

Development Control Committee

Minutes

Wednesday, 03 April 2019 at 18:30

PRESENT:

Councillor Hanton (in the Chair); Councillors Annison, Bird, G carpenter, Drewitt, Fairhead, Flaxman-Taylor, Galer, Hammond, Wainwright, Williamson, A Wright & B Wright.

Mr A Nicholls (Head of Planning & Growth), Mr D Minns (Planning Manager), Mrs G Manthorpe (Senior Planning Officer), Mr J Beck (Planning Officer), Ms C Whatling (Monitoring Officer), Mr G Bolan (Planning Technician) & Mrs C Webb (Senior Member Services Officer).

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Drewitt declared a personal interest in Item 4 as he was a Ward Councillor and he knew one of the objectors personally. Councillor Williamson declared a personal Interest in item 5 as he was a Ward Councillor.

However, in line 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 6 March were confirmed.

4 APPLICATION 06-18-0335-O - LAND OFF MILL ROAD, BURGH CASTLE

The Committee received & considered the report from the Planning Manager.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the current proposal was for a terrace of four houses with four car ports sited between the houses and Oaktree Cottage and six parking spaces elsewhere on the site. The development would be served by a single vehicular access point towards the north eastern boundary of the site. The site was outside, but adjoined the Village Development Limit. The Senior Planning Officer reported that there was adequate amenity land and curtilage to serve a development of this size.

There has been a history of refusals for dwellings on the site with the last application being refused and an appeal dismissed in 1988. There was a line of five oak trees along the southern boundary of the site with Oaktree Cottage which would be retained. Within the site, there is one large sycamore tree which is in close proximity to the oak trees and which would need to be removed to allow for the proposed development. Other smaller trees on the site would also be removed but these are not of any great amenity value and this has been assessed by our Trees Officer. The removal of the Sycamore would aid the longevity of the line of Oak trees.

The Parish Council had objected to the application due to highway safety concerns along Mill Road and at the Mill Road/Butt Lane junction, no footpath or street lighting and inadequate sewer service. Five letters of objection had been received from local residents citing too many houses, potential parking problems, road safety due to lack of pavements and street lighting and speed of traffic. The Senior Planning Officer reported comments received in another letter of objection which did not form part of the agenda report.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application had been on hold awaiting the submission of a Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (SHRA) to determine whether the application would be likely to have significant effects on one or more Natura 2000 sites. A SHRA has now been received and it has been determined that any adverse effects can be mitigated for by a contribution to the Habitats Monitoring & Mitigation Strategy and the applicant has paid a contribution of £110 per dwelling.

The Senior Planning Manager reported that an important factor when determining applications is whether a Local Authority had the ability to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. There is currently a housing land

supply of 2.6 years.

Members raised concerns regarding highway safety along Mill Road and at the Mill Road/Butt Lane junction. Councillor Williamson was concerned regarding the lack of footpaths and pedestrian safety as vehicles travelled at speed along Mill Road. Councillor Wainwright was concerned that Highways had objected to a previous application on this site but had not objected to this application. The Senior Planning Manager reported that there had been a change in highway policies in recent months. Councillor Flaxman-Taylor was concerned that Anglian Water had not commented on the application. The Senior Planning Officer reported that Anglian Water did not comment on all applications and there had been recent major upgrades to the pumping station at Stepshort, Belton.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the proposal could not be assessed against the isolation test as there were other properties in the nearby vicinity. The Planning Manager reported that the new home owners could access the village amenities by car which meant that the application was in a sustainable location and additional residents would lead to the growth of the village. The Planning Manager reported that a replacement dwelling had recently been given planning permission nearby.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that taking all the evidence and policies into account and the lack of a five year land supply, it was considered that it would be difficult to justify refusal of the application and the recommendation was to approve as the proposal complied with Policies CS1, CS2 & CS11 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan: Core Strategy and the Interim Housing Supply Policy.

Mr Swan, Parish Council representative, reported the salient areas of the Parish Council's objections to the Committee and asked them to support the Parish Council and refuse the application.

Councillor Annison made a motion that the application be refused on the grounds that it went against National Planning Policy Framework, July 2018, Paragraph 8; (b) and (c). This motion was seconded by Councillor Wainwright and following a vote; it was

RESOLVED:-

That application number 06/18/0563/F be refused.

Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy states that the Council will look favourably towards new development that successfully contributes to sustainable growth, criterion a) seeks to ensure that new development is of a scale and location that complements the character and supports the function of individual settlements, criterion e) of the Policy states that new development should provide safe accessible places that promote healthy lifestyles and provide easy access for all to jobs, shops and community facilities by walking, cycling and public transport. Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy states that growth within

the Borough must be delivered in a sustainable manner by balancing the delivery of new homes with new jobs and service provision creating resilient self-contained communities and reducing the need to travel. The proposed erection of four houses on the site is contrary to Policy CS1 criterion (a) in that it will be an over-development of the site and would have a significant adverse effect on the rural character of the area due to the loss of the trees within the site and the hedgerow along the road frontage. It is also considered that the development would have an adverse effect on the oak trees along the southern boundary that are subject to a Tree Preservation Order. There is no footpath along this section of Mill Road and there would be a highway danger for pedestrians from the site attempting to access the nearest facilities within the village. It is therefore considered that the proposal is contrary to the aims of Policies CS1, criterion (e) and CS2 in that it would be an unsustainable form of development that would not provide easy access to jobs, shops and community facilities.

5 APPLICATION 06-19-0048-F - LAND BETWEEN 7 AND 12 COTONEASTER COURT GORLESTON

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

The Planning Officer reported that the application site was an area of open space to the east of the parking & turning area that served the western end of Cotoneaster Court. The land has always been in private ownership although it appears to have been maintained by the Council until purchased by the present owner who had erected temporary fencing around the site.

The Planning Officer reported that there had been five letters of objection received from local residents and one letter in favour of the proposal subject to yellow lines being provided on the north eastern side of the road leading into the Court. The objectors cited potential parking problems and loss of open space.

The Planning Officer reported that in 2018, an application had been refused for a three bedroom bungalow and a subsequent appeal was dismissed mainly on the grounds that the proposed bungalow was too large for the plot. The current proposal was for a smaller two-bedroom bungalow without a garage which left more space around the dwelling.

The Planning Officer reported that a SHRA had been submitted any it had been assessed that any adverse effects of the development on Natura 2000 sites could be adequately mitigated for by a contribution to the Habitats Monitoring & Mitigation Strategy.

The Planning Officer reported that taking into account the Planning Inspector's conclusion that some form of residential development would be acceptable on

the site and with the lack of a highway objection, it was considered that it would be difficult to justify refusal.

Councillor Williamson, Ward Councillor, was concerned that this development would result in the loss of more green space in Claydon Ward which already had a very limited amount of green space; the least amount in the Borough.

The Planning Manager reported that he had a copy of the original planning permission granted in 1962 and there were no conditions included to protect the open space.

RESOLVED:-

That application number 06/19/0048/F be approved as the proposal complied with the aims of Policies CS1 and CS11 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan:Core Strategy and saved Policy HOU11 of the Great Yarmouth Boroughwide Local Plan.

6 APPLICATION 06-18-0563-F - FOLLY COURT COTTAGES, COURT ROAD, ROLLESBY

The Chairman reported that this item had been withdrawn.

7 DELEGATED AND COMMITTEE DECISION LIST BETWEEN 02 MARCH 2019 AND 26 MARCH 2019

The Committee received, considered & noted the Development Control Delegated & Committee Decision List for March 2019.

8 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

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

The meeting ended at: 19:30