

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK
KING'S LYNN AREA CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE - PLANNING SUB-
GROUP

**Minutes from the Meeting of the King's Lynn Area Consultative Committee -
Planning Sub-Group held on Tuesday, 29th November, 2022 at 4.30 pm
in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place,
King's Lynn PE30 5DQ**

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs S Collop (Chair)
Councillors Miss L Bambridge and B Jones

Also present:

Hannah Wood-Handy - Planning Control Manager
Natacha Osler - Senior Planner

1 WELCOME

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. She advised that the meeting was being recorded and streamed live to You Tube.

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Bambridge declared that she was appointed by Norfolk County Council as a Governor for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, but she had not been involved anything that was being discussed today.

4 URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

5 MEMBERS PRESENT PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 34

There were no Members present pursuant to Standing Order 34.

6 CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE (IF ANY)

There was no Chair's correspondence to report.

7

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

- (i) **22/01947/FM: Demolition of the Inspire Centre, including its associated car park and full planning permission for the construction of a new Multi-Storey Car Park, associated highway works, engineering works, drainage works and landscaping: Queen Elizabeth Hospital Gayton Road King's Lynn Norfolk PE30 4E**

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

The Senior Planner presented the application.

She advised that the application was for a multistorey car park. The application was in two phases. Phase 1 would take place on the car park and comprised 500 car parking spaces. Phase 2 would go where the Inspire Building was and would join on to Phase 1 and was required for future expansion of the hospital.

In response to a question regarding the number of car parking spaces, the Senior Planner advised that the hospital had confirmed that the new multi-storey car park would solve their current demand problems and would replace the 218 with 500, so that would address the existing shortfall and the remainder of the spaces would accommodate the future demand for the hospital.

The car park would comprise 5 storeys with 6 levels, 18 electric charging spaces, 7% disabled parking (98 spaces on the ground floor) with 1,267 standard bays. There would also be auto number plate recognition. The Senior Planner outlined the dimensions of the building.

One small tree would be lost as part of the proposal, but additional planting would take place on the western and southern elevation.

Councillor Jones queried what the disruption would be when building phase 2. The Senior Planner explained that the car park was being built in such a way that there would not be too much disruption. The entrance and exit would be carried out as part of the phase 1 development so that phase 2 could go ahead without any significant impact on the phase 1 development.

It was acknowledged that there would be some loss of car parking spaces whilst phase 2 was being developed, however phase 1 would be increasing the number of car parking spaces. It had been suggested that there would be application for the relocation of the 218 spaces (which had not been received to date) whilst phase 1 was being built. Both applications would be tied, and the multi storey car park would not be built until a temporary car park was in place.

Councillor Mrs Collop expressed concern in relation to where the car park would be situated, and whether it could cause a back-up of traffic. The Senior Planner explained that comments from County Highways were still awaited but the applicant would be carrying out widening and improvement works to the internal highway.

Councillor Mrs Collop referred to a meeting she had attended which included residents from Gayton Road who would be looking onto the new car park and asked what size tree would be planted. In response, the Senior Planner advised that larger trees would be looked for and this could be conditioned. She added that there had not been any objections recorded and people who lived opposite the site had been consulted.

With regards to the helipad, it was not part of the application.

Councillor Mrs Collop asked for clarification on the relocated bus route. The Senior Planner added that it did form part of the application and would ensure that it was moved including signage.

With regards to CCTV, this would be down to the Hospital Management. There would also be car number plate recognition.

Conclusion

That the KLACC Planning Sub-Group had no objection to the application subject to the bus stop being re-routed with appropriate signage and that larger trees would be used as part of the landscaping proposals on the southern and western elevation.

(ii) 22/01310/RM: Approval of matters reserved for layout, scale, appearance and landscaping following outline planning permission 16/02231/OM for the erection of new homes, open space, a car park to serve Reffley Wood, paths and cycleways and associated development: Land West of Knights Hill Village Grimston Road South Wootton

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

The Senior Planner introduced the application and outlined the proposals. It was explained that the site already had outline consent, and this was a reserved matters application for the housing, open space and internal road layout. She highlighted the area which affected the unparished area of King's Lynn which was the area south of Sandy Lane.

It was explained that the whole site was being split into 8-character areas, the Sandy Lane area fell into two areas: Reffley Wood and Sandy Lane area.

The Senior Planner then outlined the range of different house types.

It was noted that there were 6 x 2-bed dwellings, 41 x 3-bed dwellings, 65 x 4-bed dwellings in the green area. In the unparished area there were 11 x 3 bed units and 11 x 4 bed units. Out of the 127 units there were 8 x 2 bed bungalow. 32 affordable housing units were proposed in the southern element.

The Senior Planner advised that there were currently on-going discussions in relation to the parking, and in some instances triple parking occurred. There were also a few instances of properties being too close together. Amended plans were expected to amend those issues.

Councillors Jones and Mrs Collop raised concern in relation to the traffic impact and the estate could be used as a rat-run.

The Planning Control Manager advised that traffic concerns had been raised as part of the original planning application and the application had been refused but allowed at appeal and had been thoroughly tested on appeal and there was no issue with traffic impact. All the Sub-Group was considering today was the design, layout, appearance and landscaping.

Councillor Bambridge considered that the dwellings would fit in well with those off Sandy Lane.

Councillor Mrs Collop raised the issue of the dwellings having gas boilers and thought that these were being discontinued. It was advised that this would be covered by Building Regulations.

Conclusion

That issues raised by the KLACC Sub-Group had been dealt with at the outline application stage therefore the Sub-Group had no objection to the application.

- (iii) 22/01490/FM - The installation of a single wind turbine with a maximum blade tip of 100 m, with access and associated infrastructure: PIL Membranes PCL Ceramics Porelle Estuary Road King's Lynn Norfolk PE30 2HS**

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

The Senior Planner presented the application and outlined the proposal to the Sub-Group. She explained that there were already two turbines in the vicinity and highlighted them on a plan. In 2014 there had been an application for a third mast and was refused and went to appeal. The Inspector made it clear that they considered that the cumulative impact of 3 turbines was not acceptable. The Local Plan made it clear that the Council supported renewable energy unless it was wind turbines, and the emerging Local Plan still had that same policy. In a

Ministerial Statement it made it clear that we should only be permitting a wind turbine if it had been allocated.

Councillor Bambridge asked how far away it would be from the bungalows at Estuary Road. It was explained that a flicker study had been carried out, but it was considered that there would not be any impact.

Councillor Bambridge also asked if this was going to be part of the Norfolk Coastal path when it extended? In response, it was explained that the Inspector had raised concern in relation to the proximity of the byway. The Senior Planner explained that weight could not be given to the Norfolk Coastal path proposals if it was not currently adopted.

Councillor Jones advised that a survey had been carried out with residents of North Lynn in relation to the application and asked if this held any weight. The Senior Planner advised that the Ministerial Statement made it clear that in order for something to be acceptable it had to have community backing. The site also had to be identified within the Local Plan.

Councillor Jones added that within this energy crisis should consideration be given to every form of energy production.

The Planning Control Manager advised that decisions had to be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicated otherwise. In this case there was a previous appeal decision stating that a third turbine in that area would not be acceptable and a Ministerial Statement saying that a site had to be allocated and had to have community support, and it was also against Local Plan policies.

Conclusion

That the KLAAC Planning Sub-Group objected to the application.

8 **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was none.

9 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

To be arranged when required.

The meeting closed at 5.20 pm