

Development Control Committee

Minutes

Wednesday, 19 October 2016 at 18:30

PRESENT:

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

Councillor Walch attended as a substitute for Councillor A Grey.

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

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor A Grey.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following Declarations of Interest were noted:-

With regard to Item number 5, Councillor Williamson declared a personal interest.

With regard to Item number 6, Councillors Annison & Williamson declared a personal interest.

With regard to Item number 7, Councillors Annison, Flaxman-Taylor, Grant, Hammond, Thirtle, Wainwright & Williamson declared a personal interest as they were members of the Local Authority Trading Company Shareholder Committee.

However, in accordance with the Council's Constitution, they were allowed to both speak and vote on the items.

3 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 September 2016 were confirmed.

4 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

5 APPLICATION NUMBER 06/15/0737/F - FORMER CLAYDON HIGH SCHOOL, BECCLES ROAD, GORLESTON

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

The Planning Group Manager reported that the principle of development had previously been agreed on this site which was located in a sustainable location within Gorleston and within the development boundary as defined within the Great Yarmouth Boroughwide Local Plan 2001.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the application provided for a range of dwelling types as outlined in the previously approved application. The development essentially accorded with the various policies referred to in the report which sought to support development in sustainable locations and would contribute to the housing needs of the Borough.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the applicants had agreed to enter into a legal obligation regarding affordable housing at 20%, which would be provided in the form of 9 x 1 bedroom properties to rent and to look to market the 13 x 3 bedroom properties as Starter Homes.

The Planning Group Manager reported that Norfolk Constabulary had raised concerns over the highway and access proposals from the site onto Burgh Road and Beccles Road. However, the proposal now included provision, as required by Highways, to build out the entrance to the site and the provision of a 3 metre cycleway/footpath with improved visibility splays and 20 mph speed limits within the development.

The Planning Group Manager reported that four letters of objection had been received from local residents. The Planning Group Manager reported that a

fifth letter of objection had been received and he had circulated copies to the Committee prior to the commencement of the meeting.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the trees on the site which were in poor condition but covered by a Tree Preservation Order would be replaced as part of a landscaping scheme.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the application included a foul and surface water drainage strategy showing the use of sustainable drainage systems on site and connection to the existing sewerage systems. According to a letter received from Anglian Water, there was capacity to accommodate the new flows and even, it appears, the surface water, if required.

The Planning Group Manager reported that if Members were minded to approve the application, it should be subject to a s106 agreement for the provision of affordable housing (20%), education, library books, open space, play space and maintenance provision within the development of public areas together with maintenance of private drives and drainage and the highway requirements. The application complied with the saved policies in the Great Yarmouth Local Plan 2001 and Core Strategy Adopted December 2015, as set out within the report and was therefore recommended for approval.

A Member asked if the proposed development contained any private roads. The Planning Group Manager reported that there were some included in the scheme but the Council would condition a suitable maintenance scheme if the proposal was approved.

Mr Gilder, applicant's agent, reported the salient details of the application to the Committee and he assured the Committee that the application contained a detailed drainage strategy. A Member asked for clarification in regard to the proposed Starter Homes. Mr Gilder reported that half would be Starter Homes and half would be for rent.

Councillor Williamson, Ward Councillor, reported that he had not been approached by any local residents who opposed the scheme and now that the Committee were assured by Anglian Water that all surface water drainage could be dealt with on site, that he was happy to support the proposal.

Mr Routeledge, local resident, addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Mr Mills, an objector, reported his objections to the Committee. The main objection was that his property would have a terrace of four houses built behind his property, which would result in overlooking and a potential regular turnover of residents in these proposed starter homes/rental properties.

A Member reported that young people were desperate to get on the housing ladder in Bradwell/Gorleston and that he welcomed the inclusion of starter and rental homes in the proposal.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/15/0737/F be approved subject to completion of a Section 106 Agreement for the provision of affordable housing, education, library books, play space and maintenance provision within the development of public areas together with maintenance of private drives and drainage, the highways requirements and subject to clarification of the drainage details. The application complied with the saved policies in the Great Yarmouth Local Plan 2001 and Core Strategy Adopted December 2015 as set out within the report.

6 APPLICATION NUMBER 06_16_0189_F - BURNT LANE & ADDISON ROAD (FORMER IVY HOUSE & THE HOLLIES, GORLESTON

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

The Senior Planning Officer reported that this application was a full application for the erection of 18 dwellings comprising 9, three bedroom houses and 9, two bedroom flats. The three bedroom houses were arranged in a terrace facing onto Burnt Lane with the flats facing Addison Road. The terraced houses were two storey in keeping with the existing Burnt Lane frontage. The flats were three storey and will extend around the corner of Burnt Lane and front onto Addison Road.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that 5 letters of objection had been received from local residents citing lack of parking, proposed density was too high, three storey flats did not fit it with streetscene, traffic congestion, increased traffic, roads not suitable for HGV's, poor visibility due to car parking, overlooking from three storey flats, loss of home value and disruptive effect of development on existing homes.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that there had been objections from residents regarding the increase in traffic using Burnt lane and the current parking difficulties. However, there are 36 parking spaces proposed with the development which provided two spaces per dwelling. The Senior Planning Officer reported that the private driveway would have a maintenance condition attached.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that there were a number of mature trees in existence on the site, all bar two of which, were to be removed. The remaining two were located to the east of the entrance, one of which, was a Copper Beach which had a Tree Preservation Order in place.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the proposed access to the site was to be located off of Addison Road and had an adequate visibility splay to comply with Highways standards. The access led into a private drive which had parking located at each side.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that there had been an objection

regarding increased overlooking from the three storey flats towards the existing dwellings at Burnt Lane. However, given the location of the proposed development and the current density of houses, there was already a degree of overlooking from the adjacent properties and although there was an increase in overlooking from the adjacent properties, this was not deemed sufficient to refuse the application.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that there had been objections to the development regarding the potential loss in market value of the existing properties and disruption to local residents during construction. However, these were not material considerations for consideration by the Committee. If the Committee was minded to grant the application, a condition could be imposed to control the hours of construction to limit noise nuisance.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that on letter of support had been received from a local resident providing adequate space was left between their existing property and the proposed development. There would be a gap of between 1.25 m and 1.95 m between number 34 Burnt Lane and the new development.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the Conservation Officer had objected to the proposal solely on design grounds.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the development was located within the urban area of Gorleston and was in a sustainable location. The application was supported by Local and the National Planning Policy Framework which encouraged sustainable development, unless material considerations indicated otherwise.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the recommendation was to approve the application, subject to the signing of a s106 agreement, to provide compliant affordable housing, as the application complied with Local and the National Planning Policy.

Councillor Williamson, Ward Councillor, asked for clarification with regard to how the surface/roof water would be dealt with from the site as it was close to the White Horse roundabout with its inherent problems during heavy rainfall. The Senior Planning Officer reported that further drainage details could be conditioned if the application was approved. Councillor Williamson was also concerned regarding parking on Burnt Lane, as parking spaces were a premium, and the proposed access splay needed to be widened as a safety precaution. The Senior Planning Officer reported that Highways had raised no objection to the proposal.

The Planning Group Manager reported that with reference to page 61 of the agenda report; Item SHC 19, the Council would revisit County Highways with the issue of the visibility splay given the concerns voiced by the Ward Councillor.

A Member asked for clarification that the conditions requested by the Historic

Environment Service would be included if the application was approved. The Senior Planning Officer reported that they would be included.

Mr Brooks, objector, outlined his objections to the proposal to the Committee which were the unsuitability of Burnt Lane for the extra traffic which would be generated as a result of the development and the increased pressure on the existing stretched parking spaces for local residents. He was also concerned regarding increased noise nuisance for the residents of the nearby St. Augustine's Care Home during the construction period.

RESOLVED:

(i) That application number 06/16/0189/F be approved subject to the signing of a Section 106 Agreement to provide policy compliant affordable housing, other contributions in line with policy and management arrangements and conditions to ensure a quality form of development.

(ii) That the drainage condition would require details showing that all surface water would be dealt with on site and that the visibility splay would be looked at in line with Members concerns.

7 APPLICATION NUMBER 06/16/0391/SU - SITE 25 BEACON PARK, BRADWELL.

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

The Planning Group Manager reported that the proposal accorded with the aims of the adopted Local Plans and National Planning Policy Framework, in that, it represented sustainable development in the appropriate location close to facilities and adds to the Council's strategic ambition of promoting Beacon Park for mixed use development, whilst meeting the borough's identified Housing needs.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the proposal would be delivered by the Borough Council over the next five years, in partnership with the recently formed, Equinox Enterprises Ltd (the housing development company incorporated by GYBC). This means that the planning permission is for the land and not specific to the Council.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the consultation responses showed that, subject to the conditions and requirements outlined by section 106 agreement, that there was little to constrain development of the site, as identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and for the number of dwellings proposed.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the full planning application showed elements of design and layout which demonstrated a well thought out scheme, using a good range of materials which took into account it's setting and surroundings to create a high standard of development.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the Parish Council had raised a number of concerns and questions which had been addressed in the agenda report. The chosen materials and colours proposed were largely regressive in colouring and tone and the development would not be adversely intrusive in the landscape when viewed, in context, of the surrounding development.

The Planning Group Manager reported that there were a number of objections from local residents, in particular, to the affordable housing aspects of the development. It is clear that there is a misunderstanding with the location of affordable housing units in this proposal, in relation to the location of the objector's properties. However, little weight can be given to this objection in terms of planning material considerations.

The Planning Group Manager reported that Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy, required a developer contribution towards the costs of improvement or the cost of provision of a new school where development proposals created a direct need for additional educational provision which could not be met by existing facilities. The requirement for a financial contribution to meet the educational shortfall identified conformed with the policy and would be subject to legal agreement.

The Planning Group Manager reported, that subject to conditions and the s106 agreement, the impact upon the local infrastructure in terms of education, drainage, highways and schooling could be mitigated. The development could be accommodated in this sustainable location, without adversely impacting upon local amenity and interests of acknowledged importance as the proposal was compliant with the stated policy and ambition for the area, and the Borough.

The Planning Group Manager reported that as part of the application, that Woodfarm Lane would be upgraded and subject to a new Traffic Regulation Order and a condition would be imposed that no development/occupation could commence on site until these road works were undertaken.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the application was therefore recommended for approval, subject to the policies and conditions referred to in the agenda report and the s106 agreement, as it was considered compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework and the current Local Plan, providing a sustainable form of development which helped to address the housing needs identified within the Borough.

A Member asked whether the comments from the Conservation Officer had been taken on board by the developer regarding the choice of coloured materials.

Sarah Hornbrook, applicant's agent, reported that the colour palette had been chosen as it was simple and would result in a cleaner appearance of the properties. Ms Hornbrook reported the salient areas of the application to the Committee and asked that they approve the proposal.

Councillor Annison, Ward Councillor, reported that he had no comments to make in regard to the proposal and was happy to support its approval.

Councillor Williamson reported that Cliff Park Ormiston Academy had been omitted from the list of schools in the agenda report and therefore, more school places might be available. The Planning Group Manager agreed to rectify this matter.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/16/0391/SU be approved subject to the policies, conditions referred to in the agenda report and the Section 106 Agreement as necessary; as it was considered compliant with the national Planning Policy Framework and the current Local Plan, providing a sustainable form of development which helped to address the housing needs identified in the Borough.

8 PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS AND BY THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE FROM 1 SEPTEMBER TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2016.

The Committee noted the planning applications cleared by the Planning Group Manager and the Development Control Committee between 1 - 30 September 2016.

9 OMBUDSMAN AND APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee noted the appeal decisions.

10 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

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

11 EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC

The meeting ended at: 19:40