

Development Control Committee

Minutes

Wednesday, 24 May 2017 at 18:30

PRESENT:

Councillor Williamson (in the Chair); Councillors Andrews, Annison, Fairhead, Flaxman-Taylor, Grant, Hammond, Reynolds, Thirtle, Wainwright & Wright.

Councillor Walch attended as a substitute for Councillor Bird.

Councillor Weymouth attended as a substitute for Councillor Hanton.

Mr D Minns (Group Manager, Planning), Mrs G Manthorpe (Senior Planning Officer), Mr J Ibbotson (Planning Officer), Mr J Beck (Planning Officer), Miss J Smith (Technical Officer) & Mrs C Webb (Member Services Officer).

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bird & Hanton.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Walch declared a personal interest in item 6, Councillors Annison & Flaxman-Taylor declared a personal interest in item 7, Councillors Annison &

Grant declared a personal interest in item 8, Councillor Weymouth declared a personal interest in items 9 & 11 and Councillor Thirtle declared a personal interest in item 11. However, in accordance with the Council's Constitution they were allowed to both speak and vote on the item.

3 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 April 2017 were confirmed.

4 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

5 APPLICATION NUMBER 06/17/0115/F 17 GREENHILL AVENUE

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

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was for a new detached house within the residential curtilage of 17 Greenhill Avenue. An application at this address was refused in 2016.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the Parish Council had objected to the proposal as it exceeded the boundary onto the Public right of Way and was over-development of the site. There had been 6 letters of objection from members of the public citing encroachment on public land and a public right of way, loss of valuable wildlife, restricting movement of emergency vehicles, lack of space/over-development, lack of explicit dimensions, ownership of land to the rear, a previous application was refused, parking, access to the property, over-looking and covenants on deeds.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the applicant had declared ownership of the disputed public area of land on the application form. The public rights of way officer had confirmed that the proposal did not impact on the public right of way. Therefore, all available information stated that there will not be a loss of public right of way to the south. However, it was recognised that the proposal would reduce the amenity and visual value of the public right of way by the removal of the trees and the loss of the green corridor was a negative impact on the attractiveness of the footpath.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was recommended for approval, subject to all conditions to ensure a suitable development.

Mr Patrick, objector, addressed the Committee and reported that the proposed property was out of character with the street scene and would result in the loss of the only green space which was an amenity which local residents had enjoyed for many years. The development would result in the narrowing of the public right of way which would impact on wheelchair users and parents

pushing prams. The development would spoil the character of the estate and he urged the Committee to refuse the application.

A Member reported that the ownership of the disputed land was a civil matter and not a planning consideration.

A Member proposed that the application be approved, this motion was seconded, but was lost at the vote.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/17/0115/F be refused.

6 APPLICATION NUMBER 06/17/0098/F LAND ADJOINING 27 ALBANY ROAD

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

The Planning Group Manager reported that the proposal involved the building of a house onto the end of the terrace of houses on the south side of Albany Road and a detached house at the south end of the garden which would face Stafford Road. vehicular access for both houses would be from Stafford Road. The houses would have a mansard style roof containing the bedrooms on the second floor, thus keeping the height of the buildings the same as adjoining and nearby dwellings.

The Planning Group Manager reported that seven neighbour objections had been received objecting to loss of on-street parking, overlooking, over-shadowing, existing parking problems in the vicinity, drainage concerns and there were too many houses in the area already.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the occupier of 173 Stafford Road had raised concerns that the proximity of the proposed building would affect the light to the window to the side of his house which faced the passageway. It could be conditioned that the whole of this elevation be finished in white render to reflect more light and therefore, have less effect on the neighbour.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the properties would have their own parking within the site and there were no objections from Highways. It was proposed that a condition be placed on any grant of permission stating that a parking/turning area be provided on the site with a permeable surface. The ground floor of the properties would consist of a garage, utility, w.c, and a hall to offset flooding concerns and the bathroom windows would be obscure glazed.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the application was recommended for approval as it 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 with the suggested conditions.

Mr Self, applicant, reported the salient areas of his application to the committee which would result in good quality homes at a low rental for local residents.

Mr Thompson, objector, reported his concerns regarding the loss of light to the dining room at his home which was covered under the Right to Light Act. A Member asked for clarification as to whether this Act still existed. The Planning Group Manager read out a paragraph from the Law Commission in the interest of clarity, which cited loss of light to a neighbouring property as protection but not a right. He also reported that garages were not used for parking which would lead to a greater demand for parking in the area.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/17/0098/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. In addition to the standard planning conditions, approval is subject to the south elevation of unit A being finished in white render, the parking and turning area having a permeable surface, the garages being kept available for parking and removal of permitted development rights for extensions and windows.

7 APPLICATION NUMBER 06/16/0809/F (110-111 WELLESLEY ROAD, GREAT YARMOUTH)

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

The Planning Officer reported that this was a retrospective application for the change of use of the building formally to a House in Multiple occupancy with 18 bedrooms and a basement flat which raised an issue of policy compliance. The application would result in over-intensive use of the building, lack of parking, storage or amenity areas for current and future residents. The poor quality accommodation provided for residents of the scheme would result in harm to the character of the area, upon the amenity of neighbouring residents, visitors and businesses and provide inadequate amenity for current and future residents. the application was contrary to Policies CS1, CS2, and CS3 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan: Core Strategy and Saved Policy HOU23 of the Great Yarmouth Boroughwide Local Plan and was recommended for refusal.

Mrs Doyle, applicant's agent, reported that the applicants had indicated that they would be amenable to make improvements and renovations to the building to bring the building into line with Council policy and requested that the application be withdrawn to allow further discussions to take place between the applicants and the planning department.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/16/0809/F be withdrawn.

8 APPLICATION NUMBER 06/17/0229/F GORLESTON GOLF CLUB

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

The Planning Officer reported that work had commenced on the car park in February 2017, and following concerns raised by a neighbour, the site was visited by a Planning Officer. As the works were within the red site boundary line and did not extend beyond the high part of the fence to the rear of 31 Warren Road, as noted on the drawing, the Golf Club was advised that the work carried out complied with the drawing. It was assumed, at this stage, that the written dimension of 19 metres as marked on the drawing was correct.

The Planning Officer reported that after the tarmac had been laid, a further complaint was received, that the car park extended further to the south than was shown on the approved drawing, the extension to the car park was subsequently measured and found to be 22 metres long. Although the extension to the car park had not been constructed in accordance with the written dimension shown on the approved drawing, the car parking spaces did not encroach beyond the high part of the fence at 31 Warren Lane. The extra length of tarmac is visible from the objector's house and garden but as it was at ground level, it did not obstruct the outlook or view from that dwelling or have a greater effect on the residential amenities currently enjoyed by that property than if the car park had been constructed with the approved dimension.

The Planning Officer reported that the application was recommended for approval with a condition that the area to the south of the marked out parking bays should not be marked out or used for the parking of cars.

Mr Lowe, Gorleston Golf Club, reported the salient areas of the application and that the objector was still able to enjoy an uninterrupted view across the golf course.

Mr Spearritt, objector, reported that the Planning Department had made an error in the drawings and, as a result, the Golf Club had benefited from an additional 10 parking spaces, and he would be willing to fund their removal.

A Member reported that the extra tarmac was necessary to allow vehicles to enter/exit the parking spaces.

A Member reported that the additional area of tarmac amounted to an increase of 20% which was not an oversight on behalf of the builder's and that the application should be refused on the grounds of over-development. This

proposal as seconded, but lost at the vote.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/17/0229/F be approved with a condition that the area to the south of the marked out bays should remain as shown and should not be marked out or used for the parking of cars.

9 APPLICATION NUMBER 06/17/0199/O (21 CRAB LANE, GREAT YARMOUTH)

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

The Planning Officer reported that the site was a large plot accessed from Crab Lane with a dormer bungalow with a large rear garden which have not been well maintained, and the plot is relatively green. The plot measures 87m long and is 35m wide in the middle tapering to 24m wide, totalling 0.23 hectares. The Council has placed a Tree Preservation Order on 4 trees on the site.

The Planning Officer reported that outline planning permission was sought for the erection of 5 dwellings with all matters reserved. Seven letters of objection from local residents had been received citing harm and loss of trees, loss of privacy, plots not in alignment with neighbouring houses, over-development, increase in traffic, too much development in Bradwell already, host property should be retained, back land development and loss of green space.

The Planning Officer reported that it would be advisable that a condition be imposed on any dwelling in the western offshoot of the site be a bungalow or a bungalow with rooms in the roof. the Planning Officer reported that the application was recommended for approval with all matters reserved.

Councillor Annison, Ward Councillor, was concerned that a tree covered by a TPO had been felled on site and more trees would be lost to the proposed development. He questioned whether the development could be designed around the trees.

Mr Stone, Applicant's Agent, reported the salient areas of the outline application to the Committee and asked them to approve it as further detail would be submitted at the reserved matters stage.

Mrs Hall, objector, reported that she objected to the proposed removal of the Monterey Pine tree and requested a condition regarding hours of work on the site.

Councillor Wainwright reported that he thought the application was over-development of the site and that the trees which were covered by a TPO on

the site should be retained and therefore proposed that the application be refused. The proposal was seconded and following a vote, it was RESOLVED:

That application number 06/17/0199/O be refused as the proposal would result in over-development of the site and loss of trees which were covered by a Tree Preservation Order.

10 APPLICATION NUMBER 06/16/426/F PEACEHAVEN, YARMOUTH ROAD, HEMSBY

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

The Senior Planning Officer reported that this application was heard at a previous Committee meeting, but was subsequently found to be invalid, so was required to come before the Committee again. The plans remained the same, although the applicant had submitted further information on the drainage, landscaping and boundary treatments.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that there had been a slight change to the original plan whereby the footpath had been moved to the other side of the development. the senior Planning officer reported that the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions ensuring a suitable development.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/16/0426/F be approved, subject to conditions ensuring a suitable development. These include the highway conditions, archaeology and environmental health conditions, limits to extensions and sizes, appropriate obscure glazing and landscaping. the approval was subject to a Section 106 agreement regarding affordable housing, maintenance of the road and future drainage and landscaping outside the curtilage of individual properties.

11 APPLICATION NUMBER 06/16/0128/F THE FIRST AND LAST, YARMOUTH ROAD, ORMESBY ST MARGARET

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

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was for full permission to convert the public house into a residential property, to demolish most of the rear extensions and to build three cottage style bungalows. Two residential applications had previously been refused at this site. a significant proportion of the site was currently designate highways due to a recent

modification order and the applicant would need to apply for a stopping up order for the development to commence.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the Parish Council had raised concerns regarding the application and that 8 objections had been received from 7 members of the public citing that the public house was viable and should remain as a public house, loss of a community facility, loss of access to Tarn House, drainage issues, parking concerns, water main under property, outside village development limit, loss of privacy, over-development, not in character with the area and a recent approval for housing close to the site providing a greater market for the public house.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions ensuring a suitable development.

A Member asked if the public house was listed. The Senior Planning Officer reported that it was not listed.

The applicant's agent reported the salient areas of the application to the Committee and urged the committee to approve the application.

Mrs Moore, objector, reported that the village wanted to retain the public house as a community asset.

Mr Peck, Chairman of the Parish Council, reported that the proposal was over-development of the site and the PC were concerned regarding the mains water pipe which ran under the building. He urged the Committee to refuse the application and to enforce that the owners rectify the appearance of the public house which was presently, an eyesore at the entrance to the village.

Councillor Reynolds, Ward Councillor, asked for the water main situation to be clarified. The Senior Planning Officer reported that Anglian Water had stated that they had no assets in the area which would be affected by the proposed development. Councillor Reynolds reluctantly supported the application as he felt it would bring to a close, the long and sorry saga of the demise of the public house. However, he hoped that the stopping-up order would be strongly challenged.

A Member agreed with Councillor Reynolds and reported that enforcement action should have been undertaken years ago and that the appearance of the public house was a disgrace and he therefore proposed approval of the application.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/16/0128/F be approved, subject to conditions ensuring a suitable development. To include drainage, highways conditions including a stopping up order, removal of permitted development rights, construction time limits, boundary treatments, archaeology and slab levels.

12 APPLICATION NUMBER 06/17/0145/O SEACROFT HOLIDAY VILLAGE, BEACH ROAD, HEMSBY

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

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was for outline permission for a new dwelling with all matters reserved, meaning the access, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping would all be subject to a detailed application. The site was defined as primary holiday accommodation under the Boroughwide Local Plan.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that one letter of objection had been received from the public objecting to skips already sited on the land and requesting their removal and the area to the rear of the property to be tidied.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was recommended for approval, subject to conditions ensuring a suitable development.

RESOLVED:

That application 06/17/0145/O be approved subject to conditions ensuring a suitable development. Detailed reserved matters to be received including access, parking and turning requirements, slab levels and boundary treatments.

13 APPLICATION NUMBER 06/17/0143/F HOLLYWOOD COMPLEX, MARINE PARADE, GREAT YARMOUTH

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

The Planning Officer reported that this was a full application to extend the front of the existing building at the southern elevation covering a portion of the car park to form a restaurant. The entrance to the cinema would be relocated to the eastern elevation with a revised internal configuration and change of use from retail to cinema use. the bar at first floor level would be to the southern section over the proposed restaurant.

The Planning Officer reported that the application was recommended for approval with the suggested conditions.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/17/0143/f be approved with conditions as

requested by consulted parties and those deemed appropriate to ensure a satisfactory form of development.

14 DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS MADE BY DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AND OFFICERS 1 - 30 APRIL 2017

The Committee noted the planning decisions made by the Development Control committee and Officers for the period 1 - 30 April 2017.

15 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

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

16 EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC

The meeting ended at: 21:00