The site was surrounded by agricultural land to the south, existing residential development to the east and west, and to the north Stoke Road/A134 with agricultural land beyond to the north.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination 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, Sandra Calvert (objecting) and Shanna Jackson (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor Sampson addressed the Committee in support of the application. He stated that there was still a valid approval on

the site for four dwellings. About 6 years an archaeological dig was carried out on the whole site and nothing of importance was found, it seemed a bit perverse that another one was required to be carried out now particularly when adjoining plots did not have to have one carried out. There were a number of reasons why the applicant decided to redesign the original layout hence the application to be considered. He had reduced the number from 4 to 3 making the whole environment more attractive. The application was accepted at the beginning of November 2022, during that consultation period officers and County Highways had asked for a number of amendments which had been accepted and was incorporated within the application being considered today. County Highways were satisfied that their requirements had been complied with and all other statutory consultees were content. He explained that he would not comment on the objections from local residents. Following the previously approved plan a blanket TPO had been put on the trees within the site. As could be seen from the photographs this included two stumps near the drive entrance and these were still covered by the TPO. He asked the Committee to approve the application and remove the need to another archaeological dig and to remove the stumps from the TPO.

Several Members of the Committee agreed with the officer recommendation.

Councillor Mrs Spikings added that she did not like the fact that there would only be 10 m from window to window and considered it to be a poor layout.

Councillor Mrs Nockolds agreed that 10 m window to window separation distance was disappointing.

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 (12 votes for, 1 against and 3 abstentions).

**RESOLVED:** That the application be refused as recommended.

**(x) 23/00096/F**  
**Walsoken: Rowan Close: Erection of 1 x 3 bed a d 1 x 2 bed two storey semi-detached dwellings and 1 x 1 bed single storey dwelling: Insynthesis Ltd**

[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 full planning permission for the construction of a pair of semi-detached dwellings., The dwellings were proposed to be orientated in line with the neighbouring dwellings to the west. The front elevations of the dwellings will be full two-storey, but to the rear the dwellings will have a 1.5 storey appearance with reduced eaves as the site was located in very close proximity to the rear boundaries of neighbours to the south.

The vast majority of the application site was within Fenland District Council and the only part of the site which was within the Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk was a small approximately 0.6m wide strip of land that ran along the eastern edge of the application site.

The application had been referred to the Committee as it was a cross-border application.

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

**RESOLVED:** (1) That development control powers be delegated to Fenland District Council in respect of the application.

(2) That this Council forwards the comments of other consultees to Fenland District Council for them to take into account in the decision-making process, as well as the comments of officers on the planning merits of the case as set out in the report.

PC127: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

**RESOLVED:** That the reports be noted.

**The meeting closed at 12.30 pm**