

# Development Control Committee

## Minutes

Tuesday, 20 May 2014 at 18:30

### PRESENT:

Councillor Castle (in the Chair), Councillors Blyth, Cuncliffe, Collins, Field, Fairhead, Holmes, Jermany, Marsden, Reynolds, Robinson-Payne, Shrimplin and D Thompson

Mr D Minns (Planning Group Manager), Mr J Beck (Planning Officer), Mrs E Helsdon (Technical Officer), Miss G Manthorpe (Senior Planning Officer), Mr K Balls (Strategic Planning Officer) and Mrs C Webb (Member Services Officer)

### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman declared a personal interest in Item 3(a) as he was Chairman of the Education Committee at Norfolk Council and a personal interest in Item 3(b) as he had attended a pre-consultation meeting organised by Saffron Housing at Great Yarmouth High School.

### 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

It was noted that there were no apologies for absence.

### 2 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 April 2014 were confirmed.

### 3 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Chairman reported that the meeting would be recorded unless there were any objections from the Committee.

The Committee considered the Planning Group Manager's schedule of planning applications as follows:-

#### (a) APPLICATION NO 06-13-0652-O - WHEATCROFT FARM BRADWELL

The Committee considered the detailed report from the Planning Group Manager as

laid out in the agenda.

The proposal was in the form of a hybrid planning application for up to 850 residential dwellings, a new link road between the A143 and Beacon Park, a Neighbourhood Centre, Primary School, employment land and other associated uses. Full planning permission was being sought for Phase 1 of the residential development. The scheme would provide a mix of 2,3 and 4 bedroom family housing and a limited number of single storey dwellings.

The Planning Group Manager reported that whilst the A12/A143 Great Yarmouth Link Road application was being submitted separately, it was proposed in conjunction with this residential and employment planning application. The road was being funded through the Government's "Pinch Point" initiative with local contributions. This funding would help to unlock potential for new development and improve the traffic flow.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the application had been referred to the Secretary of State as a departure from the Local Plan as the application exceeded 15,000 sq. metre of office development.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the Highway signalisation would form part of the legal agreement and that an agreement had been reached with the Education Authority regarding the provision of a contribution to a new primary school along with the site which was a strategic element of the proposal plan.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the Environment Agency had objected to locating development within an attenuation basin. The Planning Group Manager reported that further talks would be undertaken with the developer and this issue should be easily overcome.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the RSPB had been sent the relevant planning documents on 7 December 2013 but a response had only just been received. They were concerned on the impact of development in the Borough on Little Terns which breed in the SSI sites between Winterton and South Denes.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the application was recommended for approval and would need to be referred to the Secretary of State prior to any decision being issued because of the level of employment uses/office space proposed.

A Member asked how many dwellings would be affordable housing units. The Planning Group Manager reported that this would be 10%.

A Member asked whether there was any access to Clay Lane identified in the plan. The Planning Group Manager reported that there was pedestrian access only.

Mr Allflat, applicant's agent, reported the salient areas of the application and would potentially create a further 1800 new jobs in this area of the Borough.

Members agreed that this application was of strategic importance to the Borough and would deliver more much needed housing.

**RESOLVED:**

That application 06/13/0652/O be recommended for approval subject to the conditions referred to in the report and the Section 106 Agreement as stated in the report; it was considered compliant with the NPPF and emerging and current local

plan providing a sustainable form of development, economic benefits and employment to the Borough.

Members should be aware that should the application be approved under the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009, because of the size and location of the proposal it will need to be referred to the Secretary of State prior to any decision being issued because of the level of employment uses/office space proposed .

**(b) APPLICATION NO 06-14-0168-F - SALISBURY ROAD GREAT YARMOUTH**

The Committee considered the detailed report from the Planning Group Manager as laid out in the agenda.

The proposal was for the construction of 12 residential units consisting of 8 one bed and 2 two bed bungalows and 2 x 2 bed semi-detached houses fronting onto Salisbury Road. The site would be accessed from Salisbury Road and Drake Road. A total of 22 parking spaces were proposed and each dwelling would have a garden area. A maximum ridge height of between 4.8 and 5.2m and maximum eaves height of 2.4 to 2.8 m are proposed for the bungalows and the height of the houses was 7.8m to ridge and 5m to eaves.

The Planning Group Manager reported that residents had objected strongly to this application and 53 letters of objection had been received and a petition with 47 signatures objecting to the proposal. 35 objections were received prior to the application being submitted. The Office of Brandon Lewis MP submitted 78 completed questionnaires which it had undertaken in the locality. The objections ranged from overdevelopment of the site, being dangerous to school children, development of social housing not in keeping in the area, site was in a flood risk area to loss of a vital resource to community for much needed parking.

The Planning Group Manager reported that this application was recommended for approval subject to conditions, as it accorded with the provisions of the adopted GYBW Local Plan.

A Member asked why this application had been brought back to committee as planning permission had been refused several years ago on the grounds of no access for emergency services and the area had not increased in size.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the previous application had not previously been considered by Development Control Committee and that access and contamination issues had now been addressed.

Members reiterated the concerns of the residents over the safety of school children in the area. A Member raised the issue of the visibility splay into the site.

Mr Hill, applicant's agent, reiterated the salient areas of the application. It was reported that the housing would be allotted to tenants with general needs and not special needs and would be referred via GYCH register and that this could form part of the S106 agreement.

Mr Babbington, objector, reported the many concerns of local residents and asked that the Committee refuse the application.

Councillor Fox, Ward Councillor, spoke in support of the application as it would provide much needed accommodation in this area. He reported that he had received no representations from any residents in objection to this proposal.

Councillor Marsden, Ward Councillor, spoke in favour of the proposal as it would tidy up an area used for fly tipping and provide much needed specialist housing.

A Member reported that the Committee should listen to the local community and refuse the application or at least reduce the number of proposed dwellings.

A Member reported that the last application had been a silly idea and so was this one and should be refused. Traffic and children should not be mixed as it was an accident waiting to happen and the application should be refused on the grounds of the adverse affect on neighbours and vehicle access.

RESOLVED:

That against the advice of the Planning Group Manager, that application no. 06/14/0168/F be refused on the grounds of the adverse affect on neighbours and vehicle access.

**(c) APPLICATION NO 06-14-01682-F - 3 LOWESTOFT ROAD GORLESTON**

The Committee considered the detailed report from the Planning Group Manager as laid out in the agenda.

The proposal was to convert the former medical centre building to four dwellings, one would have four bedrooms and the others would have two bedrooms. The only external changes would be new windows and doors and a new porch on the Lowestoft Road frontage. The property was sited within a conservation area.

In accordance with current standards, the minimum parking provision for such a development should be 9 parking spaces. There is no parking provision in this proposal but as the site is located directly adjacent to Gorleston High Street as is located close to local services and public transport links. Therefore, the Planning Group Manager felt that he could not sustain an objection on highway grounds for lack of parking provision alone.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the application should be approved as it complied with Policies HOU7 and HOU15 of the GYBW Local Plan.

Mr Duffield, applicant's agent, reiterated the salient areas of the proposal and reported that the alterations to the medical centre would be a vertical division and there would be no flats. He reported that as a result of no on-site parking, that this would reduce the appeal of the properties to multiple car owning families and would impact of the sale price of the completed dwellings.

Mrs Cossett, objector, reported that this was a very busy area and at present there were 24 parking spaces between Lowestoft and Sussex Road for 28 vehicles. The property was surrounded by many local services which people accessed via cars which further impacted on residents parking. She was concerned that the bins would need to be sited at the front of the houses and that this could result in rubbish being

strewn about on the pavements and unpleasant odours. Overlooking was also an issue and she asked that obscure glazing be included as a condition. She asked that the Committee attend a site visit before determining the application.

Councillor B Wright, Ward Councillor, objected to the application on the grounds of insufficient parking which went against the advice of the National Planning Policy Framework. She asked that the Committee adhere to the Localism Act and to listen to residents concerns in local planning applications. She asked that the Committee undertake a site visit before determining the application.

Members were concerned regarding the issue of parking. The Chairman reported that in its former use as a medical centre that the building would have attracted far more vehicular movements than it would as a result of the conversion.

A motion was put to the Committee regarding undertaking a site visit which was lost.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/14/0166/F be approved as the proposal complied with policies HOU7 and HOU15 of the Great Yarmouth Borough-Wide Local Plan.

**(d) APPLICATION NO 06-14-0182-F BURNT LANE GORLESTON**

The Committee considered the detailed report from the Planning Group Manager as laid out in the agenda.

The proposal was to demolish the 5 lock-up garages and erect a pair of semi-detached bungalows with a parking space at the side of each bungalow and a small garden at the rear.

The Planning Group Manager reported that four letters of objection had been received citing parking, the small size of the bungalows and lack of amenity space. The occupiers of 5 Burnt Lane had requested that a replacement wall be provided after the demolition of the garages.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the applicant had asked for a statement to be reported to the Committee stating that if permission was not granted, that all the garages would still be demolished and the land made unavailable for parking. The bungalows would have parking provision, would not block sunlight from adjoining properties and provide much needed accommodation.

The Planning Group Manager reported that taking this into account and the fact that the Highways Officer did not object to the application, it would be difficult to justify refusal of the application on the potential parking problems alone and was therefore, on balance, recommended for approval as the proposal complied with Policies HOU7 and HOU15 of the GYBW Local Plan.

Councillor B Williamson, Ward Councillor, reported that Burnt Lane was a narrow road which is restricted to one way traffic at the eastern end of the road which had no off-road parking for the majority of properties. Residents from other nearby roads such as High Road and Manby Road also park in Burnt Lane adding to the parking problems on the road. He asked that the Committee refuse the application.

A Councillor reported that accessing Burnt Lane and parking along the road was impossible and supported the Ward Councillor in his plea for refusal.

RESOLVED:

That against the advice of the Planning Group Manager, that application no. 06/14/0182/F be refused, as the proposed site was deemed to be unsuitable for development as it could cause further access/parking problems for existing residents.

#### **4 PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 1-30 APRIL 2014**

The Committee received the Planning Group Manager's schedule in respect of applications cleared during the period 1 April to 30 April 2014 under delegated powers, together with those determined by the Development Control Committee.

#### **5 OMBUDSMAN AND APPEAL DECISIONS**

The Committee noted the following appeal decision:-

06/13/0304/F - Sub-division of garden to form plot for detached house and garage at 14, Beach Road, Scratby, Great Yarmouth - Appeal Dismissed. (The original application was a Committee refusal).

#### **6 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

The Chairman reported that this was his last meeting as Chairman of the Committee and thanked the officers and members for their past support. He also reported that Councillor's Holmes and Marsden would not be standing for re-election and, therefore, this was their final Committee meeting.

#### **7 EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC**

The meeting ended at: 20:35