

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

Minutes from the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday, 9th January, 2024 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, R Blunt, A Bubb, C J Crofts (sub), M de Whalley,
P Devulapalli, S Everett, S Lintern, B Long, C Rose, J Rust (sub), A Ryves,
Mrs V Spikings, M Storey and D Tyler

PC94: **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 carry out a roll call to determine attendees.

PC95: **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor S Ring (Cllr J Rust sub), and Councillor de Winton (Cllr Crofts sub).

PC96: **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 December 2023 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendment:

Councillor Everett referred to page 553 of the minutes, he wished for them to say he had proposed the amendment because of the typographical error within the report, which was agreed by the Committee.

PC97: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following declarations of interests were declared:

In relation to 9/2(a), Councillor Everett declared that he was a tenant of Freebridge Community Housing (the applicant) however the application was not for where he lived and therefore had not pre-determined the application and would make his decision on the documents provided and the debate.

Councillor Lintern stated that she would be speaking on items 9/1(b) and 9/2(a).

Councillor Crofts stated that he would not be addressing the Committee under Standing Order 34 on the Outwell application, but would now be taking part as a member of the Committee.

PC98: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no urgent business.

PC99: **MEMBERS ATTENDING UNDER STANDING ORDER 34**

The following Councillors attended under Standing Order 34:

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| Councillor S Lintern 9/1(a) & 9/1(b) | Stoke Ferry |
| Councillor Beales 9/3(e) | West Acre |

There was also a statement to be read out from Councillor Lawrence in relation to 9/3 (c) – Southery.

PC100: **CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE**

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

PC101: **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.

PC102: **GLOSSARY OF TERMS**

The Committee noted the Glossary of Terms.

PC103: **INDEX AND 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) – (vii) below, where appropriate, to the conditions and reasons or grounds of refusal, set out in the schedules signed by the Chair.

- (i) **23/00605/O**
Stoke Ferry: Land east of Furlong Road: Outline planning application for construction of 2 no. retail units (and storage) plus associated parking and access and 2 no. flats to be held in association with the retail units: Mr Paul Bishopp

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

Councillor Lintern left the meeting and addressed the Committee in accordance with Standing Order 34. She took no part in the debate or vote.

The case officer presented the report and explained that the application had been deferred from the Planning Committee meeting held on 16 November 2023. The deferral was to allow for a thorough assessment of the impact of the adjacent storage building and its use on the proposed dwellinghouses, and to allow for the submission and review of a noise impact assessment. The application has since fundamentally changed with the four dwellings fronting onto Furlong Road having been entirely removed from the proposal. The report had therefore been amended accordingly.

The case officer explained that the application site was located to the north of the village of Stoke Ferry and fronted onto Furlong Road. Stoke Ferry was categorised as a Key Rural Service Centre in the adopted Local Plan. Inset map G88 identified that the application site was located outside of the development boundary for Stoke Ferry. The application site abutted the Stoke Ferry Conservation Area, which ran along the front of the site. The application site included two trees protected under a Tree Preservation Order, was within Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and within the Zone of Influence for protected sites.

The application sought outline planning consent with some matters reserved for the construction of 2 no. retail units (and storage) plus associated parking and access and 2 no. flats to be held in association with the retail units. Access was via Indigo Road. The matters included within this application were access, layout and scale.

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

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, Janet Taylor (objecting on behalf of the Village Hall Committee) and Trudy Mann (objecting on behalf of the Parish Council) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor S Lintern addressed the Committee and outlined her concerns in relation to the application.

In response to comments made by the speakers, the case officer responded in relation to the history of the Section 106 Agreement, open space, contamination, landscaping, trees and noise impact on the flats.

In response to comments made by the speakers, the case officer responded in relation to the history of the Section 106 Agreement, open space, contamination, landscaping, trees and noise impact on the residents of the flats. She added that it was a retail use primarily and condition 17 restricted that use to ensure that it was a community use to come forward and the residential units had been conditioned to be used with the retail units.

In response to comments made by Councillor Long, the case officer advised that the Conservation Officer would have a strong view on the application, and materials would be considered, as it was adjacent to the conservation area. Until housing came forward at the front of the site, it would still be visible in the Conservation Area. As part of Stoke Ferry Neighbourhood Plan, they had produced a design code document which talked about materials so that would also be taken into account at the reserved matters stage.

The case officer advised that under policy CS10 employment uses were acceptable outside the development boundary but adjacent to it so as a shop it was not contrary to the development plan.

Councillor Rust referred to page 29 of the officer's report and stated that her concern related to that by granting outline planning permission for retail with flats above this could turn into residential and no demand or business case had been put forward to demonstrate the need for the commercial units.

The case officer advised that the conditions restricted the units to commercial use.

The Planning Control Manager advised that there was not a requirement for the demonstration of need, and the applicant could apply for a change of use but that would be dealt with at the time.

It was advised that this was not an allocated site but adjacent to one.

Several Members of the Committee expressed concern that the application was outside the development boundary and there was no demand in Stoke Ferry for retail units.

It was advised that Stoke Ferry did have a neighbourhood plan and that had been taken into account when assessing the application.

Members of the Committee also expressed concern that the wider application site had extant planning consent for the construction of 13 social houses including the provision of a new village hall and 30 parking spaces. The affordable housing had been built but it was not the intention of the developer to deliver the village hall and they felt that the village of Stoke Ferry had been let down.

The Planning Control Manager reminded the Committee that the application was considered to be overall policy compliant, and they had to consider the application on its own merits.

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 lost (3 votes for, 10 votes against and 1 abstention).

As the vote for approval was lost, Councillor Rust proposed that the application be refused, seconded by Councillor Ryves on the grounds that the application was outside the development boundary contrary to Policy DM2 and SF9 of the Stoke Ferry Neighbourhood Plan. In addition, the contravention of development plan policies outweighed the benefit of the proposed community facilities.

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 (12 votes for, 1 vote against and 1 abstention).

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

The application site lies outside of the development boundary for the village of Stoke Ferry. There is insufficient justification provided for developing outside of the development boundary and this is contrary to policy DM2 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (SADMPP 2016), policy CS06 of the Core Strategy (CS 2011) and policy SF9 of the Stoke Ferry Neighbourhood Plan. The proposal would result in a level of harm which would outweigh the benefits of the new facilities.

The Committee adjourned at 10.45 am for a comfort break and reconvened at 11.02 am

- (ii) **23/01475/FM**
Stoke Ferry: Land between Bramcote House and Village Hall, Lynn Road: Full application for the erection of 29 no. dwellings, village hall car park and associated infrastructure: Freebridge Community Housing

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

Councillor Lintern left the meeting and addressed the Committee in accordance with Standing Order 34. She took no part in the debate or vote.

The case officer presented the report and explained that the application site was situated centrally within the village of Stoke Ferry to the south of Indigo Road residential development and to the north of Lynn Road and the 2Agriculture feed mill, adjacent to Stoke Ferry Village Hall. The southern and western boundaries abutted the development boundary, with the southern boundary adjacent to the Stoke Ferry Conservation Area and opposite a row of Grade II Listed Buildings. Access would be via a single point off Lynn Road.

Stoke Ferry was categorised as a Key Rural Service Centre in the adopted Local Plan. The application site included an allocation within the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan. Policy G88.3 Land at Indigo Road / Lynn Road amounted to 0.5 hectares, was identified on the Policies Map G.88 and was allocated for residential development of at least 12 dwellings. The rest of the site was within Stoke Ferry development boundary. The site area was 1.17ha in total.

The application sought planning consent for the development of 29 dwellings and associated infrastructure, and the provision of a village hall car park for 23 spaces. All 29 dwellings would be affordable housing units. A Section 106 agreement was necessary to secure the GIRAMS payment, the phasing and delivery of the village hall car park, the financial contribution for open space equipment and the affordable housing units required by policy CS09.

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

The case officer drew the Committee's attention to the late correspondence and the need to amend the conditions, which had been refined to enable the development to start sooner. There was also a correction with regards to the NPPF.

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, Trudy Mann (supporting on behalf of the Parish Council), Helen Morris (supporting), and Laura Handforth (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor S Lintern addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The case officer referred to condition 3 and the amendments suggested by the agent, which had been agreed by Norfolk County Council to read:

No works shall commence on the adoptable roads, footways and their respective foul and surface water drainage until such time as the details plans for these elements of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All construction works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Several Members of the Committee considered that there should be a local connection criteria added to the conditions and the inclusion of double yellow lines.

The Assistant Director explained why a local connection criteria condition could not be imposed. He advised that specific mention needed to be made within the Neighbourhood Plan. He added that 29 dwellings were being provided by Freebridge Community Housing so the chances were that some of them would be for local people.

The case officer explained that the issue of providing double yellow lines would be a matter for the Local Highway Authority.

The case officer also explained the drainage arrangements and that a drainage strategy had been conditioned.

Councillor Ryves referred to overshadowing of All Saints Lodge. He also asked whether discussions had taken place regarding the road through the site. The case officer responded that the Local Highway Authority had no objections to the proposal and the Committee needed to consider what had been proposed.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application, together with the amended conditions as detailed in late correspondence and amended condition 3 (as outlined in the debate), and after having been put to the vote was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the application be:

(A) APPROVED, subject to conditions (including the amended conditions in late correspondence and amended condition 3) and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure affordable housing, GIRAMS payment, open space contribution and delivery of the car park within four months of the date of this resolution to approve.

(B) REFUSED, in the event that the Section 106 Agreement to secure affordable housing, GIRAMS payment, open space contribution and delivery of the car park is not agreed within four months of the date of this resolution to approve.

- (iii) **23/00681/F**
Heacham: Porcherie, 4A Hall Close: Proposed 3-bedroom bungalow: Mr Williams

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

The case officer presented the report and explained that the application site was located to the north-west of Hall Close, Heacham and comprised curtilage land historically associated with No.4 Hall Close to the north.

Full planning permission was sought for the construction of a three-bedroom bungalow.

The site was located within the development boundary of Heacham, which was classified as a Key Rural Service Centre within the Core Strategy's Settlement Hierarchy.

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, Mr Jordan Cribb (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

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 unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, as recommended.

- (iv) **23/00940/F**
Outwell: 1 Liege Cottages, Basin Road: Retrospective Change of use of dwellinghouse to a mixed use of dwellinghouse to a mixed use as a dwellinghouse and for the keeping and breeding of up to 16 dogs together with the retention of kennel buildings, a cat building and open runs and a proposed field shelter: Mr & Mrs Jones

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

The Planning Control Manager presented the report and explained that the application site was located on the south side of Basin Road to the rear of the donor dwelling 1 Liege Cottages. While the semi-detached main dwelling was within the built-up extent of Outwell and within the development boundary, the application site was located outside the development boundary and was therefore classed as countryside. The

proposal was retrospective for the change of use of part of the residential garden to Sui Generis use for commercial breeding and selling of puppies together with ancillary development and uses. The proposal involved erection of a kennel building and runs, a cat building, and field shelter. The business currently had a breeding licence for up to 16 adult dogs and a maximum of 3 litters per year. The application arose as a result of an enforcement investigation.

The Planning Control Manager advised the Committee that there were late representations in relation to the application.

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

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 W Smith (objecting) and Paul Sharman (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

In response to comments made by the public speakers, the Planning Control Manager advised that the objector's comments had been addressed within the report. There had been no objection to the application on ecology grounds and the comments raised by CSNN had been conditioned.

Councillor Crofts stated that he felt that the application was unacceptable development to the detriment of the peace and tranquillity of local residents.

Councillor Ryves questioned whether Councillor Crofts had an open mind, as he had read out a statement.

Councillor Crofts confirmed that he had an open mind and had listened to the applicant's agent before speaking.

Councillor Mrs Spikings stated that she knew the area well and had an open mind in relation to the application. She referred to the opening hours of 8am – 8pm. She added that she understood the neighbour's concerns and felt that a business of this nature was in the wrong location. She queried the number of dogs and puppies that were allowed to be on the site.

The Planning Control Manager stated that further clarification was required on that issue and proposed that the application be deferred until after lunch, which was agreed by the Committee.

The Committee then adjourned at 12.44 pm and reconvened at 1.30 pm.

Upon reconvening, the Planning Control Manager advised that there was a typographical error on page 93 and should state that the business generates some 20 visitors per quarter and not puppies. The applicant stated that since May 2023 there had been 18 puppies in total, 6 per quarter and people visited the site when they collected their puppy.

Councillor Mrs Spikings asked for further clarification as the report stated 3 litters per year. The Planning Control Manager advised that this was in relation to the constraints of the licence.

The Planning Control Manager added that further clarification could be sought from the applicant in relation to the proposal.

The Assistant Director suggested that with the additional information presented, the application be deferred for one cycle for further clarification. He further added that he had checked with CSNN and there had been no noise complaints to date so if the application was to be deferred the report could be updated and clarified.

The deferral was proposed by Councillor Long and seconded by Councillor Rose and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: That the application be deferred for further clarification.

- (v) **23/01693/F**
Southery: Blackburn Drove, Ringmore Road: Proposed erection of cottage and barn / carport: Mr & Mrs Javey & Annette Osler

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

The case officer presented the report and explained that the application sought planning consent for the proposed erection of cottage and barn/carport with rear garden including the creation of ponds on Blackburn Drove, off Ringmore Road in the village of Southery. The site was 0.70 ha in size. The application site currently consisted of a derelict structure (formerly a dwelling) and a barn structure in poor condition with agricultural land to the rear. The existing dwelling structure was considered abandoned in line with paragraph 80 of the NPPF.

Southery was classified as a Rural Village in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2016), and as such the village had a development boundary. The application site was approximately 500 m to the north-east of the development boundary on land categorised as open countryside.

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

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 Tim Slater (supporting) addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

The Democratic Services Officer read out a statement in support of the application from Councillor Lawrence (Ward Member) who was unable to attend the meeting.

In response to comments raised by the public speaker, the case officer explained that the agent and officers disagreed with the interpretation of the NPPF and in officer's view the house had been abandoned and therefore did not retain its purpose as a dwelling, therefore it was an abandoned site in the countryside. In terms of improving the setting, the landscape was attractive it was in agriculture use, or had been historically, and so by planting trees and adding ponds and making it more domestic was not a reason to grant permission for the scheme. It was agricultural land within an open countryside setting.

The Planning Control Manager added that in terms of the word isolated it was not isolated in the terms of the NPPF. In terms of the appearance of the abandoned building, there was no premium on neglect.

Councillor Long added that there was a balance to be made as in some point in history there had been a dwelling there. He added that the Committee regularly had barn conversions in the same state as the existing structure and policy allowed for them to be converted.

The case officer advised that prior to this application there had been a scheme for redevelopment but that had been withdrawn because similar discussions had been held that the building was abandoned and would be a new dwelling in the countryside, contrary to policy. It was also important to note the extent of the domestic site and encroachment into the countryside.

Councillor Long stated that the Committee had to consider the application as presented to them which included a field as a large garden curtilage. He added that if there was a more modest size garden which did not encroach into the countryside as much then that might be more favourable.

In response to queries from Councillor Mrs Spikings, the case officer advised that none of the existing structure was going to be used in the new building. The case officer also advised that the adjacent barn could not be converted under Part Q.

Councillor Mrs Spikings added that she had sympathy for the application, as it could be a new part of the housing stock and there had been a dwelling there in the past. The application would be an

improvement and in terms of the garden area this did offer biodiversity and she would rather see the pond than the land. She added that this would provide housing for a family.

Councillor Ryves referred to paragraph 84 of the NPPF and he could not see how the building was being reused. In relation to paragraph 84 (e) this did allow for a building of exceptional quality.

The Assistant Director advised that 84(e) related to a truly exceptional housing whereas this was a new house in the countryside. He also had concerns in relation to changing the use of the field into a garden. He considered that this was a straightforward policy objection.

Councillor Devulapalli asked if the applicant was a rural worker, and it was explained that no evidence had been put forward to demonstrate this.

Councillor Devulapalli also asked to see the location of the site in relation to the rest of the village. The Planning Control Manager displayed Google earth but advised that on page 98 of the agenda this showed the site, and the village was to the east of the village.

Councillor Devulapalli stated that although it was outside the development boundary it was not too far outside. She considered that the proposal would enhance the village, and there had been letters of support for the application.

The case officer reiterated that this was a new dwelling in the countryside outside the development boundary.

Councillor Rust added that she could understand why the applicant wanted to seek to make use of an abandoned structure and want to reuse it, but there were often abandoned structures in the countryside. It was not meeting the Borough's Housing Need and was not providing affordable housing for local people as it was only one dwelling. She added that the Council had development boundaries for a reason to preserve the countryside.

Councillor Storey stated that no mention had been made to the dwelling next to it. He considered that the proposal would enhance the area. He referred to the comments of the Parish Council who supported the application. He explained that there was a small parcel of land which was probably not workable with the size of machinery that was used on farms at the moment. He considered that the design that had been proposed would fit into the area. The fact that there was a dwelling next to it, it would create a small hamlet and would enhance the area. He therefore proposed that the application be approved.

The Assistant Director advised that the issue was about upholding the development plan and its policies. He added that he could not see any material considerations to justify going against policy. If the application

were to be refused, then the applicant could appeal the decision. He added that there was no premium on neglect and there were plenty of buildings like that in the countryside. He reminded the Committee that they had refused an earlier application on the grounds it was outside the development boundary, and that was almost adjacent to the development boundary.

Councillor Ryves stated that the policies were to protect the countryside and the Council had policies for a reason and they should be supported by the Committee.

Councillor Long asked whether a Section 215 Notice could be served to tidy up the site. The Assistant Director advised that this could have been done.

Councillor Long added that the Council either had to tidy-up these areas or let people tidy them up themselves and he could see where Councillor Storey was coming from. He referred to other numerous sites in the Borough which had abandoned dwellings on them, but the Council did not serve notices on them to tidy them up.

The Assistant Director asked if each one justified a new house in the countryside? He explained that the Council did serve numerous Section 215 Notices, more than the other neighbouring authorities. He stated that it did not justify a new house in the countryside.

Councillor Ryves added that derelict structures were part of the countryside and part of the general attraction.

The Chair drew the Committee's attention to the proposal to approve the application, proposed by Councillor Storey on the grounds that the proposal would enhance the form and character of the area and the additional dwelling would be added to the housing stock. The proposal to approve the application was seconded by Councillor Spikings.

The Democratic Services Officer carried out a roll call on the recommendation to approve the application subject to conditions to be agreed with the Chair and Vice-Chair, and, after having been put to the vote was carried (8 votes for and 7 votes against and 1 abstention).

RESOLVED: That the application be approved contrary to recommendation, subject to conditions to be agreed with the Chair and Vice-Chair for the following reasons:

The proposal would enhance the form and character of the area and the additional dwelling would be added to the housing stock.

- (vi) **23/02010/F**
Upwell: Long Beach Farm, Thurlands Drove: Conversion of agricultural building to 2 x residential dwellings to

include proposed works to adjacent building for conversion into a garage: Long Beach Farm Ltd

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

The case officer presented the report and explained that this was a cross-boundary application with an identical application ref: F/YR23/0937/F being processed with Fenland District Council. It was explained that the report contained two elements: A) procedural issue regarding application ref: 22/01756/FM in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972 and B) response to consultation sought by Fenland District Council in relation to application ref: F/YR23/0937/F.

The land was approximately 0.59 ha and comprised an agricultural building within a site known as Long Beach Farm. The county boundary between Cambridgeshire and Norfolk cut across half of the proposed access / driveway from Thurland's Drove. Therefore approximately 0.08h of the overall site area was within King's Lynn and West Norfolk.

The application was for the conversion of agricultural buildings to two residential dwellings and to convert an adjacent building into a garage to serve the proposed dwellings.

The application had been referred to the Committee – devolve authority to Fenland District Council.

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

RESOLVED:

(A) That the Committee devolves its decision-making authority to Fenland District Council in respect of the cross-boundary application.

(B) If (A) is accepted, it is also recommended that the comments raised by statutory consultees, interested parties, plus any additional views of the Planning Committee, are forwarded to Fenland District Council for them to take into account in the decision-making process. This will also constitute the response to consultation sought by Fenland District Council in relation to application ref: F/YR23/0937/F and under application ref: 23/02063/CON.

(vii) **22/01857/F**
West Acre: Ford Cottage, Low Road: The Stag Inn – Alterations and extension to pub, change of use to bedrooms for short-term letting. Enlarge the car park. Ford Cottage – Change of use from dwelling house to short-term let bedrooms including extension and alterations, car park and associated landscape work: Alec Birkbeck

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

The case officer presented the report and explained that the application site related to the combined plots of The Stag, an existing pub, and Ford Cottage, an existing and currently vacant dwelling, as well as its associated plot and currently empty workshop building located on Low Road within the rural village of West Acre. The character of the area was rural in nature and was located within a sensitive locality.

The application sought full planning permission for the refurbishment and extension of The Stag, on Low Road, West Acre, which would see the provision of short term let rooms at first floor alongside works including to extend the car park and provision of cycle parking.

To Ford Cottage, immediately opposite The Stag, the application proposed the refurbishment and extension of the property to provide short term holiday let uses at first floor alongside a breakfast room, kitchen and snug alongside further toilets at ground floor. Extensive landscaping was proposed to the Ford Cottage Garden including a new car parking and cycle parking provision, areas of planting and paving.

The application site was adjacent to the River Nar Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) within the locality as well the Scheduled Ancient Monument (the precinct of the medieval West Acre Priory) to the south.

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

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

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Beales addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

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 unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, as recommended.

PC104: **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee received schedules relating to the above.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

PC105: **TREE UPDATE REPORT**

The Committee received the Tree update report.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

The meeting closed at 2.34 pm