



GREAT YARMOUTH
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Development Management Committee

Minutes

Wednesday, 20 March 2024 at 18:30

PRESENT:-

Councillor A Wright (in the Chair); Councillors Annison, Bird, Boyd, Freeman, Galer, Green, Martin, Murray-Smith, Pilkington & Williamson.

Councillor Lawn attended as a substitute for Councillor Mogford.

Mr A Chrusciak (Interim Head of Planning), Mr M Joyce (Principal Planning Officer), Mr R Parkinson (Development Manager), Mr R Tate (Planning Officer) & Mrs C Webb (Democratic Services Officer).

01 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Capewell & Mogford.

02 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman reported that in relation to item 4, that all Members of the Committee had received a notification from the developer yesterday and that this information is in the public domain.

Councillor Freeman reported a personal interest, that in relation to item number 4, that he was a Ward Councillor but he had not pre-determined the application.

Councillor Annison reported a personal interest, that in relation to item number 5, that he had a family member who was employed at the James Paget University Hospital.

In Accordance with the Council's Constitution, those members were allowed to both speak and vote on the item.

03 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 February 2024 were confirmed.

04 APPLICATION 06 22 1026 D - Land off Foster Close, Ormesby St Margaret, Great Yarmouth

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

The Planning Officer reported that this is an application seeking approval of the reserved matters details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, following outline planning permission having already been granted for residential development of up to 33 dwellings. The application site is accessed from the Northern Site whose access is via Foster Close.

This Reserved Matters application takes this into account and is closely related to the site. Many of the supporting documents relate to the northern site and the full planning permission granted under permission ref 06/22/1027/F.

The Planning Officer reported that a number of conditions remain to be discharged from the related Outline Planning permission under Ref 06/20/056/O, several prior to the commencement of development at the Southern Site, related to matters as diverse as details needing to be submitted to the LPA for approval of a temporary haul road, Ecological Mitigation and biodiversity strategies, Arboricultural Impact Statements, Surface and Foul Water Drainage, Construction Worker on-site car parking, Construction and Environmental Management Plans, Schemes of Archaeological and Contaminated Land investigations/desktop studies, provision and location of fire hydrants, and land and finished floor levels. It is not unusual for these to be determined after Reserved Matters are agreed.

The Planning Officer reported that 6 public comments had been received; including 5 objections. The representations raised are Parking pressure in Foster Close, Construction Traffic noise and disturbance, poor maneuverability, highway safety in Foster Close and beyond including near the school. Plot 14 could cause lack of privacy due to proximity. Lack of clarity in the proposed development and whether it addresses all issues raised during grant of outline planning permission.

The Planning Officer reported that in regard to Condition 5, the Haul Road, that this would be agreed prior to the commencement of the development.

The Planning Officer reported that the access road into this application site is a continuation of the road approved for accessing the 7 dwellings of the Northern Site. Immediately within the Southern Site there is a spur off the access road where there are 6 dwellings of various types proposed, comprising two semi-detached 2-bedroom homes and the rest as 3-bedroom detached houses. In layout these are positioned around the established trees to create a small 'green' between the north and south sites. The pattern is not dissimilar to that proposed in the eastern side of the northern site and as such serves as a rough mirror image.

The Planning Officer reported that further south a further spur to the east continues south to oppose the access road as it turns down towards the south-east of the site, serving 20 dwellings off the spur road cul-de-sac in a higher density arrangement of detached, semi-detached and terrace dwellings, including all 8 affordable houses.

The revised plans add a pedestrian link here significantly increasing the permeability of the site. The remaining 7 dwellings are all detached houses and bungalows positioned on the north side of the continued spur road, overlooking the drainage basin and landscaping to the south of the site.

The Planning Officer reported that the Landscaping Strategy submitted with this planning application and latterly revised sought to provide landscaping which whilst in accordance with the surrounding area was self-contained for the specific development incorporating street trees, village and linear greens and planting within front gardens and street spaces to soften the hard landscaping necessary for access and car parking. The addition of trees along the street scene and enhanced permeability between the main spine road and lower spur in the south-eastern corner of the site is welcomed by the officers and the tree placement forward of the principal elevations helps to mitigate, in part, the varied approach to the materials used, by providing some unifying consistency to the street scene.

The Planning Officer reported that a third party concern was raised about the potential impact on the amenity of the existing occupiers to the west of the site. However, plots 14 and 33-35 are approximately 30 metres from the site's western boundary and there is significant existing and proposed screening between this and the boundary. It is noted the separation distance arises from the layout of the access road between existing gardens and new dwellings, but the level of traffic anticipated is not considered likely to be so significant as to create unacceptable living conditions and the screening and vegetation offers a perceived sense of separation between the two. As the new houses are set well back from the western boundary of the site officers are satisfied that no adverse impacts on the amenity of the occupiers of these properties would arise from the dwellings themselves, nor would they for the occupiers of the properties to the south or south-west of the subject site.

The Planning Officer reported that Policy H2 sets out that where residential sites are proposed adjacent to a recently permitted scheme (within the past 3 years) and identified as phased or cumulative development, as evidenced in addition to one or more of the below criteria, the affordable housing requirement will be calculated based on the total development of the northern and southern scheme combined. The total number of dwellings to be provided across both sites (north and south) are 40 dwellings and the affordable housing requirement is for 8 dwellings within that (20% as required by policy UCS4); the applicant is proposing 7 no. affordable rent properties and 1 no. shared ownership tenure to the Strategic Housing officer's satisfaction.

The Planning Officer reported that the application for reserved matters seeks approval for submitted details of layout, scale, design and landscaping, and includes details of electric vehicle charging points to be provided, an indication of the surface water drainage scheme required by condition 9 of the outline permission, details of cycle storage and details of refuse storage and collection points and screening. The applicant has worked with the Local Planning Authority to provide satisfactory details to flesh out the outline development and in the process discharge conditions 8 and 9 in conjunction with this application.

The Planning Officer reported that it was considered that the proposal is, on balance, acceptable and whilst greater accessibility and permeability could have been achieved, it is considered that the proposal has responded to the requirements of the outline permission and provides dwellings of a good standard of accommodation and design and layout of appropriate character and scale and does not cause unacceptable detrimental impact to neighbours.

The Planning Officer reported that the design and layout is considered to be slightly positive in planning terms with the neutral impact of surface water drainage able to be addressed by pre-approval amendments and clarification of technical details by conditions, and the provision of accessible, water efficient housing with EV charging provision which can also be secured by conditions. At wider level the outline planning permission provides positives in terms of housing and affordable housing, public open space, enhanced biodiversity and security, all of which combine to outweigh the loss of the undeveloped agricultural land.

The Planning Officer reported that having considered the details provided, the proposal is considered to be acceptable and the conditions will be amended accordingly together with the remaining conditions imposed (and amended where appropriate, for example to reflect that the development commenced under the previous permission). The proposed details for reserved matters are therefore considered acceptable and to accord with Policies CS2, CS9, A1, A2, E4, E6, E7 H2, H3 and H4 as well as the adopted Great Yarmouth Design Code 2024.

There are some matters which remain outstanding, which are considered necessary to address through additional information and amendments to be secured before any permission is granted. These include; clarifying and if necessary amending the size and position of turning head requirement in the vicinity of plot 35; and, additional surface water drainage information and amended drainage scheme details concerning arrangements at plots 38, 39 and 27-28. Officers are reasonably confident that these are largely technical concerns and the above matters can be addressed within the parameters of the Reserved Matters set out before Committee without requiring further public consultation or further Committee overview.

The Planning Officer reported that it was recommended that the Committee delegate authority to the Head of Planning to resolve the outstanding matters and subsequently approve the Reserved Matters subject to the conditions proposed in the list as detailed in the agenda report.

Mr Pike, applicant, addressed the Committee and addressed the objections received in regard to parking stress and provision, the parking provided within the development exceeded the required parking standards. Mr Pike also addressed the issue of overlooking of Plot 14 and reassured existing residents that the distance between Plot 14 and the nearest existing property was double the required separation distance.

The developer was working towards the delivery of the haul road and work was expected to begin on site in September 2024. he asked that the Committee approve the application.

Mr Eburne, applicants agent, addressed the Committee and informed them that it was a seamless and integrated development and would provide much needed affordable housing units in the village. The developer was committed to providing a haul road and there were no outstanding concerns with a few minor revisions required to the layout. The new homes would be built to FHS and would have Air Source heat Pumps and Solar Panels installed to reduce the CO2 output. The applicant had already paid a significant amount of the required s106 payments. He urged the Committee to approve the application.

Mr Sparks, objector, addressed the Committee, and asked that Officers explore with the applicant the potential reorientation of Plot 14 away from his home, which had enjoyed uninterrupted views over open farmland for over 30 years, and the neighbouring properties to the west of the site.

The Interim Head of Planning reported that Plot 14 was situated over 40m away from the nearest property, which accorded with planning policy, and that rotating Plot 14 by 90 degrees might affect the development as this could result in the significant reduction in the quality of design and appearance of the development, or creation of significant adverse impacts to the amenity of future occupiers of surrounding properties. Mr Pike reported that this request was something that they could discuss with officers under the delegation process.

Councillor Murray-Smith asked Mr Sparks to identify his property on the presentation map slide and queried whether the mature tree in situ might provide adequate screening. he also asked Mr Sparks if he had submitted photographic evidence with his objection.

The Chair assured Mr Sparks that the Committee were aware of his objection as it had been included in the Committee report and had been brought to the Committee's attention whether Mr Sparks had been in attendance or not.

Councillors Annison, Boyd & Murray-Smith reported that Mr Sparks request should be further investigated by the applicant and officers to see if a compromise could be found to benefit everyone concerned.

Parish Councillor Wendt reported that she no longer wished to address the Committee as an assurance had been given in respect to Condition 5, the provision of the haul road, which would be put in place prior to the commencement of the development.

Councillor Freeman, who was one of the two ward Councillors for Ormesby St Margaret, reported that he had voted against the original application but his faith had been restored due to the hard work undertaken by the applicant and developer to ensure a first class development. He commended them both for all their hard work and compromises to bring this development to the village which included much needed affordable housing units.

The Interim Head of Housing reported that in regard to page 33 of the agenda report, an amendment to the resolution was required to clarify, and, if necessary, amend the size and position of turning head requirement in the vicinity of plot 35. A second amendment to the recommendation had been made at the meeting; that Officers had been asked to explore with the applicant the potential reorientation of Plot 14 away from neighbouring properties to the west of the site, without significant reduction in the quality of design and appearance of the development, or creation of significant adverse impacts to the amenity of future occupiers of surrounding properties.

Councillor Pilkington reported that he lived in the village and this was a welcome development which he fully supported although he had reservations in regard to the wider issue of access to the village centre from the east side of California.

Councillor Williamson reported that he fully supported the officers recommendation including the additional criteria agreed at the meeting. It was an excellent development providing ASHP, EV Charging Points and much needed affordable housing in the Northern Parishes.

Proposer: Councillor Boyd
Seconder: Councillor Williamson

Following an unanimous vote, it was RESOLVED:-

That in regard to application number 06/22/1026/D, the Committee agree to delegate authority to the Head of Planning to subsequently approve the reserved matters details and grant consent subject to:-

- (i) Resolution of outstanding details in respect of drainage matters, in conjunction with the LLFA,
- (ii) Clarifying and if necessary amending the size and position of turning head requirement in the vicinity of plot 35,
- (iii) Appropriate conditions including those listed below (to be modified where necessary); and
- (iv) That Officers explore with the applicant the potential reorientation of Plot 14 away from neighbouring properties to the west of the site, without significant reduction in the quality of design and appearance of the development, or creation of significant adverse impacts to the amenity of future occupiers of surrounding properties.

05 APPLICATION 06 23 0918 F - Site of former Car Park G, James Paget University Hospital

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

The Chair reported that retrospective planning applications did not sit well with him and perhaps this was a matter which the Committee might decide that warrants further investigation in the future to try and prevent this from becoming normal practice by applicants.

The Planning Officer reported that the application was for the retrospective redevelopment of an existing car park to provide an Orthopaedic Elective Hub and Community Diagnostic Centre (Class C2), together with associated parking, highway, drainage, engineering and landscaping works. The Planning Officer reported that this is a connected application as part of the application site is owned by the Borough Council. This application was reported to the Monitoring Officer as an application submitted for development on land owned by the Borough Council. The land owned by the Council is a short length of the 'JPUH Staff Entrance' access route to the site off Brasenose Avenue, which is within the red line of the application site.

The Planning Officer reported that the application site is within the James Paget University Hospital campus and sits on what was Car Park G located to the north- western portion of the hospital site. The site covers circa 1.19 hectares and sits next to the recently completed Concept Ward and the Diagnostic Assessment Centre (DAC) currently under construction. Car Park G is a staff car parking, although this has been closed during the construction of the neighbouring new buildings, and is now being used as a site compound.

The Planning Officer reported that the application is described as being retrospective. This is because the ground works for the proposed Orthopaedic Elective Hub and Community Diagnostic Centre commenced in December 2023 at the risk of the applicant. On the site visit on the 9th February 2024, this was confirmed with works so far being limited to the digging of foundations and associated round works.

The Planning Officer reported that the application seeks planning permission for the development of a new building that forms both an Orthopaedic Elective Hub and a Community Diagnostic Centre. The proposed building will constitute a total of 2,627m² Gross Internal Floor Space over two floors. This consists of 1,520m² at the Ground Floor which will serve as the Orthopaedic Elective Hub and 1,041m² at the First Floor which will function as the Community Diagnostic Centre, plus mechanical plant rooms and other support spaces required for both floors to function. The total Gross External Area (GEA) of accommodation equates to 2,711m².

The proposed building will include the following:-

- On the ground floor for patients, there are 2 no. fully compliant theatres for elective surgery with associated ancillary spaces including anaesthetic and preparation rooms. There are 4 no. Stage 1 Recovery Bays for patients post-surgery, plus 8 no. Admission/Discharge 'Pods'.
- A separate staff entrance point to the building (located along the northern elevation to the west), straight into the changing facilities. The main visitor access point is adjacent to the DAC building to the east.
- On the rest of the ground floor, there are separate changing facilities at the entrance point with a separate rest rooms for all staff. There are also a number of storage areas needed for the facilitation of the hospital including storage areas and a pharmacy.
- The first floor for patients will be accessed by the primary staircase and lift on the eastern side of the building. On the first floor for patients, there are 8 no. treatment rooms, 6 no. clinical consultation rooms and a waiting area. Further on the first floor, there are further staffing facilities, offices and reporting offices for the CDC staff and a plant room.

- There are also waste storage facilities including waste disposal holds that are transported from this facility to the central Hospital facility on the wider site.

The Planning Officer reported that the proposal creates 18 no. drop-off vehicle parking spaces, including 3 no. disabled parking spaces. In addition to this, a minibus space is also proposed, due to the removal of the space provided as part of the DAC scheme. The proposal allows for 40 dedicated staff cycle parking spaces, which are secured and covered to the south, and a further 10 covered visitor cycle parking spaces in the vicinity of the building entrance.

In terms of access and egress points for vehicles, the proposal seeks the blocking up of the currently consented egress point from the DAC parking area, expanding this area creating a one-way system. The system will allow vehicles to access 'in' at the most eastern point in front of the DAC and exit 'out' to the most western point in front of the OEH and CDC.

The Planning Officer reported that the existing cellular soakaway, which serves the Concept Ward located to the south of the site, is proposed to be removed as part of the new development due to its close proximity to the new building (i.e. within 5m of the proposed foundations). The connections to the existing soakaway are to be directed into the proposed building's drainage system and directed to the two new soakaways, to be constructed as part of this application, to be located to the north of the new development under the car parking area.

The Planning Officer reported that the proposal seeks permission for a landscaping strategy and demonstrates the retention of the existing trees to the west of the site as well as the planting of additional trees and other landscaping features, including: Where the DAC egress point is blocked up, additional landscaping is proposed in this area; and, whilst the scheme does not seek any changes to the Concept Ward Therapy Garden it does seek additional planting to the south of the proposed OEH and CDC building as well as to the north and west.

The Planning Officer reported that the application proposes a new building at the James Paget University Hospital which will expand the available healthcare provision which can be provided on site. This provides a public benefit and complies with the aims of improving community facilities and supporting the expansion of the Hospital as outlined in policy CS15.

The design of the new building is considered to appropriately reflect the neighbouring buildings and the positioning of the building and the material palette proposed ensures that the building will contribute to forming a street frontage, even if it is recognised that a more active frontage would have been desirable but operational restrictions mean it cannot be achieved due to the function of the building.

The Planning Officer reported that the landscaping scheme is considered acceptable if delivery is secured by condition, along with the required reinstatement and planting of the redundant access outside the DAC centre, and subject to protection of the trees. Local residential and in-patient amenity can be protected by use of planning conditions, including precautionary mitigation measures for plant and machinery and specific conditions concerning construction practices.

The Planning Officer reported that having considered the details provided, the application is considered to comply with policies CS1, CS9, CS11, CS12, CS13, CS15 and CS16 from the adopted Core Strategy, and policies GSP1, A1, C1, E4, E6, I1 and I3 from the adopted Local Plan Part 2. It is considered that the application should be recommended for approval. As works have commenced on site, there is no need to impose a condition requiring the development to commence within 3 years of the grant of planning permission.

The Interim Head of Planning asked that in regard to application number 06/23/0918/F, that the Committee delegate authority to the Head of Planning to approve the application subject to the conditions as set out in the published agenda report, as amended by the published Addendum Report and the finalisation of the wording for condition 3; Construction Environment Management Plan.

Councillor Annison asked why a Development Management Committee was required when so many recommendations by officers were to give delegated powers to the head of planning to approve an application. The Interim Head of Planning reported that this was a balancing act and officers presented all the main facts and matters of concern to the Committee, and that delegation was requested in just a few minor areas to be agreed following the Committee meeting.

Councillor Bird asked how many car parking spaces would be provided. The Planning officer reported that 376 spaces would be provided. Councillor Bird was concerned that this would not be sufficient provision. The Chair reported that car parking provision did not form part of the application before the Committee this evening.

Councillor Williamson asked if the ground works had started and the building was 30 to 40% partially constructed, why was the planning application received so late. The Chair suggested that this question should be answered by the applicant.

Councillor Murray-Smith asked which land was owned by the Council. The Planning Officer reported that this was the access strip from Brasenose Avenue into the hospital as outlined in red on the slide presentation map.

Mr Kee, Chief Operating Officer, JPUH, applicant, addressed the Committee and reported the salient areas of the application. he reported that the funding for the development had been granted in July 2023 and the building had to be occupied by July 2024 and that is why the building had begun prior to the application being heard by the Committee this evening. He respectfully asked the Committee to approve the application.

Councillor Freeman asked for clarification that the access from Brasenose Avenue was an established access. Ms Keech, agent, explained that this was an adopted highway and was purely a technical issue and was included in the application for completeness.

Councillor Boyd asked how long this development would reduce the hospital waiting list by. Mr Kee reported that it was hoped that the waiting time for surgery would be reduced from 15 months to 18 weeks.

Councillor Williamson reported that he understood the tight timescales to spend government funding but this must not be at the expense of planning law.

Councillor Freeman agreed with this sentiment; planning must not be allowed to fall at the expense of funding otherwise we would have no planning system.

Councillor Williamson reported that he was very pleased to see this application come forwards and that he fully supported it.

Proposer: Councillor Williamson
Seconder: Councillor Annison

Following an unanimous vote, it was RESOLVED:-

That in regard to application number 06/23/0918/F, that the Committee delegate authority to the Head of Planning to approve the application subject to the conditions as set out in the published agenda report, as amended by the published Addendum Report and the finalisation of the wording for condition 3; Construction Environment Management Plan.

06 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: 19:37