
APPLICATION APPEALS DETERMINED BETWEEN 25-JAN-22 AND 23-FEB-22

Reference : 06/20/0438/F
Appellant : Mr J Maitland
Site :

Unique No. 1173

Asda
Acle New Road
GREAT YARMOUTH
(land adjacent)

Proposal :

Removal of condition 1 and
variation of conditions 2, 3
and 6 of planning permission
06/19/0180/CU

Decision : ALL

Reference : 06/21/0466/A
Appellant : Mr Gary Cockerill
Site :

Unique No. 1177

Waveney Mills
Southtown Road
GREAT YARMOUTH
Norfolk

Proposal :

See Application Form

Decision : ALL

Reference : 06/20/0113/F
Appellant : Mr Barry Smith
Site :

Unique No. 1179

Land at Plane Road
Gorleston
GREAT YARMOUTH

Proposal :

New dwelling on land at Plane
road

Decision : DIS

Reference : 06/21/0606/F
Appellant : Mr & Mrs Hibbert
Site :

Unique No. 1178

Stones Throw Cottage
North Market Road
Winterton
GREAT YARMOUTH

Proposal :

Single storey front
extension.

Decision : DIS

Reference : 06/21/0136/F
Appellant : Mr and Mrs Souster
Site :

Unique No. 1181

Oak Farm
Court Road Rollesby
GREAT YARMOUTH
(land west of)

Proposal :

Erection of 1No. detached
single storey dwelling with
integrated garage and
garden/amenity space.

Decision : DIS

APPLICATION APPEALS DETERMINED BETWEEN 25-JAN-22 AND 23-FEB-22

Reference : 06/21/0137/O
Appellant : Mr R Edwards
Site :

Unique No. 1174

Land south of Short Road
Browston
GREAT YARMOUTH
Norfolk

Proposal :

The demolition of a stable
and the erection of a
dwelling

Decision : DIS

Reference : 06/20/0629/F
Appellant : Mr and Mrs Claire Smith
Site :

Unique No. 1172

96 Victoria Road
Gorleston
GREAT YARMOUTH
Norfolk

Proposal :

Ground floor rear extension
with re-roof to include
accommodation over.

Decision : DIS

***** END OF REPORT *****



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2022

by Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 FEBRUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U2615/W/21/3272101

Land adjacent to Asda, New Acle Road, Great Yarmouth NR30 1RL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a grant of planning permission subject to conditions.
 - The appeal is made by Mr J Maitland against the decision of Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 06/20/0438/F, dated 20 August 2020, was approved on 6 November 2020 and planning permission was granted subject to conditions.
 - The development permitted is "Removal of condition 1 and variation of conditions 2, 3 and 6 of planning permission 06/19/0180/CU".
 - The condition in dispute is No 1 which states that: *"This permission expires on 6th November 2025 and unless on or before this date application has been made for an extension to the period of permission and such application is approved by the Local Planning Authority the use shall be discontinued."*
 - The reason given for the condition is: *"In order to retain control over the use of the site until the effects of the proposal have been experienced and in the interest of the amenities of the locality."*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and the planning permission Ref 06/20/0438/F for removal of condition 1 and variation of conditions 2, 3 and 6 of planning permission 06/19/0180/CU at land adjacent to Asda, New Acle Road, Great Yarmouth NR30 1RL granted on 6 November 2020 by Great Yarmouth Borough Council, is varied by deleting condition 1.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr J Maitland against Great Yarmouth Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Background and Procedural Matters

3. Planning permission¹ was first granted in May 2014 for a change of use of the site to storage of pipes and metals. That permission was for a 5 year period. An extension to that time period was subsequently granted, which expires in May 2024.² The use for storage of pipes and metals had ceased by 2020.
4. In October 2019 a temporary permission³ for a 2 year period for use as open storage was granted but I understand that the site was not immediately used for that purpose. The appeal application sought to remove condition 1 and to

¹ 06/14/0132/CU

² 06/18/0212/F

³ 06/19/0180/CU

vary conditions 2, 3 and 6 of the 2019 permission. The application proposed use of the site for storage of containers.

5. This submitted details of storage containers and lighting together with an updated Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). Permission was granted for the variation of conditions 2, 3 and 6 in accordance with those details. Condition 1, which limited the period of the permission to 2 years was replaced by a condition imposing a 5 year time limit. It is that condition which is subject to this appeal.
6. The Great Yarmouth Local Plan Part 2 (Part 2 LP) was adopted in December 2021, after submission of the appeal. The appellant has commented on the relevant policies in that Plan. The Part 2 LP supplements the Core Strategy⁴ (CS) which together form the development plan.

Main Issue

7. The main issue is whether or not condition 1 is necessary and whether or not it meets the other tests that are set out in national policy.

Reasons

8. The site is a long and narrow area which is enclosed by palisade fencing and lies between the Asda supermarket and the A47, the latter being on a raised embankment. There are car parking areas on both sides of the supermarket and adjacent to each end of the site. Access to the site is via a road which runs to the east of the supermarket.
9. There are two rows of dark green containers which are arranged in the centre of the site. These are rented to customers for use as self-storage. There are lighting columns around the site perimeter. Solar panels are positioned above some of the containers. The approved plan shows 116 containers, 80 solar panels and a site office housed in a container next to the site entrance.
10. The site is within the Development Limits of Great Yarmouth as defined in the development plan. Policy GSP1 of the Part 2 LP supports development in principle in this area and Policy B1 of that Plan supports business development including storage subject to its compatibility with existing allocated and permitted uses in the vicinity. The storage use is compatible with the adjacent retail use and the development accords with those policies. It is in accordance with Policy CS6 of the CS which encourages the redevelopment and intensification of existing employment sites.
11. The site lies within the Waterfront area as designated in the CS. This area includes land on both sides of the Rivers Bure and Yare. Policy CS17 aims to create a unique and high quality environment for housing, shopping and offices. Proposals should seek to transform Great Yarmouth's arrival experience by developing a network of attractive, vibrant and well-connected neighbourhoods to create a new gateway to the town. The CS anticipates that regeneration of the Waterfront area will start to take place during the last six years of the Plan period, that is from 2024 to 2030.
12. Although the site is next to the A47 and visible at one of the gateways into the town, it is at a lower level than the road and partially screened from view by

⁴ Great Yarmouth Local Plan: Core Strategy 2013-2030 (2015)

- trees along the embankment. To the extent that the site is seen through the trees, the lower level of the site relative to the road and the subdued colour of the containers ensure that they are unobtrusive. In the context of the bulk of the adjacent supermarket building, the containers are scarcely noticeable from that road.
13. The containers are neatly arranged in the centre of the site with hard surfacing around them and contained within the boundary fencing. The solar panels and lighting columns are limited in scale and height, the lighting columns being 5 metres high as required by condition 6 of the planning permission. The site is visible from the footpath along the river, from the railway station and from New Acle Road to the east. The development has limited visual impact however because the containers are enclosed by the boundary fencing which is limited in its extent relative to the supermarket building.
 14. To the west of the site is Breydon Water which falls within The Broads Authority's administrative area. That authority did not object to the application. The Planning Officer's delegated report states that the development would not have an adverse effect on the visual amenity of the Broads and the surrounding area. The road embankment and the bridge screen the site from Breydon Water and I concur with the Planning Officer's view on this point. I find, for the reasons given that the development is visually acceptable in the context of its surroundings.
 15. The Planning Practice Guidance⁵ (PPG) states that a temporary permission may be appropriate to allow assessment of the effect of the development on the area or where it is expected that the planning circumstances will change at the end of the period. The PPG goes on to state that it will rarely be justifiable to grant a second temporary permission and that further permissions can normally be granted permanently or refused if there is a clear justification for doing so.
 16. The reason for condition 1 as stated on the decision refers to the Council retaining control until the effects of the development have been experienced. The site has been used for storage for approximately 7 years, firstly for storage of pipes and metals and subsequently for containers. While containers have been stored for a limited period of time there is no evidence before me that these give rise to any harmful effect, and indeed the Council does not claim that there is any such effect. An adequate period has been allowed to assess the effect of the development. On the basis that it has not resulted in any harmful effect, this would indicate that a permanent permission should now be granted.
 17. There is also no evidence before me that would indicate that permanent storage use of the site would be prejudicial to the aims of Policy CS17 to regenerate the area and to create a high quality environment. While I understand that supplementary planning documents (SPD) have been produced for parts of the Waterfront area, no SPD has been produced for the part of the area including the site. The appellant points out that the location of the site beyond the supermarket together with its location in Flood Zone 3a would constrain the development options that are available. There is no evidence before me to demonstrate that the appellant's view is unrealistic.

⁵ ID: 21a-014-20140306

18. In the absence of any demonstrated harm to the character and appearance of the area, permanent use of the site for storage would not conflict with Policies CS9 and CS17 of the CS which require high quality distinctive places, or with Policy CS11 which requires safeguarding and enhancement of landscape character.
19. The site is about 50 metres from Breydon Water which is part of the Outer Thames Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA), the Breydon Water SPA and Ramsar site. This is also a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Local Nature Reserve (LNR). A HRA including a shadow Appropriate Assessment has been carried out by the appellant. Natural England stated that it had no comment on the proposal.
20. The screening test carried out under the HRA concluded that storage use would have potential to pollute the designated sites. The most likely pathway for effects on the qualifying bird species would be the accumulation of toxins which could affect the health of those species and their population. The level of such effects is likely to be low in view of the limited size of the site at about 0.5ha.
21. Condition 5 of the planning permission excludes the storage of hazardous, toxic or poisonous substances at the site. That condition also restricts storage of other materials that could give rise to pollution. The lighting scheme has been demonstrated to avoid any adverse effect on the nearby habitats and condition 7 requires its retention. Subject to those conditions, I conclude that there would be no likely significant effects on both the Outer Thames Estuary SPA and the Breydon Water SPA and Ramsar site. There would be no likely adverse effect on the SSSI and LNR. The development accords with Policy CS11 of the CS which requires conservation and enhancement of designated nature conservation sites. It also accords with Policy E6 of the Part 2 LP which requires avoidance or mitigation of pollution.
22. A Flood Risk Assessment was submitted with the application which shows that the actual flood risk to the site from overtopping is high only during a 1 in 1,000 year event, allowing for climate change. In this scenario the site would be expected to flood to a depth between 0.08m and 1.58m. The assessment includes a flood warning and evacuation strategy. The development accords with Policy E1 of the Part 2 LP in this respect. The assessment was accepted by the Council and no specific concern has been raised regarding flood risk that would justify the imposition of a condition restricting the period of the permission.
23. For these reasons the limitation on the period of the permission imposed by condition 1 has not been justified as being necessary. I conclude that condition 1 is neither necessary nor reasonable. The condition therefore does not meet the tests for conditions as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

24. For these reasons I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nick Palmer

INSPECTOR



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2022

by Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 FEBRUARY 2022

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/U2615/W/21/3272101 Land adjacent to Asda, New Acle Road, Great Yarmouth NR30 1RL

- The application is made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, sections 78, 322 and Schedule 6, and the Local Government Act 1972, section 250(5).
 - The application is made by Mr J Maitland for a full award of costs against Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
 - The appeal was against the grant subject to conditions of planning permission for removal of condition 1 and variation of conditions 2, 3 and 6 of planning permission 06/19/0180/CU.
-

Decision

1. The application is refused.

Reasons

2. The Planning Practice Guidance advises that costs may be awarded against a party who has behaved unreasonably and thereby caused the party applying for costs to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process.
3. The application is made on the basis that the Council introduced consideration of Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy¹ (CS) at appeal stage. This policy was not referred to in the Council's delegated report and does not appear to have been considered relevant when the application was determined. The applicant requested further information from the Council following its decision, but no final response was provided. The information requested concerned the production of a supplementary planning document (SPD) for regeneration of the Waterfront area and a development company tasked with securing regeneration.
4. The applicant states that the late introduction of these points caused him to undertake further work in connection with the appeal, whereas this would not have been necessary if these points been fully explored during the planning application process.
5. Because the site lies within the Waterfront area as identified in the CS, Policy CS17 is a relevant development plan policy. The reason given for condition 1 on the Council's decision refers to retention of control until the effects of the development have been experienced and in the interest of the amenities of the locality. Consideration of the requirements of Policy CS17 is relevant to consideration of the amenities of the locality as referred to in the reason for the condition.

¹ Great Yarmouth Local Plan: Core Strategy 2013-2030 (2015)

6. The applicant referred to that policy in its Planning Statement submitted with the planning application. The Council does not however appear to have had regard to that policy in determining the application as it is not mentioned in the delegated report.
7. Whether or not this was the case, the Council did refer to Policy CS17 in its appeal statement and this was the correct approach. Although I appreciate the applicant's concern about an apparent change to the Council's case, this was not unreasonable behaviour.
8. Following the Council's decision, the applicant requested further information from the Council. The Council provided an initial response but did not respond to the applicant's e-mail of 26 October 2021 and did not provide the information requested. This indicates a lack of co-operation on the part of the Council which amounts to unreasonable behaviour. Further information about the production of the SPD and the development company would have been highly relevant to the applicant's case especially given the Council's focus on Policy CS17 in its appeal statement.
9. Notwithstanding this, in the absence of an SPD it seems that the Council would only have been able to provide limited information. It is not clear that the lack of cooperation by the Council in this respect necessitated any significant level of extra work or expense by the applicant in pursuing the appeal.
10. For these reasons I find that unreasonable behaviour, resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not been demonstrated.

Nick Palmer

INSPECTOR

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2022

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 JANUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U2615/Z/21/3279761

Waveney Mills, Southtown Road, Great Yarmouth NR31 0JB

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Alight Media against the decision of Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 06/21/0466/A, dated 20 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 July 2021.
 - The advertisement proposed is new single illuminated 48-sheet digital advertisement display.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for new single illuminated 48-sheet digital advertisement display at Waveney Mills, Southtown Road, Great Yarmouth NR31 0JB, as applied for. The consent is granted for a period of ten years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations and to the additional conditions included in the Schedule at Annexe A.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on the amenity of the occupiers of dwellings on Plevna Terrace.

Reasons

3. The location of the proposed new advertisement is adjacent to the south-west boundary of the Waveney Mills site. It would be positioned to be visible above the boundary fence with a backdrop of siloes and other industrial structures. The advertisement would face towards Southtown Road the other side of which to the north-west are the two storey dwellings which form Plevna Terrace and immediately south of this a garage and car dealership. The surrounding area is predominantly industrial and commercial in character and appearance, with some dwellings nearby along Station Road.
 4. Views of the advertisement would only be possible from the upper floor windows of the Plevna Terrace dwellings due to boundary fencing to their rear. The terrace is at an angle to the advertisement's location and so direct views from within the rooms served by these windows would be towards the garage to the south. It would be possible to see the advertisement from positions close to
-

the windows, although the separation distance of some 75 metres and backdrop of large industrial structures means that it would not be unduly prominent in the street scene.

5. The Council's principal concern is the effects of the illumination and changing displays during the hours of darkness. I note in this regard that the appellant proposes a condition to limit the luminance level during the other hours of darkness to 300cd/m², the appropriate darkness maximum for this type of advertisement recommended in professional guidance. Moreover, conditions are proposed which would limit the extent and type of movement of the images displayed on the advertisement.
6. These controls would help to mitigate any effects of the advertisement in the views that are available and, in combination with the distance between the windows and advertisement, in terms of possible effects of light or movement being otherwise discernible within the rooms served by the rear windows. Moreover, the surrounding area includes existing ambient light from a number of street lights and other lighting associated with the industrial and commercial uses; and there is already considerable movement in front of the advertisement's location due to traffic along the busy Southtown Road. In combination with the separation distance and lack of direct views of the proposed advertisement from the dwellings' upper floor windows, these factors will provide sufficient mitigation to any potentially harmful effects that could occur to the visual amenity of the nearby residents.
7. Accordingly, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would not have a harmful effect on the amenity of the occupiers of dwellings on Plevna Terrace. Consequently, the appeal should succeed. I have taken into account Policy CS9(f) of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan Core Strategy 2013-2030 and Policy BNV22 of the Great Yarmouth Borough-Wide Local Plan (2001), which concern protecting residential amenity and the effects of advertisements and which, therefore, are material in this case. Given that I have concluded that the proposal would not harm amenity, it does not conflict with these development plan policies.

Conditions

8. As an advertisement is involved the consent should be subject to the five standard conditions included in the 2007 Regulations. The application is for consent for a period of ten years. While express consent is usually granted for a period of five years, this period can be shortened or extended¹. The appellant indicates that the ten year period is sought because of the high initial cost of the advertisement and that there are unlikely to be any significant changes to the locality that would have a bearing on the effects of the advertisement over this time period. For the reasons given, I see no basis not to vary the consent from the standard five years.
9. In addition to the conditions referred to above, the appellant suggests a number of conditions to ensure that the advertisements displayed do not have an adverse effect on highway safety. I agree that these are necessary in the interests of safety and note that they largely are the same as those proposed by

¹ Planning Practice Guidance, paragraph: 036 Reference ID: 18b-036-20140306.

the Highway Authority (HA). The only difference, however, between the parties is that the HA suggests a two second interval between successive displays, while the appellant proposes one second. I have had regard to the appellant's arguments in this regard, but defer to the HA's views in this particular instance, which I note in any case that the appellant is willing to accept.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, the appeal should succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR

Annexe A

Schedule – conditions

- 1) The luminance level of the display shall be controlled by ambient environmental control, which will automatically adjust the brightness level of the screen to track the light level changes in the environment throughout the day to ensure that the perceived brightness of the display is maintained at a set level.
- 2) The maximum luminance of the advertisement shall not exceed 300cd/m² during the hours of darkness (dusk to dawn).
- 3) The minimum display time for each advertisement shall be 10 seconds and the advertisement shall not include any features or equipment which would permit interactive messages/advertisements to be displayed.
- 4) The interval between successive displays shall be a 2 second (minimum) fade and the complete display screen shall change without visual effects (including swiping or other animated transition methods) between each advertisement.
- 5) The advertisement shall not contain any animation, special effects, flashing, scrolling, three-dimensional images, intermittent or video elements. No images that resemble official road traffic signs, traffic lights or traffic matrix signs shall be displayed.
- 6) The advertisement shall include controls to ensure smooth uninterrupted transmission of images.
- 7) The sequencing of messages relating to the same product is not permitted.
- 8) If the installation breaks down or is not in use it shall default to a plain, black screen.

[End of Schedule]



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2022

by **Philip Mileham BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21ST February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U2615/W/21/3279327

Land at Plane Road, Gorleston, Great Yarmouth, NR31 8EG, 651939, 304882

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr B Smith against the decision of Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 06/20/0113/F, dated 6 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a new dwelling on land at Plane Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the appeal was lodged, the Council has adopted the Great Yarmouth Local Plan Part 2 in December 2021 (the GYLPP2), which has replaced the policies previously cited on the original decision notice. The appellant has had the opportunity to comment on the newly adopted policies and I have had regard to them in reaching my decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area;
 - the suitability of the proposed parking area having regard to its usability and effects on crime and disorder; and
 - the effect of the proposed development on the provision of open space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal proposal is sited at the end of a row of terraced properties on an area of grassed land at the corner of Plane Road and Beccles Road. The area of Plane Road in the vicinity of the appeal site has a mixed character of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings albeit they are predominantly set-back from the footway. The existing area of grassed land makes a positive contribution to the character of the area by providing separation between the

adjacent footpaths and the dwellings in this part of Plane Road giving the area a pleasant sense of openness.

5. The proposed development would introduce a further two storey detached dwelling at the end of the existing row of dwellings. The existing terrace of properties are positioned at angle in relation to Plane Road, and the siting of the appeal proposal would visually extend the dwellings closer to the footpath. This would reduce the separation distance to the footpath and erode the space between the footpath and residential development, harming the openness of this part of the site.
6. Directly opposite the appeal site are a pair of semi-detached properties which are also set back from the corner of Place Road and Beccles Road. These properties have a similar set-back distance from the footpath as the terrace of dwellings described above. In combination with the appeal site, their siting contributes positively to the sense of openness which is mirrored at this part of Plane Road. The siting of the appeal proposal is such that it would erode the undeveloped corner of Plane Road, resulting in the loss of symmetry to the corner of Plane Road and Beccles Road.
7. The appeal proposal would include a small area of garden land to the north-west of the site. This would be bounded by fencing which would be necessary to provide future occupants with private outdoor space. However, the presence of a fence of a height necessary to provide adequate privacy for future occupiers would further erode the space surrounding appeal site and result in an increased sense of enclosure. This would detract from the positive contribution the site makes to the wider character of the area.
8. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would fail to accord with policy A2 of the GYLPP2 which seeks to ensure that development should, amongst other things, reflect and have regard to local context, including the surrounding built environment and take advantage of opportunities to enhance the immediate street scene.
9. The proposal would also fail to accord with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are, amongst other things, sympathetic to local character.

Parking

10. The appeal proposal includes provision for 2 parking spaces which would be located towards the southern part of the site adjacent to an existing single storey block of garages that serve nearby dwellings.
11. The parking spaces would be accessed from the proposed dwelling via a pathway which runs in front of the adjacent row of terraced properties. Whilst the parking spaces would not be directly adjacent to the proposed dwelling, they would nonetheless be positioned close to existing garages. Although their position would not be as convenient for future occupiers than if the spaces were adjacent to the proposed dwelling, I do not consider them to be sufficiently distant to be unattractive for use.
12. The pathway accessing the parking spaces is not lit, however, as it runs directly in front of the existing dwellings this would provide some opportunity

for surveillance when gaining access to and from the proposed dwelling from the parking area. Furthermore, the pathway accessing the parking is not obstructed by any significant vegetation or landscaping and has good lines of sight from Plane Road. As such, I consider that notwithstanding the absence of lighting, their location is such that they would not be unattractive for use. Furthermore, the unobstructed views of the access to the spaces would not in my view have an adverse effect on crime and disorder in the area. Any residual concerns in respect of crime and disorder could be addressed through the imposition of a condition to secure the provision of a Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) system.

13. In light of the above, I conclude the proposal would accord with policy CS9 of the adopted Great Yarmouth Core Strategy (2015) (GYCS) and A2(F) of the GYLPP2 which seek to ensure that new development provides parking suitable for the use and location of the development, and that homes and external areas should be designed to be secure and reduce the risk and fear of crime.

Open space

14. The appeal proposal would be located on an area of grassed open space at the end of a row of terrace properties. The open space surrounding the terrace is made up of a number of small parcels of land which are visible from the adjacent footpath. The site makes a positive contribution to the character of the area by providing an undeveloped setting to the terraced properties as well as providing a degree of openness to this corner of the street between Plane Road and Beccles Road.
15. Policy E3 of the GYLPP2 seeks to retain open space for visual amenity purposes subject to criteria. Criterion a) requires proposals to be ancillary to the space and will add to its function for the benefit of amenity or the community. As the appeal proposal is for residential development, this would not be a form of development that would be ancillary to the open space.
16. Criterion b) of Policy E3 indicates that the loss of open space will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated it is no longer required for open space use or an alternative open space use. Whilst the appellant has indicated that the land was previously purchased from the Council as the Council no longer wished to fund its maintenance, there is no evidence before me to indicate that the open space is no longer required for its intended purpose.
17. Criterion C) of Policy E3 requires any loss of open space to be replaced by equivalent or better replacement provision in terms of quantity and quality. Whilst the proposed development would, according to the appellant, occupy a proportion of the open space, there is no evidence before me to indicate that any alternative open space would be provided as part of the proposed development. Although the appellant has indicated that qualitative improvements could be made to the remaining area of open space, the policy nonetheless requires replacement with both equivalent quality and quantity. As such, the proposal would not accord with criterion c) of Policy E3.
18. As indicated above, the land makes a positive contribution to the area through maintaining the openness of the site. I consider that the proposed development would not fulfil any of the criteria which allow for the redevelopment of open space.

19. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposal would fail to accord with Policy E3 of the GYLPP2 for the reasons set out above.
20. The proposal would also fail to accord with the requirements of paragraph 99 of the NPPF which states that existing open space should not be built on unless it is surplus to requirements, that the loss would be replaced by equivalent in terms of quantity and quality and where the development is for alternative sports and recreation, the benefits would outweigh the loss.

Other Matters

21. The proposed development would provide economic benefits as a result of its construction in terms of labour supply and through the materials supply chain. The proposal would also provide a social benefit through the creation of a new dwelling which would make a positive contribution to meeting housing needs in the area. The proposal would also have the potential to provide some environmental benefit through local biodiversity enhancement on the remaining open space.

Conclusion and Planning Balance

22. As set out above, although the proposal would accord with adopted policies in relation to parking, I have identified harm to the character and appearance of the area and a failure to accord with adopted policy in relation to open space. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would fail to accord with the Development Plan when read as a whole.
23. Whilst the proposed development would result in a number of benefits identified above, as the proposal is for a single dwelling these benefits would be limited and would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified.
24. In light of the above, the appeal is dismissed.

Philip Mileham

INSPECTOR

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2022

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25TH January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U2615/D/21/3285491

Stones Throw Cottage, North Market Road, Winterton-On-Sea NR29 4BH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Hibbert against the decision of Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 06/21/0606/F, dated 8 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Two drawings showing different designs for the front extension have been provided and the appellants request that both are considered in this appeal. However, the Council indicates that at the time of its consideration of the application, the appellants wished the application to be determined on the basis of the original drawing (ref 2149-001A) and that was the basis for its decision. For this reason and because it is unclear whether other parties were consulted on the alternative design, I have considered the proposed extension on the basis of the original drawing and have not had regard to the alternative design (ref 2149-001B).

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Winterton Conservation Area, in which the appeal property is located.

Reasons

4. The Winterton Conservation Area comprises two distinct parts; the appeal property is located adjacent to the northern boundary of the larger part, which covers predominantly residential properties as well as the nearby seafront. The appeal property is a two storey cottage in the middle of a short terrace of three cottages. This terrace is perpendicular to North Market Road and, together with other neighbouring dwellings, forms a small and distinct group of attractive cottages that appear largely to have retained their original historic
-

- character and appearance. As such, the appeal property and neighbouring cottages make a positive contribution to the conservation area.
5. The adjoining property to the south-west has a small porch and a single storey element to the front close to the road, although this is also of limited size. The property to the other side, Endcot, has a more substantive single storey element to the front that appears to be of similar depth to the appeal proposal. As such, single storey development to the front of the cottages is not an uncharacteristic feature of this part of the conservation area.
 6. However, the proposed extension appears to be of greater width than the existing features on the terrace and, consequently, it would obscure more of the original frontage than is the case for the two adjoining dwellings. Moreover, unlike the features on the neighbouring dwellings, it would result in a visually awkward relationship with the upper floor windows. The cut-away of the mono-pitch roof to accommodate these windows represents an incongruous design in this setting where no such features exist and would contrast unfavourably with the simple and original frontage of the cottage.
 7. Both the size and alien roof profile of the extension would draw attention to it as an uncharacteristic form of development in this setting. The fact that there does not appear to be a conservation area appraisal in place does not alter these findings, particularly as I must have regard to the statutory requirement that in exercising planning functions in conservation areas special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area¹.
 8. Despite the hedge to the front, the extended dwelling would be visible from the public realm and neighbouring dwellings. While the harmful effects of development in a conservation area are not dependent on such views being available, these effects would nonetheless be readily apparent from the surrounding area.
 9. Therefore, for the reasons given, I find that the proposed extension would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Winterton Conservation Area. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation². Based on the above findings, I consider the harm to be less than substantial in this instance, but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.
 10. Under such circumstances, the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal³. I acknowledge that it is not possible to extend the property to the rear and that the extension is intended to create more living space for full-time occupation rather than use as a holiday home. However, these matters relate to occupation and use of the appeal property as a private residence and, as such, there are no public benefits that would overcome the harm that has been found with regard to the proposal.

¹ Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

² Paragraph 199.

³ Paragraph 202.

11. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the proposed extension would not preserve the character or appearance of the Winterton Conservation Area. Consequently, it is contrary to Policy CS10 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan Core Strategy 2013-2030, concerning safeguarding local heritage assets; and to Policy HOU18 of the Great Yarmouth Borough-Wide Local Plan (2001), which requires residential extensions to be in keeping with the character of the area. Reference is also made to Policy H5 of the emerging Local Plan, although this apparently concerns rural worker dwellings and, therefore, is not relevant. The proposal is also contrary to section 16 of the Framework.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2022

by **Philip Mileham BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U2615/W/21/3281701

Land to the west of Oak Farm , Court Road, Rollesby, Great Yarmouth, NR29 5HQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Trevor Souster against the decision of Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 06/21/0136/F, dated 15 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 1No. detached single storey dwelling with integrated garage and garden/amenity space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the appeal was lodged, the Council has adopted the Great Yarmouth Local Plan Part 2 (GYLPP2) which has replaced policies cited on the original decision notice. The appellant has had the opportunity to comment on the newly adopted policies and I have had regard to them in reaching my decision.
3. The Council has indicated that a previous reason for refusing the proposed development in respect of the effect on trees has been addressed through the submission of the arboricultural report and a potential planning condition. As this issue is no longer in dispute between the parties, it is not considered to be a main issue and as I am dismissing the appeal on other grounds, it is not necessary for me to address it further in my decision.
4. The Council has drawn my attention to the progression of the Rollesby Neighbourhood Plan (RNP) which has recently received its examiners report although the plan has not at the time of this decision been subject to its local referendum.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposed development is in a suitable location for a new dwelling.

Reasons

Suitable location

6. The appeal site is a flat area of grassed land which is bordered by mature trees and hedges to the side and rear boundaries. The site is located on Court Road

adjacent to Oak Farm, with Folly Cottages nearby to the west. The proposal would be located within a small cluster of dwellings that are located away from the main part of the village of Rollesby, but also away from the nearby village of Fleggburgh.

7. Rollesby along with Fleggburgh are both identified in Policy CS2 of the Great Yarmouth Core Strategy (GYCS) as secondary villages reflecting the few services and facilities available with limited access to public transport and few employment opportunities. Policy CS2 also seeks to, amongst other things, balance the delivery of homes with jobs and service provision and reducing the need to travel.
8. The appeal site has been identified as being located outside any defined development limits boundary for the area. Policies GSP1 and H5 of the GYLPP2 indicate that land outside defined development limits is classified as countryside, and in this area, development will be limited to agriculture or forestry development, utilities or highway infrastructure, or other specific forms of development specified in the plan including the conversion of buildings, replacement dwellings and schemes to meet particular rural needs. As the proposal is not for agriculture or forestry development or a form of housing specifically allowed for within the plan, it would not accord with the requirements policies CSP1 or H5.
9. The site is located away from the main part of the villages of Rollesby and Fleggburgh. Court Road is a single-width rural road with no footpath or cycleway in the vicinity of the appeal site. Furthermore, there is no streetlighting present in the area which limits its attractiveness for walking and cycling into the village, particularly outside of daylight hours. Whilst I note the appellant considers that the proposal would allow future occupiers to live and work remotely as has been the case during the coronavirus pandemic, I nonetheless consider that future occupiers of the proposed development would be heavily reliant on private vehicles to access day-to-day services, facilities and employment opportunities in other larger settlements. Whilst the proposed development is for a single dwelling, over the lifetime of the development the cumulative number of trips made to access services and facilities elsewhere would be considerable which Policy CS2 seeks to minimise.
10. Due to the presence of adjacent properties, the proposed development would not result in an isolated dwelling that paragraph 80 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) seeks to avoid. As the proposal would not be isolated, the remaining criteria of paragraph 80 would not be engaged, including those related to design.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to a scheme for residential development adjacent to the appeal site which was granted in 2019. However, this was granted at a time when the Council was unable to provide a 5 year supply of housing land. Whilst I note the appellant has expressed reservations in respect of the Council's current land supply situation, paragraph 75 of the NPPF allows land supply to be established in a recently adopted Local Plan as has been the case in Great Yarmouth as part of the examination into the GYLPP2. Therefore, notwithstanding the appellant's concerns about the veracity of the current level of housing land supply, the current position remains fixed until 31st October 2022.

12. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would not be in a suitable location for a new dwelling. Accordingly, it would not comply with Policy CS2 of the GYCS and Policies GSP1 and H5 of the GYLPP2 for the reasons set out above.
13. The proposal would also fail to accord with paragraph 79 of the NPPF which states that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.

Other Matters

14. The proposed development would be located, according to the appellants measurements, within 400m of the Broads Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Trinity Broads Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Given the location of the appeal site to the European Sites, the Habitats Regulations¹ require an assessment to be undertaken, as to whether the proposal would be likely to have a significant effect, on the interest features of a protected site.
15. The appellant has provided evidence in support of a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) document. However, there is no evidence as to how the proposed foul drainage system from the site would interact with the Broads SAC and SSSI. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, it is not necessary for me to address this further.
16. In addition to the appellant's HRA document, the appeal proposal has also been supported by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) which was submitted after the appeal was lodged. The Council has indicated that the PEA has assessed the impacts of the proposal on the site, and subject to a number of potential planning conditions would enhance on-site ecology and biodiversity enhancement.
17. The Council has made reference to the lack of compliance with a number of other recently adopted policies which contain requirements in respect of open space, water efficiency and electric vehicle charging. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, I do not need to consider these matters further.
18. The proposed development would provide some economic benefit through its construction and in the supply of materials. It would also provide some social benefit through future occupants taking part in local community life and make a contribution to meeting housing need in the area. Whilst there would be some environmental benefits through the enhancement of on-site ecology and biodiversity and through its design which would include rainwater harvesting and a green roof, the lack of evidence regarding effects of foul water discharge on European sites means that it is unclear whether there would be an overall environmental benefit.

Conclusion

19. Whilst the proposed development would result in a number of benefits as set out above, as the proposal is for a single dwelling, these benefits would be limited. As such, these would not be sufficient to outweigh the conflict with the development plan when read as a whole.

¹ The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (The Habitats Regulations)

20. Therefore, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Mileham

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2022

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 FEBRUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U2615/W/21/3273903

Land south of Short Road, Browston, Great Yarmouth NR31 9DS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr R Edwards against the decision of the Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 06/21/0137/O dated 11/02/2021, was refused by notice dated 16/04/2021.
 - The development proposed is described as the demolition of a stable and the erection of a dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The application was submitted in outline with all matters reserved for future consideration, with the exception of access. I have considered the appeal on this basis.
3. The Council has drawn my attention to changes in local planning policy since the submission of the appeal I understand that the Great Yarmouth Local Plan Part 2 (2021) (the Local Plan) has been adopted. The appellant was given the opportunity to comment on this change. No party would be prejudiced or caused any injustice by me proceeding with the appeal in light of this change in policy.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is whether the development would be in a location suitable for a new dwelling.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located within the village of Browston which does not have defined settlement boundaries. The site is located south of Short Road, comprising stables and grazing land for personal use. Whilst the appeal site lies within a grouping of residential properties, for the purposes of development plan policy, it is within the countryside.
6. Policy GSP1 of the Local Plan allows for development outside of defined settlement boundaries subject to criteria such as comprising agriculture or forestry development or the provision of utilities and highway infrastructure.

- The proposed development does not meet the criteria outlined within Policy GSP1.
7. Policy CS2 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan, Core Strategy 2013-2030 (the Core Strategy) sets out a settlement hierarchy for development. The policy confirms that in the countryside development will be limited to conversions/replacement dwellings/buildings and schemes that help to meet rural needs. The proposed development would replace a large stable building on the site with a dwelling however a new stable block is also proposed within the site.
 8. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that if regard to the development plan is to be had then determination of an appeal must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Paragraph 12 of the Framework also makes it clear; the development plan is the 'starting point for decision making', not its end.
 9. The Council has drawn my attention to a dismissed appeal for residential development at the site¹. Whilst there are no substantive details before me which allows comparison of that scheme with that now proposed I am mindful that access to local amenities would be similar. Nevertheless, each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal.
 10. The Council contends that the proposed development would be outside of any settlement boundary and there would be a reliance on private motor vehicles to access services.
 11. The appeal site is adjacent residential properties fronting a narrow rural lane. Browston is classified in the Core Strategy as a tertiary village, which is defined as a settlement containing few services and facilities with limited access to public transport and very few employment opportunities.
 12. In relation to accessing services and facilities, there are no footpaths or streetlights adjacent the site and accessing local services on foot would be unrealistic for some potential users of the development and at some times of the day and year.
 13. There is a bus service a short walk away which I understand provides access to settlements which would meet the day to day needs of the future occupants. Notwithstanding this I have not been provided with substantive evidence confirming the regularity of services.
 14. I have taking into account that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport options will vary between urban and rural locations. However, the circumstances I observed do not lend themselves to safe use by pedestrians. Similarly, the lack of street lighting would be unlikely to encourage cycling to the nearest services and facilities after dark via this narrow lane.
 15. The appellant has drawn my attention to an appeal decision within Browston², which whilst dismissed considered the sustainability of the location. Substantive details have not been provided relating to the scheme, nonetheless

¹ APP/U2615/W/17/3168949

² APP/U2615/W/20/3262245

I note that proposal involved an existing business use at the site. I therefore do not consider this to be directly comparable to the proposal before me.

16. Whilst I understand that the stables at the appeal site are for personal use and current journeys to and from the site will be frequent, I am not persuaded that journeys would be reduced should the appeal be allowed given the need to travel for services, facilities and employment opportunities.
17. The appellant has provided other appeal decisions; however, again no details have been provided to allow a comparison to the appeal proposal before me. Notwithstanding this these decisions relate to sites outside the administrative boundary of the Council and therefore are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal. Nonetheless proposals must be considered on its individual merits.
18. I give limited weight to the appellants argument that the proposed development will support the rural community, local services, facilities and the economy; whilst one dwelling would contribute, I have not been provided with any substantive evidence to persuade me that this would be any more than a limited contribution.
19. On this basis I find that there would be a reliance on private motor vehicles and conclude that the proposed development would not be a suitable location for a new dwelling. The proposed development conflicts with Policy GSP1 of the Local Plan and Policies CS1 and CS2 of the Core Strategy which seeks to ensure developments are located within areas which are suitable locations, reducing the need to travel.

Other Matters

20. The appellant doubts that the Council can demonstrate a five year housing land supply however substantive evidence has not been provided to support this. The appellant advances that a five year housing land supply is not a ceiling or cap which prevents development, I agree. However, this does not persuade me that the appeal site is a suitable site for a new dwelling.

Conclusion

21. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2022

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31ST January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U2615/W/21/3274259

96 Victoria Road, Gorleston, Great Yarmouth NR31 6EA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Claire Smith against Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 06/20/0629/F, is dated 16 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as ground floor rear extension with re-roof to include accommodation over.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission for ground floor rear extension with re-roof to include accommodation over is refused.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council has drawn my attention to changes in local planning policy since the submission of the appeal I understand that the Great Yarmouth Local Plan Part 2 (2021) (the Local Plan) has been adopted. The appellant was given the opportunity to comment on this change. No party would be prejudiced or caused any injustice by me proceeding with the appeal in light of this change in policy.

Main Issue

3. This appeal has been lodged following the Council's failure to determine the planning application. The Council in their appeal statement have referred me to an earlier refusal for the same development at the appeal site¹. The Council confirm that had they been able to determine the application the reason for refusal previously given would be unchanged with the exception of reference to Policies A1 and H9 of the Local Plan which supersedes Policy HOU18 of the Great Yarmouth Borough-wide Local Plan (2001) referred to in the previous refusal.
4. The Council considers the main issue in relation to the proposal to be the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, No. 94 Victoria Road. I do not disagree with this.

Reasons

¹ Application Reference: 06/20/100/F

5. The appeal site is a semi-detached property within a residential area characterised predominantly by varying designs of detached and semi-detached properties, many of which have been extended or altered. The development proposes an extension to the rear of the existing flat roof single storey side addition and includes a pitched roof which extends beyond the eaves of the existing two storey property. The proposal includes accommodation at first floor within the proposed pitched roof.
6. I understand that there is an approved scheme² for the site which includes a rear extension with the same footprint as the proposal before me. However, the pitched roof approved is lower than the proposed development and does not include accommodation at first floor.
7. The adjacent property No. 94 Victoria Road has windows facing the appeal site. Whilst the proposed development would not extend the built form closer to the shared boundary, the increased height and mass would be a dominant and overbearing feature when viewed from No. 94.
8. The appellant has provided images in an attempt to demonstrate the proposed development would not result in further loss of light to the occupiers of No. 94. Notwithstanding this I am not persuaded that the proposed development would not overshadow the adjacent property given its orientation and scale.
9. I find that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, No. 94 Victoria Road. There is conflict with Policies A1 and H9 of the Local Plan which seek amongst other things to protect the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties.
10. There is conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) which seeks to ensure development has high standards of amenity for existing and future users.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed and planning permission is refused.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR

² Application Reference: 06/20/0397/F

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 25-JAN-22 AND 23-FEB-22 FOLLOWING
DETERMINATION BY THE HEAD OF PLANNING UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

REFERENCE **06/21/0898/F**
PARISH Belton & Browston 10
PROPOSAL Proposed front & side, two storey extensions

SITE 19 St James Crescent Belton
GREAT YARMOUTH

APPLICANT Mr R Lark
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/1035/F**
PARISH Belton & Browston 10
PROPOSAL Proposed single storey rear extension, first floor side
and front extensions.

SITE 25 Bramble Gardens Belton
GREAT YARMOUTH

APPLICANT Mr & Mrs Addy
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0792/F**
PARISH Bradwell N 1
PROPOSAL Replacement of the existing White P.v.c.u tilt/turn
windows with white P.v.c.u. casement type windows with no

SITE 78 Kingfisher Close Bradwell
GREAT YARMOUTH Norfolk

APPLICANT Mrs Marcou
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0900/F**
PARISH Bradwell N 1
PROPOSAL Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension
and extension over existing garage and office/utility

SITE 1 Cob Close Bradwell
GREAT YARMOUTH

APPLICANT Miss S Heritage and Mr S Crosby
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/1004/F**
PARISH Bradwell N 1
PROPOSAL Side and rear extension, demolish workshop and replace
with brick detached garage

SITE 10 Fulmar Close Bradwell
GREAT YARMOUTH Norfolk

APPLICANT Mrs L Wilson
DECISION **APPROVE**

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 25-JAN-22 AND 23-FEB-22 FOLLOWING
DETERMINATION BY THE HEAD OF PLANNING UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

REFERENCE **06/21/0930/F**
PARISH Bradwell S 2
PROPOSAL Front and side single storey extensions, Boundary wall
amendments, external finishes amendments
SITE 8 School Corner Bradwell
GREAT YARMOUTH Norfolk
APPLICANT Mrs S Miller
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/1024/CD**
PARISH Bradwell S 2
PROPOSAL Proposed single storey side extension to southwest
elevation to form porch, en-suite and dressing room;
SITE 210 Beccles Road Bradwell
GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT Mr S and Mrs J Knowles
DECISION **APPROVE (CONDITIONS)**

REFERENCE **06/21/0920/F**
PARISH Burgh Castle 10
PROPOSAL Remove existing conservatory and carry out internal
alterations to facilitate new first floor incorporating new
SITE Edjcove Marsh Lane
Burgh Castle GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT Mr Brown
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0987/TRE**
PARISH Burgh Castle 10
PROPOSAL Top Tree; Tree Shape; Remove dangerous boughs over
property and road
SITE Kingfisher Holiday Park Butt Lane
Burgh Castle GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT Mr A Sales Reception
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/1015/F**
PARISH Caister On Sea 3
PROPOSAL Proposed extension and alterations
SITE 29 Glenmore Avenue Caister
GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT Mr G Partridge
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/1042/F**
PARISH Caister On Sea 3
PROPOSAL Proposed rear extension, side garage extension and
conversion of carport to residential use and porch
SITE 31 Breydon Way Caister
GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT Mr and Mrs Taylor
DECISION **APPROVE**

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 25-JAN-22 AND 23-FEB-22 FOLLOWING
DETERMINATION BY THE HEAD OF PLANNING UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

REFERENCE **06/21/0326/F**
PARISH Caister On Sea 4
PROPOSAL Single storey side extension

SITE 70a Yarmouth Road Caister
GREAT YARMOUTH

APPLICANT Mr G Carter
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0993/F**
PARISH Caister On Sea 4
PROPOSAL Single storey rear extension.

SITE 27 Lacon Road Caister-On-Sea
GREAT YARMOUTH Norfolk

APPLICANT Mr S & Mrs B Greenwood
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0996/TRE**
PARISH Caister On Sea 4
PROPOSAL T1 - Horse Chestnut - reduce size by 3m off height and 2m
of the lateral branches

SITE Caister House Rectory Close
Caister GREAT YARMOUTH

APPLICANT Mr Lee
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0165/CU**
PARISH Filby 6
PROPOSAL Proposed change of use of indoor swimming pool from
private use to commercial and private use, and for holiday

SITE Black Barn Market Lane
Filby GREAT YARMOUTH

APPLICANT Mr P Thompson
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0985/TRE**
PARISH Filby 6
PROPOSAL T1 - Ash tree - Fell

SITE Linden Main Road Filby
GREAT YARMOUTH Norfolk

APPLICANT Mrs L Bevan
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0994/PAD**
PARISH Filby 6
PROPOSAL Conversion of existing agricultural barn into 1 no.
dwelling at Heath View, Ormesby Lane, Filby.

SITE Heath View Ormesby Lane
Filby GREAT YARMOUTH

APPLICANT Mr S Deadman
DECISION **REFUSED**

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 25-JAN-22 AND 23-FEB-22 FOLLOWING
DETERMINATION BY THE HEAD OF PLANNING UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

REFERENCE **06/21/0731/HR**
PARISH Fleggburgh 6
PROPOSAL See Application Form

SITE Land opposite 1 & 2 New Cottages, Main Road Billockby
Fleggburgh GREAT YARMOUTH

APPLICANT Miss Randall
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0953/F**
PARISH Fleggburgh 6
PROPOSAL Proposed 2 storey rear extension

SITE Tower Lodge Tower Road
Fleggburgh GREAT YARMOUTH

APPLICANT Mr & Mrs Flint
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0919/F**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 5
PROPOSAL Single storey rear extension

SITE 3 Claydon Grove Gorleston
GREAT YARMOUTH Norfolk

APPLICANT Mr G Baker
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/1033/F**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 7
PROPOSAL Proposed single storey front extension

SITE 15 The Mews Cliff Park Estate
Gorleston GREAT YARMOUTH

APPLICANT Mr S Lawson
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0621/F**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 9
PROPOSAL Proposed single storey front extension extending out by
1.5m and a two storey side extension

SITE 48 Southtown Road GREAT YARMOUTH
Norfolk

APPLICANT Mr A & Mrs E Hewitt
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0967/CD**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 9
PROPOSAL Discharge of condition 4 relating to pp.06/20/0053/F

SITE Park View House 26 Southtown Road
GREAT YARMOUTH Norfolk

APPLICANT Mr A Sliwinski
DECISION **APPROVE (CONDITIONS)**

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 25-JAN-22 AND 23-FEB-22 FOLLOWING
DETERMINATION BY THE HEAD OF PLANNING UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

REFERENCE **06/21/1012/F**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 9
PROPOSAL Change of use from warehouse to retail motorcycle sales,
motorcycle clothing and accessories, motorcycle
SITE Units 17/18 Bessemer Way Harfreys Industrial Estate
GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT Mr C Day
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/1013/A**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 9
PROPOSAL Change of use from warehouse to retail motorcycle sales,
motorcycle clothing and accessories, motorcycle
SITE Units 17/18 Bessemer Way Harfreys Industrial Estate
GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT Mr C Day
DECISION **ADV. CONSENT**

REFERENCE **06/21/1041/F**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 9
PROPOSAL Environmental improvement works (remediation)
SITE Gas House Quay Southtown Road/Malthouse Lane
Gorleston on Sea GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT National Grid
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0958/F**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 11
PROPOSAL Proposed two storey and single storey extension
SITE 4 Elm Avenue Gorleston
GREAT YARMOUTH Norfolk
APPLICANT Mr N Pryke
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/1016/F**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 11
PROPOSAL Proposed alterations and first floor extension above
existing ground floor garage/utility room
SITE 2 Somerville Avenue Gorleston
GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT Mr L Southey
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0895/A**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 14
PROPOSAL Proposal for advertisement stating 'Pizza GoGo'
SITE 38-41 Camperdown The Embassy Hotel
GREAT YARMOUTH Norfolk
APPLICANT Mr K Jan
DECISION **ADV. REFUSAL**

PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 25-JAN-22 AND 23-FEB-22 FOLLOWING
DETERMINATION BY THE HEAD OF PLANNING UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REFERENCE **06/21/0978/F**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 14
PROPOSAL 2 storey infill extension to rear.

SITE 18 Napoleon Place GREAT YARMOUTH
Norfolk

APPLICANT Mr C Fish
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0135/F**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 15
PROPOSAL conversion of dwelling to provide 4No. 2bed
self-contained flats. Addition of full width dormer

SITE Bramalea Guest House 114 Wellesley Road
GREAT YARMOUTH Norfolk

APPLICANT I Younis
DECISION **REFUSED**

REFERENCE **06/21/0934/F**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 15
PROPOSAL Window replacement to south and west elevations

SITE 2, 3, 6, 7, 8 and 9 Church Court Priory Plain
Great Yarmouth

APPLICANT Mr S Brister
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0980/LB**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 15
PROPOSAL Replacement sign work and lighting

SITE The Market Tavern Public House 17 Market Place
Great Yarmouth

APPLICANT P Savory
DECISION **LIST.BLD.APP**

REFERENCE **06/21/0982/A**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 15
PROPOSAL See Application Form

SITE The Market Tavern Public House 17 Market Place
Great Yarmouth

APPLICANT Mr P Savory
DECISION **ADV. CONSENT**

REFERENCE **06/21/0990/LB**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 15
PROPOSAL Proposed new entrance gates complete with keycode lock
panel

SITE Priory Day Nursery Priory Gardens
GREAT YARMOUTH Norfolk

APPLICANT Mr C Sterrett
DECISION **LIST.BLD.APP**

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 25-JAN-22 AND 23-FEB-22 FOLLOWING
DETERMINATION BY THE HEAD OF PLANNING UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

REFERENCE **06/21/0960/A**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 19
PROPOSAL See Application Form

SITE Former Albion Tavern Public House 87 Lowestoft Road
Gorleston Great Yarmouth

APPLICANT Tesco Stores Ltd
DECISION **ADV. CONSENT**

REFERENCE **06/21/0961/CD**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 19
PROPOSAL Proposed change of use from public house to convenience
store with extension, alterations to parking layout

SITE Albion Tavern Public House 87 Lowestoft Road
Gorleston Great Yarmouth

APPLICANT Tesco Stores Ltd
DECISION **APPROVE (CONDITIONS)**

REFERENCE **06/21/0962/F**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 19
PROPOSAL Installation of CO2 gas cooler, 3 no. Daikin Azas 140
AC units and satellite dish to rear of ground floor unit.

SITE Albion Tavern Public House 87 Lowestoft Road
Gorleston Great Yarmouth

APPLICANT Tesco Stores Ltd
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0927/F**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 21
PROPOSAL Erection of floodlighting to existing MUGA

SITE Great Yarmouth Charter Academy Salisbury Road
GREAT YARMOUTH

APPLICANT Inspiration Trust
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0986/TCA**
PARISH Hemsby 8
PROPOSAL T1 - Walnut Tree - Fell

SITE Stone Cottage The Street
Hemsby GREAT YARMOUTH

APPLICANT Mrs C Rundel
DECISION **NO OBJECTION**

REFERENCE **06/21/0639/TRE**
PARISH Hopton On Sea 2
PROPOSAL Copper Beach - needs to be topped
to be topped

SITE 27 Warren Road Gorleston
GREAT YARMOUTH Norfolk

APPLICANT Mr A Brooks
DECISION **APPROVE**

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 25-JAN-22 AND 23-FEB-22 FOLLOWING
DETERMINATION BY THE HEAD OF PLANNING UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

REFERENCE **06/21/0973/PU**
PARISH Hopton On Sea 2
PROPOSAL To change from a good place to a 1 surgery dental
practice. This will involve reconfiguration of the
SITE Ex-hair and beauty retail unit Adj Franson Caravan park
Warren Road Hopton on sea
APPLICANT Miss S Godbolt
DECISION **EST/LAW USE REF**

REFERENCE **06/21/0997/F**
PARISH Hopton On Sea 2
PROPOSAL Proposed extension to side of bungalow
SITE 1 Hopton Gardens Hopton on sea
GREAT YARMOUTH Norfolk
APPLICANT Mr P Golzey
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0975/F**
PARISH Martham 13
PROPOSAL Application to allow access to customers into the shop
and deliveries; Food to be made between hours of 15:00
SITE 9 The Green Martham
GREAT YARMOUTH Norfolk
APPLICANT Mr L Gilgil
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/1009/LB**
PARISH Martham 13
PROPOSAL Following a fire externally, roof and thatched roof
covering have been fire damaged beyond salvation. The
SITE The Gables Farm 3 Hemsby Road
Martham GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT Mr A Holden
DECISION **LIST.BLD.APP**

REFERENCE **06/21/0392/F**
PARISH Ormesby St.Marg 16
PROPOSAL New 8' brick wall to front of property incorporating a
personal entrance gate and electric driveway gates
SITE 64 North Road Mill House
Ormesby St Margaret GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT Mr A Barnes
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0989/F**
PARISH Ormesby St.Marg 16
PROPOSAL Proposed front garage extension and porch with
replacement pitched roof.
SITE 43 Barton Way Ormesby St Margaret
GREAT YARMOUTH Norfolk
APPLICANT Mr & Mrs Myhill
DECISION **APPROVE**

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 25-JAN-22 AND 23-FEB-22 FOLLOWING
DETERMINATION BY THE HEAD OF PLANNING UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

REFERENCE **06/21/0946/M**
PARISH Ormesby St.Michael16
PROPOSAL Demolition of existng dilapidated buildings and
 replacement building with steel portal framed building
SITE The Willows Decoy Road
 Ormesby St Michael GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT Mrs S Pigney
DECISION **REFUSED**

REFERENCE **06/22/0012/CD**
PARISH Somerton 8
PROPOSAL Retrospective application for 1.5m high fencing around
 ruins of St Mary's Church. 06/21/0419/F Conditions(s) 1
SITE Burnley Hall Estate Dark Lane
 East Somerton GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT Mr J Chapman
DECISION **APPROVE (CONDITIONS)**

* * * * End of Report * * * *

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 25-JAN-22 AND 23-FEB-22 FOLLOWING
DETERMINATION BY THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0684/F**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 7
PROPOSAL Proposed application for the proposed demolition of
existing structure and erection of a similar style
SITE 2 Gournay Avenue Gorleston
GREAT YARMOUTH Norfolk
APPLICANT Mrs Millar
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/20/0567/F**
PARISH Great Yarmouth 15
PROPOSAL Construction of 18 residential dwellings,
together with associated infrastructure works
SITE Beach Coach Station Nelson Road North
GREAT YARMOUTH (land south of)
APPLICANT Great Yarmouth Borough Council
DECISION **APPROVE**

REFERENCE **06/21/0951/F**
PARISH Hemsby 8
PROPOSAL Proposed Application for mixed use scheme comprised of
188no. dwellings and 91no. holiday lodges to let
SITE Former Pontins Holiday Centre Beach Road
Hemsby GREAT YARMOUTH
APPLICANT Mr G Avery
DECISION **REFUSED**

* * * * End of Report * * * *