

Development Control Committee

Minutes

Wednesday, 10 August 2016 at 18:30

PRESENT:

Councillor Annison (in the Chair); Councillors Andrews, Fairhead, Flaxman-Taylor, Grant, A Grey, K Grey, Lawn, Pratt, Thirtle, Wainwright, and Wright.

Mr D Minns (Planning Group Manager), Mrs G Manthorpe (Senior planning Officer), Mrs E Helsdon (Technical Officer) and Mr G Jones (Information Manager)

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor's Hammond, Hanton and Williamson.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Committee noted the following Declarations of Interest:

Councillor Thirtle declared a personal interest in item 5

Councillors Wainwright and A Grey declared a personal interest in item 8

However, in accordance with the Council's Constitution, the Councillors were aloud to speak and vote on the matter.

3 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on the 13 July 2016 were confirmed.

4 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

5 APPLICATION 06/15/0705/F - FIELD ADJACENT TOWER LODGE

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

The Senior Planning Officer reminded Members that this application had been deferred at the last meeting of this Committee to allow a site visit to take place.

The application had been amended to reduce the number of dwellings applied for from 19 to 9. It was reported that during the site visit members viewed the site and the amended plans.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the 9 dwelling that are subject to the application are accessed off Rollesby Road with all of the Tower Road dwelling having been removed from the application.

There had been 62 objections to the application summarised in the report.

The Parish Council had withdrawn their objection following the revision to the application

Norfolk County Council as Highways Authority did not object to the revised application providing the development was a private drive with appropriate maintenance agreements.

A member asked if Highways original objection would be taken into account if an additional application came in to build more houses on the site at a later date - Highways would be part of the consultation for any additional application.

A member asked if the predestination crossings were dropped curbs - they will be to Highways standards.

A member asked if there would be affordable housing on the site - No the site is under the minimum size to require it.

The developers representative stated that there would be 6 terraced and 3 detached dwellings and that the developer would meet all the Highways recommendations as well as taking into account the issues raised by the objectors.

A member asked for confirmation that the roads on the site would not be adopted - the developer confirmed that the property owners would be responsible and that a management committee would be formed.

A member asked if the fencing could be replaced with a hedge - the developer had no objection to that.

A member asked if the Foul and surface water was going to be combined for drainage - No they a separate.

A member asked what was going to happen to the rest of the site now the application had be reduced - the owner of the site intends to redevelop the site with a change of use to paddocks

An objector raised their concerns regarding the village infrastructure, Flooding, poor roads with blind corners, speeding and lack of parking in the area. he asked the committee to reject the application until these issues had been addressed.

A member observed that a number of these issues would be addressed by the application.

The ward councillor highlighted the lack of infrastructure and the visual aspect of the application

A member asked about the corner of the land being given to the village, the agent received a positive response from the applicant who was sitting in the gallery that the land could be gifted to the village.

A member stated that we have to increase the number of houses and that this small development will help the village both visually and with community assets in respect to the hedge planting, pond and pathway and additional community land which is agreed to be gifted to the village.

RESOLVED.

To approve the application 06/15/0705/F for nine dwellings subject to conditions referred to in the officers report and those that are required to ensure a satisfactory form of development and satisfactory boundary treatment, additional community land and 106 agreement.

6 APPLICATION 06/16/0387/SU - LAND OFF HERTFORD WAY, GORLESTON

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

The Planning Group Manager reported that no objections had been received however a set of questions had been received from a resident who's property backed on to the development.

The planning Group Manager responded to questions asked by a neighbour

(letter attached to report) demonstrating where necessary on the electronic plans.

The Ward Councillor indicated that he supported the application

A resident asked for clarification of the fence and roof heights that were adjacent to his south facing garden - approximately 2 and 8 meters

A resident asked if there was a point of contact should problems occur - yes they could contact the Planning section or their Ward Councillor

RESOLVED:

That application 06/16/0387/SU is approved as the proposal complies with Policies CS1, CS2 and CS3 of the Local Plan: Core Strategy and saved Policy HOU7 of the Great Yarmouth BoroughWide Local Plan

7 APPLICATION 06/16/0167/F - 115 HIGH STREET, GORLESTON

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

The Planning Group Manager reported that no objections had been received from Highways or the Conservation Officer but 2 letters of objection had been received from neighbours, these objections were on the effect on light and anti social behaviour.

A member asked about the effects on light - the building is to the north of the properties so there would be less light loss than at other locations.

A member asked if the choice of colour used in the render would encourage vandalism - no problems had been reported previously and the site was covered by CCTV.

RESOLVED:

That application 06/16/0167/F is approved as the proposal complies with saved Policy BNV18 of the Great Yarmouth Borough-Wide Local Plan and Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy

8 APPLICATION 06/16/0321/F - LAND ADJOINING BRIARCROFT, PORTERS LOKE, BURGH CASTLE

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

It was reported that the site is located outside of the village development limits and given the location, cannot be considered under the Interim Housing Land

Supply Policy. The site would be accessed from an unmade road and is a location that is remote from jobs and services and is therefore in an unsustainable location and the proposal is contrary to Policies CS1 and CS2 of the Core Strategy.

It was reported that highways objected and had recommended refusal of the application as the development as proposed would be detrimental to highway safety.

The Environment Agency - Flood risk as the application is in a flood zone, it was reported that should members be minded to approve the application the Environment Agency would need to be re-consulted prior to a decision being issued.

and

A Neighbour - the access road is a private road that he maintains.

It was reported that the application was outside of the village development limits in the worst flood zone, 3b. A previous application on the site had been refused and a similar application within the same village had been refused and the refusal had been upheld at appeal.

A member noted that Briarcroft is higher than the proposed new build so flood mitigation would be needed

The Developers representative stated that they were not happy with the report being considered as it was extremely negative.

The Developers representative highlighted that there was no mention of it being a self-build, No AMR had been published

Very little evidence from highways for their safety concerns

Applicants evidence was not included in the report

There is no evidence of accidents in the vicinity or on the lode

The build is not in the area that floods.

A member asked why being a self build was relevant

The representative responded that this was new government guidance

A member noted that it was listed as a self build in the report.

A member asked where the access to the site would be - access would be from the Loke

A member asked for clarification of the Highways objection - potential traffic

increase changed the amount of visibility required at the junction.

A member asked when the other dwellings were built and why weren't highways objections made then - the other dwellings were given permission starting in 2005, the amount of traffic increase is taken into account as additional dwellings are added to the area, also the required standards for junctions have risen

A member noted that there were a number of serious objections to this development.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/16/0321/F be refused - the proposal is contrary to the aims of Policies CS1, CS2 and CS16 of the Local Plan: Core Strategy and saved Policy HOU10 of the Great Yarmouth Borough-Wide Local Plan.

9 PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS AND BY THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE FROM 1 JULY - 31 JULY 2016.

The Committee noted the planning applications cleared by the Planning Group Manager and the Development Control Committee between 1 and 31 July 2016.

10 OMBUDSMAN AND APPEAL DECISIONS

The Group Manager Planning reported that there were no ombudsman decisions to report and reported on three appeal decisions; while reporting the appeal decision at 45 Nelson Road the Article four direction was brought up by a member and it was explained that the permitted rights to change from C3 to C4 had been removed by Article four direction across most of the borough.

45 Nelson Road, Lidl and 49 John Road appeals all allowed. 45 Nelson Road and 49 John Road were delegated decisions with Lidl (variation of condition re opening hours) was refused by Development Control Committee.

The Committee noted the Ombudsman and Appeal Decisions.

11 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

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

12 EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC

The meeting ended at: 20:05