

Development Control Committee

Minutes

Tuesday, 23 June 2015 at 18:30

PRESENT:

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

Mr D Minns (Planning Group Manager), Miss G Manthorpe (Senior Planning Officer) Mrs E Helsdon (Technical Officer) & Mrs C Webb (Senior Member Services Officer).

1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

It was noted that no declarations of interest were declared at the meeting.

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

It was noted that there were no apologies for absence.

3 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 May 2015 were confirmed.

4 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

5 APPLICATION 06/15/0132/O MEADOW WAY, (LAND OFF), ROLLESBY

The Committee considered the detailed, comprehensive report as laid out in the agenda. The Senior Planning Officer reported that the Committee had received additional documents from local objectors. The Planning Department had not received copies of this correspondence and it did not been incorporated into the report.

The Chairman requested that the Planning Group Manager give a brief report on where the Council stood in regard to this, and similar planning applications, in this interim period prior to the adoption of the revised Local Plan.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the proposed development would consist of 10 residential dwellings with access. This was an outline application which sought approval for the access with appearance, landscaping, layout and scale to be reserved matters dealt with should this application be approved.

There had been a previous application for a development of 35 residential dwellings which included the parcel of land that is subject to the current application. This was refused at Committee on grounds of highways, drainage and being outside of the village development limits and was currently at the early stages of an appeal.

It had been reported that the Parish Council had objected to the proposed development on the grounds as detailed in paragraph 2.1 of the agenda. There had been 37 objections to the application, examples of which were included in the agenda, and a petition containing 143 signatories. The grounds for their objections were listed in paragraph 2.2 of the agenda.

The Senior Planning Officer read out a letter of objection from Councillor B Coleman, who was a Ward Councillor, but was unable to attend the meeting in person.

Following the submission of amended plans, the Highways Authority did not object to the development as proposed, however, they did not want an access through the residential development to the field, conditions were requested requiring further information to be submitted at the reserved matter stage.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that Strategic Planning had indicated that if the criterion within the Interim Housing Land Supply Policy was met, the principle of residential development in this location might be acceptable.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that there was a national requirement to meet housing targets and produce sustainable development. The development proposed, although not within the village development limits, was designated in the Interim Housing Land Supply Policy as secondary village capable of some expansion. The assessment carried out as part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment had identified the close proximity of Rollesby to Martham which had key services accessible by car in addition to the minor services available within Rollesby.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the recommendation was to approve the application subject to conditions as set out in paragraph 7.1 of the agenda.

A Member asked whether a condition could be imposed to allow only single storey development on the site.

The Chairman asked if planning permission was granted for this application whether this would weaken our case in the appeal regarding the 35 dwellings. The Senior Planning Officer reported that each appeal was judged on its own merits.

Mr Gilder, Applicants Agent, reiterated the salient areas of the application and that it fulfilled the necessary criteria contained in the Interim Housing Land Supply Policy and had not been objected to by the Highways Agency.

My Day, Parish Councillor, reported the concerns of the local villagers. The main concern was the access to the busy A149 and that the access was opposite the school gates. At the moment, the Parish Council had given temporary permission for

parents to park on the unused tennis courts to alleviate the number of parked cars parked along the A149 during the school run times. An increase of yet another 10 or so cars would have a marked difference.

Residents were concerned that this might set a precedence for future development and would prefer an application which included an element of affordable housing. The proposed access to the farmland would be at 90 degrees which would be almost impossible for any farm machinery to turn into, although the owner of the land had assured the Parish Council that the access was satisfactory.

The Chairman reported that as the Highways Agency had not objected to this application, the Committee's hands were somewhat tied.

A Member asked for clarification as to the grading of the agricultural land which would be lost to the proposed development. The Senior Planning Officer reported that it was Grade 1 Agricultural land.

Members felt that they had no alternative but to approve the application as they could find no grounds for refusal which would stand up to appeal.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/15/0132/) be approved subject to conditions regarding reserved matter to include drainage details, materials, scale, layout, appearance, landscaping, slab levels and further details of parking, turning, access, cycle ways, footways, boundary treatment and all dwellings to be single storey only and to number 10 only. In addition , a Section 106 Agreement with regard to open space will be sought.

6 APPLICATION 06/15/0182/F 52 BULMER LANE, WINTERTON, GREAT YARMOUTH

The Committee considered the comprehensive report from the Planning Group Manager as detailed in the agenda.

The Senior Planning officer reported that the application site was a domestic dwelling with an attached garage located to the western side of Bulmer Lane, opposite an access off Bulmer Lane which led to 4 detached dwellings. The proposal was to change the use of the domestic garage attached to 52 Bulmer Lane to a dog grooming parlour and to carry out associated works.

The physical works are substantially complete, the flat roof of the garage had been raised by 300 mm and the garage door had been removed and French doors inserted in the front elevation which would be acceptable as domestic works and comply with Policy HOU18 of the Borough wide Local Plan. As such, the doors and raised roof height are deemed to be in character with the existing dwelling house and the residential character of the area.

It was reported that there had been 34 objections to the application which were summarised in paragraph 2.2 of the agenda. The Highways Agency had raised no objection to the application, a condition had been requested to ensure that the parking area was laid out prior to the commencement of the development and a condition requiring the use to be based on an appointment only system.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the recommendation was to approve the application for a limited time of one year subject to conditions that were recommended by consulted parties and the removal of any permitted development rights. It was also recommended, following the comments received from the Environmental Health Officer, to limit the use to one singular business, therefore, prohibiting dog breeding.

Mrs Roberts, objector, reported the feelings of the local residents who wished the village to remain residential and were concerned about the creeping commercialisation of the village.

A Member asked for confirmation that the application did not include permission for signage. A Member was concerned that the works to the building had been undertaken before planning permission had been applied for and was concerned about neighbour noise nuisance due to incessant dog barking from the premises. The Chairman reported that this would not be the case as the business would only cater for 3 dogs per day and would be for a trial period of a year.

A Member hoped that the relevant trade waste bin would be provided by the applicant.

Councillor Jermany, Ward Councillor, reported that he had attended the Parish Council meeting when the application had been discussed and it had not been objected to.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/15/0132/O be approved for a limited time of one year subject to conditions that are recommended by consulted parties and the removal of any permitted development rights. It is also recommended, following the comments received from the Environmental Health Officer, to limit the use to one singular business therefore prohibiting dog breeding.

7 APPLICATION 06/15/0030/F 112 WELLESLEY ROAD, GREAT YARMOUTH

The Committee considered the full, comprehensive report from the Planning Group Manager as set out in the agenda.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the site was visited on 4 June 2015 by available members of the Committee following a resolution to defer the decision making of the application.

The application site was currently vacant with the approved use being a single residential unit following planning permission granted in 2001 to allow the change of use from guest house.

It was reported that the Ward Councillor had written a letter of objection stating that the application site was located within the secondary holiday area and the conversion would be an over-development of the property. It was noted that five letters of objection had also been received citing objections as listed in paragraph 2.2 of the agenda. Great Yarmouth Tourism and Business Improvement Area Ltd had raised concern about the erosion on the nature and ambience of the popular tourist location. Environment Health had no objections to the proposal but had suggested hours of

work and noted that the development should comply with current building regulations.

The accumulation of rubbish was a highlighted concern but the applicant had provided an area to the rear of the property for bin storage which was accessible by a communal rear door and therefore accessible for all occupants of the proposed units.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions restricting the hours of construction and that the bin area was to be made available prior to occupation and retained as such in perpetuity.

The Chairman reported that the Council had recently lost the appeal at St.Johns Terrace which would now have implications on this item.

Mr Wheatman, Applicants agent, reported the salient areas of the application. The bin storage which had been a contentious issue could be achieved by either relocating the back gate to allow eight individual bins to be sited along the opposite wall or by utilising two large shared bins.

Councillor Bird, Ward Councillor, was still concerned about the bin storage and the possibility that another eight bins would end up being stored on the pavement to the rear of the property which would adversely affect the Prime Holiday Area which was only 50 yards away.

The Chairman reported that this was not a planning issue but was an issue for Environmental Health enforcement action.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/15/0030/F be approved subject to conditions restricting the hours of construction and that the bin area is to be made available prior to occupation and retained as such in perpetuity.

8 APPLICATION 06/15/0194/CU FORMER PORT AUTHORITY SITE, HARBOURS MOUTH, GORLESTON

The Committee considered the comprehensive report by the Planning Group Manager as detailed in the agenda.

It was reported that the proposal was to use the single storey buildings for internal stalls for craft fayres with a cafe and toilets in the building closest to the Pier Hotel. The yard would be used for open air stalls and car boot sales. The applicant had confirmed that the intended opening hours would be Tuesday to Sunday in any week from 8 am to 6 pm.

The Environment Agency had asked that the Events Manager should sign up to their flood warning service and the event should be cancelled or evacuated on receipt of a warning. The Conservation Officer had requested an upgrade on new fencing, surfacing finish and re-cladding of buildings.

Two objections had been received on the grounds of traffic, parking and the effect on the character of the conservation area. The site was next to the large pay and display car park on the pier and there was also potential for parking for stall holders/staff within the site and the Highways Officer, therefore, did not object to the proposal.

The Planning Group Manager recommended that a temporary consent was granted for a period of one year to allow for the effects of the use to be assessed with a condition limiting the car boot sales to a day and time to be agreed and requiring submission of details of any external plant or equipment as the proposal complied with Policies SHP13 and BNV 10.

RESOLVED:

That application number 06/15/0194/CU be approved - one year temporary consent with conditions limiting opening times and requiring submission of details of any external plant or equipment. The proposal complied with Policies SHP13 and BNV10.

9 PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 1 - 31 MAY 2015

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

10 OMBUDSMAN AND APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee received and noted the appeal decisions as detailed above.

Councillor Wright reported that she was extremely disappointed with the Inspector's decision to allow the appeal for application number 06/14/0780/F at 33 Nelson Road, Gorleston.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the Committee should bear in mind the scale and context of the proposal when considering similar applications in the future.

11 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business as determined by the Chairman as being of sufficient urgency to warrant consideration.

The meeting ended at: 20:15