

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

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

**PRESENT:** Councillor J Rust (Chair)  
Councillors B B Anota, R Blunt, F Bone, A Bubb, C J Crofts, M de Whalley, T de Winton, P Devulapalli, S Everett, S Lintern, B Long, S Ring, C Rose, A Ryves, Mrs V Spikings and D Tyler

An apology for absence was received from Councillor M Storey

PC12: **WELCOME**

The Chair 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 conduct a roll call to determine attendees.

PC13: **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for the meeting had been received from Councillor Storey (Cllr Crofts sub).

PC14: **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 June 2023 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

PC15: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following declarations of interest were made:

Councillor Crofts declared an interest in application 9/3(b) – Outwell and would take no part in the debate but would address the Committee under Standing Order 34.

Councillor Spikings declared an interest in applications 9/3(b) – Outwell and 9/3(d) – Upwell and would take no part in the debate.

PC16: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no urgent business under Standing Order 7.

PC17: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Councillors attended under Standing Order 34:

Councillor C Crofts            9/3(b)            Outwell

PC18: **CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC19: **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.

PC20: **GLOSSARY OF TERMS**

PC21: **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 application 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 Chair.

- (i) **23/00265/CU**  
**Walpole: 10 Folgate Lane, Walpole St Andrew: Change of use of bungalow from a dwelling (C3) to a children's home (C2) for up to two children: Mr T Dumitru**

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

The case officer presented the report and explained that the application had been referred from the 5 June Planning Committee meeting to enable the applicant to obtain his OFSTED registration.

The agent had confirmed that part of the registration process required the applicant to provide a copy of the planning permission granted, a certificate of lawfulness, a copy of a planning application or evidence that planning permission was not required. Whilst he could start the registration process, it would not be possible to complete the registration until he had the decision relating to the planning application.

The Committee was therefore asked to determine the application as submitted.

The application site was located within the development boundary of Walpole St Andrew, which was classified as a Rural Village within Policy CS02 of the Core Strategy 2011.

The site was located along Folgate Lane, at the end of a row of single storey dwellings, before the lane led out into open countryside. On site was an existing dwelling of prefabricated construction.

The proposal sought the change of use of the existing dwelling (C3) to a children's home (C2) for up to two children. The proposed number of children was reduced during the course of the application from 'up to three' and an amended description advertised.

The application had been referred to the Committee originally by the Assistant Director of Environment & Planning due to the scale of objections. The Parish Council also objected to the proposal. The application was deferred from the 5 June Planning Committee meeting.

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, Kym Marlow (objecting) and Heather Smith (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to a question from Councillor Ring about whether it was known if there was asbestos in the building, the Planning Control Manager explained that this would be covered by separate legislation.

The Executive Director, in response to a request by Councillor Blunt, read out point 2 of the Ministerial Statement and explained that it would be up to the Committee to decide whether the application met the terms of the Statement.

Councillor Blunt stated that the Committee should have more information before making a decision.

The Planning Control Manager advised the Committee that safeguarding issues and any potential risks would be considered under OFSTED rather than the Planning regime. The children would have their own personal plans.

The Executive Director explained that the circumstances of each child were not known, and the Committee needed to consider the principle of the use. He likened the situation to foster carers across the country.

Councillor Lintern referred back to point 2 of the Ministerial Statement and asked if there were any green spaces or play areas nearby? The case officer advised that there was not much in the vicinity.

Councillor Devulapalli referred to the supporting case and stated that as well as two children of teenage years in the property there would also be two adults and as such it felt very cramped.

Councillor Bone added that he worked in with people in supported accommodation and supported the application.

Councillor Spikings stated that she acknowledged that the children would be vulnerable and there was a duty of care towards them but there was also a duty of care to the neighbours as well. She considered that it would be a cramped form of development. She added that this was a poor example of housing for vulnerable children.

Councillor Ryves stated that he considered that the proposal as not in a sustainable location and did not comply with Policy DM15.

In response to comments made the Planning Control Manager advised that Paragraph 62 of the National Planning Policy Framework was a material consideration.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application and, having been put to the vote was lost 16 votes against and 1 abstention.

Because the recommendation to approve the application was lost, the debate continued and it was proposed and seconded to refuse the application on the grounds that the proposal was not in a sustainable location contrary to Policy DM15 and also contrary to paragraph 62 of the NPPF and, having been put to the vote, was carried.

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

*The proposed development, by virtue of the lack of facilities for children, was not considered a sustainable location contrary to the NPPF and DM15.*

*The size and nature of the dwelling was considered a substandard home with limited facilities and therefore not suitable for children contrary to paragraph 62 of the NPPF and Policy DM15.*

**(ii) 22/02265/FM**

**Walpole: Land opposite Walpole Sub Station, Walpole Bank, Walpole St Andrew: Proposed development of an energy storage installation and associated development to allow for the storage, importation and exportation of energy to the National Grid: Henry Energy Limited**

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

The Senior Planner presented the report and explained that the application was for the erection of a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) to the east of Walpole Bank opposite from the Walpole Substation on an irregular shaped parcel of 1.8ha of agricultural land.

Principal access to the site would be off Walpole Bank via an access already approved for a further BESS adjacent to the road under application ref: 22/00438/FM. The proposal would be undertaken either consecutively or after the development of the site to the west which had already been granted planning permission. An emergency access was also proposed to Folgate Lane to the east.

There was a land drain close to the southern boundary and an overhead power line suspended between pylons bisects the northern portion of the site.

The BESS would store excess electricity at times of low demand and then release it back into the grid when required at peak times. It would be rated at up to 100MV and would therefore be capable of serving the needs of over 280,000 homes for one hour if required.

It was anticipated that the proposed development would be operational for a period of twenty-five years to correspond with the adjacent BESS.

The site was located outside of the development boundary for Walpole St Andrew/Walpole St Peter/Walpole Marsh and was therefore in an area classed as countryside.

The site was arable grade 1 agricultural land and in an area at high risk of flooding (Flood one 3A and Tidal Hazard Mapping Zone).

The BESS was considered to be associated infrastructure in relation to the management and use of energy and the National commitment to carbon neutrality by 2050. It should therefore be considered in the

context of Policies DM2 and DM20 of the Development Plan accordingly.

The application had been referred to the Committee at the discretion of the Assistant Director of Environment and Planning and the views of the Parish Council were contrary to the officer recommendation.

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 James Whikaker (objecting) and Andy Brand (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Senior Planner provided clarification to the Committee in relation to the slide provided by the objector.

Councillor Mrs Spikings expressed concern that the sites identified on the slide were in different ownerships and what would happen if they were built at the same time? She also had concerns in relation to the loss of Grade 1 agricultural land. She considered that the cumulative impact of the sites all being developed would be excessive for the village.

Councillor Bone added that he shared the concerns raised by Councillor Mrs Spikings regarding the loss of Grade 1 agricultural land.

The Senior Planner advised that in terms of ownership of the land, numbers 2 and 13 were separate proposals and could be carried out in tandem. No.14 was a separate business proposal. County Highways were aware of the proposals and raised no objection. With regards to the Grade 1 agricultural land, he explained that the site was relatively small in comparison with the overall holding site. The units could be de-commissioned post development, and this was controlled by condition.

The Chair pointed out that Conditions 10 and 11 referred to a traffic management plan.

Councillor Bubb stated that he did not know enough about the batteries and asked if they contained any liquid content which could lead to contamination issues.

The Senior Planner advised that there were other facilities of this nature in place. There was a condition in place regarding surface water and there was a collection point shown on the plans to hold any contaminates. He did not know if the batteries contained any liquid content.

Councillor Long outlined his concerns in relation to the application including over-intensification and the loss of Grade 1 agricultural land and he did not believe that it was green energy.

Councillor de Whalley rebutted the comments made by Councillor Long and added that the battery storage area was required to support renewable energy.

Councillor de Winton acknowledged the impact on the village however he considered that this was the future. He added that any chemical contamination would be taken very seriously.

Councillor Lintern asked what would happen to the batteries after the 25-year lifespan. The Senior Planner explained that steps would be in place to meet the decommissioning criteria at that point in time. This was also covered by Condition 3.

Councillor Ryves asked how many other BESS sites were in Norfolk and whether Norfolk was the best place for them. He considered that there was not enough information to be able to make a decision on the application.

The Senior Planner explained that National Grid had a licensing regime to be complied with. He explained that the quality of electricity going back into the system was better the closer to the power station it was.

The Senior Planner also explained that he did not know nationally how many facilities of this nature there was as he would only deal with this authority. He explained that the end operators could change.

The Executive Director explained that capacity of the Fire and Rescue Service was explained on page 98 of the agenda. How the application fitted into the National Strategy was not the role of the Planning Committee.

With regard to lithium batteries, the Executive Director explained that we all had a large amount of lithium in our own homes, such as mobile phones, ipads, etc.

Councillor Ring stated that he was happy with the proposed conditions, and we all carried lithium in our pockets. With regards to the loss of Grade 1 agricultural land, he added that we were fortunate in this area to have as much agricultural land as we did.

Councillor Devulapalli added that the site was also in a flood risk and queried whether this was the right site for the development.

Councillor Blunt added that he had an interest as he lived in the vicinity of the site. He asked why it was in this location and added that residents worried about fire and flooding.

The Chair referred to the need to amend Condition 2 as outlined in the late correspondence which was agreed by the Committee.

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 (10 votes, for and 7 against).

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved as recommended, subject to the amendment to condition 2, as outlined in late correspondence.

*The Committee then adjourned at 11.07 pm for a comfort break and reconvened at 11.18 am.*

**(iii) 22/02021/FM**

**Walpole: Land opposite Walpole Sub-Station, Walpole Bank, Walpole St Andrew: Erection of a Renewable Battery Energy Storage System and associated infrastructure including access and landscaping: Field Devco 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 installation of a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) approximately 350m to the east of Walpole Bank opposite from the Walpole Substation on an irregular shaped parcel of 1.1 ha of agricultural land.

Primary access to the site would be off Folgate Lane to the east and there was a strip of land parallel to the northern side of Folgate Lane approximately 800m in length, plus a connection to a land drain to the south of the site. There were two BESS proposals adjoining Walpole Bank – one already approved under application ref: 22/00438/FM and a further current proposal under ref: 22/0265/FM (Henry Energy Limited) which was pending decision and reported elsewhere in the agenda. This proposal would be undertaken separately from those other schemes; however, an emergency access was also proposed connecting to Walpole Bank to the west via those sites.

The site was located between two overhead power lines suspended between pylons to the north and south, but not oversailing the development proposed.



The BESS would store excess electricity at all times of low demand and then release it back into the grid when required at peak times. It would be rated at up to 100 MW and would therefore be capable of serving the needs of over 280,000 homes for one hour if required.

It was anticipated that the proposed development would be operational for period of twenty-five years to correspond with the adjacent BESS facilities.

The site was located outside of the development boundary for Walpole St Andrew/Walpole St Peter/Walpole Marsh and was therefore in an area classed as countryside.

The site was arable grade 1 agricultural land and in an area at high risk of flooding (Flood one 3A and Tidal Hazard Mapping Zone).

The BESS was considered to be associated infrastructure in relation to the management and use of energy and the National commitment to carbon neutrality by 2050. It should therefore be considered in the context of Policies DM2 and DM20 of the Development Plan accordingly.

The application had been referred to the Committee at the discretion of the Assistant Director of Environment and Planning and the views of the Parish Council were contrary to the officer recommendation.

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 James Whikaker (objecting) and Ian York (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Bubb referred to de-commissioning the units and if there happened to be a fire who would be responsible for clearing up the site afterwards.

The Senior Planner advised that the majority of sites were rented out and therefore the landowner would be responsible. The Planning Control Manager explained that the planning permission went with the land, and this was covered by Condition 3 on page 72 of the agenda.

Councillor Long expressed concern over the cumulative impact of the sites and asked whether there were sufficient fire breaks between the two sites.

Councillor de Winton added that the proposal would provide work opportunities, and the village could become experts in the business.

He added that there were some negatives with the proposal, but the positives should not be discounted.

Councillor Ring commented that no-one had objected to the proposal on design grounds and 800 m of hedgerow would be put in place.

The Chair added that each case had to be considered on its own merits, however this site was closer to residential properties, and she had concerns in relation to the cumulative impact.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the late correspondence and the need to amend conditions 2 and 5, which was agreed by the Committee.

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 and 8 against).

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved as recommended subject to conditions 2 and 5 being amended as outlined in late correspondence.

**(iv) 22/0133/FM**

**Wormegay: Alfred G Pearce, Castle Road: Erection of a new cold store building, change of use of existing cold store building to packing shed, and alterations and extensions to existing cold store building:**

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application site was a vegetable processing plant located close to the centre of Wormegay, operated by Alfred G Pearce Limited. The application sought consent for alterations/extensions to an existing cold store and the construction of a new cold store elsewhere on the site.

Access to the site was via Castle Road. The site was bounded to the north by residential development and to the south and west by open countryside.

The application sought to change the use of the existing cold store to a packing shed with alterations and extensions to the building. The existing cold store was located in the southeast corner of the site, to the rear of the main processing building. The building was adjoined to the north and west by areas of concrete hardstanding, whilst to the south and east there were open fields.

The site of the proposed cold store was to the west and presently formed part of the open yard serving the business and included part of an existing effluent plant which was now defunct. There were areas of hardstanding to the south and east and open fields to the west beyond the remainder of the effluent plant. To the north was the staff car park.

The site of the proposed development fell outside but immediately adjacent to the development boundary for Wormegay, as identified in the Local Plan.

The application had been referred to the Committee as the Parish Councils comments were contrary to the officer recommendation, and it was also 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, Mr Nick Moys (agent supporting) and Barry Standing (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

During discussion of the item Councillor Mrs Spikings proposed that the earth bund should be extended. The Planning Control Manager advised that this should be something that was discussed with the applicant first.

Councillor Mrs Spikings then proposed that the application be deferred in order to allow a discussion to be held with the applicant as to whether the earth bund could be extended. This was seconded by Councillor Tyler and after having been put to the vote by a show of hands was carried.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be deferred in order to allow a discussion to be held with the applicant as to whether the earth bund could be extended.

*The Committee then adjourned at 12.18 pm and reconvened at 1.00 pm.*

Councillor Everett left the meeting at 12.18 pm.

- (v) **22/01884/F**  
**Holme next the Sea: Eastgate Barn, Eastgate: Change of use from agricultural including the demolition of the existing barn and the replacement with five new dwellings: Millthorne Developments 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 demolition of the existing agricultural building on the site and the subsequent erection of five dwellings arranged as a group of agricultural barns forming a central courtyard with the rear facing private garden spaces on the outer edges of the site.

The site was allocated land for 5 dwellings under Policy HNTS 15: Site Allocation at Eastgate Barn of the Holme next the Sea Neighbourhood Plan. The policy set out the criteria for development within the allocation and thus formed the basis of determination of the planning application.

This application was an amended scheme submitted after the refusal of application reference 21/01947/F which was refused at Planning Committee in August 2022.

The application site was immediately adjacent to the Holme Next The Sea Conservation Area and was within the AONB.

The application had been referred to the Committee as the officer recommendation was contrary to the 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, Wendy Norman (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) and Jason Law (agent, supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to comments raised by the Parish Council, the Senior Planner advised that in relation to Policy HNTS18 which required a Section 106 Agreement to secure principal residences of the units, was covered within the report.

Councillor Devulapalli proposed that the principal residences clause should be delivered by a Section 106 Agreement. This was seconded by Councillor Mrs Spikings.

The Planning Control Manager advised that there was no need to have both a Section 106 agreement and condition. Whilst a condition was enforceable, a Section 106 Agreement went further and was registered as a land-charge. If the Committee decided to go with a Section 106 Agreement, then condition 3 would need to be removed to avoid duplication.

Councillor de Winton explained that the application was within his Ward, and he supported the addition of a Section 106 Agreement instead of a condition, to add to the community.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to remove condition 3, which was agreed.

The Committee then voted on the recommendation to approve the application subject to a Section 106 to ensure that the properties were used as a principal residence, which was agreed.

**RESOLVED:** (A) That the application be approved subject to the signing of a section 106 Agreement to ensure that the properties were used as a principal residence and the removal of condition 3.

(B) That if the signing of the Section 106 Agreement is not completed within 4 months of the date of this meeting, the application be refused on the failure to secure the properties as principal residences.

*Councillor D Winton left the meeting at 1.18 pm.*

**(vi) 23/00253/F**

**Outwell: Riverbank between Arc Rouge and up to Date Cottage, Lowside: Extension to existing fishing platform for instructing children to fish:**

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

*Councillor Spikings declared an interest in the application and left meeting during consideration of the item.*

*Councillor Crofts declared an interest in the application and addressed the Committee in accordance with Standing Order 34.*

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application was for an extension to an existing timber fishing platform on the riverbank. The fishing platform was used by both adults and for instructing children to fish. The site was located on the south-east side of the river on Lowside, Outwell. The proposed extension to the platform would be constructed from timber.

The application had been referred to the Committee as the Parish Council response was contrary to the officer recommendation and 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 Martin Scott (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor Crofts addressed the Committee and outlined his concerns relating to the application. He stated that he

would be happy to support the application to teach children to fish, but the facility was predominately used by adults and this caused additional traffic and parking issues. He added that by people parking on the road this caused traffic to build up.

The case officer explained that the application had been considered on the basis of general fishing. In addition, the Local Highway Authority had no objection to the application.

Councillor Bubb pointed out that he did not see any life-saving equipment. The Planning Control Manager explained that she did not think that there was any life-saving equipment along the Well Creek.

The case officer advised that anyone with a fishing license could use the fishing platform. He explained that there were no parking facilities but there were no double yellow lines along the road. He also explained that there were no restrictions with fishing on the bank.

Councillor Rose declared that he knew the applicant and would not take part in any votes.

Councillor Bubb proposed that an additional condition be added requiring the applicant to provide safety equipment on the platform extension. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Ryves and after having been put to the vote was agreed by the Committee (10 votes for and 2 against).

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application subject to an additional condition requiring the applicant to provide safety equipment on the platform extension and, after having been put to the vote, was carried (11 votes for and 1 abstention).

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved, as recommended, subject to the imposition of an additional condition requiring the applicant to provide safety equipment on the platform extension.

**(vii) 21/01921/F**

**South Wootton: 1 Stody Drive: 2 no. proposed dwellings following demolition of existing dwelling: Mr Bush**

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application site was located within the defined settlement boundary for South Wootton. South Wootton was located to the north side of King's Lynn and was favoured residential area with its own distinct identity. The built environment predominately consisted of modern two storey, semi-detached and detached residential development. To the west of the site was a large supermarket and a petrol station.

The site was currently host to a modest detached bungalow and associated amenity land within a residential cul-de-sac and positioned on a corner plot.

The proposal sought permission for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the construction of two, two storey dwelling detached dwellings.

Amendments had been provided throughout the course of the application process showing a revised design and layout for the dwellings. Discussions were also had regarding the existing earth bund and acoustic fencing which had now been retained and included within the proposal.

The application had been referred to the Committee as the officer recommendation was contrary to the views of the Parish Council and 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 S Scales (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) and Jordan Cribb (agent, supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Mrs Spikings asked for a condition that any removal of the hedges was not carried out during the bird nesting seasons.

Councillor Ring (Ward Member) commented that there was not any green space nearby and he had concerns relating to parking. He added that people did tend to park on the road, and it was a bad bend.

Councillor Ryves proposed that the application should be refused on the grounds that it was a cramped form of development, out of character and in breach of the South Wootton Neighbourhood Plan. This was seconded by Councillor Ring.

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

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

*The proposal represented a cramped form of development, by reason of design and layout, that would not be in keeping with the surrounding area and would therefore be contrary to Policies H2, H4 of the Neighbourhood Plan and policies CS08 and DM15 of the Local Plan.*

**(viii) 23/00551/RM**

**Upwell: Plot to south of Number 19 Dovecote Road:  
Reserved matters: Application for one dwelling: Mr  
Stanford and Ms Satt**

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

*Councillor Mrs Spikings declared an interest and left the meeting*

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application was to secure details of the reserved matters at outline stage including appearance, landscaping, layout and scale in accordance with conditions 1, 2 and 3 of outline permission 22/01592/F, for the erection of one detached dwelling. The site was located in Upwell on the east side of Dovecote Road near the south of the village.

The application had been referred to the Committee as the Parish Council response was contrary to the officer recommendation and 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.

It was confirmed that Upwell did have a Neighbourhood Plan and this had been covered within the report.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application and having been out to the vote was carried unanimously.

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

**(ix) 22/00832/F**

**Walpole: Britina, Folgate Lane, Walpole St Andrew:  
Change of use of land for the keeping of working dogs and  
proposed private kennels for working dogs: Ms Claire  
Granger**

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application site was located outside the development boundary of Walpole St Andrew and within the countryside as defined by the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2018.

The site was located at the western end of Folgate Lane, within a small group of dwellings located in close proximity to its junction with Walpole Bank and Mill Road. On site was an existing single storey dwelling and stable building.



The proposal sought the change of use of some agricultural land for the keeping of working dogs and the erection of proposed private kennels for the working dogs.

The application had been referred to the Committee as the officer recommendation was contrary to the views of the Parish Council and 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, Scott Brown (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 unanimously.

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

PC22: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

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

**The meeting closed at 2.35 pm**