



**GREAT YARMOUTH**  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

# Development Control Committee

## Minutes

Wednesday, 15 September 2021 at 18:00

[

### **Attendees at the meeting**

Present :

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

Councillor Candon attended as a substitute for Councillor Hanton

Councillor Borg attended as substitute for Councillor Fairhead

Mr R Parkinson (Development Control Manager), Mr C Green (Senior Planning Officer), Mr R Tate (Planning Officer), Ms C Whatling (Monitoring Officer) & Mrs S Wintle (Corporate Services Manager).

### **1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Fairhead and Hanton.

### **2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Freeman declared a personal interest in item 4 in his capacity as Ward and Parish Councillor for Ormesby and Scratby.

### **3 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 25 August 2021 were confirmed.

#### **4 APPLICATION 06-21-0538-F - 29 (Seahaven), THE ESPLANADE, SCRATBY, GREAT YARMOUTH**

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

The Planning Officer reminded Members that this application had been originally published within the agenda for the Development Control committee on the 25 August 2021, however this item had been deferred from the meeting to enable further consultation to be undertaken. It was noted that the proposal had not been amended but the Officer's report had been updated accordingly following further consultation.

The Planning Officer reported on updates that had occurred following publication of the report as follows :-

- Expiry date is now 22nd September
- Response has now been received from the Parish Council
- One further objection had been received from a neighbour.

The Planning Officer reported that the application was for a replacement dwelling at 29 The Esplanade and the proposal would demolish the existing 4-bedroom bungalow and replace it with a larger chalet-style 3-bedroom bungalow with a detached garage.

The Planning Officer reported that the site lies across both the Indicative Erosion up to 2025 and Indicative Erosion up to 2055 zones identified in the Shoreline Management Plan. The front elevation is currently 32 metres away from the cliff edge and 170 metres away from the mean high-water mark.

The Planning Officer reported that 9 neighbour objections had been received and these were summarised as follows :-

- Overshadowing to no.31.
- Reduced view to no.27.
- No detailed measurements on the plan.
- Increase in scale over existing bungalow.
- Loss of outlook / light from the veranda of no.27.
- Will block sea views to the properties behind.
- Endangerment of the cliff top.
- Application form states no trees/hedges on the site.
- Will devalue neighbouring properties.
- Out of character – should be a bungalow.

The Planning Officer read aloud a neighbour objective that had been received since publication of the report, but advised that the comments were not dissimilar to those already received.

The Planning Officer reported on the comments received from the Parish Council who had advised that the Council would like to comment that the property is located within the government shoreline management plan which states that there should be no new development in this area and would ask that this be considered when making a

decision on the application.

The Planning Officer reported that the application site is situated on a private track and therefore the Highways agency has not provided comments on the application but noted that they could not see any issue to raise an objection for the application as it was for a replacement dwelling.

The Planning Officer reported that no objection had been received from the County Ecologist who had commented that the application site is located within the Orange Habitat Zone, however the application is for a replacement dwelling and therefore is unlikely to result in increased recreational pressure on habitats sites and therefore in their opinion a shadow HRA is not required.

The Planning Officer made reference to the relevant planning policies that had been taken to consideration.

The proposal is for the replacement of an existing dwelling and therefore would not result in a net increase in residential development. Notwithstanding this, the proposal is located within the development limits for Scratby where the principle of new residential development is considered acceptable.

The Planning Officer reported that whilst the current property formed part of a line of bungalows of a similar style, age and form, the property is the penultimate bungalow in the line. No.33 The Esplanade (next but one to the north) is also a chalet bungalow with accommodation at first floor level and a higher roof height; although it's ridge runs north-south and the front elevation is effectively pitched backwards, there are two dormer windows within it which gives the impression of a building of greater scale, mass and a much wider front elevation than is currently proposed. As such, a break in the line of bungalows in this location would not appear incongruous and the principle of a taller dwelling would be considered acceptable, especially as the general form as a bungalow with low eaves and narrowing roof is still retained when viewed from the front.

The Planning Officer reported that adequate space would be able to be provided for parking of two cars and this could be conditioned to be provided and maintained thereafter.

The Planning Officer reported that the proposal sought an increase in size over the existing dwelling, he referred to neighbours comments in which had raised concern that this would be detrimental to their amenity through overshadowing and the loss of outlook and light. However, it was considered that by virtue of siting the replacement dwelling on roughly the same footprint and maintaining the spacing between the dwellings, the proposed dwelling would not result in an unacceptable increase in overshadowing to the neighbouring property.

The Planning Officer reported that the the application is considered to comply with saved policy HOU07 (E) and core policy CS09 (F), as well as emerging policy A1 from the draft Local Plan Part 2, which seek to ensure that developments do not significantly detrimental to the residential amenities of adjoining occupiers or users of land.

The Planning Officer advised that the Coastal Manager had been consulted on the application but had not provided any comments. It was therefore noted that as a replacement dwelling, the proposal should not change the level of risk or affect

coastal processes, and as the eastern building line remains as existing the future residents should be put at no greater / earlier risk than the existing dwelling. However, an informative note should be included on the decision notice to remind the application of the longer-term potential for coastal change.

Members were asked to note that the proposal did include more hard surfacing and a larger footprint which would mean more run-off from the property, which if not addressed sensitively could serve to concentrate erosion or undermining of dunes / cliffs. The proposed dwelling is to be discharged via soakaway, so a surface water drainage scheme shall be required by condition to ensure that this disperses run-off to an appropriate location at suitable rates.

The Planning Officer reported that the application was recommended for approval subject to the following conditions :-

- Standard 3 year time limit
- In accordance with plans
- Scheme of landscaping/planting to be agreed
- Surface water drainage scheme to be agreed
- Colour of cladding to be agreed
- Provision of 2no. swift terrace boxes
- Parking to be provided
- Bat Informative
- Coastal change informative

And any other conditions or notes considered appropriate by the Development Management Manager.

Councillor Freeman referred to a "Hold the line" comment within the coastal report and commented that this had been revised as this area was now protected by the Gabions.

Councillor T Wright made reference to the Shoreline Management Plan which had advised that no further development should be carried out and whether this application was recommended for approval in light of the development being a rebuild, this was confirmed. Councillor T Wright further asked with regard to sub soil intervention and with this application being so close to the cliff whether this would create any disturbance and cause coastal erosion. The Planning Officer advised that whilst he could not provide comment on this question, this application was similar to applications that have previously been agreed close to the site and the Coastal Manager had provided comment on these.

Councillor T Wright asked where the services for the property were situated, although the planning Officer was unable to provide this answer. The Development Control Manager advised that this was not a material consideration for the planning application although would be looked at as part of the process if approved.

Councillor Myers asked for clarification as to the Chalet being referred to as a bungalow, it was confirmed that a chalet bungalow has living accommodation in the roof space.

Mr Graham Norse, agent reported that the applicant welcomed the recommendation for approval from the Planning Officers, he advised that there were no statutory

consultee objections although noted local neighbour objections. Mr Norse commented that he felt the key element of consideration was the layout of the development and impact of the character of the locality. He commented on the proposed dwelling and its proposed height and dimensions and commented that it could not be considered as a large development. The Proposed scheme was not considered to adversely affect neighbouring dwelling in terms of loss or outlook of light.

Mr Norse advised that the applicants had purchased the property with a view to renovating the property but had found due to the state of the existing structure it was far more practical to rebuild the property. he commented that the applicants had worked hard to ensure the development did not impact neighbouring properties.

In summary Mr Norse advised that the dwelling proposed for a well designed dwelling which reflected existing character of other dwellings in the locality both in terms of scale and design features and would result in a much improved development to that of the existing bungalow. He asked the Committee to approve the application as per the Officers recommendations.

Councillor Wright asked Mr Norse if he was aware of where the services for the development were located whether this was at the front of the bungalows or the rear. Mr Norse confirmed that the existing services were situated at the rear of the properties and this would remain if the new dwelling was approved.

Members hereby entered into a general debate where it is was proposed and seconded that the application be approved as per the Officers recommendations.

RESOLVED :

That application 06-21-0538-F be **approved** subject to the following conditions :-

- Standard 3 year time limit
- In accordance with plans
- Scheme of landscaping/planting to be agreed
- Surface water drainage scheme to be agreed
- Colour of cladding to be agreed
- Provision of 2no. swift terrace boxes
- Parking to be provided
- Bat Informative
- Coastal change informative

And any other conditions or notes considered appropriate by the Development Management Manager.

## **5 APPLICATION 06-21-0329-F - POPS MEADOW, GORLESTON**

Committee received and considered the Senior Planning Officer's report.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that that the application was a retrospective planning application for planning permission to regularise development that has already taken place, it should be noted that in selling the land to the applicant the purchase form the Council did not override the need to require planning permission.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the development that has been carried out is deemed to be significantly different from any historic works that have been completed.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the retrospective application asked for the installation of an 8ft security perimeter fence, a 32-foot portacabin (office/medical room), a wood cabin for cash/token box, a 20x8 foot cabin for the sale of refreshments when the park is open, reinstatement of small childrens' fairground rides to the site and the addition of coin operated small childrens' rides. Fencing includes a section of 6ft wooden fence to enclose the portacabin and bin storage.

The area of land on which the recreations use takes place has been enlarged from that used previously, to now include a strip of land at the north of the property adjoining Fiskes' Opening. The strip was formerly used as parking by touring motor homes. Additionally, the position of the boundary fence fronting Pavilion Road has been extended towards the road.

It was reported that The proposed hours of opening for the ride area are 10am to 8pm Monday to Friday, weekends and bank holidays. The application also identified hours of opening for the cafe. It was noted that the cafe has an existing planning permission without restriction to the hours of opening and it is not deemed reasonable or necessary to restrict the hours of opening for the existing cafe in relation to this current application.

Since publication of the report, the Senior Planning Officer reported that 60 letters in support of the application had been received. It was also noted that a number of objections had been received of which were summarised within the agenda documents/

The Senior Planning summarised comments that had been received from statutory authorities.

The Senior Planning Officer made reference to the relevant planning policies that had been taken to consideration.

The Senior Planning Officer reminded Members that this was a retrospective application, where development has taken place without planning permission. The application had arisen as the result of complaints from members of the public to the local planning authority with regard to enforcement of planning legislation. It was reported that it was not unusual for development to be undertaken without planning permission, there are extensive development rights for smaller scale development of both residential and non-residential property. Any development carried out without permission and where permission is determined to be required is at risk of enforcement including the requirement of removal where not acceptable or alteration and the inherent expenses involved.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that in determining planning applications all applications are judged on their merits including ones seeking retrospective permission. The Local Planning Authority takes into account the planning permission history of the property, any relevant national and local planning policy that has been adopted for the assessment of the acceptability of new development and any representations received.

It was advised that the application was proposing the rides and structures currently already installed and used on the site and shown on the submitted layout with accompanying

photographs.

The Senior Planning Officer summarised the main impacts on the conservation area and the neighbouring residential amenity which had been detailed within the agenda documents.

The Senior Planning Officer concluded that it was therefore considered that in order to determine whether the intensified and materially different use can successfully operate without detriment to the amenity of adjoining residents, the local planning authority should grant a temporary permission for the use and the portacabin for at least 2 years (including the c.6 months use already undertaken without permission during 2021). This will allow factors such as effectiveness of the fencing, noise from rides etc to be reviewed over a reasonable period of time and over both an extraordinary year and hopefully a more usual year of holiday use.

It was reported that the fence as erected without permission is not appropriate and any new permission to be granted pursuant to this application shall require that the fence be replaced at the end of this tourist season, with one of style compatible with the conservation area. Details of the fence including the height and siting in relation to Marine Terrace and 27 Pavilion Road have been requested from the applicant to be provided prior to the Committee meeting and should be agreed prior to the issue of any permission. Members will be updated verbally as to the appropriateness of the proposed fencing designs (and siting in relation to the aforementioned dwellings).

A condition of any permission should be that rides and structures approved will be as submitted for the application; details of any replacements to those rides would require express prior written permission from the Local Planning Authority in the form of a further planning application in order to assess that they would be compatible without causing significant disturbance to the amenity of adjoining residents.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that given the site is located in a flood zone, conditions to this permission will require the provision of means to anchor the portacabin and structures in a flood situation and for the use to be supported by an emergency evacuation plan.

In order to demonstrate that the proposed use and activities can be acceptable in the location and in terms of highways safety, the following matters shall need to be revised and confirmed to be acceptable by the Local Planning Authority before permission is granted:

- Prior to issuing a planning permission a revised rides and structures layout plan shall be submitted and agreed in writing. Details to include a schedule of rides and structures with identifying serial numbers.
- Prior to issuing a planning permission details of a replacement fence shall be submitted and agreed in writing. Details to include siting, height, design, material and finish.
- Prior to issuing a planning permission a plan showing the necessary visibility splay shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highways Authority.
- Prior to issuing planning permission a flood warning and evacuation plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

In the event that the applicant does not provide suitable details, a permission would not be appropriate as the scheme would not be acceptable, and Officers would recommend that the application is brought back to Committee if so.

It was reported that in the event that permission be granted, in order to safeguard the residential amenities of the occupiers of nearby dwellings and the character of the Conservation Area a list of matters including but not limited to the following would be the basis for conditions to any approval:

- The permission for childrens' rides expires on 1st Sept 2023 (by which time the applicant will have benefited from 3 Easter holidays and 3 full summer seasons). The permission for the portacabin, refreshment cabin and cash/token cabin expire on 1st Sept 2023
- There shall be no rides or structures used on the site other than those specifically included in the schedule to be agreed (see paragraph 9.4)
- No rides or structures shall be sited within 10m of the boundary with Marine Terrace (and to be confirmed by a rides and structures layout plan)
- The existing fencing is to be removed and the replacement fencing (to be approved) is to be installed by 01 December 2021, with visibility splay incorporated therein
- The removal of permitted development rights for the erection of any additional Gates, Walls, Fences, or other means of enclosure
- The use of the site for childrens' rides shall not be open to customers outside of 10am-7pm seven days a week.
- No use of loudspeakers and public address systems (Except for safety announcements).
- No use of external amplified music.
- The portacabin shall be securely anchored to its base and anchor retained in perpetuity (details needed if not provided beforehand).

The Senior Planning Officer advised that since publication of the report some of the requested information has been supplied although it had been advised that it was problematic to provide a schedule of rides for next season as the rides are yet to be leased and the applicant request that the permission should be not temporary, however it is noted that this is not recommended due to the uncertainty and in order to assess the impact of the use. The Senior Planning Officer advised that the applicant had made a counter proposal that instead of there being no rides or structures within 10 metres of the boundary of marine parade and marine terrace that rides in this location would only be of a low level type, this could be a condition if Committee were minded to agree to state no rides or structures over 8 metres in height within 10 metres of the location.

The Senior Planning Officer reported the application was subject to approval subject to agreement of details, detailed within the report and presentation.

Mr Lewis, applicant addressed the Committee, he advised that he had answered and provided comments to all neighbour complaints together with the possible proposal terms from the Council. Mr Lewis advised that he had successfully tendered to purchase the site, in the legal documents between Mr Gray and the Council it was always noted that the area was to be solely used a children's amusement park and food outlet facilities. Mr Gray advised that within the legal documents it had also stated terms that the purchasers would not apply for planning permission between the 25 and 50 year period.

Mr Gray advised that he had a young family and wanted to introduce some new business into the area which would attract those of all ages. Comments which had been received by Mr Gray had been positive. Mr Gray advised that they had been more than happy to assist local charities.

Mr Gray reported that he was happy to change the structural fence as specified by the Conservation Officer and is also willing to carry forward the recommendation from the Highway Officer and spray the front corner from the post to the road. Mr Gray referred to some comments that had been made by the Council with regard to the application, firstly he referred to a request for a 10 metre section to be left empty in front of the marine terrace houses, and stated that he felt this should have been stated within the deeds and the terms of conditions when purchasing, he commented that he was more than willing to work with tenants to not restrict light. Mr Gray advised he was happy to supply a full layout of drawings and rides for each year and submit this to the council, although he felt a 2 year temporary planning application should have been advised.

Councillor T Wright asked for clarification from Mr Gray in relation to the fencing at Marine Terrace, Mr Gray confirmed that discussion had been held with the landlord of the properties. Mr Gray felt that a six foot fence would prevent a safety net for the site and those using it and would alleviate any concerns from neighbours with regard to people looking into their properties.

Councillor Williamson asked Mr Gray if he was happy to have the recommended fence painted and Mr Gray confirmed this.

Mr Edwards, objector to the application addressed the Committee, he advised that he would be speaking on behalf of tenants within his properties. He confirmed that the main concerns raised were that of the fence and the main proximity of the rides in situ.

Mr Edwards advised that the close board fence that had been erected had caused an impact on the amount of light that was being let into the properties. Mr Edwards referred to some shrubs that had been planted prior to the close board fencing which the tenants in place were happier with and would be happier if these could be reinstated.

Mr Edwards advised that a concern had been raised with regard to a gap between the fencing and the galvanised fencing and how rubbish would be collected if found in this area.

Mr Edwards commented that it was disappointing that no consultation had been undertaken with his tenants.

Councillor Williamson commented that he fully supported the recommendations of the Officers, he made reference to the fence which was in obvious need of replacing and suggested that pre coated fencing be considered which would provide for a better finish than galvanised fencing and would be more pleasing to the eye in a conservation area. Councillor Williamson further made reference to the opening times of the facility of 10am until 7pm which in his opinion as restrictive.

Councillor Flaxman-Taylor sought clarification with regard to the opening times of the venue as listed within the pack as 10am until 7pm and asked whether this was both summer and winter opening times, this was confirmed as summer and winter opening

times. Councillor Flaxman-Taylor commented that she felt it would be more appropriate to have similar times to that of what was previously agreed for the site of 9am till 9pm. The Senior Planning Officer reported that the applicant had requested 10am until 8pm within their application.

Councillor Myers sought clarification as to paragraph 10.2 within the Committee report and asked whether this agreement had been given on this matter. The Senior Planning Officer advised that this had been agreed and the Conservation Officer had advised that the fence should have a painted finish.

Councillor T Wright sought clarification on paragraph 10.1 within the report with regard to temporary permission for the use of the portacabin for two years including the six months of use already taken as it had been detailed this would take the permission to September 2023 which would allow for 2 and a half years. It was confirmed if approved this would grant permission until the beginning of September 2023.

Councillor Hammond asked whether any noise levels had been recorded by Environmental Health at the site, as he commented in his opinion this would have been helpful to know. The Senior Planning Officer advised that this information had not been presented by the Environmental Health department, the department had advised that they had received no noise nuisance complaints. The Development Control Manager advised that Officers deemed it necessary to issue temporary permission to understand if the rides which are materially different to the existing use are going to create any prolonged nuisance, this will allow monitoring to be undertaken.

Councillor T Wright asked if any discussions had been held with nearby residents of Marine Parade in order to understand preference for fencing.

Councillor B Wright commented that she had discussed the facility with Mr Gray and felt that he would be happy to work with everyone to get the best out of the facility.

Members hereby entered into general debate about the application.

RESOLVED :

That application 06-21-0329-F be approved, subject to the following conditions :

- (1) The opening and closing times be amended to 10am to 8pm
- (2) Replacement fencing details to be submitted and agreed in association with the Conservation Area Officer by November 1st 2021.
- (3) Landscape scheme to soften boundary ( to dwellings on southern boundary)
- (4) A revised rides and structures layout plan
- (5) A plan showing provision of visibility splay
- (6) flood warning and evacuation plans submitted, before any permission is issued [as described at paragraph 10.5 above].
- (7) For a temporary period - in order to further assess the impact of the use and safeguard the residential amenities of the occupiers of nearby dwellings and the character of the Conservation Area – subject to Conditions as listed at paragraph 10.6 with the amendment of the existing fencing to be removed and the replacement fencing (to be approved) is to be installed by Easter 2022 (1 March), with visibility splay incorporated therein above and any others considered appropriate by the Development Management Manager including lighting.

## **BRIEFING OF APPLICATIONS**

The Senior Planning Officer gave a brief summary of the following applications which were to be considered :-

Works detached from buildings in the public realm

- 06/21/0585/F Town Hall freestanding lighting column
- 06/21/0593/F Tolhouse freestanding lighting column
- 06/21/0587/F Hollywood freestanding lighting column
- 06/21/0586/F St Georges Theatre freestanding lighting Column

Works to buildings or in their grounds

- 06/21/0591/F and 06/21/0592/LB Tolhouse
- 06/21/0589/F and 06/21/0484/LB Gorleston Theatre
- 06/21/0590/F and 06/21/0537/LB St Georges
- 06/21/0590/F and 06/21/0528/LB Minster church

The Senior Planning Officer advised of the terms mentioned :-

- Light emitting diode
- DMX - digital multiplex. Fixture identity, channels 1-512, each with 256 values
- RGB and RGBW
- Wash (beam angle)
- Gobo Projector
- Linear fixture (also known as batten light)

The Senior Planning Officer reported on the general considerations for the Committee as follows :-

- Light pollution
- Distraction to drivers
- Bats

•Note to members that given the subdivision of the sites into separate applications for light post and works attached to the buildings these can be determined separately.

## **6 APPLICATION 06-21-0589-F AND 06-21-484-LB - GORLESTON PAVILION, PAVILION ROAD, GORLESTON**

The Committee received and considered the Senior Planning Officer's report.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the site was situated within the Gorleston Development boundary. The premises are in use as a place of public entertainment formerly within use Class D2, but now classed as a "sui generis" use. The site is within the Gorleston extended Conservation Area No 17. The opposite side of the street to the south boundary is not within the conservation area. The building is identified in policy and on mapping as a key tourism attraction.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that no public objections had been received and this particular application had received support from the Theatres Trust.

The Senior Planning Officer summarised the policies which were relevant to consideration for the application.

The Senior Planning Officer provided an overview summary of the Principle of Development as follows :-

The proposal is considered to meet with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework as it applies to the economic and cultural wellbeing of place where paragraph 8 sets out that sustainable development is defined by the economic objective , the social objective - to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities and cultural well-being; and the environmental objective - to contribute to protecting and enhancing built and historic environment; including moving to a low carbon economy.

The proposal is considered to meet these objectives and the use of LED lighting delivery illumination around five to six times more efficiently than tungsten lighting, on average for a given colour.

Policy CS8 - Promoting tourism, leisure and culture: Encourages the upgrading and enhancement of existing visitor attractions and specifically at sub section c: Safeguards key tourist, leisure and cultural attractions and facilities, such as Gorleston Pavilion Theatre.

The proposal will assist in encouraging the early evening and night-time economy, in an appropriate location that contribute to the vitality of the borough.

This proposal will support the role of the arts, creative industries and sustainable tourism sectors in creating a modern and exciting environment that will attract more visitors to the borough.

Emergent Policy C1: Community facilities reinforces the core strategy policy by seeking the retention of existing community facilities

Retained Policy BNV27 does not apply to this application as the lighting here considered is not of the projected form.

The Senior Planning Officer reported on the Planning Balance and commented that it was considered that the proposal would be positive in enhancing the building, reduces light spillage by directionality and offers some better cable routing. The equipment involved offers energy efficiency. The proposal would increase public awareness of the venue and potentially custom tourism interest.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that application 06-21-0589-F and application 06-21-484-LB were recommended for approval subject to a number of conditions as detailed within the report.

Councillor Jeal asked that consideration be given to the lighting used in order to maintain the lights working due to being in a salt water area, the Senior Planning Officer advised that the lighting to be used was waterproof and LED;s which had a life cycle of around 55 years

Councillor T Wright asked with regard to the lighting on Pavilion road and although noted these were not emitting outwards by virtue these were going to light up the west side of the pavilion where there were a few terraced houses and therefore asked if residents were consulted and this was confirmed and it was noted that no correspondence had been received.

RESOLVED :

That application 06-21-0589-F and application 06-21-484-LB be approved subject to conditions as outlined within the Senior Planning Officers report.

## **7 APPLICATION 06-21-0587-F - HOLLYWOOD CINEMA, GREAT YARMOUTH**

Committee received and considered the Senior Planning Officer's report.

The Senior Planning Officer reported the site is situated within the Great Yarmouth Development boundary. The premises to be lit are in use as a cinema formerly in use Class D1, but now within Class F2 (b) Halls or meeting places for the principal use of the local community. The site is within the Seafront Conservation Area. It was noted that this specific application is for a free-standing column to carry a lighting installation and is set in the south of the forecourt on the centreline of the facade.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that no objections had been received.

The Senior Planning Officer provided Members with a summary of the points for consideration within the application.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions as detailed within the application pack.

Councillor Hammond raised some concern with regard to the siting of the light directly in line with the entrance of the cinema and that this could potentially be damaged.

RESOLVED :

That application 06-21-0587-F be approved subject to conditions as outlined within the Senior Planning Officer's report.

**8 APPLICATION 06-21-0590-F AND 06-21-537-LB - ST GEORGES THEATRE, KING STREET, GREAT YARMOUTH**

Committee received and considered the Senior Planning Officer's report.

The Senior Planning Officer reported the site is situated within the Great Yarmouth Development boundary. The premises are in use as a place of public entertainment formerly within use Class D2, but now classed as a "sui generis" use. The site is within the King Street Conservation Area No 4. The building is identified in policy and on mapping as a key tourism attraction.

It was noted that the premises was a grade one listed building.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that no objections had been received.

The Senior Planning Officer provided Members with a summary of the points for consideration within the application.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions as detailed within the application pack

RESOLVED :

That application 06-21-0586-F be approved subject to conditions as detailed within the Senior Planning Officer's report.

**9 APPLICATION 06-21-0586-F - 145 KING STREET AND YARMOUTH WAY (CORNER OF)**

Committee received and considered the Senior Planning Officer's report.

The Senior Planning Officer reported the site is situated within the Great Yarmouth Development boundary. The premises associated with this application are in use as a theatre formerly in use Class D1, but now a "Sui Generis" use. The site is within the King Street Conservation Area No 4. The theatre building is identified in policy and on mapping as a key tourism attraction

It was noted that the premises 145 King Street was a grade two listed building.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that no objections had been received.

The Senior Planning Officer provided Members with a summary of the points

for consideration within the application.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions as detailed within the application pack

Councillor Hammond asked with regard to the situe of the light, and it was advised that the light would be situated on the post.

RESOLVED :

That application 06-21-0586-F be approved subject to conditions as detailed within the Senior Planning Officer's report.

**10 APPLICATION 06-21-0585-F - TOWN HALL (LAND TO NORTH OF) HALL QUAY, GREAT YARMOUTH**

Committee received and considered the Senior Planning Officer's report.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the site is situated within the Great Yarmouth Development boundary. The premises to be lit are the Great Yarmouth Town Hall, a mixture of use as offices (Use Class E) and (Class F2(b)) 'halls or meeting places for the principal use of the local community'. The site is within the Hall Quay/South Quay Conservation Area No 3. It was reported that this specific application is for a free-standing column to carry a lighting installation and is set in the south west corner of the triangular planted area to the north of the Town Hall, lighting the main public entry point. The town hall is a Grade 2 starred listed building (27/06/53) (abridged).

The Senior Planning Officer reported that no objections had been received.

The Senior Planning Officer provided Members with a summary of the points for consideration within the application.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions as detailed within the application pack.

Councillor Hammond and Jeal asked with regard to the flag pole in situe at the application site and whether these would interfere with the lighting column. It was confirmed that this matter would be looked into to ensure no interference with the flag poles.

RESOLVED :-

That subject to further investigations with regard to the flag pole height application 06-21-0585-F be approved subject to conditions detailed within the Senior Planning Officer's report.

**11 APPLICATION 06-21-0531-F AND 06-21-0593-LB - TOLHOUSE GAOL, 12 TOLHOUSE STREET, GREAT YARMOUTH**

Committee received and considered the Senior Planning Officer's report.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the site is situated within the Great Yarmouth Development boundary. The premises to be lit are in use as a museum formerly in use Class D1, but now within Class F1(c) Museums. The site is within the Hall Quay/South Quay Conservation Area No 3. These specific applications are for planning permission and listed building consent for lighting attached to the museum building as described.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that no objections had been received.

The Senior Planning Officer provided Members with a summary of the points for consideration within the application.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions as detailed within the application pack.

RESOLVED :

That application 06-21-0531-F and 06-21-0593-LB be approved subject to conditions as detailed within the Senior Planning Officer's report.

**12 APPLICATION 06-21-0593-F - TOLHOUSE GAOL (LAND NORTH WEST OF) TOLHOUSE STREET, GREAT YARMOUTH**

Committee received and considered the Senior Planning Officer's report.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the site is situated within the Great Yarmouth Development boundary. The premises to be lit are in use as a museum formerly in use Class D1, but now within Class F1(c) Museums. The site is within the Hall Quay/South Quay Conservation Area No 3. This specific application is for a free-standing column to carry a lighting installation and is set in the garden to the east of the library and north of the

Tolhouse Museum. The museum is a Grade 1 listed building (27/06/53).

The Senior Planning Officer reported that no objections had been received.

The Senior Planning Officer provided Members with a summary of the points for consideration within the application.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions as detailed within the application pack.

RESOLVED :

That application 06-21-0593-F be approved subject to conditions as detailed

within the Senior Planning Officer's report.

**13 APPLICATION 06-21-0588-F AND 06-21-0528-LB - THE MINSTER CHURCH OF ST NICHOLAS, CHURCH PLAIN, GREAT YARMOUTH**

Committee received and considered the Senior Planning Officer's report.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the site is situated within the Great Yarmouth Development boundary. The premises associated with this application are a church (place of worship) in use Class D1, but now in Class F1(f). The site is within the No 5 St Nicholas/Northgate Street Conservation Area. The minster is not identified in policy and on mapping as a key tourism attraction. The church is a Grade 2 starred listed building.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that no objections had been received.

The Senior Planning Officer provided Members with a summary of the points for consideration within the application.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions as detailed within the application pack.

RESOLVED :

That Application 06-21-0588-F and Application 06-21-0528-LB be approved subject to conditions as detailed within the Senior Planning Officer's report.

**14 DELEGATED DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 1 AND 31 AUGUST 2021**

Committee note the delegated decisions made between the 1 and 31 August 2021.

**15 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business discussed at the meeting.

The meeting ended at: 20:00