

# Development Control Committee

## Minutes

Thursday, 24 September 2015 at 18:30

### PRESENT:

Councillor Reynolds (in the Chair); Councillors Andrews, Annison, Bird, Collins, Grant, Jermany, Lawn, Linden, Sutton, T Wainwright, Wright.

Mr D Minns, Miss G Manthorpe & Mr G Jones (GYBC Officers)

### 1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

All Councillors declared a personal interest in item 4 as they had been written to by the applicant.

Councillor Annison declared a personal interest in item 5 as he had been approached by the objectors.

Councillor Jermany declared a personal interest in item 9 as the applicant is the landlord of his business.

### 2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Davis.

### 3 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2015 were confirmed.

### 4 APPLICATION 06/15/0325/F PASTEUR ROAD

The Planning Group Manager reported that the application was a revised version of the one rejected by committee in November 2014. The rejected application is currently under appeal.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the size of the development had been reduced from 10,000SqM to 6,000SqM and that a new roundabout was included to assist with traffic flow.

The Group Manager Planning also explained the report from Carter Jonas.

Following consultations 14 letters of objection and 1 letter of support had been received.

A member asked how this application aligns with paragraph 8.2 and it was explained that this was a restricted application that would limit the impact on the Town Centre.

A member asked what was the definition of bulky goods and it was explained that these were goods that you would not reasonably expect someone to carry i.e. large physical material.

A member asked where the roundabout was to be located and it was explained that this would be located before the current traffic lights.

The agents for the applicant highlighted that they had reduced the size of the application from 7 to 3 units, that they had agreed to bespoke conditions, that they would be submitting additional plans for a hotel on the site and that should this application be approved they would be withdrawing the appeal against the refusal made in November 2014.

A representative from Pasta Foods informed the Committee that the revenue they received would be reinvested in the current factory to improve the facilities.

A member asked the representative why they had recently opened new facilities in Norwich and had not extended their current facilities on this location. The member was informed that developing the site would not have been viable.

Savills on behalf of Market Gates highlighted their objections to the application. They reminded members that since the original refusal, progress had been made in regenerating the Town Centre and that this application would adversely impact this.

Mr Sturrock representing Palmers also objected to the application informing members that the town is still in a weak state, footfall is down and has got worse since Marks and Spencers left and that it would appear that the Gapton Hall estate is morphing into the new town centre.

The Town Centre Manager Mr Newman reiterated that the current situation in the town centre highlighted the 16% vacancy rate and that footfall was down and that he believed that this application, if approved, would further contribute to the decline.

Mr Newman also reminded members that they had contributed £1M to the regeneration of the Town Centre and that this application if approved would contradict this.

A member asked would this development be a threat to the Town Centre and was informed that it would discourage investment.

A ward councillor supported the application because the potential occupiers would not move into a Town Centre and that parking would be easier. The Councillor asked that

consideration be given to creating a pedestrian access into the site.

The Chairman reported that the application had now been fully reported and that it was for members to determine it.

A member expressed concern that it was Council policy to protect the Town Centre and that this application contradicted this. They stated that common sense needs to be kept, we need to increase footfall and this will only happen if we back the town centre.

A member stated that investment must be made in the town centre and that there were large units available such as the old Marks and Spencer store that was currently empty.

The Chair summed up, recognising the importance of Pasta Foods to the area but also recognised the investment the Council had made in the town centre.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/15/0325/F be refused as per the reasons of the previous application as the application would impact on the town centre and was contrary to the councils policy to protect the town centre.

## **5 APPLICATION 06/13/0703/O MEADOWLAND DRIVE (LAND SOUTH OF) BRADWELL**

The Planning Group Manager reported that, as shown, the application was an outline planning application for the principle of development and access.

The Planning Group Manager reported that there would be a buffer zone between the development and the existing houses and that existing trees and hedges would be kept and enhanced.

The Parish Council had no objections to the proposal but requested that the open space areas were not spread thinly across the development. They also requested that they be included in the negotiations regarding the 106 agreements.

Highways had no objections

Seven letters of objection had been received from the public, the main concern being the increase in traffic the estate would produce and construction traffic.

It was reported that a new school was planned on the Persimmon site and the build rate and that Norfolk County Council would be requiring a contribution from the developer, the developer has accepted this condition.

A member asked about the drainage of the site and was informed that information submitted stated that the site drained well and that no concerns had been raised.

A member asked why the access to the estate could not be from the new link road currently under construction and was informed that the access from Meadowland Drive and Caraway Drive was considered by Highways to accommodate the additional capacity.

A member asked about traffic light timings in the area and was informed that as part of the Persimmon development additional controls on the traffic lights could be implemented.

The agent for the applicant stated that all reports and concerns have been considered and addressed, the existing roads are of sufficient size to cope with the additional traffic, the local drainage is fine due to the open spaces and they have taken into account adjacent developments.

A member asked when the building work was likely to start and was informed that this would be once the detailed plans were submitted and approved.

A member asked if the surface water would drain into the existing drains and was informed that this water will be contained within the site.

Mr Ellis on behalf of the local residents highlighted their objections. A number of the residents were unaware that the outline plans had been submitted. They could not understand why the traffic was being put via the existing roads and not via the new link road. They requested that the Council instructed the developer to use the link road and that consideration be given to a pedestrian crossing.

The Parish Council reiterated their request to be involved in the 106 agreement.

A member asked for confirmation that access was being agreed at this meeting. A member asked if this could be agreed as temporary access and was informed that they were agreeing the access and that it could not be a temporary agreement.

A member asked if they could agree the outline without agreeing the access. The member was informed that they could not, they must include the access in their decision.

A member asked if the decision could be deferred until there were more details on the traffic flow and was informed that this was not possible as highways had raised no objections.

**RESOLVED:**

That application number 06/13/0703/O be approved for outline consent subject to the conditions and planning obligations set out in the report.

## **6 APPLICATION 06/15/371/O 11 FELL WAY**

The Senior Planning Officer reported the details of the application and noted that a similar application had previously been refused and the current application had been amended by moving the garage back on the site.

There were no objections from Highways.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the Parish Council objected on the basis that the proposed access was onto the bridleway, this impacted on the safe use of the bridleway and was in conflict with HOU15 and criterion (C) of HOU7.

Neighbours objected on vehicular access to the bridleway.

A member asked what would happen if the owner of the bridleway was traced and

they refused access to the site and was informed access could be withdrawn but this was not grounds to refuse the planning application as it would be a private civil matter.

A member asked if when granting permission if a clause could be included for maintenance of the bridleway and was informed that this could be considered when a detailed application was submitted and that highways had recommended a condition to record the condition of the bridleway before and after a repair.

Mr Carter objected to the plans on the grounds that you cannot allow vehicular access on a bridleway. In support of this he referenced various acts and problems that might have occurred with a recent removal of a caravan from the site.

A member of the Parish Council reiterated that their objections also referred to the access on the bridleway and this conflicted with policies HOU13 and HOU17.

A member asked if any existing properties had access onto the bridleway and was informed that two properties had access.

The ward councillor reminded the committee that previous refusal had been on the grounds of access to the bridleway and that it was possible to access the site via Fell Way, the objection was to the access not the buildings.

RESOLVED:

That outline planning permission be approved for application 06/15/371/O subject to the conditions requested by Highways and the removal of permitted development rights for extensions and windows in the roof space.

## **7 APPLICATION 06/15/0363/F 1 BEACONSFIELD ROAD**

The committee considered the report from the Senior Planning Officer for the conversion of 1 Beaconsfield Road, currently unused shop with residential accommodation at the first floor, to 3 self contained residential units.

It was reported that the property is in flood zone 3.

Letters of objection had been received from five people and a petition against the development had been signed by 96 individuals and these were summarised.

A member asked if there was areas for bins and cycles in the development and was informed that there was space for bins but not for cycles.

A member asked if the ground floor would sit proud of the existing property and was informed it would be proud of the existing building line but no more than the current line of the shop front.

A member asked if provision for dropped curbs could be added in the future to allow for off road car parking on the site and was informed that this was possible should it be required at a later date.

A member asked if the bin storage was for individual bins or a communal one and was informed that it was for individual bins and that a condition could revise details of

screening and storage could be placed on a grant of planning permission.

Mr Stacey on behalf of the neighbours highlighted the objections, access, parking, loss of a shop, that it was another HMO in the area, design out of character in the area.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the planning application was recommended for approval. the application site is within a sustainable location and the development was in accordance with local and national planning policy.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be approved for application 06/15/0363/F subject to the conditions that the development is built in accordance with approved plans and the boundary walls have been constructed in accordance with the details submitted and bin storage and screening details to be provided and maintained.

## **8 APPLICATION 06/15/0348/O SOUTHTOWN ROAD HORATIO HOUSE**

The Committee considered the detailed report for the outline application 06/15/0205/O for the demolition of the existing building and the construction of 24 dwellings.

There were no objections to the application.

RESOLVED:

That outline planning permission be approved for application 06/15/0205/O subject to the condition requiring reserved matters to be submitted, the recommended conditions from consulted agencies and a legal agreement under s106 to be drawn up securing the affordable housing provision and the required monies for appropriate levels open space and children's play space.

## **9 APPLICATION 06/15/0448/F SUNDOWNER HOLIDAY PARK HEMSBY**

The committee considered the detailed report for an outline application for 16 static holiday caravans with associated parking, internal roads and play area.

There were no objections to the application.

RESOLVED:

That application 06/15/0448/F be approved with the condition that the pitches are only used for holiday purposes with appropriate time restrictions and that a full landscaping scheme is submitted prior to the development commencing for the approval of the Local Planning Authority.

## **10 APPLICATION 06/15/308/F MAIN ROAD FILBY**

The Planning Group Manager reported that the application was for eight dwellings

and that the site was grade 1 agricultural land.

The Planning Group Manager reported that 3 objections had been received from the neighbours.

A member asked for confirmation that two of the dwellings would be affordable housing and was informed that this was correct.

The applicant stated that the existing street layout would be kept, that two of the dwellings were affordable housing and that the existing drainage ditch would be maintained.

RESOLVED:

That application 06/15/0308/F be approved with the conditions that the existing drainage is maintained, a s106 agreement ensures that the affordable housing is provided. these conditions are in addition to the standard planning and highways conditions.

## **11 APPLICATION 06/15/0168/F 30 WELLESLEY ROAD**

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was for conversion of a single residential unit to five residential flats.  
The building had received an established use certificate for single residential unit.

No objections had been received.

4 letters of support had been received.

A member inquired as to the size of the bedrooms and was informed that all were of adequate size, the smallest main bedroom being 11sqm and no Environmental Health objections .

The applicant informed the Committee that the conversion of the building will take into account the request from Environmental Health over working hours of construction and that the flats will be sound proofed.

A member asked if the location of the bin storage would be at the rear of the property and not later moved to the side and was informed that layout ensured the bin storage would remain available at the rear.

A member welcomed that the application was for flats and not a HMO but expressed concern that it was the loss of another guest house.

RESOLVED:

That application 06/15/0168/F be approved with the condition that the hours of construction comply with the request from Environmental Health and a condition requiring the provision and retention of a bin storage area to the rear of the property.

## **12 PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 1 AUGUST 2015 AND 31 AUGUST 2015**

The Committee received and noted the planning applications cleared between 1 and 31 August 2015 by the Planning Group Manager and the Development Control Committee.

### **13 APPEAL DECISION**

The Committee noted that the appeal against the Committee refusal for 06/14/0381/O – Residential development of thirty five dwellings including access at land off Meadow Way, Rollesby, Great Yarmouth had been dismissed.

### **14 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

No items had been submitted.

The meeting ended at: 21:20