

Development Control Committee

Minutes

Tuesday, 09 February 2016 at 18:30

PRESENT :

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

Councillor Grey attended as a substitute for Councillor Annison

Councillor Fairhead attended as a substitute for Councillor Wainwright

Councillor Walker attended as a substitute for Councillor Blyth

Mr D Minns (Planning Group Manager), Miss G Manthorpe (Senior Planning Officer), Mrs E Helsdon (Technical Planning Officer) and Mrs S Wintle (Member Services Officer)

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Annison, Blyth, Grant and T Wainwright.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

It was noted that Councillor Grey declared a Personal Interest in item 5 and in accordance with the constitution was allowed to both speak and vote on the matter.

3 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held 15 December were confirmed.

4 APPLICATION 06/15/0545/F POTTERS LEISURE RESORT COAST ROAD HOPTON

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

The application sought to construct a coastal protection scheme to protect the coastline fronting Potters Leisure Ltd site at Hopton. The works will consist of a rock revetment that will run along the toe of the existing concrete sea wall and four rock groynes.

Members were advised that by implementing the scheme it is anticipated a satisfactory level of protection will be restored to the coast, managing the erosion that is currently effecting it and thereby protecting Potters Leisure which is located on the cliff top.

The Planning Group Manager advised that the scheme was to be entirely funded by the applicant's Potter Leisure Limited.

The Planning Group Manager informed Members that the application proposal was similar to a previous application in January 2014 from Bourne Leisure and that the proposal for the coastal defence below Potters would be contiguous with the Bourne Leisure completed coastal defences.

It was reported that should the application be approved the scheme would take approximately 6 months to complete and would be staged to minimise exposure risks between removal of the old and construction of the new defences. Normal working hours would be Monday - Friday 07:30 to 17:00 and Saturdays 08:00 to 13:00, however it is noted the "rock dumping" from the barge is tidally dependant, so some infrequent working hours may be required, although any working outside of normal hours would be agreed in advance with the Council's Environmental Health Department.

It was reported that 23 letters of support had been received, Hopton Parish Council, Natural England, Hopton Coastal Action Group and Environmental Health had no objections. Whilst it was noted that the Environment Agency had no objection they had recommended that the GYBC Coast Protection Team agree coastal monitoring programme with the applicant as a condition of consent. Norfolk Historic Environment Service had no objections subject to imposition of archaeological condition.

The Planning Group Manager provided Members with a summary of comments made by Waveney District Council Coastal Management.

It was reported that a Marine Management Organisation (MMO) licence would be required, the applicant had stated that discussions had been held and an application was in the process of being made.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the works proposed would help with the sustainability of the Potters Leisure Site, provide stability to the remaining defence structures, contribute to alleviate the concerns of the local community and continue to promote the social and economic activity in the area whilst protecting the substantial and future financial investment in Potters Leisure.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the application was recommended for approval as it conformed to Policies INF16, CS16.

A Member requested information on what expert advice had been sought. The Planning Group Manager advised that Bernard Harris, Coastal Manager had provided expert advice.

A Member asked if the completed works at the Bourne Leisure site gave an indication

of success, and was advised that it was too early to tell although it was reported that the prediction for the defences lasting was 20-30 years with no additional maintenance required.

A question was raised in regard to communication between both GYBC and Waveney District Council, Members were advised that a Coastal Partnership Group was being formed.

RESOLVED :

That application 06/15/0545/F be approved as the proposal complied with Policies INF16, CS16 and the aims of the NNPF and Marine Policy subject to a monitoring agreement including trigger levels, and subject to referral to the Secretary of State in accordance with the Environment Assessment Regulation 2011 as necessary.

5 APPLICATION 06/15/0580/F LOWESTOFT ROAD HOPTON ON SEA

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

The application sought approval for 15 single storey dwellings. The proposal is located outside the current development limits of Hopton on Sea therefore development would be contrary to the Borough wide Local Plan (2001).

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the site is bounded on one side by the A12 and accessed via Lowestoft Road. It was noted that there had been a previous application approved on the land adjacent to the site to the South for 30 private and affordable dwellings.

It was reported that the site is outside the defined development limits and had been identified in the Strategic housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2010 and 2012 as being a deliverable site, it was reported that the site was then removed from the 2014 SHLAA as planning permission had been granted on a portion of the site to the south for 30 residential dwellings.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the Parish Council had objected to the application, the main objection was regarding sewerage and water drainage, although it was reported that Anglian Water had stated that the sewerage system had available capacity for these flows and had not recommended any conditions.

Norfolk County Council - Historic Environment Service had recommended that in accordance with paragraph 141 of the NPF a programme of archaeological mitigatory work be carried out and conditions imposed.

It was reported that there had been 3 objections received from neighbours the main concern being the preservation of the trees at the boundary to Lowestoft Road, surface water flooding, protection of the ring ditch and levels of noise.

There had been no objections from the Highways Agency, Norfolk county Council and Natural England.

It was noted that although no response had been received from the Environmental Health Department the adjoining development had been conditioned and so this would be carried over to the current application.

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

The Chairman asked in regard to the responsibility after construction of private road access, the Senior Planning Officer advised that the purchasers of the properties would be responsible although the main part of the road would be adopted by Norfolk County Council.

Concern was raised in regard to the drainage on the proposed development site.

A Member asked if the archaeological area would remain untouched, the Senior Planning Officer advised that the Norfolk Archaeological had requested that disturbance be limited and that permitted development rights be removed on buildings with archaeological remains.

The Chairman informed Members of an email received from Councillor H Wainwright that reiterated the objection received from the Parish Council.

Mr Mark Nolan - Agent presented a report on behalf of Cripps Development Ltd to Members.

A Member asked in regard to the location of the drainage soakaways, and was advised that most were located in the back garden of the properties although some properties soakaways were located through the brick weave on the driveways.

A question was raised in regard to the maintenance of the private roads and how purchasers would know that they were liable, it was advised that this would be reported in completed searches.

The Chairman expressed concern in regard to the history of the developers and suggested that the application if successful should have a clear management plan in place with purchasers prior to completion.

Mr Ramsden, Parish Council representative presented a report on behalf of the Parish Council to Members.

A Member asked in regard to the preservation of the trees, Mr Ramsden stated that he had approached the development company and made an offer to purchase the area of trees within the boundary, although this had been refused, it was noted that the trees had since been destroyed and a new fence erected.

Concern was raised in regards to the management of properties established on private roads.

RESOLVED :

That application 06/15/0580/F be approved subject to conditions to provide a satisfactory form of development and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement.

6 APPLICATION 06/15/0685/O PEACEHAVEN YARMOUTH ROAD HEMSBY

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

The Senior Planning Officer reported that this was an outline application for the demolition of the existing property and the erection of 8 bungalows.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that there had been 9 Letter of objections from neighbours/public the main concerns were incorrect boundary, disturbance, wildlife preservation, pressure on local services and drainage.

There had been an objection received from the Parish Council due to overdevelopment of land and concerns with regard to the visibility exiting the land.

It was reported that the UK power Networks requested the nearby substation be considered as it generates noise.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that initially Highways had raised objections to the access particularly regarding the visibility splay, however an amended drawing had now overcome this concern and highways had withdrawn their initial comments. It was noted that Highways still had concerns regarding the parking and layout although this would be resolved at a more detailed stage.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the boundary of the site had been a matter of many objections received, however a certificate A had been signed stating the applicant was the owner.

The Senior Planning officer stated that the applicant had agreed to Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy and that if approval is given a Section 106 would be required.

It was reported that the layout of the application appeared to be contrived, although it was reported that subject to an acceptable layout which provided sufficient levels of curtilage and parking, the density of the proposal would be considered acceptable.

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

The Chairman suggested that a condition be recommended in regard to the developments private road that an agreement be established to state that property owners would be responsible for the maintenance of the road.

The Ward Councillor asked in regard to drainage and flooding and was advised that drainage ditches would be in place.

RESOLVED :

That application 06/15/0685/O be approved subject to conditions regarding drainage, parking provision, a limit on the size of the properties, construction time limits, boundary treatments, highways conditions and slab level, and that approval be subject to a 106 agreement regarding affordable housing.

7 APPLICATION 06/15/0749/SU EUSTON ROAD GREAT YARMOUTH

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

The Planning Group Manager reported that the application sought to change the use of the bowling green into a car park.

It was reported that no comments had been received from environmental Health, Health and Safety Executive, Property Services, Great Yarmouth Tourism Authority and Strategic Planning.

It was noted that highways had no objections subject to conditions ensuring the lighting poses no hazard to the highway. British Pipeline Agency had no objections subject to restrictions when developing close to a pipeline.

It was reported that there had been 10 letters of objections had been received the main concerns noted were the loss of green space and amenities, whether there is a need for additional car parking, disruption during construction and site location.

The Planning Group Manager reported that the application was recommended for approval.

A Member asked how many extra car spaces were to be provided if the application were successful, and was advised 51 regular bays, 3 disabled and 5 motorcycle bays.

A question was raised in regard to the balustrade removal, Members were advised that the ornamental stone balustrades were to be retained with the exception of the access to the car park.

The Ward Councillor for Central and Northgate Ward reported that he had no objections to the development.

RESOLVED :

That application 06/15/0749/SU be approved subject to conditions regarding the BPA recommendations, the highways conditions and a flood response plan.

8 APPLICATION 06/15/0631/F GLEBE FARM MAIN ROAD FILBY

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

The Group Manager Planning reported that application sought approval to demolish Glebe Farmhouse and replace it with two pairs of semi-detached houses.

It was reported that Highways had initial concerns with regard to layout, access and visibility, following receipt of these concerns the proposed plans were amended the Highways Officers objections had been withdrawn subject to standard conditions including the provision of visibility splays, the driveway to be a minimum of 4.5m for a minimum length of 10m and footway widening.

The Group Manager Planning reported that the Parish Council had objected with the main objections being, site not within Borough-Wide Plan area, the access road, and visibility splay.

The Group Manager Planning reported the development of this site would appear to be a logical infilling between existing houses and would not result in any harm to the street scene, and that the proposal complies with relevant criteria within the Interim Housing Land Supply Policy.

It was reported that the distance between the dwellings and siting of the car shelter,

the proposal if approved would not have a significant adverse effect on the neighbouring property as to justify refusal on the grounds of overlooking.

The Group Manager Planning reported that the application was recommended for approval.

The Chairman reported that the Local Parish Councillor had initial concerns but since the plans had been amended these concerns had been withdrawn.

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

- Inadequate parking provisions
- A1064 main road cannot sustain parking
- Pedestrian hazards
- Privacy
- Elevated Land
- Plans for adjacent Barns

A Member in relation to Mr Bartlett's concern regarding inadequate parking asked if this had been raised by the Highways Officer and was advised that the Highways Officer had no objections.

The Chairman agreed with Mr Bartlett in regards to the A1064 main road.

A Member asked in relation to the distance of the nearest property to Mr Bartlett's and was advised that this was approximately 100ft.

A motion was moved and seconded that application 06/15/0631/F be rejected on the grounds that it was unneighbourly.

Following a vote, the motion was lost.

A second motion was made to approve the application in line with the recommendation of the Planning Group Manager.

RESOLVED :

That application 06/15/0631/F be approved as the proposal complies with the Interim Housing Land Supply policy, subject to the conditions required by Highways.

9 PLANNING APPLICATIONS CLEARED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS AND BY DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE FROM 1 JANUARY - 31 JANUARY 2016.

The Committee noted the planning applications cleared under delegated powers and by the Development Control Committee for the period 1 January 2015 to 31 January 2016.

10 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

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

The meeting ended at: 20:45