



GREAT YARMOUTH
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Development Control Committee

Minutes

Wednesday, 13 April 2022 at 18:00

Present :

Councillor Annison (in the Chair); Councillors G Carpenter, Fairhead, Flaxman-Taylor, Freeman, P Hammond, Hanton, Jeal. Mogford, Myers, Williamson, B Wright and T Wright.

Also in attendance :

Mr M Turner (Head of Planning), Ms C Whatling (Monitoring Officer), Mr R Parkinson (Development Manager), Mr C Green (Senior Planning Officer) & Mrs S Wintle (Corporate Services Manager).

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence received.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Flaxman-Taylor declared an interest in Item 3 in her capacity as Chairman of the Wellesley Recreation Ground Members Working Group and advised that she would not partake in the voting on this item.

Councillor Williamson declared an interest in Item 3 in his capacity as a member of the Wellesley Recreation Ground Members Working Group and as Chairman of the

Preservation Trust.

Councillor Bird declared an interest in Item 3 in his capacity as a member of the Wellesley Recreation Ground Members Working Group.

3 APPLICATION 06-21-0914-F - LAND ON HEMSBY BEACH BETWEEN NEWPORT ROAD AND NORTHERN END OF OVERFLOW CAR PARK, OFF BEACH ROAD, HEMSBY, GREAT YARMOUTH

The Committee received and considered the Planning Manager's report which proposed construction of a rock berm on Hemsby beach measuring a maximum 1330m long, 20m wide and +3m high; installation of new beach access ramp at Hemsby Gap; removal and relocation of existing Hexiblocks from southern end of site for use within the berm feature.

Members received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer which highlighted areas for planning consideration with the main issues summarised as follows :-

1. Principle of development
2. Wider policy context
3. Method of construction
4. Landscape and appearance of the area
5. Residential amenity
6. Traffic and highways impacts
7. Public beach access
8. Ecology and biodiversity
9. Heritage and cultural impacts
10. Flood risk
11. Coastal erosion effects
12. Social and economic impacts
13. Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)
14. The EIA process

The Planning Manager provided members with a comprehensive summary on the planning balance as follows :-

The Environment Agency and other consultees previously suggested the berm might compromise the longer-term natural protection that the dune system provides against coastal erosion. There were concerns that the berm could affect sediment transfer which would be detrimental to natural sea defences either side of the application site. Furthermore, there were concerns the berm could interrupt natural sediment recharge into the dune system which would be detrimental to habitats. And therefore the semi-permanent rock berm would be contrary to the shoreline management plan recommendations.

The proposal is a short-term measure that would have a life of up to 20 years. The ES identifies that the siting in front of the dunes would have no significant effect on sediment transfer. A short-term measure would not be contrary to the SMP.

The rate of erosion at Hemsby has increased with three significant events in a short period. Local Plan policy recognises coastal change areas and supports the movement

of commercial and residential uses from these locations. The berm will provide time for commercial and residential occupants at Hemsby to plan to relocate inland.

The berm would have a minor and low level impact on the landscape and a less than substantial level of harm to the setting, character and appearance of the two adjoining conservation areas at each end of the berm. There is also potential for archaeological interest and some significant potential for extremely valuable geological and paleo-environmental assets at the site which if discovered and if then disturbed would be a major impact of national significance, but by imposing careful controls through conditions these can be mitigated and appropriate precautions arranged.

In the short-term the berm would provide additional economic benefit to Hemsby through supporting leisure and tourism and little negative impact during the work. 25.11 It is therefore considered that if the ES findings are corroborated in respect of the impacts on protected species sites, and natural habitats and species, then there should be little lasting impact on ecology and natural habitat regeneration, and the benefits of the development would be considered to outweigh the drawbacks.

The Planning Manager reported that the applicant has supported the application with detail of the means of construction, the method of delivery of the rock to the site, the storage of plant vehicles and machinery and the likely impacts to the local area during the construction period and after.

The application has identified that the berm is a short-term solution where the longterm strategic adopted policy is to allow natural change to the coastline in this area. Assessments of the beach erosion and tidal activities suggests that longer term beach recession trends could see the beach level drop by up to 2m over the next 20 years causing greater undermining of the dune cliffs and significant erosion losses up to 20m per storm, so the importance of a short-term protection measure cannot be overstated to enable the community to consider longer term adaptation strategies.

The Planning Manager reported that having considered the details provided, the application is considered to comply with policies CS6, CS8, CS10, CS13 and CS16 from the adopted Core Strategy, and policies GSP4, A1, E1, and E5 from the adopted Local Plan Part 2. The proposed development is in line with the general ambitions and objectives of the Shoreline Management Plan and in particular the SMP allowance for short-term protection measures only where assets are at risk.

Although not all consultee feedback has been received and therein lies a risk of further assessment and reconsideration being required, it is considered likely that there are no other material considerations to suggest the application should not be recommended for approval.

Councillor T Wright asked if there was an anticipated timescale for works to commence. The Planning Manager advised that currently this was dependant on funding but the application if approved would be subject to commencement within 3 years.

Councillor Hammond raised some concern with regard to children being able to climb up onto the rocks. Councillor Hammond also asked if there were any guarantees this system would work for Hemsby, it was advised that this type of structure had been used at the nearby neighbouring village of California and was currently still in place.

Councillor Jeal asked for clarification as to who owned the land, this was confirmed as Geoffrey Whatling Group. Councillor Jeal also advised that he was aware that dredging within half a mile of the coastline was not allowed and wondered therefore if this would have an impact on the project, it was advised that the Marine Management would be looking into this matter.

Ann Casey, Coastal Adaptation Officer addressed the Committee and thanked them for considering the application she advised that she had prepared the planning application being considered by the Committee and had undertaken the work and studies for the Rock Berm solution.

Ann advised the Committee that with regard to the timetable this was dependant on funding and this remained a challenge but noted that most funders would not allow schemes to apply for funding until planning permission had been granted.

Members were advised that 19 options were considered for Hemsby with 6 options being shortlisted, Rock Berm had been the option selected. It was advised that whilst Rock Berm would not stop erosion this would be a measure to slow down the process of erosion.

Councillor T Wright asked if any cost benefit analysis had been completed on the application, this was confirmed.

Lance Martin, Supporter to the application hereby addressed the Committee. Lance advised that he had backfilled his property 5 times due to erosion and would need to continue to do this until a solution such as rock berm was in place, he put a plea to the Committee to have the rock berm approved and put in place as soon as possible. He reported that 49 properties were affected by the ongoing erosion.

Councillor T Wright asked how long could Mr Martin's home be backfilled before this could no longer be done, Mr Martin advised approximately 24 months.

Councillor Galer, Ward Councillor addressed the Committee and commented that Hemsby's economy was built on 90% tourism and therefore if erosion continued at the current rate this could see a loss of a number of businesses and services, therefore having a detrimental impact on the industry within Hemsby. He commented that if investment is put into the scheme then there is a confidence that the berm would see erosion reduced.

Councillor Bensly, Ward Councillor addressed the Committee and thanked Officers for their work on the application, he commented that Hemsby had become fragile since the beast from the east had struck and therefore the Rock Berm solution was very much needed. He advised that the scheme would allow for a ramp for the lifeboat and accessibility would be maintained.

RESOLVED :

That Committee Agree

(1) To delegate authority to the Head of Planning to approve the application following

receipt of outstanding comments from Consultees; and, subject to satisfactory completion of the Habitats Regulations Assessment process; and, subject to conditions.

(2) That in the event that comments are received from those consultees which state objections or which request conditions that are not practical for inclusion within the project, to revert back to Development Control Committee for the application's determination.

4 APPLICATION 06-22-0109-F AND 06-22-0058-LB - WELLESLEY ROAD, RECREATION GROUND, GREAT YARMOUTH

The Committee received and considered the Senior Planning Officer's report which presented a proposed creation of Community 3G Football Turf Pitch with 4.5m high fencing, a maintenance equipment storage container and 6 no. 12 m high LED Floodlights, associated hard standing, and external works to refurbish Tennis Pavilion at the Wellesley Road Recreation Ground, Great Yarmouth.

Members received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer which highlighted areas for planning consideration with the main issues summarised as follows :-

1. Principle of development: Proposed use and sustainability of the location
2. Principle of development: Impact on Open Space and Community Facilities
3. Principle of development: Loss of existing sports facilities
4. Impacts on heritage assets
5. Impacts on trees and landscape
6. Highways, access and transport
7. Flood risk and sustainable drainage
8. Amenity and lighting

The Senior Planning Officer reported on the following planning balance :-

- This application to improve a recreation area and bring a historic building back into use is positive in character, providing improved and enhanced sport facilities for the community overall.
- The need to provide a storage container for sports equipment is harmful to the character of the conservation area, but this has been reduced by negotiated repositioning, use of trees to help screen, and the improvement to the listed heritage asset is likely to be more enduring.
- The new floodlighting is designed to reduce light spillage compared to existing models at the site. This will represent an improved condition regarding floodlighting.
- The catch nets shown on isolators represent an improved form in comparison to the existing catch netting with regard to noise generation. Noise from sports-facility users is outside the controls achieved by BS4142 (planning and noise).
- The benefits of the potential repurposing and future use of the heritage asset as part of the new community facility are considered to outweigh the 'less than substantial'

harm to the listed building and its setting, whilst conditions can be used to secure the ongoing storage and future re-installation of the veranda feature which is said to make an important contribution to the original character of the listed pavilion building.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the scheme had no notable drawbacks other than the need to use a steel container for secure storage in a sensitive location and the loss of the underused tennis court.

It was reported that the collective benefits of proposal were considered to outweigh the low level of heritage harm involved and therefore the proposal was recommended for approval.

Attention was drawn to the conditions listed as part of the recommendations and Members were advised from Councillor Flaxman- Taylor and Matthew Hollowell, Estates Surveyor that the pitch registration had now been completed.

RESOLVED :

(1) That application 06/22/0109/F be approved subject to the conditions as listed within the Senior planning Officers report.

(2) That application 06/22/0058/LB be approved subject to the conditions as listed within the Senior planning Officers report.

5 APPLICATION 06-22-00093-F - LOWER ESPLANADE, GORLESTON

The Committee received and considered the Planning Manager's report which proposed construction of 11 Beach Huts at the Lower Esplanade, Gorleston.

Members received a presentation from the Planning Manager which highlighted areas for planning consideration with the report detailing the assessment of the application.

Members were advised that the proposal complies with the aims of Policies CS8, CS09 and CS10 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan: Core Strategy and adopted policies L2 and E3 from the adopted Local Plan Part 2 and was therefore recommended for approval subject to a number of conditions.

Councillor Myers asked if there were to be provisions for extra litter and waste bins at the site, it was advised that this had not been confirmed as part of the planning application but it was assumed that these would be in place.

Councillor T Wright raised some concern with regard to people using the huts and encroaching on the promenade area, it was advised that this would be a matter for the Licensing and Enforcement services as planning would be unable to enforce any of these measures.

RESOLVED :

That Committee approve application 06/22/0093/F subject to conditions as detailed within the Planning Managers report.

The meeting ended at: 20:00