



GREAT YARMOUTH
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Development Control Committee

Date: Tuesday, 05 April 2016
Time: 18:30
Venue: Council Chamber
Address: Town Hall, Hall Plain, Great Yarmouth, NR30 2QF

AGENDA

CONTENTS OF THE COMMITTEE AGENDA PLANNING APPLICATIONS & CONDUCT OF THE MEETING

Agenda Contents

This agenda contains the Officers' reports which are to be placed before the Committee. The reports contain copies of written representations received in connection with each application. Correspondence and submissions received in time for the preparations of the agenda are included. However, it should be noted that agendas are prepared at least 10 Working Days before the meeting. Representations received after this date will either:-

- (i) be copied and distributed prior to or at the meeting – if the representations raise new issues or matters of substance or,
- (ii) be reported orally and presented in summary form by the Principal Officer of the Committee – especially where representations are similar to, or repeat, previous submissions already contained in the agenda papers.

There are occasions when the number of representations are similar in nature and repeat the objections of others. In these cases it is not always possible for these to be included within the agenda papers. These are either summarised in the report (in terms of numbers received) and the main points highlighted or reported orally at the meeting. All documents are available as 'background papers' for public inspection.

Conduct

Members of the Public should note that the conduct of the meeting and the procedures followed are controlled by the Chairman of the Committee or, if he/she so decides, the Vice Chairman. Any representations concerning Committee procedure or its conduct should be made in writing to either –

- (i) The Planning Group Manager, Town Hall, Great Yarmouth. NR30 2QF
- (ii) The Monitoring Officer, Town Hall, Great Yarmouth. NR30 2QF

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCEDURE

- (a) Thirty minutes only will be set aside at the beginning of each meeting to deal with applications where due notice has been given that the applicant, agent, supporters, objectors, and any interested party, Parish Council and other bodies (where appropriate) wish to speak.
- (b) Due notice of a request to speak shall be submitted in writing to the Planning Group Manager one week prior to the day of the Development Control Committee meeting.
- (c) In consultation with the Planning Group Manager, the Chairman will decide on which applications public speaking will be allowed.
- (d) Three minutes only (or five minutes on major applications at the discretion of the Chairman) will be allowed to (i) objectors together, (ii) an agent or applicant and (iii) supporters together, (iv) to a representative from the Parish Council and (v) Ward Councillors.
- (e) The order of presentation at Committee will be:-
 - (1) **Planning Officer presentation** with any technical questions from Members
 - (2) **Agents, applicant and supporters** with any technical questions from Members
 - (3) **Objectors and interested parties** with any technical questions from Members
 - (4) **Parish Council representatives, Ward Councillors and Others** with any technical questions from Members
 - (5) **Committee debate and decision**

1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

You have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in a matter to be discussed if it relates to something on your Register of Interests form. You must declare the interest and leave the room while the matter is dealt with.

You have a Personal Interest in a matter to be discussed if it affects

- your well being or financial position
- that of your family or close friends
- that of a club or society in which you have a management role

- that of another public body of which you are a member to a greater extent than others in your ward.
You must declare a personal interest but can speak and vote on the matter.

Whenever you declare an interest you must say why the interest arises, so that it can be included in the minutes.

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence.

3 MINUTES

5 - 12

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on the 8 March 2016.

4 06/15/0486/F - 10 WHITE STREET MARTHAM

13 - 25

Full planning application for 100 new dwellings, public open space, associated infrastructure and demolition of 10 White Street (existing dwelling) to form access.

5 06/15/00769/F - 32 MARINE PARADE, ATLANTIS COMPLEX, GREAT YARMOUTH

26 - 32

Full planning application for the conversion of floors 4,5 and 6 into 18 self-contained flats.

6 06/16/0028/F - MARINE PARADE, SEALIFE CENTRE, GREAT YARMOUTH

33 - 41

Erection of 3 kiosks, mixed use A1/A5 retail and sale of non-alcoholic hot and cold beverages and food.

7 PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS AND BY DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE FROM 1 MARCH TO 31 MARCH 2016

42 - 63

Report attached.

8 OMBUDSMAN AND APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee is asked to note the following appeal decision:-

06/15/0100/CU - Change of use from redundant guest house to house in multiple occupation at 84 North Denes Road, Great Yarmouth - Appeal dismissed.

Original application was an Officer delegated refusal.

9 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

To consider any other business as may be determined by the Chairman of the meeting as being of sufficient urgency to warrant consideration.

10 EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC

In the event of the Committee wishing to exclude the public from the meeting, the following resolution will be moved:-

"That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 1 of Part I of Schedule 12(A) of the said Act."

Development Control Committee

Minutes

Tuesday, 08 March 2016 at 18:30

PRESENT :

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

Councillor Fairhead attended as a substitute for Councillor T Wainwright.

Councillor Jeal attended as a substitute for Councillor Blyth.

Mr D Minns (Planning Group Manager), Miss G Manthorpe (Senior Planning Officer), Mrs J Smith (Technical Assistant) and Mrs S Wintle (Member Services Officer).

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Blyth and T Wainwright.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

It was noted that the Chairman and Councillor Jermany declared Non Pecuniary interests in item 4 and in accordance with the Constitution were allowed to both speak and vote on the matter.

Councillor Jeal declared a Non Pecuniary interest in item 7 and in accordance with the Constitution was allowed to both speak and vote on the matter.

3 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 February 2016 were confirmed.

4 APPLICATION 06/15/0441/O FORMER PONTINS HOLIDAY CENTRE, BEACH ROAD, HEMSBY

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

The outline planning permission sought the re-development of the site for up to 200 dwellings and community/commercial facilities, together with associated public open space and landscaping. Members were advised that the means of access to the application site was also to be considered as part of the application.

It was reported that a previous application was submitted in 2011 although had been withdrawn prior to being considered by the Development Control Committee

Members were advised that the Design and Access Statement submitted with the application stated that approximately 8.04 hectares would comprise residential development, including affordable housing. The housing mix would comprise predominantly detached family housing with some semi-detached and terrace units.

The Planning Group Manager reported that 48 letters of objection had been received from neighbouring owners, the main concerns were summarised to Members. Members were advised that 1 letter of support had been received.

It was reported that the Parish Council objected to the application for the following reasons :-

1. The site is a PRIME Holiday area, which will also require change of use, but are concerned if approved will this set a precedent for other Prime holiday areas in Hemsby or the Borough to have this protection removed and re-developed.
2. The infra-structure is not adequate to cope with the increase of population or increase in traffic on the highways. Drainage is poor on the site and regularly flooded the area with increased demand.
3. Lack of educational facilities to cope with extra child places.
4. One medical centre in the village which is already struggling with high number of patients.
5. As a holiday resort the site employed many from the local area, where will new residents find work in an area which is mainly tourism.

It was reported that Norfolk County Council would not sought contributions for Nursery, Primary or High School.

There had been no operational objections received from the Norfolk Fire Service, although the requirement for 4 fire hydrants on no less than 90mm main and 1 no less than 150mm be noted.

It was reported that the Highways had no objections further to an agreed mitigation package which would include a zebra crossing as well as two new bus stops with shelters an length of improvement/widening of the east side footway and subject to an s106 being completed.

Norfolk County Council flood Authority had no objection subject to a detailed design of a surface water drainage scheme.

It was noted that Essex and Suffolk water had no objection subject to the compliance of requirements and that Anglian Water confirmed the foul drainage and sewerage system had adequate capacity for the flows.

Environmental Health had no objections to the outlined planning application.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the site is designated as a prime holiday site in the Borough Wide Local Plan 2001, policy TR4 stated the following :-

'Proposals to change the use of tourist facilities, attractions or accommodation to purposes which are not tourist related will not be permitted where the site or premises are within primary holiday accommodation and primary attraction areas as shown on the proposals map.'

Members were advised that policy TR4 remained a saved policy.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the application had been recommended for approval subject to the conditions required.

A Member asked how many public meeting had been held in relation to the application, and was advised that several meetings had been held.

Mr De Pol - agent presented a report on behalf of Northern Trust Company Limited.

The Chairman made reference to a previous meeting that he and the Planning Group Manager had attended with Northern Leisure Trust and advised that a suggestion had been made that a small scale Tourism and Leisure be maintained with in the application site, the Chairman asked why this had not been considered. Mr De Pol advised that the suggestion had been considered through various different active marketing options.

A Member expressed concern that no monetary value had been available when the site was marketed, Mr De Pol advised that this was a more flexible approach to marketing the application site.

Concern was raised in regard to the advertising of the application site.

Mrs Simone Calnon - Objector presented a report of her main objections to the Committee.

The Group Planning Manager clarified to Members the outline applications retail unit sizes.

A Member asked Mrs Calnon if her objections were just based on retail concerns or both retail and housing, Mrs Calnon advised that she felt the whole site should be maintained for tourism.

The Chairman asked in relation to the application and whether a condition could be made to remove the retail units from the application, the Planning Group Manger advised that should the Committee be minded to approve the application subject to the condition above that this would be a decision for the applicant. Mr De Pols advised that he could not make this decision.

Mr Tony Reeves - Objector presented a report of his main objections to the Committee.

The Chairman advised that should the Committee be minded to refuse the application the application could be sent to appeal therefore the loss to the Borough could be of great cost.

It was clarified to the Committee that the application sought for up to 200 dwellings and that any increases to the number of dwellings would be subject to further planning applications.

A Member asked in relation to the land owners of the application site, and was advised that Northern Trust had owned the land for numerous years.

Marie Ellis - Objector presented a report of her main objections to the Committee.

Keith Kyriacou - Objector presented a reported on behalf of Hemsby Parish Council.

A Member raised awareness in relation to the Government guidelines for housing supply.

Councillor Weymouth - Borough Councillor for Hemsby summarised main objections to the Committee.

Councillor Jermany - Borough Councillor summarised main objections to the Committee.

The Chairman asked in relation to the Localism act, he was advised that this was in the process of being addressed by the Parish Council although a timescale for completion was unknown.

The Members of the Committee entered into a general debate regarding the points raised by the applicant and objectors the main concern being :-

- Viability for tourist site
- History of site
- Cost to the Council

A motion was moved and seconded that application 06/15/0441/O be approved in line with the recommendation of the Planning Group Manager.

Following a vote, the motion was lost.

A second motion was moved and seconded that application 06/15/0441/O be rejected on the grounds that the application was against TR4 of the Borough Wide Local Plan, unneighbourly and that there was other development land available.

RESOLVED :

That application 06/15/0441/O be rejected on the grounds that the application was contrary to TR4 of the Borough Wide Local Plan and CS8 of the Core Strategy, was unneighbourly and that there is other development land available.

5 APPLICATION 06/14/0817/O HEMSBY ROAD, MARTHAM

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

The application sought a residential development, access, public open space,

associated works and B1 employment land.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was a outline application with access only being applied for and that all other matters, scale, landscaping, layout and appearance would form part of the reserved matters application if Members were minded to approve the application.

It was reported that the original application had been 125 dwellings and that this had been reduced to 108 and now included B1 employment land.

Members were advised that the application site is located on grade one agricultural land outside of the village development limits and that a section of the site, partially included in the application as B1 employment land is identified in the Borough Wide Local Plan as employment land.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that there had been 14 objections from neighbours had been received, although Members were advised that following consultations and amended plan 3 responses had been received to state that the original objections still stood.

It was reported that the Parish Council had objected to the application and that the objection remained following amended application.

Members were advised that there had been no objections from Environmental Health, Anglian Water, Norfolk County Council - Education and the Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service.

The Highways authority although initially objected to the application following amendment of the application had no objections.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the site had been assessed as part of the Strategic Housing Land Supply Assessment and had been summarised as adjacent to the village development limits and was considered to have good access to a range of facilities.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application is recommended for approval.

A Member asked for clarification in relation to B1 employment land.

A question was raised in relation to the sewerage and drainage within the application site, the Senior Planning Officer advised that no objections had been received from Anglian Water and that they had stated that there would be available capacity at the application site.

A Member asked whether the site was within the boundary, and was advised that the site was outside but adjacent to the boundary.

Mr Presley - Agent presented a report on behalf of Norfolk Land Limited to the Committee.

A Member asked in reference to the affordable housing scheme and was answered by Mr Hooper.

Mr Hooper - Objector presented a report of the main objections on behalf of the

Parish Council to the Committee.

A Member asked what Mr Hooper what he felt best suited the land, Mr Hooper stated that he would like considerably more employment land to be maintained than had been proposed within the application.

The Members of the Committee entered into a general debate regarding the points raised by the applicant and objector.

RESOLVED :

That application 06/14/0817/O be approved subject to the conditions as recommended by consulted parties and those to ensure a satisfactory form of development and obligations as set out by Norfolk County Council and mitigation measures in line with the aims of the Natura 2000 sites Monitoring and Management Strategy and S106 agreement being signed.

6 APPLICATION 06/15/0780/O REAR OF SELWYN HOUSE 28 THE GREEN MARTHAM

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

The Senior Planning Officer advised that the application sought for three detached dwellings with garages, Members were advised that the access and layout formed part of the application with appearance, landscaping and scale to form part of a reserved matters application.

It was reported that the site was within the Village Development limits as prescribed within the adopted Borough Wide Local Plan and is within a sustainable location.

The Parish Council had recommended that a bat survey be conducted and that the natural habitat be protected.

The Senior Planning Officer advised that 11 objections had been received from neighbours.

There had been no objections received from Norfolk County Council Highway Authority and no response received from Environmental Health.

Members were advised that the dwellings would be limited to be single storey with no living accommodation within the roof.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the main concern that had been raised was additional traffic and private road access, Members were advised that the applicants agent had submitted a report stating that applicant had right of way over the land.

The Senior Planning Officer advised that the application was recommended for approval.

A Member asked in relation to the size of the road and whether an emergency vehicle could gain access, and was advised that vehicular turning had not been addressed within the application as it was an outline application.

Mr Huke - Objector presented a report of his main objections to the Committee.

Mr Hill - Objector presented a report of his main objections to the Committee.

A Member asked in relation to the bat survey that had been conducted and whether sheds and garages had been surveyed and was advised that they had not been.

A question was raised in relation to the private road width, it was advised that the road width was approximately 4 Metres.

Following general debate a motion was moved and seconded that application 06/15/0780/O be approved in line with the recommendation of Senior Planning Officer.

Following a vote, the motion was lost.

A second motion was moved and seconded that application 06/15/0780/O be refused on the grounds that it was contrary to HOU17.

RESOLVED :

That application 06/15/0780/O be refused on the grounds that it is contrary to HOU17.

7 APPLICATION 06/15/0579/F 101 CHURCHILL ROAD GREAT YARMOUTH NORFOLK

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

The application sought for a change of use from public parking to private GYBS parking.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application site comprised a car park within ownership of GYB Services which is used by employees of GYB Services and the public for parking vehicles.

It was reported that 6 letters of objection had been received with the main objections to the application relating to the loss of parking for local residents, the impacts upon highway and pedestrian safety, loss of trees / bushes and part demolition of an existing wall.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was recommended for approval as the proposal accords with policy CS9 and CS16 of the Core Strategy.

Mr S Mutton, representative from GYB Services presented a report on behalf of GYB Services to the Committee.

A Member asked in relation to the trees within the application site, it was advised that the self seeded sycamore trees would be replaced.

A question was raised in relation to the survey that GYB Services had carried out on the car park and whether this had been carried out at an appropriate time of year, Mr Mutton advised that the survey had been carried out in the late summer.

Mr Bennet - Objector presented a report of his main objections to the Committee.

The Members of the Committee entered into a general debate regarding the points raised by the applicant and objectors

A motion was moved and seconded that application 06/15/0579/F be refused on the grounds of policy CS16 and effect on residents parking.

Following a vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED :

That application 06/15/0579/F be refused on the grounds of policy CS16 and the effect on residents parking.

8 PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS AND BY DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE FROM 1 FEBRUARY - 29 FEBRUARY 2016

The Committee noted the planning applications cleared under delegated powers and by the Development Control Committee fro the period 1 February 2016 to 29 February 2016.

9 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

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

10 EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC

The meeting ended at: 22:35

Reference: 06/15/0486/F

Parish: Martham

Officer: Miss G Manthorpe

Expiry Date: 10/03/16

Applicant: Persimmon Homes Ltd (Anglia)

Proposal: Full planning application for 100 new dwellings, public open space, associated infrastructure and demolition of no.10 White Street (existing dwelling) to form access.

Site: 10 White Street Martham

REPORT

1. Background / History :-

- 1.1 The site which is subject to the application covers an area of 3.20 hectares and is located in the parish of Martham adjacent to, but outside of, the village development limits. The application site also comprises the residential property and curtilage of a property known 10 White Street and the majority of the land is locally referred to as the Mushroom or Duck Farm.
- 1.2 The entrance to the site is currently between two residential properties, one of which is 10 White Street. The entrance falls partially within the conservation area. The conservation area is in line with the boundary of the site to the western boundary. The village development limits bound the site to the western and northern boundary of the site.
- 1.3 The land to the south of the site has been subject to a recent outline planning application for residential and commercial (B1) land which was approved at Development Control Committee on the 8th March 2016. The current application and the application to the south both show potential links, the current application shows a potential pedestrian link to this site to the south.
- 1.4 Conservation area consent has been approved for the demolition of 10 White Street Martham. The consent was conditioned to prevent demolition until a development scheme was approved and a contract for carrying out works of redevelopment made.

2 Consultations :-

2.1 Highways – No objection to the revised layout and access, full details of condition not available at time of writing however these can be verbally reported.

2.2 Norfolk County Council (Surface Water Drainage Local Lead Flood Authority) – Application fell below the threshold so standing advice given.

2.3 Neighbours – There have been 13 responses to the letters and site notice, a selection of responses are attached to this report and there is a summary of responses below:

- No right to give use of the turning head to others.
- How will maintenance of the turning head be covered.
- Object if Back Lane were to become a thoroughfare.
- Concern over the hedge to the rear of Back Lane properties and the wildlife within.
- The closure of Back Lane.
- Increased noise of vehicles using the new junction.
- The turning head is not adequate to accommodate large vehicles.
- Irregularities in the traffic assessment.
- Inadequate sewerage and rain water removal provision.
- Too high density.
- Removal of trees-replanting should take place.
- The pumping station exclusion zone will encroach on the adjacent site.
- Disappointing that there is no vehicular link to the adjacent site.
- Retention of a strip between the two adjoining (separate ownership) sites.
- A mini roundabout and keeping Back Lane open would be a better option.
- Loss of privacy.
- White Street is already too busy.
- Possibility of light blockage.
- Doctors surgery will not be able to cope.

One comment in support of closing back lane provided adequate turning can be provided.

A selection of objections are attached to this report.

2.4 Martham Parish Council – Full comments are attached to this report and summary is as follows:

The Council would draw attention to the SHLAA assessment of MA10B 'Anglian water have indicated that there are major constraints with regards sewerage infrastructure which would require flow attenuation and may require a larger wet well at the pumping station. In addition there is no capacity in the existing surface water sewers therefore alternative drainage measures such as SUDs may need to be explored where appropriate'. The Council would support this assessment with local knowledge.

As part of a planning condition clarity needs to be sought for the open space over ownership and ongoing responsibility.

The traffic solution of blocking off Back Lane is objected to most strenuously. The Council has concerns about the turning bay provided.

Additional people will increase pressure on an already struggling doctors practise.

There is a considerable concern over low mains water pressure in the village.

- 2.5 Police Architectural Liaison Officer – Very comprehensive recommendations made for security measures and security improvements such as additional fencing with natural boundaries. Full comments are attached to this report.
- 2.6 Environment Agency – No objection to the application and comment as follows: the site is wholly outside of the flood zone; we are no longer a statutory consultee for these sites and the assessment of flood risk from surface water is a matter for Norfolk CC as the Lead Local Flood Authority. The site is also on an unproductive aquifer but as the risk from contamination from the previous use is low as is the risk to groundwater we have no comments in this regard.
- 2.7 Essex and Suffolk Water – The site is outside of the area of supply.
- 2.8 Natural England – Object – further information required. On going communications about contribution to mitigate against the impact on the Natura 2000 site. Advise that further assessment of potential impacts from recreational disturbance to Broadland SPA and Ramsar site, The Broads SAC and Breydon Water SPA and Ramsar is required within the project HRA. Where impacts cannot be ruled out, mitigation will be required in accordance with Policy CS11 and CS14 of the emerging (now adopted) Core Strategy.

In order to avoid adverse impacts to Winterton – Horsey Dunes SAC and Great Yarmouth North Denes SPA, we advise that proportionate developer mitigation should be secured in accordance with Policy CS11 and Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy.

- 2.9 Anglian Water – The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment area of Caister Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows.

The sewerage system at present has available capacity for these flows. If the developer wishes to connect to our sewerage network they should serve notice under Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991. We will then advise them of the most suitable point of connection.

Surface Water disposal, from the details submitted to support the planning application the proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets. As such we are unable to provide comments in the suitability of surface water management.

- 2.10 Environmental Health – The recommendations in the site investigation report are reasonable, with further investigation and some remediation and protection measures required. I am aware from regularly visiting the site, and meeting with Harrison's Geotechnical Engineers whilst they carried out further investigations in August, that the degree of asbestos and hydrocarbon soil contamination may be worse than the assumptions in the report dated February 2015. However, the site can still be safely remediated for the proposed future use, and so we have no objections and instead recommend conditions to control this.

In addition to the comments above full comments are attached to this report and conditions are requested with regards hours of work, contamination, lighting and foul drainage.

- 2.11 Norfolk County Council Fire – No objections providing that the proposal meets the necessary requirements of the building regulations.
- 2.12 Cycle forum – Comprehensive comments received and are available on file, and extract follows. The secondary streets and cul-de-sacs should be more permeable and that the BOAT should form part of a safe route to school. Provision should be made for a 5m wide segregated pedestrian/cycle link between this proposal and any future development to the south of the site.
- 2.13 Historic Environment Service – The proposal does not have any implications for the historic environment and there are no recommendations for archaeological works.
- 2.14 Public Rights of Way Officer – The Mushroom Farm sits to the east extent of the village of Martham, with a public footpath running along the NE boundary of the site. Access to this Public Right Of Way (PROW) would be beneficial for daily

recreational activities, such as dog walking and exercise, and would make circular routes available as well as providing access to the nearby, but presently difficult to access countryside.

- 2.15 Norfolk County Council Infrastructure and Economic Growth: The proposed development comprises 100 multi-bed houses. The County Council does not seek education contributions associated with 1-bed units and only seeks 50% contributions for multi-bed flats. Therefore in net education terms this represents the equivalent of 100 dwellings, which will generate:

- 1.Primary School – 26 children (5 – 11);
- 2.High School – 17 children (11 – 16).

Martham Primary School (5-11), May 2015 has 420 spaces, 331 on roll which provides +89 school spaces.

Flegg High School (11-16), May 2015 has 950 spaces, 811 on roll which provides +139 school paces.

There is sufficient capacity at Primary and High School levels; therefore Norfolk County Council will not be seeking Education contributions on this occasion.

- 2.16 Norfolk Fire Service: Norfolk Fire Services have indicated that the proposed development will require 1 hydrant per 50 dwellings (on a minimum 90-mm main) for the residential development at a cost of £ 447.80 per hydrant. The number of hydrants will be rounded to the nearest 50th dwelling where necessary.

Please note that the onus will be on the developer to install the hydrants during construction to the satisfaction of Norfolk Fire Service and at no cost. Given that the works involved will be on-site, it is felt that the hydrants could be delivered through a planning condition.

- 2.17 Healttheast: No comment.

3 Policy :-

- 3.1 Local Policy - Saved Great Yarmouth Borough-Wide Local Plan Policies (2001):
- 3.2 Paragraph 215 of the NPPF states that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF. The closer the Local Plan is to the policies in the NPPF the greater the weight that is given to the Local Plan policy. The Great Yarmouth Borough Wide Local Plan was adopted in 2001 and the most relevant policies were 'saved' in 2007 and reassessed in January 2016.

- 3.3 The Saved Policies, listed have all been assessed as being in general conformity with the NPPF, and add further information to the policies in the NPPF, while not contradicting it. These policies hold the greatest weight in the determining of planning applications.
- 3.4 HOU10: Permission for new dwellings in the countryside will only be given in connection with agriculture, forestry, organised recreation, or the expansion of settlements.
- 3.5 HOU16: A high standard of layout and design will be required for all housing proposal. A site survey and landscaping scheme will be required will all detailed applications for more than 10 dwellings. These should include measures to retain and safeguard significant existing landscape features and give details of, existing and proposed site levels planting and aftercare arrangements.
- 3.6 HOU17: requires housing developments to have regard to the density of the surrounding area.
- 3.7 BNV10: New development in or adjacent to a conservation area will be required to be sympathetic to the character or appearance of the area in terms of scale, height form, massing, materials, siting and design.

(Objective: To retain and enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas)

4 National Policy:- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 4.1 The presumption in favour of sustainable development is set out under paragraph 4.
- 4.2 Paragraph 49: Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.
- 4.3 Paragraph 42: The supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or extension to existing villages and towns that follow the principles of Garden Cities. Working with the support of their communities, local planning authorities should consider whether such opportunities provide the best way of achieving sustainable development.

4.4 Paragraph 50 states that to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities, local planning authorities should:

- Plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes);
- identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand; and
- where they have identified that affordable housing is needed, set policies for meeting this need on site, unless off-site provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified (for example to improve or make more effective use of the existing housing stock) and the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities.

4.5 Paragraph 63 states that: 'in determining applications, great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which help raise the standard of design more generally in the area'. Paragraph 64 states that 'permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

4.6 Paragraph 55: To promote sustainable development in rural area, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of small settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.

4.7 Paragraph 17. Within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land-use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. These 12 principles are that planning should:

- encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value;

4.8 Paragraph 111. Planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value. Local planning authorities may continue to consider the case for setting a locally appropriate target for the use of brownfield land.

- 4.9 Paragraph 173. Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.

5 Core strategy – Adopted 21st December 2015

- 5.1 Policy CS2: Achieving sustainable growth. This policy identifies the broad areas for growth, sets out the sustainable settlement hierarchy for the borough and two key allocations. Martham is identified as a Primary Village and is expected to receive modest housing growth over the plan period due to its range of village facilities and access to key services.
- 5.2 Policy CS4: Delivering affordable housing. This policy sets out the thresholds for the provision of affordable housing. Martham is within affordable housing sub-market “1” where developments of 5 dwellings or more are expected to provide 20% affordable housing. A commuted sum is acceptable in exceptional circumstances.
- 5.3 Policy CS9: Encouraging well designed and distinctive places. This policy applies to all new development.
- 5.4 Policy CS11 sets out the Council’s approach to enhancing the natural environment. Consideration should still be given as to how the design of the scheme has sought to avoid or reduce negative impacts on biodiversity and appropriately contributes to the creation of biodiversity in accordance with points f) and g). In addition criterion c) states that ‘The Natura 2000 Sites Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy will secure the measures identified in the Habitat Regulation Assessment which are necessary to prevent adverse effects on European wildlife sites vulnerable to impacts from visitors’.
- 5.5 Policy CS14 states that all developments should be assessed to establish as to whether or not any infrastructure or infrastructure improvements are required to mitigate the impacts of the development. This includes seeking contributions towards Natura 2000 sites monitoring and mitigation measures (criterion e).

6 Interim Housing Land Supply Policy (July 2014)

- 6.1 This policy only applies when the Council's Five Year Housing Land Supply utilised sites identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).
- 6.2 New Housing development may be deemed acceptable outside, but adjacent to existing Urban Areas of Village Development Limits providing the following criteria, where relevant to development, have been satisfactorily addressed: inter alia points a to n.

7 Appraisal

- 7.1 The site was assessed as part of the Strategic Housing Land Supply Assessment (SHLAA) and summarised as adjacent to the village development limits of Martham and is considered to have good access to a range of facilities such as local shops, a secondary school and medical facilities. The site is potentially suitable as a large extension to Martham in conjunction with site MA10c, however the site could also be brought forward in isolation in the next 5 years due to a suitable access off White Street and could potentially yield up to 100 dwellings over the short to medium term.
- 7.2 In terms of highways and access, Norfolk County Council had commented on the SHLAA in terms of highways and access, Norfolk County Council indicated that the site is acceptable for estate scale development although this should be limited to parts of the site with existing brownfield uses. It was considered that a suitable access from Hemsby Road could be attained which could come forward through the development of site MA10c directly below. Norfolk County Highways are now satisfied that a singular access off White street with off-site highway improvements to include a zebra crossing are acceptable for the development.
- 7.3 Anglian Water have indicated that there are major constraints with regard to sewerage infrastructure which would require flow attenuation and may require a larger wet well at the pumping station. In addition there is no capacity in the existing surface water sewers therefore alternative drainage measures such as SuDS may need to be explored where appropriate
- 7.4 There are no other major constraints identified which may hinder the suitability of the site, however any proposal would need to take into account the Martham conservation area adjacent to the site.
- 7.5 To meet the housing needs of the borough by 2031, the majority of new housing development occurring in the Primary Villages is likely to take place on greenfield land outside the currently adopted development limits. Prior to the adoption of the Local Plan Site Allocations document, the Council adopted its Interim Housing Land Supply (IHLS) policy in June 2014 as a means of delivering suitable

housing sites in the short term before they are formally allocated in the Local Plan. The IHLS is a material consideration and is only utilised when the Council's five year housing land supply policy includes 'deliverable' sites identified through the SHLAA.

8 Assessment :-

- 8.1 The application, is for the redevelopment of a previously developed site, with the demolition of a dwelling house to accommodate the access and the erection of 100 residential dwellings with associated infrastructure and public open space.
- 8.2 The layout provides a density of 31.25 properties per hectare, taking into account the open space provision and the land used for the pumping station. There is a mix of properties provided ranging from 1 to 4 bedrooms.
- 8.3 There are a number of neighbour objections to the partial closure of Back Lane. This aspect of the application has undergone extensive negotiation and discussion with Norfolk County Highways and the access as currently applied is acceptable. The closure of Back Lane will occur by off-site highway works to the White Street entrance. The offsite works include the movement of the speed limit sign and signage to identify the newly formed cul de sac. Back Lane will have a size five turning head at the northern closed section and a type three turning head within an existing access to provide additional turning. The works will also include the provision of a widened footpath and zebra crossing. There is a pedestrian crossing with tactile paving at the entrance to the site. It is accepted that a partial closure of Back Lane will alter the way that existing residents utilise there accesses however it will remove the ability to utilise this road as a rat run thus protecting the amenities of the residents.
- 8.4 The drainage, water pressure and foul sewerage disposal were commented on during the SHLAA assessment and the consultation responses. There is no objection from Anglian Water who have stated that there is adequate capacity for the foul water flows. There are no objections to the drainage proposal for surface water from the Internal Drainage Board, Environment Agency, the LLFA (below size threshold) or Anglia Water for the surface water drainage. It is recommended and shall be conditioned that further drainage details are submitted prior to the commencement of development.
- 8.5 Other neighbour and parish objections include the concern over the lack of infrastructure within the village to cope with this and other developments. Paragraph 2.18 of this report outlines a portion of the response received from the County Council noting that there are no contributions being sought for education as the local schools have sufficient space to accommodate this development.

- 8.6 Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy (adopted December 2015) outlines the provision of affordable housing for the Borough. The affordable housing requirement for this area is 20% which would equate to 20 dwellings. The application has submitted a viability assessment as part of the application which has sought to evidence that the site is not viable should the policy compliant levels of affordable housing be provided. The report is, at the time of writing, being assessed by the District Valuation Office and the Local Authority is in possession of a draft report. Viability of a site and the ability to reduce or remove contributions by negotiation using an evidence based approach, are contained within the NPPF and reinforced within the Core Strategy and are available to developers to ensure that housing is delivered.
- 8.7 The viability of this site is questioned as the previously developed land contained a number of large outbuildings many of which had been subject to several fires. The NPPF is in favour of development on land that has previously been developed and the reduction or removal of contributions can bring brownfield land into use for housing but it is accepted that this land is more expensive to develop than previously undeveloped land.
- 8.8 The applicant has verbally agreed to some contributions which are still undergoing negotiation. These negotiations will continue upon the receipt of the valuation assessment. The contributions to mitigate the effect on the Natura 2000 sites are part of those agreed, open space and childrens play are still under negotiation and if written agreement in principle occurs prior to the day of committee these shall be reported verbally.
- 8.9 The Parish Council raised an objection to the open space management. Notwithstanding any contributions that are made the open space shall be secured through s106 agreement and managed by a management company in perpetuity. This should meet the Parish concerns regarding this aspect of the development.
- 8.10 Concerns have been raised regarding an increase in overlooking to the properties on Back Lane. There are trees indicated on the site location and landscape plan (revision J) to a section of the boundary with the Back Lane properties indicated as to be retained. The comments received from the Tree and Landscape Officer request that the development is carried out in accordance with the details submitted. The tree and landscape officer, upon visiting the site as part of the application process has not recommended the service of a tree preservation order on any of the specimens. It is noted that any trees that are within the relevant criteria within the conservation area are protected by virtue of being within the Conservation Area.
- 8.11 The overlooking has been reduced by the depth of gardens of the type of housing that is proposed upon this boundary. The three storey properties are designed so

that the second floor is velux windows which can be conditioned to be 1.7m from the floor level to reduce overlooking. The other properties at this boundary have the largest bedrooms facing to the front to minimise the overlooking. It is not disputed that there will be an increase in overlooking from the existing situation however this is not deemed so significant so as to recommend refusal.

- 8.12 Natural England have objected to the application on the grounds of the effect that will be had on the Natura 2000 sites and the lack of information that demonstrates mitigation for this effect. As part of the process an appropriate assessment has been carried out which has taken into account current policy and the draft Natura 2000 policy. Given the agreement for a contribution in line with the Natura 2000 draft policy to be made to mitigate any adverse effect and this has been deemed appropriate.
- 8.13 The application shows a pedestrian link at two points to the existing public right of way. The access to this will increase, in line with the comments from the Public Right of Way Officer, the use of this link and will provide opportunities for walking and recreational use within the immediate locality reducing the need to travel.
- 8.14 The proposed development lies outside of the village development limits however the Interim Housing Land Supply Policy (IHLSP) has been drafted and adopted in order that developments, specifically those for housing outside of the village development limits can be assessed with a view to meeting housing targets prior to the adoption of the site specific allocations. The IHLSP is a material consideration and as such shall be afforded appropriate weight as a means of assessing development for housing outside of village development limits.
- 8.15 The Core Strategy identifies that 30% of new housing development should be located within key service areas or primary villages. The application, being located within the village of Martham, a primary village has access to village amenities including schools and shops. The development is, in accordance with the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, a sustainable location.

9 RECOMMENDATION :-

- 9.1 It is accepted that the application is outside of the village development limits and contrary to the adopted Borough Wide Local Plan 2001 however the site has been identified as a brownfield site which is developable and deliverable and there is no objection in planning terms to the development going ahead prior to the formal adoption of the site specific allocations subject to conditions.
- 9.2 Approve - The recommendation is to approve the application subject to conditions as recommended by consulted parties and those to ensure a satisfactory form of development and obligations as set out by Norfolk County Council and mitigation

measures in line with the aims of the Natura 2000 Sites Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy. Should members be minded to approve the application the recommendation is such that the permission is not issued prior to the signing of an agreement under section 106 for provision for schools, infrastructure, mitigation, affordable housing, children's play equipment/space and opens space management.

Reference: 06/15/00769/F

Parish: Great Yarmouth
Officer: Miss G Manthorpe
Expiry Date: 22/03/16

Applicant: Mr C Abbott

Proposal: Full planning application for the conversion of floors 4,5 and 6 into 18 self-contained flats.

Site: 32 Marine Parade, Atlantis Complex, Great Yarmouth.

REPORT

1. Background / History :-

- 1.1 The site comprises 1896 square metres over three floors of former hotel located on the western side of Marine Parade. The first, second and third floor are to remain in commercial uses and do not form part of this application. The seventh floor is not part of the application and as such shall not be assessed.
- 1.2 The hotel has not operated, according to the information provided, since 2000. There has been a feasibility statement provided within the design and access statement outlining the cost and viability of re-opening the site for holiday accommodation.
- 1.3 There have been numerous applications on the site, in excess of 50, although the relevance to this application is limited. A full list is available online or on the paper file. The most relevant historical application to the current application is 06/02/0569/F which was approved 28th February 2003. The application was for the refurbishment of the hotel, change of use of disco to casino, first floor balcony extension, restaurant, catering facilities/retail and general refurbishment of the building.

2 Consultations :-

- 2.1 Highways – No objection following additional information provided.
- 2.2 British Pipeline Agency – Not in a zone of interest.

2.3 Neighbours – no comments received.

2.4 Conservation Officer – This proposal has no consequence in terms of environmental character or quality. Perhaps some consideration to gains being made with regards the rear ramp.

2.5 Building Control – no adverse comments.

2.6 Environmental Health – No comments received

2.7 Strategic Planning – No comments received.

3 Policy :-

3.1 Local Policy - Saved Great Yarmouth Borough-Wide Local Plan Policies (2001):

3.2 Paragraph 215 of the NPPF states that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF. The closer the Local Plan is to the policies in the NPPF the greater the weight that is given to the Local Plan policy. The Great Yarmouth Borough Wide Local Plan was adopted in 2001 and the most relevant policies were 'saved' in 2007.

3.3 The Saved Policies listed have all been assessed as being in general conformity with the NPPF, and add further information to the policies in the NPPF, while not contradicting it. These policies hold the greatest weight in the determining of planning applications.

3.4 HOU16: A high standard of layout and design will be required for all housing proposal. A site survey and landscaping scheme will be required will all detailed applications for more than 10 dwellings. These should include measures to retain and safeguard significant existing landscape features and give details of, existing and proposed site levels planting and aftercare arrangements.

3.5 HOU17: requires housing developments to have regard to the density of the surrounding area.

3.6 BNV10: New development in or adjacent to a conservation area will be required to be sympathetic to the character or appearance of the area in terms of scale, height form, massing, materials, siting and design.

(Objective: To retain and enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas)

- 3.7 TR4: Proposals to change the use of tourist facilities attractions or accommodation to purposes which are not tourist related will not be permitted where the site or premises are within primary holiday accommodation and primary holiday attraction areas, as shown on the proposals map. In secondary holiday accommodation areas, as shown on the proposals may, policy TR12 will apply.
- 3.8 TCM18 – Within Gorleston and Great Yarmouth Town Centres ,Great Yarmouth Seafront, Hemsby commercial centre and Caister High Street, where non-operational car parking cannot be provided to serve a development proposal in accordance with the Councils standards, or the standards are not waived in respect of an application for a change of use on a town centre site, in lieu of such provision, the Council may require developers to pay a commuted sum which will be used for provisions of public car parking or improvements to public transport facilities.

4 National Policy:- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 4.1 The presumption in favour of sustainable development is set out under paragraph 4.
- 4.2 Paragraph 49: Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.
- 4.3 Paragraph 50 states that to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities, local planning authorities should:
- Plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes);
 - identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand; and
 - where they have identified that affordable housing is needed, set policies for meeting this need on site, unless off-site provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified (for example to improve or

make more effective use of the existing housing stock) and the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities.

4.4 Paragraph 63 states that: 'in determining applications, great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which help raise the standard of design more generally in the area'. Paragraph 64 states that 'permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

4.5 Paragraph 17. Within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land-use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. These 12 principles are that planning should:

- encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value;

4.6 Paragraph 111. Planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value. Local planning authorities may continue to consider the case for setting a locally appropriate target for the use of brownfield land.

4.7 Paragraph 173. Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.

5 Core strategy – Adopted 21st December 2015

5.1 Policy CS2: Achieving sustainable growth. This policy identifies the broad areas for growth, sets out the sustainable settlement hierarchy for the borough and two key allocations.

5.2 Policy CS4: Delivering affordable housing. This policy sets out the thresholds for the provision of affordable housing. The site is within affordable housing sub-

market area 3 Great Yarmouth Town Centre with a threshold of 15 dwellings providing 10% affordable housing.

- 5.3 Policy CS8: As one of the top coastal tourist destinations in the UK, the successfulness of tourism in the Borough of Great Yarmouth not only benefits the local economy but the wider sub-regional economy as well. To ensure the tourism sector remains strong, the Council and its partners will:

b) Safeguard the existing stock of visitor holiday accommodation especially those within designated holiday accommodation areas, unless it can be demonstrated that the current use is not viable or that the loss of some bed spaces will improve the standard of the existing accommodation

(note only b of a-o is shown)

- 5.4 Policy CS9: Encouraging well designed and distinctive places. This policy applies to all new development.

6 Assessment :-

- 6.1 The application, is for the conversion of three floors of a disused hotel to 18 no. residential flats. The Atlantis complex comprises three floors of commercial use including amusement arcade, food sales and drinking establishments. Planning permission was granted in 2003 for a refurbishment which included external improvements to the appearance.
- 6.2 The Atlantis Complex is a prominent feature on Great Yarmouth's seafront and is a focal central point located opposite the Marina Centre. The 2003 refurbishment updated the eastern elevation and provides a frontage which is in keeping with the tourism and commercial use of the area. The site is located within a conservation area.
- 6.3 The proposal involves the removal of the balcony's which currently serve the hotel rooms to the north and southern elevation. The existing windows will be replaced to the north, south and western elevation in white UPVC. The change of windows and alterations to the appearance will enhance the external appearance as the current elevations are tired and worn and do not add to the conservation area. The conservation officer has noted that the rear of the building, western elevation, could benefit from works to remove the ramp and improve the appearance of this elevation. Although any improvement would be beneficial given the character of the area to the rear of the building improvements are not deemed intrinsically linked to the approval of the application. It is further noted that any alterations to the rear access would require a fresh application and may,

depending on what is deemed possible, impact on the commercial and tourism uses.

- 6.4 The internal configuration will be altered to accommodate the proposed new residential dwellings. Each floor will comprise 2 no. 1 bed dwellings, 3 no. 2 bed dwellings and 1 no. large 2 bed dwelling. The difference in size and bedrooms provides for a mix of units seeking to meet different needs for housing. The seventh floor will be mothballed until, according to the submitted details, there are funds available.
- 6.5 The site is located within an area designated as prime commercial holiday and as such tourism policies apply to the application. Policy TR4 states that development shall not be permitted for the change of use within prime holiday areas to uses that are not tourism. Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy, while not superseding TR4 allows for changes of use to occur if they are not viable. The viability appraisal within the design and access statement seeks to show that the use is no longer viable and details the demand for bed spaces and the current availability. While accounts have not been provided to demonstrate the viability at the time of closing it is accepted that major upgrade would be required and that the hotel use has been closed for several years.
- 6.6 The proposal retains the holiday uses at the lower levels which is mitigation against the loss of the holiday accommodation. It is noted that the applicants agent states that there is no loss of accommodation as the hotel has not operated in several years however this is not compelling in isolation. The loss of holiday accommodation, while resisted, can be looked at in terms of CS4 and it is accepted that the accommodation available has changed over the years. Marine Parade, unlike other accommodation areas, is a mixed use area with commercial tourist uses at street level for the majority of the golden mile. Other properties have first and second floor tourist and commercial uses such as Mission nightclub however there are a notable number of properties which are commercial on the ground floor and residential on the upper floors.
- 6.7 The viability assessment that has been submitted covers the changing nature of accommodation and character of the area. Given the size of the building and the length of time that the hotel use has been inactive it is accepted that the use in this would not be demonstrably harmful to the character of the tourism area. The use of the lower floors would not be acceptable as residential as this would have a significantly detrimental effect on the viability and vitality of the area.
- 6.8 Sufficient parking is being provided for the development. It is noted by the Highways Officer that the site is in a sustainable location with good links to public transport however given the number of dwellings proposed it is likely that there would be a displacement of parking were spaces not provided.

6.9 The Core Strategy policy CS2 identifies Great Yarmouth as a Main Town where approximately 35% of all new residential development should be located as it is a sustainable location. Policy CS4 requires 10% affordable housing for new residential development over 15 dwellings within this area.

7 RECOMMENDATION :-

7.1 It is accepted that the conversion of the hotel to residential use is contrary to policy TR4 of the Borough Wide Local Plan however provision is made within the Core Strategy to change the use of existing holiday or commercial uses if they are not viable. The closure and disrepair of the building and the cessation of the holiday use is not alone in proving a lack of viability however this, coupled with the distinct character and size of this building adds weight to the argument and compliance with CS8.

7.2 It is recommended that the application be approved as, on individual merits, the loss of the holiday accommodation would not have a significant adverse effect on the existing holiday accommodation or commercial uses and would provide housing in a sustainable location. Any application should be subject to all conditions appropriate to secure a satisfactory form of development. Should members be minded to approve the application it is recommended that the permission not be issued until the section 106 agreement securing the affordable housing provision has been agreed and signed.

Reference: 06/16/0028/F

Parish: Great Yarmouth

Officer: Mr J Beck

Expiry Date: 30-03-2016

Applicant: Merlin Entertainment plc

Proposal: Erection of three kiosks, mixed use A1/A5 retail and sale of non-alcoholic hot and cold beverages and food

Site: Marine Parade Sealife Centre
Great Yarmouth

REPORT

1. Background / History :-

1.1 The application site is on the south side of Marine Parade which forms the main tourism destination for the town of Great Yarmouth. The site is used as a Sealife Centre which is a visitor attraction for the display of oceanic creatures. The Sealife Centre was approved in 1989.

1.2 The surrounding uses are predominantly visitor based with South Beach Gardens to the north and The Winter Gardens to the south. Other commercial units are also present within the vicinity including a cafe.

1.3 The application is for the erection of three kiosks along the frontage of the Sealife Centre for use as mixed use A1 (retail) and A5 (hot food takeaway in total 49sqm to use as three separate units potentially linked by internal doors. Each kiosk would also have individual external doors. The units would project out by 2.8m approx. 17.5m long in total with individual openings 4.2m long. Materials include blue painted steel box section frames to match the existing main entrance to the building and roller canopy to the kiosks.

1.4 Planning History:

9788 – Replacement kiosk. 24-04-1969

06/88/1678/O – Sealife Centre with shop, restaurant and outdoor eating area and seafront gardens. Approved with conditions. 24-10-1989

06/89/0900/D – Sealife Centre with shop, restaurant and outdoor eating area and seafront gardens. Approved with conditions. 22-05-1990

06/90/0441/A - Box signs to face building. Advert consent. 06-06-1990

06/95/0258/F - Erection of canopy to main entrance of centre. Approved with conditions. 05-05-1995

06/99/0330/A - Hoarding/signs to advertise attraction. Advert Consent. 24-05-1999

06/08/0822/F - Construction of a Penguin enclosure to the existing Sealife Centre. Approved with conditions. 16-12-2008

06/10/0430/A - Adverts to front canopy/atrium and window entrance signs. Advert consent. 17-09-2010

06/15/0067/CC - Demolition of two wooden gates and replacement with two new gates. Conservation Area Consent. 30-03-2015

2. Consultations :-

2.1 Public consultation – 2 objections. The main objections are: An overconcentration of takeaways, particularly in light of a number of takeaway units in close proximity and the disruption to the holiday trade. They have also raised concerns regarding the advertisements of the application.

2.2 Highways – No objection subject to conditions. They are satisfied with the height of the units that they do not create a significant issue to users of the public highway. They have requested a condition ensuring a minimum vertical clearance.

2.3 Conservation – Supports the application.

3. Policy and Assessment:-

3.1 Saved policies from the Borough Wide Local Plan:

POLICY SHP14

SUBJECT TO THE SIZE OF THE PROPOSAL, THE CONVERSION OR REDEVELOPMENT OF PROPERTIES TO PROVIDE CLASS A1 OR CLASS A3 USES WILL BE PERMITTED IN THE PRIME COMMERCIAL HOLIDAY AREAS SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAP.

(Objective: To ensure the continued commercial vitality of designated tourist shopping areas.)

POLICY SHP15:

PROPOSALS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF HOT FOOD TAKE-AWAYS NOT FALLING TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF POLICY SHP4 WILL BE PERMITTED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

- (A) THE PROPOSAL WOULD NOT CREATE AN OVER-CONCENTRATION OR PREPONDERANCE OF CLASS A3 USES WHICH WOULD SIGNIFICANTLY DETRACT FROM THE VITALITY AND VIABILITY OF A SHOPPING FRONTAGE;
- (B) THE PROPOSAL WOULD NOT SIGNIFICANTLY ADVERSELY AFFECT ADJOINING OR NEIGHBOURING OCCUPIERS AND USERS OF LAND OR PREMISES BY VIRTUE OF NOISE, DISTURBANCE, SMELL OR FUMES;
- (C) THE PROPOSAL WOULD NOT BE LIKELY TO RESULT IN A SIGNIFICANT HAZARD TO ROAD SAFETY OR SIGNIFICANTLY IMPEDE THE FREE FLOW OF TRAFFIC;
- (D) COMPLIANCE WITH THE COUNCIL'S PARKING AND SERVICING STANDARDS AS SET OUT AT APPENDIX (A) TO CHAPTER 3 IN THE CASE OF ALL NEW OPERATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, AND WHERE POSSIBLE OR NECESSARY IN THE CASE OF A CHANGE OF USE; AND,
- (E) THE PROPOSAL WOULD NOT SIGNIFICANTLY ADVERSELY AFFECT THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA OR THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT.

(Objective: To allow the provision of hot food outlets outside shopping areas whilst safeguarding the amenities and character of the area.)

POLICY SHP16

ANY PROPOSALS TO ESTABLISH NEW RETAIL FOOD OUTLETS IN THE FORM OF KIOSKS OR STALLS WILL BE TREATED ON THEIR MERITS. HOWEVER, ANY PROPOSAL LIKELY TO OBSTRUCT THE FOOTWAY WILL BE STRONGLY RESISTED. THE BOROUGH COUNCIL WILL NOT PERMIT PROPOSALS TO

ESTABLISH NEW REFRESHMENT OR FOOD OUTLET KIOSKS/ CONCESSIONS ON THE SEAFRONT TO THE EAST OF MARINE PARADE, GREAT YARMOUTH, OR ON THE ESPLANADE AT GORLESTON. ALTERATIONS AND EXTENSIONS TO SEAFRONT REFRESHMENT OR FOOD OUTLET CONCESSIONS/KIOSKS EAST OF MARINE PARADE, GREAT YARMOUTH WILL BE PERMITTED PROVIDED THE APPLICANT CAN DEMONSTRATE THAT:-

- (a) THERE IS NO LOSS OF DESIGNATED OPEN SPACE;
- (b) THE PROMENADE/FOOTWAYS WILL NOT BE OBSTRUCTED;
- (c) THE RECONSTRUCTED KIOSK WILL BE DESIGNED TO INCORPORATE MATERIALS APPROPRIATE TO ITS LOCATION AND SETTING AND IS COMPLIANT WITH THE DESIGN GUIDE; AND
- (d) THE RESULTANT BUILDING/STRUCTURE IS NOT IN AN AREA WHICH COULD BE LIABLE TO COASTAL EROSION OR SEA INUNDATION OVER THE ANTICIPATED LIFETIME OF THE DEVELOPMENT.

CONDITIONS WILL BE IMPOSED ON ANY PLANNING APPROVAL TO ENSURE THAT CRITERIA (a) TO (c) OF THE POLICY ARE COMPLIED WITH. CONDITIONS MAY ALSO BE IMPOSED RESTRICTING THE AMOUNT OF EXTERNAL SEATING AND TABLES ASSOCIATED WITH THE KIOSK.

(Objective: To ensure that the character of the seafront is maintained, to ensure the free flow of pedestrians and to maintain and improve the character and appearance of the seafront east of Marine Parade.)

Note: Applicants will be expected to provide evidence that the requirements of the Chief Building Control Officer and the Environmental Health Officer can be met.

POLICY TR5

THE COUNCIL WILL PRESERVE AND ENHANCE THE EXISTING CHARACTER OF HOLIDAY AREAS BY ENSURING THAT THEY ARE NOT SPOILT BY OVER-DEVELOPMENT. PROPOSALS FOR USES SUCH AS FUN-FAIRS, DISCOTHEQUES OR OTHER USES LIKELY TO GENERATE SIGNIFICANT LEVELS OF NOISE OR DISTURBANCE OR OPERATE DURING UNSOCIAL HOURS WILL BE PERMITTED ONLY IN THE PRIME COMMERCIAL HOLIDAY AREAS (AS DEFINED ON THE PROPOSALS MAP) AND WHERE THE APPLICANT CAN DEMONSTRATE THAT THERE WOULD BE NO SIGNIFICANT DETRIMENT TO THE OCCUPIERS OF ADJOINING PROPERTIES AND USERS OF LAND.

(Objective: To preserve and enhance the character of existing holiday areas.)

POLICY TR7

PROPOSALS FOR NEW VISITOR FACILITIES AND ATTRACTIONS MAY BE PERMITTED IN THE PRIME COMMERCIAL HOLIDAY AREAS OF CAISTER-ON-SEA, CALIFORNIA, GORLESTON-ON-SEA, GREAT YARMOUTH, HEMSBY, HOPTON-ON-SEA, NEWPORT AND SCRATBY AND WILL BE ASSESSED HAVING PARTICULAR REGARD TO THEIR SCALE, DESIGN AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER USES AND TO LANDSCAPE, ENVIRONMENTAL, RESIDENTIAL AMENITY AND TRAFFIC CONSIDERATIONS.

(Objective: To meet increasing visitor expectations and changing tourist trends whilst safeguarding the natural environment.)

POLICY TR21

IN THE GREAT YARMOUTH SEAFRONT AREA, WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF ITS STATUTORY DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POWERS, THE COUNCIL WILL:

- (A) MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE THE STATUS OF GREAT YARMOUTH'S GOLDEN MILE (THE SEAFRONT BETWEEN EUSTON ROAD AND THE PLEASURE BEACH) AS THE MAIN FOCUS OF THE BOROUGH'S TRADITIONAL TOURIST INDUSTRY, AND PROVIDE THE BALANCE AND RANGE OF FACILITIES AND ATTRACTIONS WITHIN THIS AREA THAT MEETS THE NEEDS AND EXPECTATIONS OF ALL SECTIONS OF THE POTENTIAL MARKET;
- (B) PROTECT THE PREDOMINANT CHARACTER OF THE DIFFERENT AREAS OF THE SEAFRONT BY:
 - i RETENTION OF THE UNCOMMERCIALISED OPEN CHARACTER OF THE AREA TO THE NORTH OF THE BRITANNIA PIER;
 - ii RETENTION OF THE OPEN CHARACTER OF AREAS TO THE EAST OF MARINE PARADE BETWEEN BRITANNIA PIER AND THE PLEASURE BEACH, INCLUDING THE AREAS OF PUBLIC OPEN SPACE; AND,
 - iii STEERING PROPOSALS OF A HIGHLY COMMERCIAL NATURE TO AREAS PREDOMINANTLY IN SUCH USES;
- (C) SUBJECT TO AESTHETIC, CONSERVATION AND OTHER LAND-USE CONSIDERATIONS, EXTEND THE SEAFRONT ILLUMINATIONS SCHEME;
- (D) SUBJECT TO PROVEN NEED, PERMIT ADDITIONAL GAMING FACILITIES, INCLUDING A CASINO ;

- (E) SUBJECT TO THE LIKELY EFFECT ON ADJOINING OR NEIGHBOURING LAND-USES, FAVOURABLY CONSIDER PROPOSALS FOR ENTERTAINMENT DEVELOPMENT WITHIN AREAS DESIGNATED AS PRIME HOLIDAY ATTRACTION OR PRIME COMMERCIAL HOLIDAY AREAS ON THE PROPOSALS MAP;
- (F) MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE THE EXISTING CHARACTER OF THE AREA TO THE EAST OF MARINE PARADE;
- (G) SUBJECT TO SCALE AND DESIGN, FAVOURABLY CONSIDER ANY PROPOSAL TO EXTEND THE MARINA LEISURE CENTRE NORTHWARDS;
- (H) SUBJECT TO A DESIGN WHICH RETAINS THE PIER DECK AND PAVILION, FAVOURABLY CONSIDER REDEVELOPMENT OF THE WELLINGTON PIER COMPLEX.

3.2 Core Strategy:

CS8 – Promoting Tourism, Leisure and Culture

As one of the top coastal tourist destinations in the UK, the successfulness of tourism in the Borough of Great Yarmouth benefits not only the local economy but also the wider sub-regional economy as well. To ensure the tourism sector remains strong, the Council and its partners will:

- a) Encourage and support the upgrading, expansion and enhancement of existing visitor accommodation and attractions to meet changes in consumer demands and encourage year-round tourism
- b) Safeguard key tourist, leisure and cultural attractions and facilities, such as the Britannia and Wellington Piers, Pleasure Beach, Hippodrome, the Sea Life Centre, the Marina Centre, Great Yarmouth Racecourse, St Georges Theatre and Gorleston Pavilion Theatre
- e) Support the development of new, high quality tourist, leisure and cultural facilities, attractions and accommodation that are designed to a high standard, easily accessed and have good connectivity with existing attractions

Policy CS9 - Encouraging well-designed, distinctive places

- a) Respond to, and draw inspiration from the surrounding area's distinctive natural, built and historic characteristics, such as scale, form, massing and materials, to

ensure that the full potential of the development site is realised; making efficient use of land and reinforcing the local identity

c) Promote positive relationships between existing and proposed buildings, streets and well lit spaces, thus creating safe, attractive, functional places with active frontages that limit the opportunities for crime

4. Assessment

4.1. The application site is situated on Marine Parade amidst the main visitor attractions. To the east is the coastline with key tourist attractions both to the north and the south. The Sealife centre itself is within an area marked as Prime Holiday Commercial whilst its surroundings are open amenity space. In front of the Sealife Centre is a broad highway expanse for pedestrians. On the opposite side of Marine Parade is a collection of hotels. The site is within a flood zone and the Great Yarmouth seafront conservation area.

4.2 The proposal is for 3 kiosk units to the frontage of the Sealife centre under use class A1 and A5. The façade will be incorporated within the existing Sealife centre frontage. The kiosks are partially under the existing canopy of the Sealife Centre.

4.3 Marine Parade is predominantly characterised by tourism uses, South Beach Gardens are to the North whilst to the South is Winter Gardens; marginally further south is the Wellington Pier. There are also commercial kiosks within the area. There are a number of A1 and A3 uses within the vicinity both opposite the application site and to the rear. The Sealife Centre itself contains retail and cafeteria area. A1 and A5 uses are considered suitable to a commercial holiday area and are supported under policy SHP14 of the Borough Wide Local Plan.

4.4 The design and appearance of the kiosks are considered sympathetic to the wider conservation area. Marine Parade is defined by its tourism appeal which often provides colourful designs. The overall appearance of the scheme is considered to be of a good quality and is not considered to have an adverse impact on the conservation area. The design appears to match the existing structure reducing the overall visual impact of the kiosks. In accordance with Policy CS9 the design responds to the nearby landmarks. The conservation officer has supported the scheme and has advised it is encouraged under the Inter-great enhancement programme. He has stated that table and chairs would require further co-ordination, however a seating area has not been included in the plans.

4.5 Policy SHP15 of the Borough Wide Local Plan aims to ensure there is not an overconcentration of hot food takeaways. The intention is to over a proliferation which significantly impacts upon the vitality and viability of the wider seafront. It is recognised that there are a number of hot food takeaways on Marine Parade. The policy does not extend to A1 retail uses.

4.6 Policy SHP16 is unequivocal in stating that *'THE BOROUGH COUNCIL WILL NOT PERMIT PROPOSALS TO ESTABLISH NEW REFRESHMENT OR FOOD OUTLET KIOSKS/ CONCESSIONS ON THE SEAFRONT TO THE EAST OF MARINE PARADE, GREAT YARMOUTH, going on to state ALTERATIONS AND EXTENSIONS TO SEAFRONT REFRESHMENT OR FOOD OUTLET CONCESSIONS/KIOSKS EAST OF MARINE PARADE, GREAT YARMOUTH WILL BE PERMITTED PROVIDED THE APPLICANT CAN DEMONSTRATE ...* that a kiosk does not obstruct the highways and does not result in a loss of open space.

4.7 The kiosks are new additions to the building and not linked to the existing retail or cafeteria areas in the existing Sealife building and therefore strictly speaking cannot be regarded as extensions to the existing offer but as a potentially an independent retail offer. As such the buildings if permitted in the context of Policy SHP16 should be restricted to limit the amount of food on offer particularly hot food and sold from the premises if members are minded to approve the application..

4.8 The kiosks are partially within the covered area of the Sealife Centre, although it is recognised it will extend beyond this is not considered to significantly disrupt the functioning of the highway nor will it result in a significant loss of open space. Highways have not objected to the development, they have stated that despite the development being situated on land owned by the applicant the canopy could extend into the public highway. Subject to a condition ensuring a minimum vertical clearance it is not considered that the development will disrupt the highway.

4.9 There have been two public objections to the development; the main concerns were firstly that there is an overconcentration of hot food uses. The second concern is the disruption caused by the potential for the works to be undertaken in the holiday season. If considered necessary the works could be conditioned to be undertaken out of season.

5.0 RECOMMENDATION :- Approve subject to conditions regarding restricting the use to A1 ie non hot food, highway clearance in relation to the footpath and the finish of the shutters to be agreed prior to the commencement of the development.,

PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 01-MAR-16 AND 25-MAR-16 FOLLOWING DETERMINATION BY THE GROUP MANAGER (PLANNING) UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REFERENCE **06/16/0039/CU**
PARISH Belton & Browston 10
PROPOSAL Change of use from C3 (residential) to D1 (non-residential institution)
SITE Caretakers Bungalow Bell Lane
 Belton GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT Mr M Scott
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/16/0035/F**
PARISH Bradwell N 1
PROPOSAL Proposed first floor extension over existing garage and utility room
SITE 14 Mallard Way Bradwell
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR31 8JJ
APPLICANT Mr & Mrs Faulkner
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/16/0060/F**
PARISH Bradwell N 1
PROPOSAL Ground and first floor extension - kitchen and bedrooms
SITE 4 Curlew Way Bradwell
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR31 8QX
APPLICANT Mr P A Finch
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/16/0032/F**
PARISH Bradwell S 2
PROPOSAL Alterations to existing shop, pair of doors added to side elevation
SITE 137 Beccles Road Bradwell
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR31 8AB
APPLICANT Arthur Jary & Sons Limited
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/16/0024/F**
PARISH Burgh Castle 10
PROPOSAL Proposed two-storey side extension. Form bedroom in roof with balcony
SITE 6 Coronation Terrace Butt Lane
 Burgh Castle GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT Mr D Perry
DECISION **APPROVE**

PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 01-MAR-16 AND 25-MAR-16 FOLLOWING DETERMINATION BY THE GROUP MANAGER (PLANNING) UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REFERENCE **06/16/0029/F**
 PARISH **Burgh Castle 10**
 PROPOSAL **Proposed new chalet bungalow**

SITE **Briarcroft (Land adjacent) Porters Loke
 Burgh Castle GREAT YARMOUTH**

APPLICANT **Mr E Foster**
 DECISION **REFUSED**

REFERENCE **06/16/0038/F**
 PARISH **Caister On Sea 3**
 PROPOSAL **Proposed first floor extensions and alterations**

SITE **23 Jack Plummer Way Caister On Sea
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR30 5WD**

APPLICANT **Mr & Mrs M Beer**
 DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/16/0030/A**
 PARISH **Caister On Sea 4**
 PROPOSAL **Replacement fascia sign and vinyl opening hours sign to front elevation**

SITE **48 High Street Caister
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR30 5EH**

APPLICANT **Midlands Co-operative**
 DECISION **ADV. CONSENT**

REFERENCE **06/16/0053/F**
 PARISH **Caister On Sea 4**
 PROPOSAL **Conversion and extension of garden store to create annexe for disabled relative**

SITE **6 West Road Caister
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR30 5AQ**

APPLICANT **Miss J Santi**
 DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/16/0037/F**
 PARISH **Fleggburgh 6**
 PROPOSAL **First floor extension over existing house. Two-storey front extension and single storey rear extension**

SITE **Lavender House Royden Way Fleggburgh
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR29 3AZ**

APPLICANT **Mr & Mrs I Lavender**
 DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/16/0040/F**
 PARISH **Fleggburgh 6**
 PROPOSAL **Flat roof extension to rear and dormer to form bathroom & office**

SITE **12 Royden Way Fleggburgh
 GREAT YARMOUTH**

APPLICANT **Mr D Gooch**
 DECISION **APPROVE**

PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 01-MAR-16 AND 25-MAR-16 FOLLOWING DETERMINATION BY THE GROUP MANAGER (PLANNING) UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REFERENCE **06/16/0002/LB**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 5
 PROPOSAL New combi boiler in bedroom with new flue on external wall

SITE Brooklyn Cottage 96 High Road
 Gorleston GREAT YARMOUTH

APPLICANT Mr S Dye
 DECISION **LIST.BLD.APP**

REFERENCE **06/16/0073/PDE**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 5
 PROPOSAL Notification of a larger home extension - single storey
 kitchen extension

SITE 29 Shrublands Way Gorleston
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR31 8DU

APPLICANT Mr D Lawrence
 DECISION **PERMITTED DEV.**

REFERENCE **06/16/0018/CU**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 7
 PROPOSAL CoU from residential flat to cafe (above 58 Bells Rd), Mon
 to Sat 8.00-23.00, Sun and BH 9.00-22.00

SITE 17A Upper Cliff Road Gorleston
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR31 6AL

APPLICANT Mrs K Halladay
 DECISION **REFUSED**

REFERENCE **06/16/0020/F**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 7
 PROPOSAL Extension to rear

SITE 18 Kennel Loke Hopton
 GREAT YARMOUTH

APPLICANT Mr and Mrs J Bloomfield
 DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/16/0047/F**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 7
 PROPOSAL Proposed utility room extension

SITE 25 Marine Parade Gorleston
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR31 6DY

APPLICANT Mr A Smith
 DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/16/0059/PDE**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 7
 PROPOSAL Notification of a larger home extension - single storey
 kitchen extension

SITE 28 Mariners Compass Gorleston
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR31 6TQ

APPLICANT Ms K Hood
 DECISION **PERMITTED DEV.**

PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 01-MAR-16 AND 25-MAR-16 FOLLOWING DETERMINATION BY THE GROUP MANAGER (PLANNING) UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REFERENCE **06/16/0067/PDE**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 7
 PROPOSAL Notification of a larger home extension - proposed conservatory
 SITE 31 South Garden Gorleston
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR31 6TL
 APPLICANT Mr G Bullent
 DECISION **PERMITTED DEV.**

REFERENCE **06/16/0055/F**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 9
 PROPOSAL External alterations to facilitate the subdivision of Unit C and associated works
 SITE Gapton Hall Road Units C, C1 & C2
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR31 0NL
 APPLICANT Electricity Supply Nominees Ltd
 DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/16/0072/PDE**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 11
 PROPOSAL Notification of a larger home extension - single storey flat roof extension with roof lantern
 SITE 11 Poplar Avenue Gorleston
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR31 7PW
 APPLICANT Mr P Moughton
 DECISION **PERMITTED DEV.**

REFERENCE **06/16/0023/CC**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 14
 PROPOSAL Demolition of former Amazonia reptile zoo, boundary walls & fencing; clearance of debris; level site, leave clean & tidy
 SITE Marine Parade Amazonia
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR30 3AH
 APPLICANT Great Yarmouth Borough Council
 DECISION **CON.AREA.CONS'T**

REFERENCE **06/16/0041/F**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 14
 PROPOSAL Proposed galvanised steel shutter at front of shop
 SITE 170 King Street GREAT YARMOUTH
 Norfolk NR30 2PA
 APPLICANT Mr P Barulis
 DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/16/0042/EU**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 14
 PROPOSAL Application for certificate of lawfulness for existing use as HMO
 SITE 18-19 Nelson Road South Ashwood Hotel
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR30 3JL
 APPLICANT R & D Properties (UK) Ltd
 DECISION **EST/LAW USE CER.**

PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 01-MAR-16 AND 25-MAR-16 FOLLOWING DETERMINATION BY THE GROUP MANAGER (PLANNING) UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REFERENCE **06/16/0062/F**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 14
 PROPOSAL Internal remodelling to provide 8 additional bedrooms and ground floor bedroom entrance altered
 SITE Andover Hotel Camperdown
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR30 3JB
 APPLICANT Mr P Newstead
 DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/16/0063/LB**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 14
 PROPOSAL Internal remodelling to provide 8 additional bedrooms and ground floor bedroom entrance altered
 SITE 27 Camperdown GREAT YARMOUTH
 Norfolk
 APPLICANT Mr P Newstead
 DECISION **LIST.BLD.APP**

REFERENCE **06/16/0078/SU**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 14
 PROPOSAL New external lift and entrance together with works to toilets
 SITE St Georges First School St Peters Road
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR30 3BQ
 APPLICANT Norfolk County Council
 DECISION **NO OBJECTION**

REFERENCE **06/16/0092/F**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 14
 PROPOSAL Proposed rear extension and alterations
 SITE 108 Havelock Road GREAT YARMOUTH
 Norfolk NR30 3HJ
 APPLICANT Mr W Whitton
 DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/15/0764/CU**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 15
 PROPOSAL Use of land for car parking
 SITE 83 Marine Parade Raynscourt Hotel
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR30 2DJ
 APPLICANT Mrs K S Rockach Raynscourt Hotel
 DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/16/0045/CD**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 15
 PROPOSAL Discharge of conditions 2 and 3 of Planning Permission 06/11/0099/CU in respect of flood protection
 SITE 189 Northgate Street GREAT YARMOUTH
 Norfolk NR30 1DA
 APPLICANT Mrs I Graefin Grote
 DECISION **APPROVE (CONDITIONS)**

PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 01-MAR-16 AND 25-MAR-16 FOLLOWING DETERMINATION BY THE GROUP MANAGER (PLANNING) UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REFERENCE **06/16/0061/F**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 15
 PROPOSAL Formation of vehicle parking facilities over existing lawn area to serve new i-CASH clinic
 SITE Northgate Hospital Northgate Street
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR30 1BU
 APPLICANT Cambridge Community Services c/o Serco
 DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/16/0004/CU**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 19
 PROPOSAL Use of property for a cafe with adult gaming centre at the rear
 SITE 127 High Street Gorleston
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR31 6RE
 APPLICANT Mr R Wood
 DECISION **REFUSED**

REFERENCE **06/16/0007/F**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 19
 PROPOSAL Proposed first floor extension to form additional bedrooms and ground floor kitchen extension
 SITE Gresham Nursing Home 49 John Road
 Gorleston GREAT YARMOUTH
 APPLICANT Mr N Ruhomatally
 DECISION **REFUSED**

REFERENCE **06/16/0066/F**
 PARISH Great Yarmouth 19
 PROPOSAL Side extension to form level access shower room, ground floor adaptation works
 SITE 4 Englands Lane Gorleston
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR31 6BG
 APPLICANT Miss L Duke
 DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/15/0771/F**
 PARISH Hemsby 8
 PROPOSAL Conversion of outbuilding to holiday let with 2 car parking spaces
 SITE Pit Road Allens Butchers Hemsby
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR29 4LG
 APPLICANT Mr G Allen
 DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/15/0773/A**
 PARISH Hemsby 8
 PROPOSAL Two galvanised steel post signs
 SITE 28 Beach Road Lost World Adventure Golf Hemsby
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR29 4HS
 APPLICANT Mr J Gray Lost World Adventure Golf
 DECISION **ADV. CONSENT**

PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 01-MAR-16 AND 25-MAR-16 FOLLOWING DETERMINATION BY THE GROUP MANAGER (PLANNING) UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REFERENCE	06/16/0033/F
PARISH	Hemsby 8
PROPOSAL	Increase rear playground by 20 m2
SITE	Hemsby Primary School School Loke Hemsby GREAT YARMOUTH NR29 4LH
APPLICANT	Hemsby Primary School
DECISION	APPROVE
<hr/>	
REFERENCE	06/16/0054/F
PARISH	Hemsby 8
PROPOSAL	Variation of condition 1 - Planning Permission 06/09/0593/D changes to layout and house designs
SITE	Martham Road/Common Road Hemsby GREAT YARMOUTH Norfolk
APPLICANT	Norfolk Homes Ltd
DECISION	APPROVE
<hr/>	
REFERENCE	06/16/0077/F
PARISH	Hemsby 8
PROPOSAL	Proposed single storey front extension
SITE	19 The Pastures Hemsby GREAT YARMOUTH NR29 4HF
APPLICANT	IM & KJ Mercer
DECISION	APPROVE
<hr/>	
REFERENCE	06/16/0013/F
PARISH	Hopton On Sea 2
PROPOSAL	Replace existing timber windows, and conservatory windows & doors. Replace existing timber style door
SITE	Hall Road Manor Cottage Hopton GREAT YARMOUTH NR31 9AX
APPLICANT	Mr J Avery
DECISION	APPROVE
<hr/>	
REFERENCE	06/16/0048/F
PARISH	Hopton On Sea 2
PROPOSAL	Demolition of existing garage. Erection of new.
SITE	13 Station Road Hopton GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT	Mr R Ballard
DECISION	APPROVE
<hr/>	
REFERENCE	06/16/0012/F
PARISH	Martham 13
PROPOSAL	New chalet bungalow
SITE	R/O 33 Staithe Road Martham GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT	Mr and Mrs T Green
DECISION	APPROVE
<hr/>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 01-MAR-16 AND 25-MAR-16 FOLLOWING DETERMINATION BY THE GROUP MANAGER (PLANNING) UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REFERENCE	06/16/0068/F
PARISH	Martham 13
PROPOSAL	Extension to rear of property and associated works
SITE	11 Black Street Martham GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT	Mr J Rounce
DECISION	APPROVE
<hr/>	
REFERENCE	06/15/0747/F
PARISH	Ormesby St.Marg 16
PROPOSAL	Demolish existing bungalow and construct 5 new chalet bungalows and gardens
SITE	Green Acre Meadowcroft Yarmouth Road Ormesby St Margaret GREAT YARMOUTH NR29 3QQ
APPLICANT	Vista Residential &
DECISION	REFUSED
<hr/>	
REFERENCE	06/16/0019/F
PARISH	Ormesby St.Marg 16
PROPOSAL	Flat roof extension and replace conservatory roof with flat roof and roof lights
SITE	The White Lodge 52 North Road Ormesby St Margaret GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT	Mr N Pienaar
DECISION	APPROVE
<hr/>	
REFERENCE	06/16/0026/F
PARISH	Ormesby St.Marg 16
PROPOSAL	Erection of two metre fence at front of property
SITE	25 Station Road Ormesby St Margaret GREAT YARMOUTH NR29 3NH
APPLICANT	Mr J Betts
DECISION	REFUSED
<hr/>	
REFERENCE	06/16/0034/F
PARISH	Ormesby St.Marg 16
PROPOSAL	Conversion of existing garage for use as a bedroom, extension to form wetroom bathroom to link to dwelling
SITE	3 Dene Avenue Ormesby St Margaret GREAT YARMOUTH NR29 3RZ
APPLICANT	Mr J Hosier
DECISION	APPROVE
<hr/>	
REFERENCE	06/16/0065/F
PARISH	Ormesby St.Marg 16
PROPOSAL	Redevelopment of site to construct 3 no detached bungalows and retain existing dwelling
SITE	Meadowcroft House Yarmouth Road Ormesby St Margaret GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT	Mr B Hunt
DECISION	APPROVE
<hr/>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 01-MAR-16 AND 25-MAR-16 FOLLOWING DETERMINATION BY THE GROUP MANAGER (PLANNING) UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REFERENCE	06/16/0075/O
PARISH	Ormesby St.Marg 16
PROPOSAL	Erection of 3 bedroom bungalow
SITE	3 Nightingale Close Scratby GREAT YARMOUTH NR29 3NR
APPLICANT	Mrs S Tuttle
DECISION	APPROVE
<hr/>	
REFERENCE	06/16/0083/F
PARISH	Ormesby St.Marg 16
PROPOSAL	Remove existing conservatory & replace with brick/tile extension to make larger kitchen and seating area
SITE	7 Sharpe Way Ormesby St Margaret GREAT YARMOUTH NR29 3PT
APPLICANT	Mrs D Ashleigh
DECISION	APPROVE
<hr/>	
REFERENCE	06/16/0003/CD
PARISH	Rollesby 13
PROPOSAL	Erection of single storey bungalow to the rear of Lenroy - Discharge of Condition 3 re: PP: 06/15/0424/F
SITE	Court Road (Rear of Lenroy) Rollesby GREAT YARMOUTH NR29 5ET
APPLICANT	Holmes and Harris Limited
DECISION	APPROVE (CONDITIONS)
<hr/>	
REFERENCE	06/15/0759/F
PARISH	Winterton 8
PROPOSAL	Variation of condition 8 of pp 06/97/0838/F, cond. 5 of pp 06/03/0701/F & cond. 3 of 06/15/0041/F - occupancy
SITE	Church Farm Cottages Empsons Loke Winterton GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT	Mr R Kenyon
DECISION	APPROVE
<hr/>	
REFERENCE	06/16/0010/F
PARISH	Winterton 8
PROPOSAL	Proposed ground and first floor extensions. Balcony at rear
SITE	Green Tiles Bush Road Winterton GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT	Mr C Pitts
DECISION	APPROVE
<hr/>	
REFERENCE	06/16/0025/F
PARISH	Winterton 8
PROPOSAL	Proposed side and rear two storey extension and single storey rear infill extension
SITE	78 Bulmer Lane Downing Farmhouse Winterton GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT	Mr S Rees
DECISION	APPROVE
<hr/>	

PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 01-MAR-16 AND 25-MAR-16 FOLLOWING DETERMINATION BY THE GROUP MANAGER (PLANNING) UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REFERENCE	06/16/0074/F
PARISH	Winterton 8
PROPOSAL	Variation of condition 7 re: 06/14/0277/F -upstairs seating area of the function room to be converted to a letting room
SITE	Fishermans Return PH The Lane Winterton GREAT YARMOUTH NR29 4BN
APPLICANT	Mr D Winter
DECISION	APPROVE

* * * * End of Report * * * *

PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 01-MAR-16 AND 25-MAR-16 FOLLOWING DETERMINATION BY THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

REFERENCE **06/15/0631/F**
PARISH Filby 6
PROPOSAL Demolition of Glebe Farmhouse and construction of four new dwellings with associated garaging and parking
SITE Glebe Farm Main Road
 Filby GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT Execs. of Miss P Dixon & Mrs B Blaxell
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/15/0549/F**
PARISH Hopton On Sea 2
PROPOSAL Proposed coastal protection scheme
SITE Hopton Beach Adjacent to Potters Leisure Resort
 Coast Road GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT Mr J Potter
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/15/0780/O**
PARISH Martham 13
PROPOSAL 3 No detached dwellings with garages
SITE R/O Selwyn House 28 The Green Martham
 GREAT YARMOUTH NR29 4PA
APPLICANT Mr N Dyball
DECISION **REFUSED**

* * * * End of Report * * * *

