

Development Control Committee

Minutes

Wednesday, 14 December 2016 at 18:30

PRESENT:

Councillor Annison (in the Chair); Councillors Flaxman-Taylor, A Grey, Hammond, Hanton, Thirtle, Wainwright, Williamson & Wright.

Councillor Borg attended as a substitute for Councillor Fairhead.

Councillor K Grey attended as a substitute for Councillor Andrews.

Mr D Minns (Planning Group Manager), Mrs G Manthorpe (Senior Planning Officer), Mrs E Helsdon (Technical Planning Officer) and Mrs C Webb (Member Services Officer).

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Andrews, Fairhead and Reynolds.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Committee noted the following Declarations of Interest:-

Councillors Annison, A Grey, Hanton & Wainwright declared a personal interest in Item number 7, application 06/16/0188/F, as they had received correspondence in relation to the application and the applicant was known to them, but in accordance with the Council's Constitution were allowed to both speak and vote on the matter.

3 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 November 2016 were confirmed.

4 MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising from the above minutes.

5 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

6 06/16/0188/F 132 GORDON ROAD SOUTHTOWN

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

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application site was located towards the eastern section of the southern side of Gordon Road, Southtown, on the southern side, there was a large commercial area which was the application site, and terrace housing to the western and northern side.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application site was located within Flood Zone Three, as identified by the Environment Agencies Flood Map and was accompanied by a flood risk assessment. The application complied with the sequential test and the exemption test and could be adequately conditioned as per the Environment Agency recommended conditions.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the site currently was a commercial use surrounded by predominately residential uses. The site was located within a sustainable location with good links to transport and services. Although an intense use of the site was proposed, the residential use was in keeping with the character of the area.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that two neighbour objections had been received citing that three storeys were too high, increased traffic along Gordon Road, the traffic lights are on a short timer, the number of dwellings will cause more sewerage and drainage problems, a tree will have to be removed, over-

development of site, more than 22 parking spaces will be required and better vehicular access into the site is required.

A Member asked for clarification regarding the number of spaces provided for car parking. The Senior Planning Officer reported that 22 spaces would be provided.

A Member asked whether the development would deliver any affordable housing units. The Senior Planning Officer reported that details of the affordable housing allocation had not yet been approved.

A local resident was concerned regarding the overlooking of her garden from the flatted development. The Senior Planning Officer reported that the distance from window to window was 7 metres to the nearest dwelling. A Member asked whether obscured glazing could be conditioned to help negate overlooking. The Planning Group Manager reported that as the living rooms were dual aspect, the height of one of the windows could be raised to negate overlooking of the residential garden concerned.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/16/0188/F be approved as the proposal complied with Policies CS1 and CS2 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan: Core Strategy and saved Policy HOU7 of the Great Yarmouth Boroughwide Local Plan. Any permission shall be subject to a s106 agreement for all appropriate contributions including County obligations, including GI payments to be negotiated between the applicant and Norfolk County Council as per the consultation response and these have not been decided, open space payments, recreation payments and affordable housing. All conditions requested shall be appended to any grant of permission including any further that secure an adequate form of development including obscure glazing and raised window height as required to prevent overlooking of adjacent residential properties.

7 06/16/0529/O BURGH HALL LEISURE CENTRE, LORDS LANE, BURGH CASTLE

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

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application site was an area of land on the north side of Lords Lane between the road and the buildings which formed Burgh Hall Leisure Centre. There were some houses to the east of the site and open farm land to the west and on the opposite side of Lords lane to the south. There were a number of mature trees on the application site which were covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO).

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was in outline form to erect three dwellings with vehicular access to the rear, served by the existing

accesses to the Leisure Centre. In 2015, Planning permission was refused for the erection of eight dwellings on the site, which was outside the Village Development Limit, was not in sustainable location being remote from the village centre, transport, jobs and the effect on the trees covered by the TPO.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the Parish Council had raised no objection to the development and one letter of objection had been received from the Managing Director of Burgh Hall Holiday Park. The Trees Officer had agreed removal of some of the mature trees and work to others.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the proposed development was closer to the Bradwell Village Boundary than the Burgh Castle Village Boundary.

Mr Stone, applicant's agent, reported the salient areas of the "enabling" application to the Committee which would result in the regeneration of Burgh Hall creating 11 extra jobs for local people from the revenue resulting from the sale of the three properties.

A Member reported his concerns regarding the lack of a pedestrian footpath from the application site and that approval would go against Policies CS1, CS2 and HOU10.

A Member reported that the application would have an adverse effect on the area and did not support the loss of some of the trees which were preserved under a TPO.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/16/0529/O be refused as it was considered in weighing the planning balance, that the proposal was contrary to the aims of paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policies CS1 and CS2 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan: Core Strategy and saved Policy HOU10.

8 06/16/0636/F 87 NELSON ROAD CENTRAL GREAT YARMOUTH

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

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the site was a former Guest House situated on Nelson Road Central and the proposal was to convert it into a hostel with six bedrooms and an area for management staff.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that there had been no letters of objections received from local residents.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that a proposed hostel would be acceptable adjacent to residential properties. The original plan had not been

considered acceptable in terms of room size and layout. However, an amended plan had removed most of these concerns. The rooms were deemed as an acceptable size with the smallest still exceeding 9 metres squared and it was notable that Environmental Health whose legislation covered room sizes did not object.

A Member asked for clarification as to the difference between a HMO and a Hostel.

A Member asked if a condition could be imposed to ensure that the hostel could only operate if it was managed.

Members were minded to approve the application as hostel accommodation was much needed in the Borough.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/16/0295/F be approved subject to that all conditions to ensure a satisfactory form of development and a condition to ensure that only the rooms shown as bedrooms on the approved plan are used as such and that the use is limited to that of a managed hostel.

9 PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BY THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AND UNDER DELEGATED POWERS FROM 1 - 30 NOVEMBER 2016

The Committee noted the planning applications cleared under delegated powers and by Committee from 1 - 30 October 2016.

10 OMBUDSMAN AND APPEALS DECISIONS

The Planning Group Manager reported that there were no Ombudsman & Appeal decisions to report to the Committee.

11 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

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

The Chairman wished all present a very Happy Christmas.

12 EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC

The meeting ended at: 20:30