

Development Control Committee

Minutes

Monday, 10 March 2014 at 10:00

PRESENT:

Cllr Castle (Chair), Cllrs Collins, Field, Fairhead, Marsden, Reynolds, Shrimplin, D Thompson.

Mr D Minns (Group Manager Planning) and Mrs C Webb (PA to CEO).

1 APPLICATION NO. 06-13-0736-F 7 MAY COTTAGES, BACK ROAD, WINTERTON

The Committee undertook a site visit to the above site to inspect the proposals for the construction of ground and first floor extensions to form a care home at ground floor level and additional domestic accommodation at first floor, together with associated car parking and improved vehicular access. Following the site visit the Committee returned to the Town Hall to give further detailed consideration to this planning application.

The Group Manager Planning reported that the group of houses known as May Cottages consisted of a terrace of traditional red brick and tiled properties on the east side of Back Road. As usual with dwellings of this age various alterations had been carried out over the years, for example, extensions, replacement windows and colour washing. Number 7, May Cottages was situated on a larger plot than any of the other houses, with a sizeable garden to the side as well to the front. The section of Back Road which served May Cottages was an unadopted, unsurfaced road which, had a right angle bend at the southern end where it joined the adopted part of Back Road and a similar junction at the north end, where it joined Old Chapel Road. The site is within the Winterton Conservation Area.

In 2012 an application for a similar proposal, albeit with a larger extension, was refused by the Development Control Committee for three reasons. The access was a long, unadopted, unmade, narrow section of Back Road with no footpath or street lighting, with a difficult right angle bend for large vehicles to negotiate. No evidence had been submitted to demonstrate that the access arrangements were suitable for ambulances. The proposal involved a major

extension to the property which would have significantly alter the character of the building and its setting, at the end of an iconic terrace of former fisherman's cottages and lead to development which was unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the Conversation Area in terms of its scale, form, massing and design. Insufficient information had been submitted with the application to show that the development and its operation as a care home would not significantly affect the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining or neighbouring properties.

The Group Manager Planning reported that this application was for two storey/single storey extensions and formation of a care home at ground floor level, the applicant had submitted a planning statement explaining how the property would operate and also how the applicant felt that the current proposal overcame the reasons for refusal of the previous application.

The Group Manager Planning reported that 8 letters of objection and a petition signed by 15 people had been received. One letter of support and a petition supporting the proposal signed by 82 people had also been received. Brandon Lewis MP, had also written on behalf of constituents who were concerned about the application. The main reasons for objection were access, effect on the Conservation Area and lack of services. The Parish Council were also concerned about the restricted access. Environmental Health had raised concerns regarding potential effects of construction noise and requested that if the application was approved, that hours of work conditions should be imposed.

The Group Manager Planning reported that criterion A, of policy HOU21, required new homes to have good access and good approach roads which obviously did not apply in this case. However the policy was intended to relate to new residential homes or nursing homes on a larger scale than what was proposed. Class C3 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes order), allowed for up to 6 residents living together as a single household, including where care was provided. In this case it was felt that the use fell within Class C2 because the applicant would live separately from the elderly residents and the extension was being built specifically for this purpose, but with only some minor changes to the operation, it could be argued that planning permission was not required for use as a care home.

An objector reported that the main objections to the proposal were the condition of the unmade part of Back Road and the difficulties of turning into this part of the road from the adopted highway at either end. Damage had been caused to walls and fences by vehicles trying to enter and exit the unmade section and vehicles had driven over driveways, private verges and garage forecourts when manoeuvring around the area. Residents were concerned that the proposed use and the delivery vehicles involved in the construction works would make the situation worse and cause more damage.

The applicant reported that a fire engine had been able to reach the property in the past. This evidence would indicate that ambulances were also able to access the site. The care home facility would be for a maximum of 3 persons

specialising in care for those who were no longer able to support themselves in their own home, offering care and not nursing. The home would be run by the applicant with help from local people who lived within walking distance which would not generate a great deal of additional traffic.

Members agreed that the access to the site was not ideal but that the provision of a 3 bedroom care home would not generate additional traffic.

A member suggested that the applicant should be asked to install security lighting on their property at the bend in the road, as lighting would make access safer in the dark and further suggested that the back fence to application site should be removed.

Resolved:-

That Application Number 06-13-0736-F be approved, as the proposal complies with policies BNV10 and HOU21 of the Borough Wide Local Plan. The approval should be subject to the number of care home residents being no more than 3, and for that specific use, and the conditions required by Highways and Environmental Health and the fencing to the rear of the application site to be removed.

2 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Application number 06-13-0679-F, New play area at Elmhurst Court Estate, Leman Road, Gorleston. The Group Manager, Planning, reported that the applicant had withdrawn the sighting of picnic tables from the application and at the e would submit photographs of the play trail equipment they intended to site in the play area.

The meeting ended at: 11:10