

Development Control Committee

Minutes

Wednesday, 07 February 2018 at 18:30

PRESENT:

Councillor Williamson (in the Chair), Councillors Andrews, Annison, Cutting, Fairhead, Flaxman-Taylor, Hammond, Hanton, Lawn, Reynolds, Thirtle, Wainwright and Wright.

Mr A Nicholls (Head of Planning & Growth), Mr D Minns (Planning Manager), Mrs G Manthorpe (Senior Planning Officer), Ms C Whatling (Monitoring Officer), Mrs E Helsdon (Technical Officer) & Mrs C Webb (Senior Member Services Officer).

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence given at the meeting.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Fairhead & Wright declared a Personal Interest in Item 5.
Councillor Thirtle declared a Personal interest in Items 6 & 7. Councillors Flaxman-Taylor & Hanton declared a Personal Interest in Item 9.

However, in accordance with the Council's Constitution, all Members were allowed to speak and vote on the matters.

3 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2017 were confirmed.

4 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

5 06/17/0247/F LAND AT REAR OF ST. MARY'S ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOOL, EAST ANGLIAN WAY GORLESTON

The Committee received and considered the comprehensive report from the Planning Manager.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that this application had been deferred at the September meeting of the DC Committee to enable a site visit to take place. During the site visit, and which was later confirmed by e-mail, the applicant requested that the application be deferred to enable other access options to be assessed and discussed with the Highway Authority. However, the Developer had now requested that the application be determined as per the submitted application, with access from East Anglian Way including the provision of a school drop off and pick up point.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that there had been 11 neighbour objections to the application prior to the site visit and a further 5 had subsequently been received (as detailed in paragraph 2.1 of the agenda). Comments from Strategic Planning had now been received indicating that the application site was an allocated site contained in the SHLAA 2014 document.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that, in this location, and given the proximity to existing public open space, that no public open space was being sought. However, as indicated on the submitted plans, open space was being offered by the applicant, but this could be provided as private open space with payment in lieu of provision at £480 per dwelling. If public open space was to be provided, then the Council would not take ownership or liability for it and a s106 agreement would secure the provision of a management company to manage the open space in perpetuity.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was recommended for approval with requested conditions to ensure a satisfactory form of development.

Mr Gilder, applicant's agent, addressed the Committee and reiterated the salient points of the application. He reported that this application would address the parking/traffic issues arising from the nearby school for the local residents.

A Member asked whether the possibility of another access to the site across the Recreation Ground onto Church Lane had been explored any further by the Developer, as following the meeting last September he had received an e-mail on the matter indicating that this might be possible. Mr Gilder reported that at a subsequent meeting, the Council had expressed concerns regarding loss of public open space to this proposed access.

Mr Baker, objector, urged the Committee to refuse the application due to the unsafe access to East Anglian Way.

A Member reported that parking was an issue for residents who lived in close proximity to any school across the Borough and, in his opinion, this proposal would go along way to negating parking issues for local residents of East Anglian Way.

The Ward Councillors reported that they both still held grave reservations regarding the access to the site and were concerned for the welfare and safety of local school children.

A Member reported that he was astonished that the Council had refused to consider a possible access across the Recreation Ground on to Church Lane.

A Member reported that it would have been helpful to the Committee to have a Highways Agency Officer present at the meeting to respond to questions.

A Member proposed that the application be approved. This motion was seconded but was not carried at the vote.

Another Member proposed that the application be deferred to enable further investigation to take place in regard to an access to the site across the Recreation Ground onto Church Lane. This motion was seconded and a vote followed.

RESOLVED:-

That application 06/17/0247/F be deferred.

6 06/17/0387/F MANOR FARM FILBY

The Committee received and considered the comprehensive report from the Planning Manager.

The Planning Manager reported that the application was for the demolition of a redundant cattle building which stood within agricultural land to the south of Filby Church and to replace it with 3 poultry sheds and a Manager's house with vehicular access from Church Lane. The Planning Manager reported that the new access road would run along existing field boundaries and would join Mautby Lane where there was existing field access.

The Planning Manager reported that Parish Council and thirty local residents had strongly objected to the application and a public meeting was called to discuss the application on 29 January 2018 with thirty eight members of the public in attendance. A site visit was subsequently arranged by the applicant and, if the Committee was minded to approve the application, those additional conditions agreed with local residents at the site visit to be attached to any approval.

The Planning Manager reported that each poultry shed would have 13 ventilation fans set into the roof which would help to mitigate possible noise/odour nuisance by ensuring an ambient temperature in the sheds at all times and could be operated independently of each other to reduce noise emanating from the site. There were two existing poultry farms in Filby which were closer to residential dwellings than the proposed site and Environmental Health had not received any noise or odour complaints from these sites.

The Planning Manager reported that following the submission of additional details the Lead Local Flood Authority had not responded at the time of committee, any permission will be subject to conditions requested.

The Planning Manager reported that the proximity of the proposed site to the Grade 11*listed Church Building was a material planning consideration and the Committee must ensure that the development did not adversely affect the setting of the listed building. The Committee should have regard to Sections 16 & 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which required the Council to have special regard to the desirability of features of special architectural or historic interest, preserving listed buildings and their settings in exercise of planning functions. The applicant had agreed to plant trees to screen the buildings from the west and south and raise an earth bund to the east and north. This will help to reduce the effect of the buildings on the landscape and the proposal was considered not to have any adverse on the setting or users of the church.

The Planning Manager reported that this application was recommended for approval but suggested that with such strong local feeling, that the Committee might wish to consider undertaking a site visit prior to determining the application.

Mr Wharton, applicant, reported the salient points of his application and that he accepted the additional conditions requested by the Parish Council. He asked that the Committee approve the application. which would bring much needed employment to the village and assist with the sustainability of the longstanding family farm

Mr Morris, objector, reported the objections of the villagers to the proposed application and requested that the Committee refuse the application on the grounds of visual impact, noise and smell concerns.

Mr Thompson, Chairman of Filby Parish Council, reported that he declared a

personal interest in this application as he owned two poultry sites in the village. However, he had been asked to address the meeting on behalf of local residents who requested that the application be refused as there were far more suitable sites available in the village for this type of development which were much further away from residential dwellings thus negating possible resulting noise/smell issues.

A Member reported that he had similar poultry sheds in his Ormesby ward and he had not received a single complaint regarding them in over 30 years.

Councillor Thirtle, Ward Councillor, vehemently reiterated the concerns of the Parish Council and local residents and requested that the Committee refuse the application.

A Member requested that the Committee be shown the proposed plans for the Manager's accommodation. The Planning Manager duly obliged.

RESOLVED:-

That application number 06/17/0387/F be approved, subject to the requirements of the Local Lead Flood Agency as the proposal complied with the aims of Policies CS6 and CS11 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan:Core Strategy and Paragraph 28 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The additional conditions agreed by the applicant and the Parish Council at the site visit on 29 January 2018 to be attached to the grant of approval.

Approval should be subject to conditions requiring submission of a detailed landscaping scheme, drainage details including the proposed pond, security gates and lighting and agricultural occupancy of the manager's dwelling.

7 06/17/0625/F 2 CHAPEL COTTAGES, ROLLESBY ROAD, FLEGGBURGH

The Committee received and considered the comprehensive report from the Planning Manager.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was for a two storey extension to an existing residential dwelling which would provide for two additional bedrooms, one en-suite at first floor level and the plans had been amended to move a first floor window at the western elevation to the northern elevation to mitigate overlooking.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that during the application process it had been noted that the land in the applicants ownership had been incorrectly identified in the application. this has been amended with the correct boundary line as shown by Land Registry. The Committee is asked to note that land ownership is a civil and not a planning matter. The additional curtilage had been submitted to Highways who had objected to the application. Highways had reported that, in view of the LPA, the vehicular access had a lawful

permission and that this access could be used to serve number 2 Chapel Cottages without the need for further permissions. However, given that no vehicles currently access number 2 Chapel Cottages through the present access this would result in an intensification of use of a sub-standard access onto the highway. Therefore, Highways would leave this for Members to discuss and make a balanced view at Committee.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that five letters of objection and one letter of support had been received and were summarised in paragraph 2.2 of the agenda report. The Parish Council also objected to the application citing overcrowding, insufficient parking and turning and highways access to road, boundary issues and loss of privacy were also grave concerns.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was recommended for approval with suitable conditions to provide an adequate form of development.

Mr Bullen, applicant's agent, reported that there was adequate parking and turning area provided within the application site and that the application would improve and be in-keeping with the street scene and respectfully requested that the Committee approve the application.

Mrs Watkins, objector, reported that the application would result in additional pressure in parking within the development which often resulted in resident's driveways being blocked. Concerns were also raised regarding the siting of bins on collection day which would reduce the width of the access road considerably, garden and curtilage issues.

Councillor Thirtle, Ward Councillor, reported that the proposal would result in over-development which was dangerous as it could set a precedence for the village and he urged Members to refuse the application.

A Member reported that he was unhappy with the response of the Highways Agency by passing the access issue to the Committee to decide.

RESOLVED:-

That application number 06/17/0625/F be approved with conditions requiring the development to be built in accordance with the approved plans. The Bathroom and en-suite windows at first floor level of the northern elevation were obscured glazed and the parking and turning areas were provided prior to occupation and retained thereafter for that use. In addition, it is recommended that any conditions requested by the Highways Authority are attached to any grant of permission and any such conditions that are assessed as required to provide an adequate form of development.

8 06/17/0743/F HALL FARM HALL ROAD MAUTBY

The Chairman reported that this item had been deferred.

RESOLVED:

That application 06/17/0743/F be deferred.

9 06/17/0585/F 70 MARINE PARADE GORLESTON

The Committee received and considered the comprehensive report from the Planning Manager.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the proposed development was for the demolition of the existing house on the site built in the 1950's and the replacement with two new dwellings of modern design.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that 15 objections had been received from local residents regarding the original and amended plans citing over development, design, overlooking and the effect on the character of the area.

Members were asked to bear in mind Paragraph 60 of the NPPF and Policy HOU17 when determining the application.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was recommended for approval, with required conditions.

Mr Bullen, applicant's agent, reported that salient areas of the application which would result in two homes fit for purpose for family requirements in the 21st century and asked Members to approve the application.

A Member asked if the applicant had considered building one large detached property which would be in keeping with the street scene.

Councillor Flaxman-Taylor reported that she supported local residents in their objections to the application as it would result in gross over-development of the site and have an adverse effect on the Marine Parade street scene and she urged the Committee to refuse the application.

A Member proposed approval of the application which was seconded but lost at the vote.

A Member proposed another motion that the application be refused as it was contrary to Policy HOU17 of the Great Yarmouth Boroughwide Local Plan which was subsequently seconded and put to the vote.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/17/0585/F be refused as it was considered to be contrary to saved Policy HOU17 of the adopted Great Yarmouth Boroughwide Local Plan.

10 06/17/0622/F LAND AT HEATH LIVERIES BROWSTON

The Committee received and considered the comprehensive report from the Planning Manager.

The Planning Manager reported the proposal was for the construction of a curved dwelling with a green roof that would be partly sunken into the sloping paddock area to reduce its impact on the surroundings. The building would have rammed earth walls which would be constructed using the soil excavated from the site.

The Planning Manager reported that the application met the criteria of Paragraphs 55 and 63 of the National Policy Planning Framework, Policies CS9 & CS12 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan Core Strategy and was recommended for approval with requested conditions.

Councillor Lawn, Ward Councillor, reported that he had not been approached by anyone in his ward regarding the application of which he was supportive.

Members were unanimous in their support of the application.

RESOLVED:

That application 06/17/0622/F be approved as the proposal complied with Paragraphs 55 & 63 of the NPPF and the aims of Policies CS9 and CS12 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan:Core Strategy.

11 PLANNING DECISIONS MADE BY THE PLANNING OFFICERS AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE BETWEEN 1-31 JANUARY 2018

The Committee received and noted the planning decisions made by the Planning Officers & Committee between 1 - 31 January 2018.

12 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

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

13 EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC

The meeting ended at: 21:05