

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

Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 6th November, 2023 at 9.30 am in the Assembly Room, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ

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

PC61: **WELCOME**

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

He invited the Democratic Services Officer to conduct a roll call to determine attendees.

PC62: **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Ryves (Councillor Bearshaw (sub) and Councillor Storey (Councillor Barclay sub)

The Chair thanked Councillors Barclay and Bearshaw for attending the meeting as a substitute.

PC63: **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 October and of the Reconvened meeting held on 5 October 2023 (previously circulated) were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

PC64: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

PC65: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was none.

PC66: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Councillors attended under Standing Order 34:

Councillor Coates 9/1(a) Knights Hill
 Councillor Rust 9/1(a) Knights Hill – statement to be read out
 Councillor Moriarty 9/1(a) Knights Hill

Councillor Coates 9/1(b) Castle Rising

PC67: **CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC68: **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.

PC69: **GLOSSARY OF TERMS**

The Committee noted the Glossary of Terms.

PC70: **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) – (vi) below, where appropriate, to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chair.

- (i) **22/01310/RMM**
King's Lynn / South Wootton / Grimston / Castle Rising: Land west of Knights Hill Village, Grimston Road, South Wootton: 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: BDW Trading Ltd and Whistle Wood and Reffley Wood

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the site was located on the north-eastern outer limits of King's Lynn partly within the parishes of South Wootton and Castle Rising and an unparished part of King's Lynn and was immediately to the west of Grimston Parish boundary. It was located to the west of the A149, Queen Elizabeth Way and south of the A148, Grimston Road adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and Knights Hill Hotel complex of which the main building, Rising Lodge was Grade II Listed.

The site was located within Flood Zone 1.

The site was bisected by Sandy Lane. The section of Sandy Lane which crossed the site was a pedestrian route with restricted vehicular access onto the A149. To the west of the site Sandy Lane returned to an unrestricted road that curved to the north to a point that linked up with the A148, Grimston Road.

Adjacent to the site (to the northwest) was a recently approved development site known as Claylands permitted under applications 15/017782/OM and 20/00666/RM. Both the Claylands permission and the outline consent for the site that was the subject of the report required a pedestrian / cycle link between the two sites.

To the south and southwest of the site was Reffley Wood (a designed Ancient Woodland). The wood provided a large recreational area for residents as well as an important wildlife habitat.

In broad terms, levels across the site decreased from north to south with the lowest elements in the most southern part of the site.

Although there was a level change of approximately 37.5 m between the highest and lowest parts of the site (AOD in the north and 5-6AOD in the south), gradients were relatively shallow due to the size of the site (35.3ha).

The application sought reserved matters (RM) approval for 574 dwellings, open space, formal sports pitches, a car park to serve Reffley Wood and associated development including substations, drainage, roads, cycle and pedestrian paths and other such works, following the grant of outline planning permission under application 16/02231/OM granted at public inquiry in July 2020. (APP/V2635/W/19/3237042).

The site represented one of the borough's main housing allocations.

Access was approved at outline stage, so the reserved matters application sought approval of layout, appearance, scale and landscaping.

The Local Centre and Community Facility Land for a Community Use were not part of this reserved matters application and will / may be the subject of future reserved matters application(s). Whilst provision of the Local Centre was secured by condition 6 on the outline consent, the possible provision of a Community Use on Community Facility Land was contained within the S106 Agreement and would only be a requirement if certain triggers were met as set out in the S106 (which was appended to the report).

The application proposed 574 dwellings; 108 of which would be affordable.

A total of 157,291m² of open space was proposed including that contained within the Ecological Mitigation Zone.

Members were advised that it was of significance that the outline approval on the site was made after a Public Inquiry, with the final decision made by the Secretary of State, who agreed with their Inspector's views.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as it had been called in by Councillors Rust, Coates and former Councillor Howard, and the officer recommendation was contrary to the Parish Council's recommendations, and it also raised issues of wider concern.

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, David Goddard (objecting), Ben Coulson (representing Castle Rising, North Wootton and South Wootton Parish Councils), Louise Simmonds and Paul Belton (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Coates and Councillor Moriarty (Cabinet Member for Development and Regeneration) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Also, in accordance with Standing Order 34, the Democratic Services Officer read out a statement from Councillor Rust who could not be present at the meeting.

In relation to some of the comments raised the case officer responded to issues regarding density, harm to the scheduled ancient monuments, sports and recreation and the character of Grimston Plaza area and how this blended in with the use of materials.

Also, in response to comments made the Norfolk County Council Highways representative advised that the turning provision had been tracked and worked satisfactorily but that did not mean that an alternative option could not be considered. With regards to cyclists given priority on side roads, this was standard practice and would come forward as the application progressed.

The Assistant Director stated that he thought that the public speakers had raised some very sensible comments. He referred the Committee to his comments, as set out on page 5 of the late correspondence, where it proposed a replacement condition 26 be imposed as it would be sensible that the bus stop infrastructure was put in place when the roads were constructed, to help promote the use of public transport, which was seen as important at the outline stage. This could be attached to the reserved matters, because it related to the site layout.

With regards to the specifics of a bus route, this could not be conditioned because it was not related to physical layout, and it was already covered as part of the Section 106 agreement of the outline planning permission. How the contribution was spent, would be a matter for future detailed discussion between the Borough, County and Parish Councils, although the final decision would be made by Norfolk County Council. It was therefore proposed that liaison meetings be set up with the Parish Councils going

forward, to discuss the Knights Hill site and ongoing issues. The main issue related to the bus service contribution and how that was spent.

The Committee then adjourned for a comfort break at 10.32 am and reconvened at 10.42 am.

Councillor Mrs Spikings raised issues regarding:

- In order to promote sustainable transport, the distances for walking needed to be attractive for people.
- The need to recognise that urban policies do not always recognise the rural areas.
- She agreed with the amended condition 26.
- She referred to the Inspectors Decision, page 122 of the agenda which made reference to the welcome pack which should include appropriate dog walking routes and the impact – did a condition need to be imposed.
- Affordable housing provision and lack of pepper-potting across the site.
- when would the affordable housing be delivered.
- Access to the rear for the terraced housing.
- Width of the garages.
- When would the community centre be delivered and what assurances were in place for its delivery.
- The design should take into consideration the needs of disabled people other than the affordable housing bungalows.

In response, the case officer explained that the affordable housing would be delivered through triggers contained within the Section 106 agreement. The case officer highlighted the affordable units on the plan. With regards to pepper-potting, the proposal met the Borough Council's policy requirements and was considered to be well spaced out across the site. The affordable housing properties were also considered to be tenure blind.

The Senior Housing Development Officer confirmed that in relation to pepper-potting the Council's policy stated that on a site of this size there should be no more than 12 units in a cluster and the plan complied with this. In terms of the triggers within the Section 106 agreement, it stated that the affordable housing would be delivered before 50% of the open market housing was delivered in each phase.

With regards to the terraced housing, the case officer confirmed that the terraced units had a rear access, and this was highlighted on the plans.

In relation to the point raised by Councillor Spikings regarding dog walking, this was covered by condition 20 of the outline consent.

The case officer also explained that the land would be made available and retained for the community facility building and prior to 25% occupation of the site, reserved matters application would have to be submitted. Prior to the occupation of 95% of the site the land would be transferred to the Borough Council if requested by the Borough Council. The Assistant Director advised that the request was likely to be made well before the 95% occupation of the site.

The Assistant Director advised that the Council did have a Section 106 Monitoring Officer in place to monitor the site and there would also be the Community Liaison Meetings to take that forward.

Councillor Mrs Spikings stated that she was disappointed with the timescales involved in providing the Community Facility.

Councillor Lintern added that she was pleased that there was a S106 Monitoring Officer in place to monitor the trigger points within the Section 106. She also considered that a turning circle should be provided rather than a turning head, as suggested by Councillor Coates. She made reference to the comments by Councillor Rust regarding the character areas potentially becoming divisive and what mitigation measures were proposed.

In response the case officer advised that as stated by the County Highways Officer the proposed turning head had been deemed acceptable. With regards to the character areas, she explained that they had been designed to blend in with each other by the use of materials and a transition in character areas would be seen.

Councillor Ring added that the Parish Councils, developer and Borough Council were all in agreement regarding including the bus stops and it was a shame that Norfolk County Council was not in agreement. He hoped that there would be a satisfactory outcome to this point.

With regards to the community facility, he had concerns and stated that officers and the Parish Councils and Ward Councillors needed to carefully monitor this to ensure that it was delivered. He also referred to the exit off Sandy Lane onto the A149 and asked how this would be prevented? He also considered that a turning circle should be proposed rather than a turning head.

The case officer explained that a deed of variation was running alongside the application to amend the existing Section 106 agreement and would progress a Traffic

Road Order (TRO) to prevent vehicular access/egress between Sandy Lane east and the A149 Queen Elizabeth Way. The TRO would go through a consultation period. The deed of variation also increased the habitat fee (now GIRAMS fee) that had been previously approved.

Councillor Ring asked if there was a physical barrier to prevent access from Sandy Lane onto the A149? The case officer explained that condition 7 covered this. The County Highways Officer explained the TRO process to the Committee which would be intended to prohibit traffic using Sandy Lane. The condition would require the detailed design of any drawings to be agreed for any works which would include appropriate measures to prevent it being used by vehicular traffic whether it be bollards, barrier or gates which would still be allow it to be used by pedestrians but not motorists.

It was confirmed that the TRO was subject to consultation which would include all statutory consultees including Parish Councils. Councillor Ring advised that Sandy Lane was in an unparished area. It was explained that if the Parish boundary went along Sandy Lane, then both parishes either side would be consulted.

Councillor Ring then proposed that a turning circle be provided rather than a turning head, which was seconded by Councillor Lintern with the exact wording of the condition to be agreed with the Chair and Vice-Chair.

The Committee then discussed the proposed condition. The Committee were informed that talks around the type of bus to go onto the development had been around a Hopper style bus, but this would be something for the Liaison Meeting to consider.

Councillor Mrs Spikings suggested that the application should be deferred for one month only, as she felt that there was not enough firm information to be able to make a decision.

The Assistant Director advised that he considered that the Committee did have enough information to be able to make a decision. The Committee needed to consider whether the scheme should include a turning head or a turning circle. The issue over the bus service provision would be considered separately.

Councillor Devulapalli added that she agreed with Councillor Mrs Spikings, and it would have been better to have reached agreement on issues before it came before the Planning Committee. She added that she would prefer a turning circle rather than a turning head.

The Assistant Director referred back to the late correspondence, which had set out what could and could not be considered in relation to this application. The bus service issue would be sorted out in due course, as set out in the outline planning permission, it was not physical layout, the details would come forward through discussions with the Parish and representatives, the Borough and County Council.

The Committee then voted on the proposal to include a turning circle rather than turning head, details of which to be agreed with the Chair and Vice-Chair and after having been put to the vote was carried unanimously.

Councillor De Whalley raised issues in relation to:

- Boundary treatments
- Pedestrians and cyclists crossing the A149
- Bus stops
- Solar panels
- Sports pavilion
- Reffley Wood
- Light pollution
- GIRAMS – there was nothing to assist the Woodland Trust.

The case officer advised that the boundary treatment walls were dotted around the site and covered on page 22 of the report. In relation to pedestrian / cycle access onto the A149, the plan had been approved at outline stage. There was an existing right of way to be retained. Solar panels were covered by condition 25. The impact on Reffley Wood had been fully covered by the outline application and had been considered. In relation to light pollution, there was a condition but did exclude residential dwellings. This could not be physically controlled.

With regards to bus shelters, the Assistant Director advised that it was not entirely straightforward as it was the future maintenance of them which needed to be considered.

In relation to the A149 pedestrian crossing, he asked whether something could be included within the welcome pack or cautionary road markings would be helpful.

The County Highways Officer advised that County Highways could not control what went into the pack however as part of the condition to be approved regarding Sandy Lane, he could not see any reason why there could not be some warning signs on the A149 that there was a pedestrian crossing. The case officer advised that there were conditions relating to Sandy Lane so it could be included as part of that.

Councillor Blunt stated that it seemed that from the public speakers they all wanted to work together towards a public transport service for the site. There had also been an offer from the Portfolio Holder to facilitate liaison meetings. He asked if a condition could be added to ensure that the applicant and interested parties worked together. The Assistant Director advised that a condition of this nature would not meet the required tests. However, if the Committee were minded, a letter could be written to Norfolk County Council from the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee, urging them to work together to promote a bus service into the site using the £500,000 contribution. This was proposed by Councillor Blunt and seconded by Councillor Mrs Spikings and, after having been put to the vote was agreed by the Committee.

Councillor Long added that the bus operators had to be on-side and needed to be included with any meetings.

The Assistant Director advised that Norfolk County Council's Public Transport Team did have connections into the bus companies, and Mr Coulson did have experience in that area.

In response to a comment from Councillor Bubb, the County Highways Officer explained the emergency access arrangements.

Councillor de Winton added that he found the layout to be acceptable. He asked if the TRO would go out to public consultation and how would this work as the site was spread over 3 parishes and no-one lived there at the moment – who would represent these people that were going to live there. He stated that bus stops were generally provided by Parish Councils. He asked if the roads would be fully made and adopted before the dwellings were occupied.

In response the County Highways Officer explained that consultation would only take place where the TRO would come into effect. The only other TRO within the development apart from the one relating to Sandy

Lane, would be to make it a 20mph zone. In general, the TRO's were not advertised until people had moved into the development and would therefore automatically be consulted. In relation to adoption of the roads there was a condition requiring the roads to be built to binder course prior to occupation and then to be finished before penultimate occupation of each dwelling in each phase. The adoption of roads was outside the planning process. The case officer advised that this was also covered by Condition 5.

With regard to a comment from Councillor Mrs Spikings regarding trees, the Council's Arboricultural Officer explained that whips were used when planting larger areas and the reasons for this. The case officer added that there was a suite of conditions regarding trees.

In response to comments from Councillor Bearshaw, the case officer explained that any works / barriers to Sandy Lane was covered by condition together with drainage.

Councillor Devulapalli added that she welcomed the design, open space and cycleways and use of air source heat pumps. She referred to the sports facilities and stated that their appeared to be discrepancies from responses received and what was actually being provided and the comments from Sports England. She also asked on what basis the number of bungalows had been determined. In response it was explained that the provision of the equipped play areas there were discussions with the Open Space Team, and this was proposal which had been agreed. It was policy compliant and met the Fields in Trust requirements. In relation to the provision of bungalows, there was no policy requirement that they had to provide any bungalows at all.

The Chair made comments on reflective practice about going against the recommendation on the original outline application, when the site was allocated in the local plan and the lack of robust conditions because of that decision.

The Chair drew the Committee's attention to the late correspondence and the need to amend Conditions 16 and 26 and the change to the recommendation, which was agreed. The Committee had also agreed to the inclusion of a turning circle rather than turning head – the wording of the condition to be agreed with the Chair and Vice-Chair and that a letter be written to Norfolk County Council from the Chair and Vice-Chair urging them to work together with the developer, Parish and Borough Councils to promote a bus service for the site using the £500,000 contribution.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application with the amendments listed above and, after having been put to the vote was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: (A) That the application be approved subject to the completion of the Deed of Variation within four months of the date of this resolution to approve, and subject to the conditions below:

(B) That the application be refused if the Deed of Variation is not completed within four months of the date of this resolution to approve.

- (1) Conditions 16 and 26 being amended and the change to the recommendation, as detailed in late correspondence.
- (2) A condition to provide a turning circle rather than turning head – the wording of the condition to be agreed with the Chair and Vice-Chair
- (3) A letter be written to Norfolk County Council from the Chair and Vice-Chair urging them to work together with the developer, Parish and Borough Councils to promote a bus service going into the site using the £500,000 contribution.

The Committee then adjourned at 12.09 pm and reconvened at 12.15 pm

- (ii) **23/00086/F**
Castle Rising: Land west of Knights Hill Village, Grimston Road, South Wootton: Application for a temporary construction access and haul road in association with development approved under 16/02231/OM: BDW Cambridgeshire

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application had been deferred at the Planning Committee held on 31st July 2023 in order to seek further clarification on the suggested conditions from the Parish Councils, and the potential for including these within any decision. A meeting with the Parish Councils and applicant had taken place and a final updated response from the applicant had been received addressing the issues discussed with the Parish Councils.

The application proposed the widening and alteration of an existing field access to act as a temporary construction access for the Knights Hill residential development site, located to the west of Knights Hill Village and to the south of Grimston Road. This would be to serve the construction of the roundabout approved under 16/02231/OM alongside a temporary haul road leading to a site compound. Once the roundabout was constructed the temporary access and haul road would be required to be removed and the use discontinued.

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

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 John Mason (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Coates addressed the Committee.

In response to comments raised by Councillor Coates, the case officer explained that Condition 3 dealt with surface water drainage.

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.

The Committee then adjourned at 12.28 pm and reconvened at 1.10 pm.

(iii) **22/01657/OM**

Outwell / Upwell: Land NW of Whetstone Way, Whetstone Way, Outwell: The development of up to 26 affordable dwellings with associated infrastructure and open space with all matters reserved except access: George Scarborough Ltd

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application site comprised a parcel of grazing / agricultural land (0.97 ha) to the northwest of Whetstone Way, abutting but outside the defined development area of the village of Outwell (which was combined with Upwell to create a Key Rural Service Centre). Outline permission was sought for the development of up to 26 dwellings. All matters were reserved for future consideration save for the means of access, which was proposed to be taken off Whetstone Way,

The dwellings were proposed to be affordable units, and this comprised an 'entry-level exception site' in accordance with Paragraph 72 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2023).

In terms of constraints, the site was located in an area classed as 'countryside' and within Flood Zone 1 and a Dry Island of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

The application was accompanied by a Design & Access Statement, Preliminary Ecology Appraisal, Transport Statement, Affordable Housing Statement, Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Geo-environmental Assessment.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination as the views of both Outwell and Upwell Parish Councils were 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, Gabrielle Rowan (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Mrs Spikings added that she represented Upwell Ward. She asked if the bungalows could be retained along the south-eastern boundary. She also asked if allocations would be for local residents.

In response the case officer explained that it as it was an entry-level housing scheme, it had to be Borough-wide rather than at local level.

Councillor Mrs Spikings added that Outwell had a large amount of affordable housing all packed into one area and she would like to see a better borough-wide spread.

The case officer advised that the cumulative impact was addressed on page 211 of the agenda.

The Council's Senior Housing Development Officer explained that there was a Borough-wide need to 211 units per year but had fallen short of that. The affordable housing units at Knights Hill would help to address that but would be delivered in stages. He added that there was a need in Upwell/Outwell which was a Key Rural Service Centre.

The case officer added that bungalows could not be conditioned at this outline stage but would be taken into account at the reserved matters stage.

The Chair drew the Committee's attention to the late correspondence and the need to remove SUDS from the recommendation, which was agreed.

The Democratic Services Officer then carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application subject to the removal of SUDs from the recommendation and, after having been put to the vote was carried (15 votes for and 1 abstention).

RESOLVED: (A) That the application be approved, subject to the completion of Section 106 agreement to secure tenure of dwellings and Public Open Space provision and maintenance and payment of GIRAMS fee within 4 months of this resolution to approve.

(B) That the application be refused if the Section 106 agreement is not completed within 4 months of the date of the resolution to approve.

(iv) 23/00384/F

Brancaster: Quexcroft, Cross Lane: Proposed extension, an increase of ridge height for loft conversion and renovation of the existing dwelling: Mr and Mrs Insch

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application site consisted of a detached bungalow dwelling and associated parking area to the front of the dwelling. The application proposed an extension to the existing side projection between the main house and garage with a new pitched roof as well as an extension to the rear in pace of the current conservatory, an increase of ridge height to the main dwelling for a loft conversion and renovation of the existing dwelling.

The application had been amended over time to seek to address concerns regarding the design and materials of the dwelling. The site was not included within the Conservation Area but was adjacent to it.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination at the request of former Councillor Lawton and subsequently by Councillor de Winton.

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

Councillor de Winton explained that the application was in his ward and he was pleased that the issues had been resolved to the satisfaction of the applicant and Planning Department.

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.

- (v) **23/01371/F**
Burnham Market: Burnham Rise, Herrings Lane: Variation of Condition 1 attached to planning permission 22/01459/F: existing house and garden structures are to be demolished. A two-storey replacement dwelling – three pavilion structures with pitched roofs on a masonry plinth is proposed. The scheme includes a driveway and associated hardstanding for vehicle parking: Mr Piers Harris

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that the application was to vary condition 1 of planning application 22/01459/F which granted permission for a new dwelling.

Condition 1 listed the approved plans which the applicant wished to amend to enable the retention of a new first floor window on the western elevation.

The site was located within the development boundary for Burnham Market, within the North Norfolk Area of Outstanding Beauty. The site accommodated a significant number of protected trees, none of which would be affected by the insertion of the window.

The application had been referred to the Committee for determination 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, Mr Piers Harris (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Councillor Mrs Spikings stated that she was amazed that the Committee was discussing the application. The case officer explained the reasons why it had been included in the agenda.

The case officer drew the Committee's attention to Condition 11 and suggested that the reason for Condition 11 should be amended to read on design grounds, as it looked odd without the slat being included.

In response to a comment regarding overlooking if the slats were not in place, the case officer explained that in her considered opinion there would not be any material overlooking, but there were no photographs or views to demonstrate this. She advised that if the Committee felt that there would not be any overlooking then Condition 11 should be removed but if they felt that there would be overlooking then Condition 11 should be retained.

Councillor Ring proposed that the application be approved condition 11 being removed. This was seconded by Councillor Mrs Spikings and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as recommended subject to the removal of Condition 11.

(vi) 23/01248/F
King's Lynn: 1 Newlands Avenue: Construction of new dwelling:
White Feather Projects Ltd

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

The case officer introduced the report and explained that full planning permission was sought for the erection of a new dwelling.

The site comprised a corner plot between Newlands Avenue and Sr Edmundsbury Road in the North Lynn residential area of King's Lynn. A 'village green' lies to the south-west of the site. Development to the immediate north, east and south of the green was largely characterised by two storey, semi-detached dwellings, as was the case with the donor dwelling.

The site was located within Flood Zones 2 and 3, as depicted on the Local Authority's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Maps and the Environment Agency's Tidal Breach area.

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

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

Councillor Long explained that the nature of Newlands Avenue was semi-detached properties, tree lined and no terraces so this proposal would change the form and character of the area.

Councillor Ring disagreed with the comments made by Councillor Long.

Councillor Bubb agreed with the comments made by Councillor Long and added that he felt that the site was too cramped as well as detracting from the form and character of the area.

Several Members of the Committee agreed with the comments made by Councillor Long.

Councillor Mrs Spikings added that the proposal looked out of balance, lacked design merit and detracted from the street-scene.

Councillor Long then proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that it would be a cramped form of development; detracted from the street-scene contrary to policies CS08, DM15 and paragraph 130 of the NPPF. In addition, the proposal would not provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweighed the flood risk, as required by paragraph 164 of the NPPF, 2023. and This was seconded by Councillor Bubb.

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 (9 votes for refusal, 3 against and 2 abstentions).

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

1. The proposal would represent a cramped form of development; and detracted from the street-scene contrary to policies CS08, DM15 and paragraph 130 of the NPPF.
2. The proposal would not provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweighed the flood risk, as required by paragraph 164 of the NPPF, 2023.

PC71: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

RESOLVED: That the reports be noted.

The meeting closed at 2.18 pm