



GREAT YARMOUTH
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Development Control Committee

Minutes

Wednesday, 19 May 2021 at 17:00

PRESENT:-

Councillor Annison (in the Chair), Councillors Bird, Fairhead, Flaxman-Taylor, Freeman, P Hammond, Lawn, Mogford, Myers, Wainwright, Williamson, A Wright & B Wright.

Ms C Whatling (Monitoring Officer), Mr D Glason (Director of Planning & Growth), Mr D Minns (Planning Manager), Mr C Green (Senior Planning Officer), Mr G Bolan (Planning Officer), Mr R Parkinson (Development Control Manager), Miss J Smith (Planning Technician), Mrs S Wintle (Corporate Services Manager) & Mrs C Webb (Executive Services Officer).

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence reported at the meeting.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Flaxman-Taylor declared a personal interest in item 6 as several of her family members had signed an on-line petition in regard to the application.

Councillor Freeman declared a personal interest in item 8 and would only speak as the Ward Councillor on the item and would not vote.

Councillor Annison declared a personal interest in item 9, as the application was from an existing Councillor who was a close friend.

However, in accordance with the Council's Constitution, they were allowed to both speak and vote on the matter if they so wished.

3 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 31 March 2021 were confirmed.

4 APPLICATION 06-20-0566-F - LAND NORTH OF CRAB LANE. GORLESTON

The Committee received and considered the report from the Senior Planning Officer.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that this proposal was presented to Members because the site was owned by the Borough Council and the Council was also the applicant. The proposed affordable modular housing was being promoted by the Council but would be built by and operated in partnership with a local affordable housing Registered Provider, Broadland Housing Association.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that statutory consultation took place on 26 November 2020 and again following revisions to design on 25 March 2021 with residents and ward councillors. The revisions were considered to be of a minor and localised nature to which only the immediate neighbours were reasonably expected to express any different opinion to that originally expressed.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that Members of the Development

Control Committee considered this application on 31st March 2021 and resolved to undertake a site visit to gain a contextual understanding of the site and issues raised. This report was an updated version of the report considered and minuted on 31 March 2021. It had been changed in format and appearance but had incorporated all representations and officer responses to date, and should ensure the application could be considered afresh.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that a fact-finding site visit meeting of the Planning Committee was held on 15th April 2021. Since the last DC Committee, the applicant had provided further information with regard to details of lighting bollard positions, electric vehicle charging points, bird box locations, and Secured by Design proposals. The aim of this was to reduce the likelihood of needing planning conditions of a nature that required further information before commencement and where consultation to specialist consultees had been carried out. None of these matters were considered to require public consultation, in the same way as discharge of condition applications were not publicly consulted. In addition, information relating to the thermal and acoustic performance of the modular design were provided direct to the Environmental Health team for comment.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the site was situated within the Gorleston Development boundary and with good access to shops, and other facilities. This site is of 0.294 hectares and was orientated east – west parallel to Crab Lane. The site formed part of a wider broad grassed strip retained alongside Crab Lane, perhaps in the past it was intended for road widening. There was no footway to the highway edge, instead there was a footpath along Crab Lane and set inwards and north from the highway along the gable flank walls of the existing two storey terraced housing. Density would represent 30 dwellings to the hectare.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the grass strip was devoid of planting and despite forming a prominent part of the urban street-scene environment, it was not formally designated in the Local Plan or Core Strategy as any form of Open Amenity Space. The surroundings included 3 storey, flat-roofed flat development on Laburnum Road opposite to the south for much of the frontage, and, to the eastern end part of the well-planted cemetery opposite, which has Open Amenity Space status.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that Crab Lane was a C class road. It was a principal route from Bradwell to Gorleston, although an alternative route via the link between the A47 and A143 had recently opened to the south. It was on bus route 6, Great Yarmouth to Bradwell with an hourly service and service 6B, Gorleston to Bradwell, twice a day.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that this was a full application for the erection of ten one bedroom self-contained modular flats, in two groups of four on two storeys around a central stair (plot 3 to 6 and 7 to 11) and one group of

two in two storeys (plot 1 and 2) with the stair at one end. The block of 4 flats (Plots 3 – 6) and their parking are proposed on the west of Forsythia Road, and a block of 4 flats (Plots 7 – 10) are proposed on the east of Forsythia Road.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that parking was shown between plots 1-2 and 3-6 in a court for 8 vehicles and to the east of plots 7-10 for another ten vehicles. The revised scheme submitted in March features a steeper better proportioned roof pitch and a lower roof to the stair access, helping to break up the roof line of the four-unit blocks. Each dwelling's size is 50m square, compliant with the national guidance on standards for a one bedroom two-person home (50 sq m).

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the proposal scheme was set a footway width from the Crab Lane highway and north of it, to provide a 1.2m width path along Crab Lane in front of the dwellings. This leaves approximately half of the existing grass strip to the north of the proposed dwellings in situ and introduces some hedging and planting into the grassed area. The reason for the layout is derived from the presence of underground services within the grass strip. At the closest the highway is 1.9m from the buildings and at the furthest 2.8m. The slightly tapered relationship ensures vision splays. The applicant has indicated that vehicle noise will be reduced within the properties by control of air paths and other technical means.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that accompanying the proposal were the following documents:

- Planning Application Forms and Certificates of Ownership;
- Application drawings as detailed on the Drawing Register;
- Design and Access Statement;
- Planning Statement (including Statement of Community Involvement);
- Preliminary Risk Assessment (Contamination) (and subsequent phase 2 testing and mitigation recommendations)
- UXO Report;
- Topographical Survey;
- Ecology Report; and
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment

The development is too small to require either a Transport Statement, Air Quality Assessment, or a Noise Impact Assessment, and it is considered unnecessary to delay determination of the application to obtain these.

The Senior Planning officer reported that it was true that the spacious character of Crab Lane will change through development within the locally valued greenspace. Furthermore, it is noted that the NPPF and development plan policies seek designs to be reflective of local character, yet this proposal would erode a significant component of the local character of the area. However, the open space feature is not a formally designated area in planning policy so is not expected to be preserved as a matter of course, although its

loss is resisted by Policy CS15(a). Whilst the impact on the open space will be significant, and to some will be sorely missed as a recreational resource and area of local character, the need for its protection must be weighed in the planning balance.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that irreversible development of large areas of characteristic greenspace is regrettable and generally resisted by adopted policy, but must be weighed against the severity of the housing shortage for those in need of 1-bedroom properties which is the most acute need in the Borough. Given the timely positive provision of affordable housing that this application represents, it is considered to outweigh the impacts on greenspace, in this occasion. The Green Mile also provides a valued informal recreation area for walking dogs and children's play, although there are others in the vicinity and this site is not ideal for play use, given the road. It should also be noted that the provision of another footway along the roadside will act to improve walking opportunity and considerable retained elements of the current green strip will remain, both to the north of the buildings proposed and to the east so the opportunity for recreation is not completely removed.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that Members will be keenly aware of the strength of feeling towards the loss of greenspace. For this reason, Officers wish to make clear that this recommendation is finely balanced whereby the site's use for all 10 affordable homes is the overriding factor behind making a recommendation of approval. A number of concerns are raised in respect of the localised highways impacts and perceived detriment to highways safety. To some, this includes exacerbating a perceived shortage of existing car park provision for local residents. Whether this is an accurate concern or not, it should be noted that this scheme does deliver slightly more parking than is strictly needed to address the published parking standards.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that on this occasion, the delivery of ten affordable homes is considered in planning terms to carry greater weight than the slightly additional potential traffic generation set against the benefit of surplus parking facilities. By virtue of its modular construction and the relatively unconstrained nature of the site, this scheme will very rapidly deliver a significant contribution to smaller housing accommodation where there is a significant shortfall in the overall housing stock, so is tailored to specific needs.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that notwithstanding the applicant being the Borough Council, and the site being owned by the Borough Council, it is recommended that the permission be subject to a legal agreement or other appropriate mechanism to require all homes to be used only for affordable housing. If this were not the case, Officer's would need to reappraise the exercise of planning balance.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that in conclusion, the site offers a contribution to the specific 1-bedroom affordable housing supply and is well

located in relation to access to services and transport links, and in some respects reflects and fits in with the wider pattern of the settlement. Whilst loss of a valued space of local character and recreation value is unfortunate, there are no departures from policy and no overriding material considerations to suggest that the development cannot address its impacts. It is considered that the public benefits of providing 10 1-bed dwellings to be provided as affordable housing will outweigh the relatively low levels of impacts on amenity and highways networks functions. Subject to being secured as affordable housing, the development will deliver an all affordable housing scheme of 10 dwellings which provides considerable material benefit and weight when considering the overall planning balance.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was recommended for approval, subject to:-

- completion of legal agreement or appropriate alternative mechanism to secure all 10 dwellings as affordable housing
 - the payment for Habitat Regulations mitigation (£1100)
 - undertaking a stopping-up order process and section 278 TRO funding and subject to conditions for:
 - Timing
 - Compliance with approved plans
 - Passive EV provision
 - Highway conditions for availability of onsite parking before occupation, vision splay formation and including that the TRO to be in progress at the time of occupation (note the funding of the agreement has been agreed)
 - Provision of suitable 'secured by design' or alternative features, in discussion with the police as consultee
 - Unexpected contamination during construction
 - Hours of construction and noise controls
 - Ecology: The works should be carried out in accordance with the Landscape Management plan and landscape plans submitted.
 - Noise protection measures and ventilation and extraction (if required)
 - Car Park Management Plan, including trial programme of allocation and identification
 - Tree works as per AIA and AMS
- Informative notes to include (but not be exclusive to):
- Noise mitigation suggestions
 - Timing of works expectations
 - Air quality during construction and any other conditions or notes considered appropriate by the Planning Manager.

Councillor Williamson asked for clarification regarding paragraph 6.22 of the report and the definition of the open space referred to.

Councillor Hammond was concerned that the front doors of the proposed properties would open outwards directly onto Crab Lane.

Mr Chris Stammers, applicant's agent, addressed the committee and reported

the salient areas of the application and asked that the Committee approve the application for these much needed one bedroom homes in the Borough.

Councillor Bird asked whether the fences would remain between the front doors of the properties and the highway as improved safety measures given the proximity to the road.

Councillor Williamson questioned the agent's supposition that as homes were normally built this close to roads in villages, it was acceptable that these properties could be built 1.9m away from a main feeder road from Belton/Bradwell into the centre of Gorleston.

Councillor Price, Ward Councillor, spoke on behalf of his constituents who opposed the application as it would result in the loss of valuable, green amenity space in the area and would cause untold additional highway problems. The application was over-development in the wrong area and he urged the Committee to refuse the application.

Councillor Wainwright agreed with Councillor Price that the application site was in the wrong place and he proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Myers was not happy with the application as the properties were too close to a major road and he had concerns regarding the resulting pollution.

Councillor Hammond reported that he could not support the application as the properties were to be built too close to a major road, as did Councillors Williamson and Mogford.

The Planning Manager reported that if the Committee was minded to refuse the application, they could cite Policy CS9, encouraging well-designed, distinctive places, but he would rather the Committee defer the application to allow the Council to withdraw the application. Councillor Myers proposed that the application be deferred to allow the Council to withdraw the application and this was seconded by Councillor Flaxman-Taylor.

Councillor Wainwright asked for an assurance from the Planning Manager that the Council would indeed, withdraw the application first thing tomorrow morning.

The Monitoring Officer reported that it was possible to refuse the application, the Planning Manager was purely suggesting a way forward but it was up to members to decide.

Councillor Wainwright once again proposed that the application be refused and this time, Councillor Hammond seconded the proposal.

RESOLVED:

That application 06-20-0566-F be refused as it was contrary to Policy CS9, Encouraging well-designed, distinctive places.

5 APPLICATION 06-20-0568-F - GREAT NORTHERN CLOSE, GREAT YARMOUTH

The Committee received and considered the report from the Senior Planning Officer.

This proposal was presented to Members because the site is owned by the Borough Council and the Council is also the applicant. The proposed affordable modular housing is being promoted by the Council but would be built by and operated in partnership with a local affordable housing Registered Provider, Broadland Housing Association.

The choice of the modular housing sites has been predicated by the need for rapid delivery of smaller homes to meet need, requiring the utilisation of land within the Borough Council's existing estate. The plans have been revised during the application process following discussions with Officers at the Borough, including Design and Conservation Officers, and a re-consultation has been conducted and concluded. A fact-finding site visit meeting of the DC Committee was held on 15th April 2021.

The proposal is on land currently forming a parking court associated with other blocks of flats in this area of Great Northern Close. The application site lies to the rear (east) of terraced houses at 115-116 North Denes Road, and north of the existing blocks of flats in Great Northern Close. To the north of this application site is open playing fields associated with the

Charter Academy, formerly the High School, is separated from the site by a chain-link mesh fence. Immediately adjacent to this site, to the east, is a recreation ground (Beaconsfield Recreation Road) also used for sports facilities in conjunction with the school and by other users. There is a gate in the brick wall between the recreation ground and the existing and proposed flats. The land intrudes into flood zone two, though the land levels all around this

site appear very close to level and land to the north and south is shown as being in zone one. It is situated within the town's development boundary and with good access to shops, and other facilities. The site area is of 0.11 hectares (density 70 dwellings per hectare). The flats now occupying the land date to the late 1960s following closure of the railway. These flats are owned by the Borough Council.

Within the existing portion of the development known as Great Northern Close there are 60 flats. Within the whole of Great Northern Close, to provide for the 60 existing flats there are presently 71 spaces. There are 36 further flats to the south of those, forming Midland Close, which have their own parking provision. There are eleven houses fronting North Denes Road with rear gardens abutting Great Northern Close, where the road has enough

length for

12 on street parking places. There are two parking areas in this vicinity serving the existing flats, one closer to the flats which appears well used, and the larger parking area that serves as this application site immediately to the south of the playing field which appears less well used, but has capacity for up to 44 vehicles (60m x 17m approx).

Should this proposal be approved, the application site is still intended to serve as a car park for the surrounding area. The number of spaces as proposed for general use would be 27 spaces, in addition to providing 7 spaces open to all residents within the site of the 8 flats shown. This gives a total of 34 spaces for 68 flats across the Great Northern Close residential area. There are various other local parking sites in the vicinity as set out in section 6 of this

report. The land features some small ornamental trees planted as landscaping when

the housing was built. There is a row of trees on the recreation ground, to the east, close to the boundary wall. The character of the area is relatively open to the north and east with large recreation spaces, with terraced development to the west fronting North Denes Road. To the west side of North Denes Road close to this site is the Estcourt Road application site for 30 dwellings (Application Reference 06/21/0618/F). These are two number x four-bedroom (7 person), three number x three-bedroom (five person), seven number x three-bedroom (six person), fourteen number x two-bedroom (four person) and four number one-bedroom flats. Fifty-six car parking spaces are provided giving each house two spaces and each flat one space. This is in accordance with Norfolk County Council parking guidelines.

This is a full application for the erection of eight one-bedroom self-contained modular flats, in two buildings of two storeys. This comprises a group with four flats around a common stair in an L shape at the west of the site and a group of four flats in an H shape around a common stair. This creates a courtyard. Parking is shown for the flats created in a small parking area to the west side with capacity for seven vehicles and bin storage. Over the whole site therefore this represents a loss of 37 parking spaces. Unit size is 50m square, compliant with the national standard for a one bedroom two-person home (also 50 sq m).

Accompanying the proposal are the following documents:

- Planning Application Forms and Certificates of Ownership;
- Application drawings as detailed on the Drawing Register;
- Design and Access Statement;
- Planning Statement (including Statement of Community Involvement);
- Preliminary Risk Assessment (Contamination);
- UXO Report;
- Topographical Survey;

- Ecology Report; and
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment.
- Sequential test for flood risk

The development is too small to require a Transport Statement.

There is no relevant planning history. Various applications for satellite dishes on the existing flats dating to the mid-1990s.

Consultations:-

All consultation responses received are available online or at the Town Hall during opening hours. The ward councillor has objected, raising the following concerns: • Impact on parking for the current residents and properties nearby. County Highways have objected that there are insufficient spaces for new residents. When Beaconsfield Park is being used parking needs increase.

- The proposed housing development on Estcourt Road might not provide enough parking, adding to the local parking pressures.
- Site notice was removed and no replacement provided.
- Covid restrictions make engagement with residents difficult. More time is required notwithstanding the pre-application consultations made by the developer.

Neighbours and residents have objected, on the following summarised points:

- Notification has been poor as the site notice was removed the next day.
- The council have underestimated the displacement of parking facility at 22 vehicles. There are 60 flats in the estate.
- The surveys carried out during covid are not representative.
- The car park is used by residents, council contractors doing repairs and grounds maintenance, paramedics, home delivery drivers and sports teams using the Beaconsfield recreation ground.
- The emergency services struggle to negotiate the on-road parking in the Close.
- Registered disabled drivers struggle to find accessible parking spaces.
- Carers and people with children often cannot find space to park.
- Delivery drivers will find it difficult to park especially during covid.
- There are restrictions on the North Denes Road.
- There are no details for electric car charging points or consideration of what the end of petrol cars will mean.
- As the new tenants will have designated parking spaces there will be resentment from existing tenants will have no allocated provision.
- There are no disabled spaces and five are required on the whole site.
- By 7pm all spaces are occupied.
- The poor condition of the existing car park limits its use.
- The area is used for drug dealing and is poorly lit and the lights not maintained.
- The proposal creates a good place for drug dealing.
- This will lead with other schemes to overdevelopment of the area.
- The ward councillor further objects that asbestos has been found rendering development unsafe and restating previously expressed concerns regarding parking.

Norfolk County Council – Local Highways Authority – No objection. The amended plans show a technical shortfall of one space, however, in an email dated 18.3.21, the Highway officer agrees that if spaces are not hypothecated to this scheme then that is not objectionable, subject to a condition requiring that prior to the first occupation of the development the proposed access, on-site car and cycle parking and turning area shall be laid out in full, to ensure the availability of this space.
Historic Environment Service – No objection, nor recommendation for archaeological conditions.

Lead Local Flood Authority: No comments. This is a minor development below LLFA threshold for comment.

Norfolk Fire and Rescue. No objection and standard comments regarding provision for firefighting to accord with the Building Regulations.

Norfolk Police: CCTV is required to maximise surveillance at access points. The footpath is close to an area known for anti-social behaviour and should be gated with access for occupants only. Ideally the entire site will be fenced to 1.8m height. Access to the stairs should be by electronic key. Bin stores should be gated and key fob access to prevent arson. Good lighting combined with CCTV is recommended. Robust, secure lit cycle storage is required. 'Private residents only' signage needed. Access control to parking might be required. Note, a submission was received 6 May 2021 providing a revised 'Secured by Design' scheme and this has been sent to the police for further comment.

Environmental Health – (contaminated land, noise, air quality) No objections: A condition is required for contaminated land matters to be mitigated on site and validated before construction proceeds further, as the phase 1 and 2 studies showed some asbestos particles in one location. Construction work period should be restricted to protect adjacent residents and maintain air quality during construction works.

Building Control – Were critical of the originally submitted design showing open balcony access, but the revised scheme addresses the issue and allows firefighting hoses access within the prescribed 45m distance.

Anglian Water - Below threshold for comment.

The applicant has submitted a bespoke Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA).

As this site is at increased risk of flooding (zone 2) it is the duty of the Council to consider other sites when determining the application, in the form of a sequential test for flood risk. Officers have considered other available land in the Yarmouth urban area. The application has come forward due to the delivery support available from the Government's funding of housing schemes that can be delivered quickly in response to the Covid-19 Pandemic. As such, there are timescale constraints relating to the development being achieved pursuant to this application, so it has been considered necessary to only consider alternative sites of lesser flood risk on land owned by the Council, because that is available and "deliverable" (in terms of the NPPF definition) in the timescales required to enable this development to proceed. In effect, the need to achieve rapid delivery defines the criteria for testing the

availability of other land in lower flood risk, and largely rules other sites out unless in the Council's ownership.

Members will note that there are two alternative sites available for modular housing construction that fall within the Council's ownership: one with planning permission resolved to be granted at the Beach Coach Station, Yarmouth, and one recommended for approval at Crab Lane, Gorleston, at this same meeting of the DC Committee. It cannot be said that this is the only site available for delivery of a scheme of 8 dwellings within the same timescale, but it can be said that the site is the only one which can provide this scale of development in addition to those two other schemes under consideration. As such, given the pressing importance of delivery of affordable housing in the Borough, it is considered that this is the most appropriate available and deliverable site for 8 homes from a flood risk sequential assessment point of view.

Although the Council owns the land, there has been no consideration given to any possible financial implications linked to the development of the site. A small grant of 'new homes bonus' may arise, should this scheme qualify, but that is not considered a significant material factor in the weighting of this assessment.

The planning balance in this case is heavily weighted towards an approval recommendation for these vitally needed all-affordable form of housing directed at single persons and couples without children, where there is a substantial shortfall of such accommodation and of accommodation of this type that meets good standards of provision. The site offers a contribution to housing supply and is well located in relation to the pattern of the settlement. Against this there will be some impact on existing residents from the reduction in parking provision, however there are alternative sites for parking in the locality, and while these may not always be practical solution for mothers with children, for example, occurrences where there is no space to drop off are considered sufficiently rare so as to be outweighed by the public benefits of the provision of affordable homes.

Other matters such as amenity impact are considered satisfactory and a lot of work has been conducted to remove the need for pre-commencement conditions to expedite the delivery of homes. By virtue of its modular construction and the relatively unconstrained nature of the site, this scheme will very rapidly deliver a significant contribution to smaller housing accommodation where there is a significant shortfall in the overall housing stock, so is tailored to specific needs. Notwithstanding the applicant being the Borough Council, and the site being owned by the Borough Council, it is recommended that any permission be subject to a legal agreement or other appropriate mechanism to require all homes to be used only for affordable housing. If this were not the case, Officer's would need to reappraise the exercise of planning balance.

The application is recommended for approval subject to:

- completion of legal agreement or appropriate alternative mechanism to secure all 8 dwellings as affordable housing
- the payment for Habitat Regulations mitigation (£880) and subject to conditions for:
 - Timing.
 - Compliance with approved plans.
 - Development to be in accordance with the contamination report.
 - Securing parking and cycling spaces to be available before occupation.
 - Passive EV provision and external lighting positions as shown on latest drawings, a pre-occupation condition to agree lighting intensity.
 - Highway conditions.
 - A security condition to reflect the recently received “secured by design” or alternative features, in discussion with the police as consultee.
 - Provision of the agreed Ecology mitigation.
 - Construction to be in accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement.
 - Contamination precautions during development.
 - Hours of construction and noise control.

Councillor Bird asked whether it was intended to provide EVCP as part of the application. The Senior Planning Officer reported that cables would be laid for EVCP points to be sited in the future.

Councillor Hammond asked for clarification regarding the number of parking spaces to be provided. Councillor Williamson agreed that the proposed 34 parking spaces to serve 68 flats was insufficient and was the Council only proposing this number of spaces as the it was the applicant.

Mr Chris Stammer, applicant's agent, reported the salient areas of the application to the Committee and urged them to approve the much needed 1 bedroom accommodation in the Borough.

Councillor Waters-Bunn addressed the Committee as an objector on behalf of her mother and reported that the loss of parking would greatly affect the elderly who relied on multiple care visits a day and mothers with young children. Access to the rear of her mother's property was often blocked due to lack of parking nearby resulting in the missing of hospital appointments. She strongly urged the committee to refuse the application.

Councillor Martin, Ward Councillor, addressed the committee and reported the concerns of local residents to the proposal and the resulting loss of much needed parking in the area and she asked the committee to refuse the application.

Councillor Wainwright acknowledged that this type of housing was much needed in the borough but there were other, better sites for it and not just building it on infill sites and taking away much needed parking spaces for local residents who were already struggling to park.

Councillor Myers asked for clarification regarding paragraph 6.5 on page 39 of the agenda report.

Councillor Williamson reported that the proposal was suggesting half a parking space for 68 properties which was preposterous.

Councillor Hammond suggested there were other much better suited brownfield sites nearby on Estcourt road and Beach Coach Station and in all good consciousness, he could not support this application.

Councillor Wainwright proposed that the application be refused as it was over-development and would result in loss of amenity and car parking for local residents. This was seconded by Councillor Myers.

RESOLVED:-

That application 06-20-0568-F be refused as it was over-development and would result in loss of amenity and parking for local residents.

6 APPLICATION 06-20-0514-F - LYNN GROVE ACADEMY, LYNN GROVE, GORLESTON

The Committee received and considered the report from the Planning Officer.

The Planning Officer reported that the proposed site had current permission for floodlighting to the proposed all-weather pitch which was allowed at appeal (planning reference number 06/05/0582/F). The main reason for the objections to this application is due to the effects the proposal would cause on nearby residential amenities. The proposed lighting scheme provided has accommodated these concerns and the light spill from the floodlights does not extend into the neighbouring properties on the boundary. It is possible that the main concerns from neighbouring properties were raised due to the testing of the LED bulbs in the current set up, before this amended proposal was put forward. That testing process found that the current approved set up could not use the more energy efficient bulbs on the existing 15m poles without causing unacceptable impacts, and the scheme was duly amended into the proposed scheme considered in this application.

The application site provides a much need facility for the school and wider community and already benefits from floodlighting under a different scheme. The proposed scheme is considered to not cause any more harm than what is currently allowed on site and with the introduction of LED bulbs it is a much more energy efficient option than what is currently being used.

The application is therefore considered appropriate for the area and use as required. Whilst all objections have been taken into account, it is noted that the information supplied supporting the application provides proof that

the residential amenities of nearby residents will not be detrimentally affected by the proposal, and the Environmental Health officer has accepted the proposal. Subject to the same conditions around hours of use of the floodlights as already exist, the development as proposed is considered acceptable and is recommended for approval.

Mr Shaun Walker, objector, addressed the Committee and reported his concerns and those of his neighbours regarding the application and urged the committee to refuse the application to protect their amenities and enjoyment of their homes.

Councillor Hammond asked for clarification that the proposed lights would be lower in light and be less lux.

Councillor Wainwright asked for clarification regarding the new legislation which the objector claimed came into operation on the 30/10/2020. The Planning officer reported that the application had been tested against this policy.

Councillor Myers asked for clarification regarding paragraphs 5.4 and 5.6 of the agenda report.

Following the debate, members were minded to approve the application.

RESOLVED:-

That application number 06-20-0514-F be approved, subject to the use of conditions as set out below, the proposal will comply with the aims (c) and (e) of policy CS15 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan: Core Strategy, remaining Borough Wide Local Plan Policy EDC3 and Paragraphs 91 and 92 of the NPPF, and is consistent with the aims set out in emerging policies of the final draft Local Plan Part 2.

Proposed Conditions:

1. Standard time limit.
2. In accordance with approved plans.
3. The floodlights shall not be operated outside the following hours:
09:00 to 21:30 hours on Mondays to Thursdays (except between Christmas Day and New Year's Day as provided below)
09:00 to 21:00 hours on Friday (except between Christmas Day and New Year's Day as provided below)
09:00 to 20:00 hours on Saturdays, Sundays, Bank Holidays and during the period from Christmas Eve to New Year's Day inclusive.
4. No floodlighting or external lighting shall be installed other than in accordance with the SEEKING LED - lighting plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 6th October 2020
5. There shall be no use of the floodlights until they have been reduced to 10m tall poles, and thereafter each lighting column shall be no more than 10 metres high and shall support 2 KW asymmetric floodlights mounted horizontally, with zero degree of tilt. The floodlights shall be retained

in that configuration and shall not be replaced or altered except with prior written

approval of the local planning authority.

6. A 'Use Management Plan' for the lights – to be implemented, brought into use and published to all users prior to first use of this form of lighting.

7. The perimeter gate to the school site adjoining Heron Close shall be locked between the hours of 17:00 hours on any day and 08:00 hours on the following day.

and any other conditions considered appropriate by the Planning Manager.

7 APPLICATION 06-19-0625-F - HALL FARM, HALL ROAD, MAUTBY

The Committee received and considered the report from the Planning Officer.

The Planning Officer reported that this application was previously considered by Development Control Committee on 17 March 2021; at that meeting the Committee voted to defer its determination in order to fully consider a late representation received at 16:59 on 15 March 2021. Members will recall being briefed verbally during the meeting, and requesting a written report and assessment of the issues raised.

This report is an updated version of the report considered on 17 March 2021. It has incorporated all representations and officer responses and should ensure the application can be considered afresh. Members may wish to note that in the intervening period since March, the applicant has been asked to provide additional information to address some of the issues which Officers identified as needing to be subject to proposed planning conditions. Further information has not been forthcoming, and there has been no requirement for additional public consultation and as at 10/05/21 no additional public or consultee comments have been received. Notwithstanding the matters raised on 15th March, the recommendation remains for approval, subject to new / revised conditions proposed herein.

The application site land is currently without an authorised planning use, but is being used as part of the operations of Maple Tree Services, a business operated by the applicant from the farm buildings at Hall Farm, directly to the north of the field which forms the application site.

The applicant's business at Hall Farm involves importing, cutting, splitting, storage and distribution of firewood. This use within the buildings and their immediate curtilage at Hall Farm was established when a Certificate of Lawful Existing Use was granted approval on 13th July 2016 (GYBC ref. 06/16/0280/EU) following 10 years' continuous woodyard use / activity. The planning use of the group of buildings is now established as a permanent woodyard use for: "importing, cutting, splitting, storage and distribution of firewood with an average of 60 loads to 668 loads being bough to the Site each year (one load weighing between 0.7 tonnes and 0.9 tonnes)."

Over time, storage of logs for the business has extended beyond the

existing buildings and shelters of Hall Farm and onto the field to the south of the woodyard. Originally, without the benefit of planning permission, external storage began on part of the field to the east of this application site, for which temporary planning permission was subsequently granted for a period of one year (ref. 06/16/0590/CU), which expired on 17th November 2017.

A subsequent planning permission for temporary wood storage on that same site was granted permission for two years, which expired on 1st December 2019 (ref. 06/17/0743/F). As a result, all planning permissions for use of the land to the east of this current application site for wood storage have now expired, and wood has gradually been moved from the original temporary site to the east across towards the current application site. The previous temporary planning permissions were granted subject to a number of conditions in addition to being temporary in nature, and included the following:

- the permission was made personal to the applicant, such that only the applicant could benefit from the permission;
- no deliveries to the site or movement of wood within the site were to take place outside the following hours:- 08:00 to 18:30 Monday to Friday;
- the site was to be used for the storage of timber/firewood only;
- no mechanically powered cutting, sawing or splitting of timber (or other similar operation) shall take place within the site.

The reason for granting temporary approval subject to the above restrictions was in order for the LPA to retain control over the use of the site until the effects of the proposal have been experienced, and in the interest of protecting the amenities of the locality. When the applicant applied for a temporary twoyear permission in December 2017 they did so with the expectation that a temporary permission would allow the applicant's business to operate whilst an alternative location was being arranged for the entire business, and with that the cessation of the permission would allow the site to be cleared. Relocation may not have proven possible in practice, but the LPA's reasons for issuing temporary permissions were only for the purposes of monitoring the activities and impacts and being able to control the use overall, as stated on the decision notices.

Norfolk County Council did propose an alternative location for relocating the applicant's business to Decoy Wood, Mautby. However, the formal application was subsequently refused by Development Committee on 11/09/19, in line with the Officers' recommendation (application ref no. 06/18/0384/F). The current application is for open storage on the field south of the woodyard, and is proposed to continue the same use as was previously permitted on the adjoining part of the same wider field. This is a different area of land but is more central to the overall site and covers 1756 sqm in area. The current application is to regularise the use which has already begun on this site without planning permission. It is therefore a retrospective application, at least on part of the site.

Mautby Parish Council – No objections.

Cllr Adrian Thompson, Fleggburgh Ward - supports the application due to the potential economic benefits for the rural area. Highways Authority – No objection. Environmental Health Officer – No objections subject to use of

conditions: Working hours to be 0800 – 1700 Mon-Fri and 0800 – 1300 Sat only, with no work on Sundays or Public Holidays; and the site shall only be used for storage of timber and not for plant and machinery.

GYBC Arboriculturalist has reported that:-

- Tree screening is an imperative, and requires a mix of native species.
- A recommended list of trees to be planted includes Oak, Ash, Sycamore, Monterey Cypress, Rowan, Bird Cherry, Beech, Crab Apple, Hazel, Hawthorne, Blackthorn, and Scott's Pine.
- At least 50 trees would be needed, with specimens of 12-14cm 'stem diameter', to both extend the tree line and infill any gaps.
- This will create a habitat and food source for wildlife in the winter months, as well as screening throughout the year, complementing the existing conifer trees which are now c. 7 years old which cause concern to the Broads Authority.

Broads Authority – Objected and full comments are discussed in the report and attached at the appendices.

Neighbours / Public Representations – are detailed in section 4 of the report. Detailed comments from the closest neighbouring residents are provided attached at the appendix to this report.

The Planning Officer reported that in conclusion, the applicant has previously been granted temporary permissions for the same use on an adjoining area of land, which has enabled the Local Planning Authority to assess whether the character and activity of the use can be acceptable in principle, and establish possible areas which should be controlled. As the use proposed is for storage of timber only, it is unlikely to cause any significant harm to the amenities of the nearest dwellings and it is considered that the use can be controlled to an acceptable level, and the arrangement of wood storage on site can be compatible with the landscape impacts.

Taking all the above issues into account, it is considered that the potential harm associated with the proposed use of the site solely for storage of timber will be minimal if appropriately conditioned, and the economic benefits will outweigh the limited extent of detrimental impacts.

The proposal will comply with Policies CS1, CS6 and CS11 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan: Core Strategy, and Paragraphs 83, 84, 98 and 170 of the NPPF, and is consistent with the aims set out in emerging policy E4 of the final draft Local Plan Part 2.

The application is recommended for approval subject to the imposition of conditions as listed below:

1. Permission shall be granted on a personal basis, for the benefit of the applicant only.
2. The site shall only be used whilst the applicant operates from Hall Farm.
3. Within 1 month of the use ceasing or if the applicant relocates from the existing site, the land shall be cleared of all wood and woodchip and

activity and shall be reverted to agricultural use.

4. An appropriate tree planting and landscape plan to be submitted within 2 months of the decision date. The mix of trees shall be native, semi-mature 12-14cm stem diameter, mixed species of Oak, Ash, Sycamore, Monterey Cypress, Rowan, Bird Cherry, Beech, Crab Apple, Hazel, Hawthorne, Blackthorn, and Scott's Pine. The landscape plan and tree

protection measures to be implemented in the next planting season following approval of those details.

5. The former temporary use site to the east to be planted with native meadow species in the first planting season in accordance with a scheme to be submitted within 2 months of the decision date.

6. The storage area is to be defined and marked by an appropriate boundary scheme (such as 2.5m tall poles) in accordance with a boundary scheme details to be agreed. Scheme to be submitted within 2 months, and implemented in accordance with the approved details within 2 months.

7. A plan for the layout of the site shall be submitted within 2 months of the date of this permission, detailing areas for wood piles in the site, including areas for woodchip and orientation of logs, distribution of woodpile heights etc – with the aim to appear more recessive in views from the south, and shall be laid out within 1 month.

8. Details of a scheme for the provision of improved surfacing within the Hall Farm environment to prevent debris being brought into the public highway and/or scarring the landscape, shall be submitted within 2 months, and implemented in accordance with the approved details within 2 months.

9. No woodpiles shall be any more than 3.0m in height, at any part of the site at any time.

10. Use / operations within the site to be restricted to hours of 0800 – 1700 Mondays – Fridays only, with no work on Saturdays, Sundays, Bank holidays or Public holidays;

11. There shall be no deliveries to the site outside 0800 – 1700 Mon - Fri.

12. The site shall only be used for storage of timber and not for plant and machinery and apparatus, and there shall be no parking or storage of vehicles on the site when those vehicles are not in use.

13. There shall be no storage of machinery, plant, apparatus or vehicles on any adjoining land in the applicant's ownership / control not covered by the established Hall Farm woodyard use under application ref. 06/16/0280/EU.

14. There shall be no mechanically powered cutting, sawing work, or splitting of timber (or other similar operation) taking place on the application site.

15. No sales of wood, fuel or timber from the site.

and any other conditions considered appropriate by the Planning Manager.

Mr Hewitt, applicant, addressed the Committee and reported the salient areas of his application and respectfully asked the committee to approve it so he could move his business forward.

Mr Younge, objector, reported his objections to the Committee detailing the effect the operation of the unregulated adjoining wood yard had on his enjoyment of his property and urged the Committee to resolve this application which had blighted his life for so many years.

Councillor Thompson, Ward Councillor, spoke in support of the application as he thought it important that local businesses were supported after the pandemic and the applicant needed security to take his business forward which offered local employment opportunities.

Councillor Mogford reported that he could not see any problem with the application and that rural businesses needed to be supported. he noted the objections from the Broads Authority but the determining of the application was outside of their remit.

Councillor Wainwright moved the recommendation for approval which was seconded by Councillor Freeman.

RESOLVED:-

That application number 06-19-0625-F be approved subject to the proposal to comply with Policies CS1, CS6 and CS11 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan: Core Strategy, and Paragraphs 83, 84, 98 and 170 of the NPPF, and is consistent with the aims set out in emerging policy E4 of the final draft Local Plan Part 2.

The application is recommended for approval subject to the imposition of conditions as listed below:

1. Permission shall be granted on a personal basis, for the benefit of the applicant only.
2. The site shall only be used whilst the applicant operates from Hall Farm.
3. Within 1 month of the use ceasing or if the applicant relocates from the existing site, the land shall be cleared of all wood and woodchip and activity and shall be reverted to agricultural use.
4. An appropriate tree planting and landscape plan to be submitted within 2 months of the decision date. The mix of trees shall be native, semi-mature 12-14cm stem diameter, mixed species of Oak, Ash, Sycamore, Monterey Cypress, Rowan, Bird Cherry, Beech, Crab Apple, Hazel, Hawthorne, Blackthorn, and Scott's Pine. The landscape plan and tree protection measures to be implemented in the next planting season following approval of those details.
5. The former temporary use site to the east to be planted with native meadow species in the first planting season in accordance with a scheme to be submitted within 2 months of the decision date.
6. The storage area is to be defined and marked by an appropriate boundary scheme (such as 2.5m tall poles) in accordance with a boundary scheme details to be agreed. Scheme to be submitted within 2 months, and implemented in accordance with the approved details within 2 months.
7. A plan for the layout of the site shall be submitted within 2 months of the date of this permission, detailing areas for wood piles in the site, including areas for woodchip and orientation of logs, distribution of woodpile heights etc – with the aim to appear more recessive in views from the south, and shall be laid out within 1 month.
8. Details of a scheme for the provision of improved surfacing within the Hall

Farm environment to prevent debris being brought into the public highway and/or scarring the landscape, shall be submitted within 2 months, and implemented in accordance with the approved details within 2 months.

9. No woodpiles shall be any more than 3.0m in height, at any part of the site at any time.

10. Use / operations within the site to be restricted to hours of 0800 – 1700 Mondays – Fridays only, with no work on Saturdays, Sundays, Bank holidays or Public holidays;

11. There shall be no deliveries to the site outside 0800 – 1700 Mon - Fri.

12. The site shall only be used for storage of timber and not for plant and machinery and apparatus, and there shall be no parking or storage of vehicles on the site when those vehicles are not in use.

13. There shall be no storage of machinery, plant, apparatus or vehicles on any adjoining land in the applicant's ownership / control not covered by the established Hall Farm woodyard use under application ref. 06/16/0280/EU.

14. There shall be no mechanically powered cutting, sawing work, or splitting of timber (or other similar operation) taking place on the application site.

15. No sales of wood, fuel or timber from the site.

and any other conditions considered appropriate by the Planning Manager.

8 APPLICATION 06-21-0052-F - 32 BEACH DRIVE, SCRATBY, GREAT YARMOUTH

It was noted that Councillor Mogford left the meeting at 19:20.

The Committee received and considered the report from the Planning Officer.

The proposal is for the change of use of an existing residential dwelling bungalow (C3 use class) to a 'residential institution' (C2 use class) to provide a care home facility for adults with learning disabilities. It should be noted that Sections 16 and 17 of the application form originally failed to indicate the loss of C3 accommodation. Although, all consultations have been carried out with the current description of the application and therefore the proposed change of use has been clear and understood by consultees. An updated section of the application form has nevertheless now been received and is accurate.

The proposal will create 6 ensuite individual bedrooms with the rest of the bungalow being set aside for communal areas and an office space. The bedrooms will have an area of:

- Bedroom 1: 9.0sqm
- Bedroom 2: 10.3sqm
- Bedroom 3: 10.9sqm
- Bedroom 4: 10.5sqm
- Bedroom 5: 7.6sqm
- Bedroom 6: 8.3sqm

To facilitate the change of use two extensions are required. The rear extension measures 1 metre out from the rear wall of the dwelling for a length

of 3.5m. This is in line with the existing rear wall of the dwelling. The side extension measures 3.5 metres out from the southern wall for the full width of the bungalow. The hipped roof will be extended, retaining the appearance of the existing bungalow. Further to the extensions, the existing carport will be removed and then in its place the garden will be enlarged, to extend over the current car port area and by moving the fenced area closer to Nightingale Close with planting proposed to the front.

At the front, off Nightingale Close, 6 parking spaces will be provided. A bin collection area is proposed just off the pavement but the bins will be stored securely within the enclosed garden area, ensuring that they do not have a harmful effect on the street scene. A condition can require the bin area provision and use. For the avoidance of doubt, these are not independent living units, and all catering and medical care is provided for each resident. The applicant expects 13 full time and 2 part time members of staff to be employed directly at the new care home, working on a shift pattern.

The Principle of Development noted that saved policy HOU21 from the Borough-Wide Local Plan allows for changes of use to C2 accommodation within the village development limits subject to meeting the criteria specified. The application site is located within walking distance to the village shop, approximately 700m away, and Scratby also benefits from a number of Holiday Parks whose amenities are accessible to the neighbouring residents. Furthermore, the site is in close proximity to the beach and therefore residents would be able to enjoy activities outside of the facility.

The removal of the car port will allow for the rear garden to be extended, and excluding paving and planting areas this will measure 72sqm. Saved Policy HOU21 (c) requires sufficient garden space to be provided for residents. The Parish Council and neighbours noted concerns about the extent of outside space provided. It is recognised that this enclosed area is not the only garden area available, and in combination with the grassed area at the front there would be sufficient space for residents and staff and the activities that would normally be associated within these spaces.

Core Policy CS03 “[Supports] the provision of housing for vulnerable people and specialist housing provision, including nursing homes, residential and extra care facilities in appropriate locations and where there is an identified need”. Whilst no empirical evidence has been provided, the design and access statement notes the need for this type of accommodation in Norfolk. The proposal would therefore be compliant with CS03 (e).

Although the proposal would require an extension, what is being proposed is not excessive and would not impact the character of the property. Its appearance would remain essentially as a residential dwelling with no impact on the wider character of the area. The extension would add mass to the bungalow, however, this would be offset by the removal of the carport and therefore would not have an adverse effect on the street scene. Moreover, the space required for the change of use is minimised by conversion of the garage.

A number of neighbour responses raised concerns around the increase in vehicle movements, additional parking and highway safety. Revised plans were sought to ensure adequate parking provision for staff, visitors and residents to the satisfaction of the Local Highways Authority (Norfolk County Council). The County Parking Standards (2007) require 1 car parking space / 3 beds, plus 1 space / resident staff, plus 1 space / 3 staff present during the busiest period. There is no turning space or separate area available for deliveries available in the parking area, however when considering that this is a lightly trafficked area this is not considered to pose a significant issue.

Policy HOU21(f) requires care homes to demonstrate suitable access arrangements for ambulances and parking and service space provided in accordance with Local Plan standards. The plans show no specific medical or ambulance space, nor servicing area. However, this is accepted because a flexible approach has been taken due to the need for this type of accommodation. Restricting the use to 6 residents only mitigates the frequency of the pressures on the highway. Furthermore, it is recognised that being a home for those with learning disabilities can reasonably be expected to involve less frequent servicing and visitations than a care home for the elderly or those of ill-health, for example. Planning conditions are proposed to maintain this restriction.

The proposal includes 6 parking spaces. The applicant has confirmed (by email 11/05/21) that Parking Space 1 will be for the pool car, 3 spaces will be for the staff travelling by car, and 2 will be for professional visitors and deliveries. This appears appropriate to accommodate the demands and conditions can require the provision, allocation, signage and management as so. It is noted that there is no general space provision planned for visitors of each resident, but this is accepted to be of relatively low demand with visits of low frequency. As such it is considered unlikely that up to 6 cars for visitors would arrive at the same time, and any space that couldn't be used on the site would not create an unacceptable impact on the surrounding streets that wouldn't already be felt through pre-existing C3 residential dwelling use.

The creation of 6 parking spaces off Nightingale Close will have an impact on the street scene by removing the low wall adjacent the footpath and the removal of some of the garden area. However, whilst the street does have a shared character, there is not uniformity and the creation of the parking spaces is not considered to have an unduly harmful effect on the street scene. Officers consider that highways impacts are largely minimised due to the nature of care provision being proposed for adults with learning disabilities, and the intended occupants being unlikely to drive but requiring care in the form of communal services. These equate to a lesser demand for parking, servicing and medical treatments that might be required with other forms of care homes, be that caring for residents with greater physical health needs or being more elderly. As such it is considered necessary to restrict the form of occupancy by planning conditions, in the interests of preserving highways safety and neighbouring amenity.

Policy HOU21(j) requires a conversion to a care home to avoid significantly affecting the amenities of occupiers of adjoining or neighbouring buildings. Neighbours raised concerns that additional traffic movements would be detrimental to their amenity. Whilst it is noted that the proposal would likely generate more vehicle movements, through the arrival of staff, deliveries and services, to mitigate concerns regarding additional disturbance, it can be required by condition to restrict deliveries to only occur between 08:00 and 18:00.

It was also raised as part of the consultation response that the proposal would result in adverse levels of light pollution to neighbouring properties. No additional outside lighting is shown on the submitted plans. Furthermore, due to the nearby presence of street lighting any additional lighting is unlikely to be severely adverse. By virtue of its scale and positioning, in combination with its hipped roof, the extension is unlikely to have a significantly adverse or overbearing impact on the neighbouring residents. The main habitable rooms of 1 Nightingale Close are at a sufficient distance away that there would not be significant levels of overshadowing, as they are separated by the garage and drive. The rear extension, by virtue of its small scale and remaining in line with the existing rear building line, would not have an adverse effect on amenity of no.34 Beach Drive.

Each resident will have their own private bedroom and wet-room / shower room. Bedrooms range in size from 7.6sqm to 10.9sqm. Whilst it is noted that bedroom 5 in particular is on the smaller side, for a comparison this is above the minimum requirements for a single occupancy room in an HMO (7.5sqm) in emerging policy H12. It should be noted that there are communal rooms within the dwelling as well, meaning residents would not be expected to spend all their time in their private spaces.

The proposal does offer some private outdoor space. Whilst it is recognised that this is limited, Scratby also benefits from a number of Holiday Parks whose amenities are accessible to the neighbouring residents. Furthermore, the site is in close proximity to the beach and therefore residents would be able to enjoy activities outside of the facility. This is considered on balance therefore to offset any concerns about provision of private outdoor space. The application is recommended for approval subject to conditions. The proposal is a care facility that will comply with saved policy HOU21 from the Borough-Wide Local Plan when subject to conditions as follows:

- Standard time limit
- To accord with plans
- Restricting use to a care home for people with learning disabilities
- Restrict to only 6 residents
- Restricting residents to 18+ only
- Widening of access
- Parking area to be provided
- Parking spaces to be used as follows: Parking Space 1 will be for the

pool car, 3 spaces will be for the staff travelling by car, and 2 will be for professional visitors and deliveries (unless otherwise agreed)

- Restricting hours of delivery to only occur between 08:00 and 18:00
- Bird box to be installed
- Landscaping and boundary treatments to be provided

and any others considered appropriate by the Planning Manager.

Councillor Williamson asked for confirmation of the total area of each bedroom including the en-suite bathrooms as he was concerned about the size of bedroom 5.

Councillor Bird asked for confirmation as to whether the application site was presently a business or a residential home.

Mrs Payling, applicant, addressed the committee and reported the salient areas of her application for a much needed facility within the village of Scratby and asked the committee to approve the application. Mrs Payling reported that there would be 2 waking cares on duty every night.

Councillor Fairhead reported that she fully supported the application.

Councillor Freeman, Ward Councillor, spoke in support of the application as he was a keen advocate of care in the community and reported once again, that he would not be voting in this application. Some of his constituents were concerned that this application would alter the street scene but he felt this was a small price to pay for such a much needed facility in the village.

Councillor Myers and Flaxman-Taylor reported that they welcomed the application and would support it as it was much needed.

Councillor Flaxman-Taylor proposed that the application be approved which was seconded by Councillor Wainwright.

RESOLVED:-

That application number 06-21-0052-F be approved subject to conditions. The proposal is a care facility that will comply with saved policy HOU21 from the Borough-Wide Local Plan when subject to conditions as follows:

- Standard time limit
- To accord with plans
- Restricting use to a care home for people with learning disabilities
- Restrict to only 6 residents
- Restricting residents to 18+ only
- Widening of access
- Parking area to be provided
- Parking spaces to be used as follows: Parking Space 1 will be for the pool car, 3 spaces will be for the staff travelling by car, and 2 will be for professional visitors and deliveries (unless otherwise agreed)
- Restricting hours of delivery to only occur between 08:00 and 18:00

- Bird box to be installed
- Landscaping and boundary treatments to be provided and any others considered appropriate by the Planning Manager.

9 APPLICATION 06-21-0019-F - SITE OF 341 CALIFORNIA SANDS ESTATE, CALIFORNIA ROAD, ORMESBY ST MARGARET WITH SCRATBY

The Committee received and considered the report from the Planning Officer. This application is coming before the Committee as it was submitted by a serving Councillor, Councillor Grant.

The proposal is to allow the construction of a new holiday chalet into an existing group of 3 holiday chalets, to make 4 in total. Currently, since the demolition of the previous unit, there is one detached unit (Chalet 342) and two joined units (Chalets 340 and 349), and this proposal intends to attach the new chalet to Chalet 342 to then allow all 4 units to be attached together. This is consistent within the California Sands Estate with clusters of 4 holiday chalets placed throughout the site.

The proposed chalet is to be of similar design to the neighbouring chalets with a flat grey felt roof, white UPVC windows and doors and buff cement fibre weatherboarding. This is similar to other chalets that have been upgraded over time. The size and layout mirror the adjoining chalets and is considered in keeping with its surroundings. The amenities of adjoining holiday chalets have been considered however the site itself and surrounding area is prime holiday accommodation, and it is not expected to detrimentally harm the amenities of the adjoining units, especially as a previous holiday chalet occupied the site. As conditions will be used to maintain holiday occupancy only, it is expected that amenity will continue to be acceptable to holiday makers through a turn-around of holiday occupation which is consistent with the use of the site.

The location of the site is with Prime Holiday Accommodation and although it is for the re-instatement of 1 holiday chalet and will only contribute on a small scale, it is still considered to benefit the local economy by boosting the use of tourist facilities across the Borough and attracting visitors, which is consistent with the aims set out in Core Strategy policy CS8.

Holiday let accommodation is normally required to make payment towards the international designated site protection (HMM) payment in accordance with the Habitat Regulations but in this instance it is appropriate to be exempt as the proposal reinstates a chalet where previously one existed.

In conclusion, the proposal is considered acceptable in the proposed location and area; the area is Prime Holiday Accommodation and will bring much needed benefits

to the tourism and leisure industry. The proposed chalet is considered in keeping with the design and character of the California Sand Estate and with the application site previously occupying a holiday chalet it is considered the reinstatement of the holiday chalet will have an acceptable relationship in amenity terms, subject to imposition of appropriate conditions.

The application is recommended for approval, subject to restricting the use to holiday only and restrictions on occupancy over the year, the proposal will comply with the aims set out in policy CS8 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan: Core Strategy, and is consistent with the aims set out in emerging policy L1 of the final draft Local Plan Part 2.

Conditions:

1. The development must be begun not later than three years from the date of this permission.
 2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the application form and approved plans (drawing reference: 2587.02 and location) received by the local planning authority on the 7th January 2021.
 3. The Holiday chalet hereby approved shall only be used for holiday purposes.
 4. Holiday chalet hereby approved as shown on approved plan (location plan) received by the Local Planning Authority on the 7th January 2021, shall only be occupied during the period of the 1st March in any year to 14th January in the following year.
 5. The holiday unit hereby permitted shall not be occupied as a person's sole or main place of residence.
 6. The owner of the unit shall maintain an up-to-date register of the names and home addresses of all of the occupiers of the holiday units and shall make this available at all reasonable times for inspection by the Local Planning Authority.
 7. The holiday unit hereby permitted shall not be used by an individual or family group for more than a single period of more than four weeks at any one time.
- and any other conditions considered appropriate by the Planning Manager.

RESOLVED:-

That application number 06-21-0019-F be approved, subject to restricting the use to holiday only and restrictions on occupancy over the year, the proposal will comply with the aims set out in policy CS8 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan: Core Strategy, and is consistent with the aims set out in emerging policy L1 of the final draft Local Plan Part 2.

Conditions:

1. The development must be begun not later than three years from the date of this permission.
2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the application form and approved plans (drawing reference: 2587.02 and location) received by the local planning authority on the 7th January 2021.
3. The Holiday chalet hereby approved shall only be used for holiday purposes.
4. Holiday chalet hereby approved as shown on approved plan (location plan)

received by the Local Planning Authority on the 7th January 2021, shall only be occupied during the period of the 1st March in any year to 14th January in the following year.

5. The holiday unit hereby permitted shall not be occupied as a person's sole or main place of residence.

6. The owner of the unit shall maintain an up-to-date register of the names and home addresses of all of the occupiers of the holiday units and shall make this available at all reasonable times for inspection by the Local Planning Authority.

7. The holiday unit hereby permitted shall not be used by an individual or family group for more than a single period of more than four weeks at any one time.

and any other conditions considered appropriate by the Planning Manager.

10 DELEGATED DECISIONS OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS BETWEEN THE PERIOD 1 APRIL TO 30 APRIL

The Committee received and noted the planning applications made by delegated decision and by the Development Control Committee for the period 1 to 30 April 2021.

11 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Chairman reported that there was no other business being of sufficient urgency to warrant consideration at the meeting.

The meeting ended at: 19:00