

Development Control Committee

Minutes

Wednesday, 13 July 2016 at 18:30

PRESENT:

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

Mr D Minns (Planning Group Manager), Miss J Smith (Technical Officer) and Mrs C Webb (Member Services Officer)

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Reynolds.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Committee noted the following Declarations of Interest:

Councillor Thirtle declared a personal interest in Item 5, Councillor Williamson declared a personal interest in Item 7 and Councillors Annison, Wainwright and Wright declared a personal interest in Item 8.

However, in accordance with the Council's Constitution, the Councillors were allowed to speak and vote on the matter.

3 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2016 were confirmed.

4 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

5 APPLICATION 06/15/0705/F - FIELD ADJACENT TOWER LODGE

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

The Planning Group Manager reported that the application had been amended and reduced in number from nineteen to nine dwellings accessed off Rollesby Road, Fleggburgh. The site was 1.66 hectares and was currently in agricultural use with an access for agricultural machinery to the east of the site. There were no relevant planning applications for this site which is adjacent to the village development limits of Fleggburgh which is considered to have relatively poor access to a range of facilities, as it has a complete lack of public services, local facilities and restricted links to public transport.

The Planning Group Manager reported that a high number of objections had been received from local residents consisting of 62 letters of objection plus an additional letter of objection which had been received today, and a petition signed by 153 residents. The Planning Group Manager reported the concerns highlighted by residents and proposed that the Committee should undertake a site visit prior to determining the application.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/15/0705/O be deferred pending a site visit on Wednesday, 27 July 2016 at 10.00 am.

6 APPLICATION 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 this was a full planning application for 113 dwellings, access road and open space. The site would be developed in two separate sections linked by a footpath and open space. The Southern part would be 89 dwellings on the site of the former school buildings and accessed from Beccles Road. The remaining 24 dwellings would be accessed from Burgh Road and the open space was formed of two separate sections. The application proposed 14 two bedroom, 35 three bedroom and 42 four bedroom dwellings together with 22 properties (20%) in line with the Council's affordable housing policy for this part of the Borough.

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, a soakaway, and connection to the existing sewerage system. According to the correspondence 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 this appeared to override the response received by the Council from Anglian Water which stated that Anglian Water had stated that the development would lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream in terms of foul sewerage along with the suggested condition requiring a drainage strategy to be submitted prior to the development commencement. A drainage strategy would need to be prepared in consultation with Anglian Water to determine mitigation measures. The Planning Group Manager was seeking further clarification from Anglian Water.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the recent heavy rain had resulted in flooding in Beccles Road and Burgh Road at the White Horse roundabout. As Anglian Water had not yet responded to the Council with their definitive response to the drainage issues, the Planning Group Manager suggested that the Committee should consider deferring the application.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/15/0737/O be deferred pending receipt of further correspondence from Anglian Water.

Following the determination of the application as detailed above, the Chairman allowed Councillor Wainwright to speak.

Councillor Wainwright asked why the application was being deferred and not determined, as the only difference since the original submission of the application in 2011, was the addition of three extra dwellings. The drainage was not considered a serious issue on the site in 2011, so why was it considered as such now. The local residents were happy with the proposed development, so the Committee should have approved the recommendation with the appropriate drainage condition attached, as the Government had instructed Local Authorities to build a set number of new homes to meet the national housing crisis.

7 APPLICATION 06/15/0775/LB - 06/15/0779/F - THE DRILL HOUSE (ADJACENT) YORK ROAD, GREAT YARMOUTH

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

The Planning Group Manager reported that the application site adjoins the Drill House (formally referred to as the Drill Hall) for change of use to workshop and multi-purpose facility including overnight accommodation, open pole barn for

storage, minor works and stopping up the alley west of the Drill House with gates either end of the alley.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the application had since been amended to remove the pole barn from the application by the applicant and it would not be assessed further. There was currently an application in with Norfolk County council for the stopping up of the highway to the west of the Drill House and this order cannot be determined without a valid planning permission. The area of highway which was subject to the application for the stopping up order was to be re-surfaced with Yorkstone paving. New external lighting via floor mounted luminaires would be installed.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the building at the south west boundary of the site was proposed to undergo renovation, the addition of a first floor and change of use to a workshop to support residential artists and provide additional storage.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the proposed change of use of the building at the north end of the alley to a multi-use building providing meeting rooms, workshop space and overnight accommodation for up to eight people for up to six months a year. This is not appropriate for long term accommodation for this number of persons and should Members be minded to grant permission, a temporary permission is recommended in order that any impact of the development can be assessed.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the four proposed caravans would act as sleeping accommodation only and be under the control of Seachange Arts. Three of the caravans would be smaller than average and the fourth one would be a standard sized caravan. When not in use during the winter months, the caravans would be stored under cover in the Ice House. Comments were still awaited from Environmental Health in this matter.

The Planning Group Manager reported that objections had been received regarding the closing up of part of the historic Town Wall, however, viewing would be available by appointment and residents that abound the site will have access to the alley by key. The Great Yarmouth Residents Association had requested access via a coded entry system as opposed to a key entry system. They also requested that as the area which was proposed for staff parking had been gifted by the Council, the local residents felt this should also be accessed by residents who themselves did not fall within the resident parking scheme area.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the applications were recommended for approval but conditioned to be temporary for one year. in order that the effect can be assessed and all future information is submitted to ensure the development was carried out in an acceptable way.

A Member was concerned that the Council had gifted another area of land which included part of the historic Town Wall.

Mr Cross, Communications Director, Seachange Arts, reported that the vision for the Drill House was to become an International Creation Centre and the on-site accommodation was a vital part of the scheme. The alley way land had been gifted to them in return for them addressing the condition of the Town Wall which would be undertaken via grant funding. Mr Cross reported that Seachange Arts were conscious of the concerns of local residents.

A Member questioned why the stopping up process of the adjacent alley had been started prior to planning permission being granted. Another Member was concerned that rusty old caravans would be sited in the development. Mr Cross assured the Committee that the caravans were antique and would be used as sleeping pods only.

A Member reported that the stopping up of the alleyway would negate historical anti-social behaviour in that area which should be welcomed by the Committee. He congratulated Seachange Arts for delivering the Arts Policy on behalf of the Council, on a relatively small grant and reported that this proposal should be supported as this level of investment would attract further funding from the Arts Council in the future.

A Member reported that the proposal was contrary to Policy HOU7(E) which stated that the proposal would not be significantly detrimental to the residential amenities of adjoining occupiers or users of land to safeguard the character and form of settlements and should be refused.

Councillor Jeal, Ward Councillor, reported that he spoke on behalf of Councillor Robinson-Payne, Ward Councillor, too.

He reported that he supported Seachange Arts when ever he could, but, as a Ward Councillor, he had been badly let down by Seachange Arts recently and therefore, he was unable to support this application.

Local residents had reported that the Drill House contained a bar which had caused noise nuisance on a regular basis to nearby residents. The stopping-up of the alleyway would affect the amenity of local residents and the proposed siting of caravans presented a substantial fire risk. Many residents had stopped him and voiced their concerns regarding the development and stated that they had been unaware of the public consultation on the proposal so they had not been able to voice their concerns. The gating up of part of the historic Town Wall was also wrong and he urged the Committee to refuse the application.

A Member reiterated that there were serious problems on this road and the alleyway was mainly utilised as a dogs toilet area and urged the Committee to give Seachange Arts the benefit of the doubt and to grant the application with a temporary condition to allow Seachange Arts to prove themselves. He reported that he was aware that there was plenty of accommodation in the locality but that it was expensive for a performing artist to stay in guest accommodation for a week and that was why the siting of the caravans was vital to the scheme.

A Member disputed that local accommodation was expensive and reported that bed and breakfast accommodation could be found for £15 a night.

A Member reported that the gating up of the alleyway would ensure the preservation of the Town Wall which would be brought up to condition via the Preservation Trust at a cost of £30,000, which the Council would not have to fund.

A Member proposed that the application should be refused and this motion was seconded.

RESOLVED:

That application numbers 06/15/0775/LB & 06/15/0779/F be refused as they were contrary to Policy HOU7(E) as the proposal was felt to be significantly detrimental to the residential amenities of adjoining occupiers or users of land to safeguard the character and form of settlements.

8 APPLICATION 06/16/0275/CU - HIGH ROAD, CROWS FARM, BURGH CASTLE, GREAT YARMOUTH

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

The Planning Group Manager reported that the application site was a rectangular piece of land to the south of Crows Farm. The land is adjacent to Mill Road on the west and Market Road to the south. Another piece of land to the south of market Road was also utilised for an outdoor market, the applicant had stated that this would revert back to sole agricultural use.

The Planning Group Manager reported that Highways had not objected in principal but had raised concerns regarding the access from Mill Road and had asked for a condition restricting access from North Market Road and a suitable visibility splay.

The Planning Group Manager reported that there had been 20 neighbour responses to the application, 10 letters in support, 3 raised no objections and 7 objected. The Planning Group Manager reported that Mr Dowsett had since withdrawn his objection, as detailed on page 79 of the agenda. The Broads Authority had not objected subject to a condition restricting the days in use and that the development involved no built structures.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the opening times stated on the application were 06:00 to 15:00 which Members might regard as too early a start and to not affect neighbours, Members might be minded to allow car booters access to the site at 07:00 with the public allowed on site from 08:00. This could be conditioned for 12 months to ascertain the impact upon the neighbouring properties.

A Member was concerned regarding pedestrian access to the site.

Another Member was concerned that hedging would be removed from around the site to accommodate the visibility splay and that the increase from 14 to 28 days would double the amount of noise nuisance to neighbouring properties.

Mrs Church, applicant, reported that the farm would not have survived without the diversification into car boot sales. Mrs Church reported that , to date, there had been no accidents resulting from the Sunday Markets and although some of the hedging would be lost, in line with guidelines from Farming England, this would not be undertaken until the end of July to ensure that nesting birds would not be disturbed. A new copse of trees would be planted to act as screening of the site. Mrs Church reported that the Sunday Markets were a meeting place and a social event for local people and visitors alike.

Mrs Church reported that the 06:00 start was a safety issue as it was necessary to clear the road of stall holders before the customers arrived.

A Member reported that using the land as a Sunday Market was attractive as it left the land unblemished so it could be returned to farming use at any time.

A Member asked the applicant why she had not considered using the land on the other side of the road as it would impact less on local residents. Mrs Church reported that it was a smaller field, 16 acres compared to 18 acres.

A Member asked whether the travelling Circus would use this field in future. Mrs Church reported that this would be the case.

Mr Cole, an objector, who was a resident at Mill Road, Burgh Castle, reported that there was a restricted access to the site just after a tight bend in the road and that traffic was an issue for villagers up until 14:00. Several of the letters of support had been written by people who did not live in the village and experienced the inconvenience and nuisance caused by the Sunday Markets. Mr Cole reported that an extension from 14 days to 28 days had been applied for in 2005 and been refused, and he could not see what the difference was in these two applications, and why it had been recommended for approval now. Mr Cole reported that as a compromise, that villagers would accept 28 days approval on the opposite field.

The Chairman asked Mrs Church whether she would consider using the opposite field. Mrs Church responded that this would not be considered as it was a smaller field.

RESOLVED;

That application number 06/16/0275/CU be approved subject to the following conditions; the approval was temporary so the impact of the development on the neighbouring amenities could be assessed. The temporary condition should be over a year and end following the summer of 2017. In the interests of highway safety, the highways conditions to be included, the conditions

suggested by the Broads Authority to be included, and appropriate opening times to be conditioned.

9 PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS AND BY DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE FROM 1 JUNE - 30 JUNE 2016

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

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: 20:05