



**GREAT YARMOUTH**  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

# Development Control Committee

## Minutes

Wednesday, 10 November 2021 at 18:30

### PRESENT:-

Councillor Freeman (in the Chair); Councillors G Carpenter, Fairhead, Flaxman-Taylor, Mogford, Williamson, A Wright & B Wright.

Councillor Candon attended as a substitute for Councillor Hanton, Councillor Galer attended as a substitute for Councillor P Hammond & Councillor Wainwright attended as a substitute for Councillor Jeal.

Mr D Glason (Planning & Development Director), Ms C Whatling (Monitoring Officer), Mr R Parkinson (Development Control Manager), Mr G Bolan (Planning Officer), Mr C Green (Senior Planning Officer), Mrs H Ayres (Planning Technician) & Mrs C Webb (Executive Services Officer).

### **1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Annison, P Hammond, Hanton, Jeal & Myers.

### **2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The Chairman asked that it be recorded in the minutes that all Councillors had

received an email from the applicant giving further information regarding application number 06/21/0356/F on 9 November 2021.

Councillor G Carpenter reported a personal interest in item number 4 as the applicant and his family were known to him personally.

However, in accordance with the Council's Constitution , all Councillors would be allowed to both speak and vote on the item.

### **3 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 October 2021 were confirmed.

### **4 APPLICATION 06-21-0356-F - EX-EDWARD WORLLEDGE SCHOOL SITE, LAND WEST OF 63-78 LICHFIELD ROAD**

This application was deferred.

### **5 APPLICATION 06-21-0237-F - 4 BURTONS BUILDINGS, ST PETERS ROAD**

The Committee received and considered the report from the Planning Officer.

The Planning Officer reported that a site visit had been undertaken to 3 Burtons Buildings, St Peters Road, Great Yarmouth on Monday, 8 November 2021.

The Planning Officer reported that the site occupies a plot located between properties on St Peters Road and Lancaster Road and has a pedestrian access from St Peters Road.

St Peters Road is made up of mainly commercial use on the ground floor with residential above with Lancaster Road being predominantly made up of residential terrace properties.

The Planning Officer reported that the application relates to the existing 3-storey building being demolished and the construction of a new 4-storey building to form 4 residential self-contained flats, the proposal will be utilising the existing pedestrian access with the outside area to the north proposed to be used as a bin and cycle store for the development.

The Planning Officer reported that the current use of the existing building is full residential, the current state of the building is in slight disrepair with the conversion to form flats not considered achievable by utilising the existing building. The proposed site is located on St Peters Road, under the new emerging policy UCS7 of the Local Plan Part 2, St Peters Road is identified as a local centre and all though we cannot apply full weight to the policy due to the plan not being fully adopted we can consider this relevant, the site is considered within close proximity to the proposed local centre and with links to the seafront on Marine Parade, Great Yarmouth, which is located to the east of the site, and with easily accessible links into the Town Centre to the north.

The Planning Officer reported that since the submission of the application the original proposal has been revised from 6 flats to 4 with each flat occupying its own floor, it has also gone from a 2 bedroom flat development to 1 bed flats over all floors.

The Planning Officer reported that the proposal is to have a similar shape to the existing dwelling. The building will sit in a similar footprint to the existing dwelling but the proposal is to have a smaller footprint at ground floor level to allow good access to the site so the depth will increase by 1m from the first floor upwards. Throughout the planning process the roof has been changed from a flat roof to a mansard style roof, this is considered to allow the development to fit in with the character of the area with the majority being pitched roofs, by doing this it has allowed the head space for the 4th flat.

The Planning Officer reported that the proposal sees the west elevation having balconies though the centre of the building from the first-floor level to the top of the development with windows consistently located either side of the balconies. The only windows proposed on the development are mainly located on the west elevation with single windows located on the north elevation - with these being bathroom windows any permission granted will be conditioned to ensure these will be obscurely glazed. The east and south elevations do not contain any windows as these are upon boundaries of the site.

The Planning Officer reported that the proposed materials suggested for the development are as follows:

- Red clay roof tiles to match adjacent dwellings
- White K Render finish to the external walls from first to third floor
- Red brick on the ground floor element matching the existing buildings
- Fenestration around the windows to be PVCU in Anthracite grey.

The Planning Officer reported the details of the floor plans, site photographs, public comments and the principle of development to the Committee.

The Planning Officer reported that within this particular area of Great Yarmouth there are large amounts of tall buildings and with the height not increasing substantially from the existing the proposal is considered in character with the area, whilst all efforts have been made to keep the proposal in keeping with the existing area. The use of white render will copy that of the existing building and help reduce a sense of scale by avoiding heavier materials.

The Planning Officer reported that Core Policy CS9 seeks to 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.

The proposal is considered to tie in with the surrounding area with the variety of buildings within the vicinity of the site, it makes use of materials to match the existing character of the area whilst also introducing new and modern techniques to the area, the proposal makes use of a mansard style roof which has allowed the roof

height to remain lower in terms of the scale of the area but also allowing the proposal to utilise the roof space and provide good levels of amenity spaces for potential future occupiers.

The Planning Officer reported that the proposed site is visible from the street scene although it is set behind buildings located directly on the street but is consistent with the street scene.

The Planning Officer reported that at the time of writing, there have been 10 objections received from residents close to the application site and in surrounding areas, with further comments being received in relation to the revised plans; the issues raised are summarised as below:

- Over-development
- Anti-social behaviour
- Overlooking
- Loss of light
- Increase pressure on parking.

The Planning Officer reported that the proposal for 4 self-contained flats was consistent with the surrounding area. Lancaster Road is predominately made up of terraced properties, however, St. Peters Road is made up of commercial on the ground floor with flats above. This type of accommodation is well suited to this location and will be consistent with the aims set out in policies CS2 & CS3 in respect of providing well accessed and sustainable developments with good types of housing mixes.

The Planning Officer reported that the proposal is to be built larger than the existing building, the existing building has a height of 9.67m with the proposal increasing the total height to 10.8 m, the proposal also includes a lift shaft duct which protrudes 1m above the proposed roof height bringing the total height of the building, including the lift shaft to 11.5m. The enlargement is due to the extension of the existing building footprint to the north, as the existing width of the building is 7.41m with the proposal looking to achieve a width of 10m, which will cause the building to be located closer to properties 74,75 & 76A Lancaster Road. Given the proximity of the building to its neighbours, it will be important to establish precise site levels and both the existing and proposed floor levels, which can be achieved by condition.

The Planning Officer reported that the proposal, in shape, will be similar to that of the existing building, however, the ground floor will have a different depth with the first floor and above, protruding out by a metre which will allow better access to the site for future residents.

The Planning Officer reported that the proposal was originally submitted with a flat roof, however, this was considered not to be consistent with the style of the surrounding area as most had a pitched roof and therefore, it was considered that a mansard roof would be beneficial which gives the visualisation of a pitched roof fitting in with the street scene whilst allowing for utilisation of the roof space.

The Planning Officer reported that the proposal has the west elevation having balconies through the centre of the building from the first floor level to the top with windows located either side of the balconies with single windows located on the north elevation. These are bathroom windows and any permission granted will be conditioned to ensure these are obscurely glazed. The east and south elevations do

not have windows as these are boundaries of the site.

The Planning officer reported that the proposal includes an area to the north to house cycle and bin stores, this being a discreet area and away from the street and allows for safe storage of cycled for future occupiers which can be easily accessed from the site with pedestrian access from St Peters Road.

The Planning Officer reported that concerns had been raised to the LPA that the proposal will result in over-development but the proposal is not increasing in size dramatically, with the proposal extending further north and west than the existing dwelling, the site lends itself to a substantial residential dwelling.

The Planning officer reported that the current outside amenity areas are proposed to be built on and then the area to the north utilised as the cycle and bin store, and the inclusion of balconies to allow the first, second and third floors a level of outdoor amenity space. In regard to the first floor, it is proposed to have improvements to the western boundary of the curtilage by the use of conditions enabling the LPA to comment of the proposed improvements.

The Planning Officer reported that objections had been received from local residents on the enjoyment and amenities of their dwellings and these have been considered. However, this area of GY is heavily populated with terraced houses and flatted developments and the site lends itself to a large residential property with the application allowing the demolition of the existing building then the proposed building being erected.

The Planning Officer reported that the area is built up with back to back properties and there has always been an element of over-looking but this proposal has reduced the number of elevations with windows, only on the west and north elevations. This allows the property to have an outlook whilst reducing over-looking. As the existing property offers the same outlook, it is the opinion of officers that the proposal will not adversely affect the enjoyment and amenities of neighbours.

The Planning Officer reported that the site is accessed via a shared gate at St Peters Road to the south, the possibility of providing a security gate was suggested, however, due to right of access, the shops must have access to the rear of their buildings and it would not be in the applicant's control to achieve this. However, the proposal will result in more people living in the area with more journeys which will result in more natural surveillance in the area.

The Planning Officer reported that the proposed site is considered a sustainable location with good access to St Peters Road and good public transport links into the town centre and outer town centre facilities.

The Planning Officer reported that NCC Highways have raised no objection, there is no parking on site and there is a cycle store, no permanent parking can be achieved on St Peters Road and the surrounding streets are for permit holders. It is therefore considered the development would be less suitable for car owners.

The Planning Officer reported that the site is located within the orange 400m to 2.5k Indicative Habitat Impact zone and proposes the net increase of two dwellings. A Shadow HRA has been submitted and is deemed acceptable and the fee of £440 has been received prior to any permission being granted allowing the application to address the impacts on the designated wildlife areas.

The Planning Officer reported that no measures to ensure biodiversity enhancements have been proposed but measures such as bird boxes should be conditioned if permission is granted.

The Planning Officer reported that the application was recommended for approval subject to the use of conditions as set out within the agenda report and presentation, the proposal will comply with the aims of policies CS1, CS2, CS3, CS9 & CS11 of the GY Local Plan: Core Strategy, paragraphs 8, 62, 111 and 130 of the NPPF, and is consistent with the aims set out in the emerging policies of the final draft Local Plan Part 2.

Councillor A Wright asked the Planning Officer if he was aware that there used to be a car repair garage on the site. The Planning Officer reported that he was not aware of this and that there had always been a residential property on the proposed site.

The Chairman asked for clarification regarding the use of wording slight disrepair at paragraph 1.3 of the report and had a structural survey been carried out as part of the application process.

The Development Control Manager clarified paragraph 1.3 as follows; the current use of the existing building is full residential and is being proposed to us that the current state of the building is in slight disrepair.

The Monitoring Officer asked for clarification of the application site. The Planning Officer confirmed that the application site was 3 Burtons Buildings and that the previous application and the site notices had all had the address as 3 Burtons Buildings.

Mr Parrott, applicant's agent, addressed the concerns of the objectors to the Committee and asked them to approve the application.

Councillor G Carpenter was concerned how the building materials would be taken to and away from the application site without causing undue dust, noise and distress to neighbouring home owners and asked how the applicant planned to mitigate this. He also asked how long would the process take from start to finish.

Mr Parrott reported that it was a difficult site but that the existing building would be demolished brick by brick and materials would be brought to site by hand. The build would be completed as quickly as possible as additional labour would be utilised on site as it was a labour intensive project.

Councillor A Wright asked why the existing building could not be converted into three flats which would negate the need for demolition. Mr Parrott explained that the existing floor space was not large enough and it would not be financially viable.

Councillor A Wright was concerned regarding the old Victorian drains in that part of town and whether this development would damage them and asked if a survey of the drains had been undertaken as part of the application process. He further asked how long the property had been in the ownership of the applicant. Mr Parrott thought it was approximately 18 months to 2 years and that the drains issue would be a matter for building control.

Councillor G Carpenter reported that the proposal would result in the over-development of the site and result in the loss of amenity for neighbours and therefore he could not support the application.

Councillor A Wright also felt that the development would result in over-development, although he did not oppose the architectural design, unfortunately, it was proposed in the wrong area and would greatly affect the amenity of the neighbours due to noise and dust from the demolition phase.

Councillor Flaxman-Taylor & Williamson reported that they agreed with Councillors Carpenter & Wright and that they could not support the application either.

Councillor Mogford spoke in favour of the application.

The Chairman reported that after going on the site visit that he was concerned about the sheer bulk size of the northern elevation.

Councillor A Wright proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that it would result in over-development of the site due to scale, mass and footprint. This motion was seconded by Councillor Flaxman-Taylor.

The Development Control Manager suggested that the Committee cite policy CS9 of the Core Strategy; high quality of design, HOU17 and Local Plan Part 2; policy A2 as grounds for refusal.

Following a vote, it was RESOLVED:-

That application number 06/21/0237/F be refused as it would result in over-development due to its scale, mass and footprint, as it was contrary to policy CS9 of the Core Strategy, HOU17 & Local Plan Part 2; policy A2.

## **6 DELEGATED DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 1 SEPTEMBER 2021 AND 31 OCTOBER 2021**

The Committee received and noted the delegated decisions made by the planning officers between 1 September 2021 and 31 October 2021.

## **7 PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED BETWEEN 1 SEPTEMBER AND 31 OCTOBER 2021 FOLLOWING DETERMINATION BY THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

The Committee received and noted the planning applications approved by the Development Control Committee between 1 September 2021 and 31 October 2021.

## **8 APPEAL DECISIONS BETWEEN 1 SEPTEMBER AND 31 OCTOBER 2021**

The Committee received and noted the appeal decisions made between 1 September 2021 and 31 October 2021.

## **9 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

The Development Control Manager asked the Committee whether they would like to undertake a site visit to a site at Euston Road, Great Yarmouth in connection to an application which had previously been withdrawn by the applicant, Hammond Property Developments Ltd, due to design concerns.

Councillor A Wright asked if the Committee could also undertake a site visit to the ex-Edward Worledge School site, land west of 63-78 Lichfield Road.

RESOLVED:-

That the consensus of the Committee was that site visits to be undertaken at Euston Road, Great Yarmouth & Lichfield Road, Southtown prior to the determination of the associated planning applications by Hammond Property Developments Ltd.

The meeting ended at: 20:30