

**LARGER PRINT COPY AVAILABLE  
PLEASE TELEPHONE: 01493 846325**

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**19 June 2007 – 6.00 pm**

**PRESENT:**

Councillor Reynolds (in the Chair); Councillors Blyth, Castle, Hodds, Jeal, Jermany, Linden, D Thompson and M Thompson.

Councillor Cook attended as a substitute for Councillor Burroughs.

Councillor M Coleman (Ward Councillor) attended for discussion of item 2(c).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Burroughs and Hewitt.

Mr D Minns (Development Control Manager), Mrs L Penn (Technical Assistant), Mr J Gregory (Trainee Solicitor) and Miss K Edmonds (Senior Member Services Officer).

**1. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 May 2007 were confirmed.

**2. PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

In accordance with the agreed procedure for public consultation, the Committee considered the following applications:-

- (a) **Application Number 06/07/0350/F – Garage to side of property and single storey extension to rear of property at 29 Connaught Avenue, Gorleston, Great Yarmouth**

The Committee received details of the application and were informed that the applicant wished to demolish the existing garage and construct a single storey, pitched roof extension that would wrap around the side and rear of the house to form a sun room, extended kitchen and garage. It was reported that the extension would project out 3.8 metres. Two letters of objection had been received from neighbours on both sides of the applicant's property. The objections related to loss of light and damage to the foundations of the boundary wall. Members were informed that the Party Wall Act negotiations would need to be instigated for the fence between the two properties.

One of the objectors stated that he felt that approving the application would reduce the value of his property and that the suggestion of painting the side wall of the garage white would not resolve the light issue.

## RESOLVED:

That, contrary to the Head of Planning and Development's recommendation, Application Number 06/07/0350/F be refused on the grounds that it contravenes Policy HOU18 option (b) and would significantly affect the amenities of any neighbouring dwelling.

(b) **Application Number 06/06/0999/F – Construction of a two storey dwelling opposite 15-19 Cliff Hill, Gorleston**

The Committee received details of the application and were informed that nine letters of objection had been received. Concerns related to a loss of view and outlook over the Harbour's Mouth from Cliff Hill; the effect on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area; possible subsidence caused by the excavation of the site; the parking space on Cliff Hill and the issue of overlooking. It was, however, noted that the occupier of the dwelling immediately to the south of the site had written to say that he supported the application.

Members were informed that the Conservation Officer had expressed his support of the application, stating that it enhanced the Conservation Area.

A Member expressed concern at the applicant being able to build on top of the flat roof in the near future, and Members were informed that if the applicant wished to further develop in the future, he would have to re-submit an application which would be brought back to Committee for consideration. Reference was made to the subsidence conditions in the area and it was noted that further detailed information would need to be submitted if the application was approved.

The applicant informed the Committee that he had purchased the land 15 months earlier and that he intended to build the property himself and would be living there. He stated that the land had been for sale for two years before he purchased it and that the concern that had been raised, relating to the obstruction of view, did not stand as the residents would look across the road and see a garden. Members were informed that the applicant would excavate one metre at a time whilst replacing the retaining wall. The applicant pointed out that the garage next door was already built into the cliff.

Three of the objectors addressed the Committee, stating that the area was a Conservation Area and so this development should not be agreed, as this would change the view and the area of Cliff Hill. Concern was expressed that an aerial and roof light would be placed on the flat roof. It was reported that four years ago sewage works were carried out and cracks had been appearing since. It was stated that parking in the area was a problem and that the road could not accommodate additional vehicles. One of the objectors expressed concern that their own property could suffer subsidence as a result of the development.

## RESOLVED:

That Application Number 06/06/0999/F be approved, as complying with Policies HOU7, BNV10 and REC11 of the Borough-Wide Local Plan.

(c) **Application Number 06/06/0875/F – Erection of 40 Dwellings and Ancillary Works at Elmside, White Street, Martham, Great Yarmouth**

The Committee was informed of the details of the application for 40 dwellings and ancillary works at the land adjacent to Elmside, White Street, Martham. Members were informed that the area in question was in a Conservation Area and the site opposite had bungalows. It was noted that there were additional traffic concerns from the local residents. The development proposed that three houses would be at the front of the development with 16

affordable houses which would be advertised locally. The developer would also have a joint partnership with Circle Anglia.

Members were informed that, after consultation had been carried out, the Parish Council objected to the application, along with four local residents; the objections being:-

- Massive increase in the density by some 250%, maintaining objection to the principle of development on the grounds of the unsuitable nature of the site due to the flood risk.
- Additional traffic movements in the village and onto White Street in particular.
- The development was not sympathetic with this part of Martham.
- Loss of privacy and sunlight to adjacent properties.
- Objection to the junction of the proposed feeder road between the two bends in White Street, which would give limited visibility to approaching traffic.
- Adverse impact upon the existing preserved trees and Conservation Area.

The Environment Agency initially raised objection to the proposal with regard to the handling of the surface water. The objection was, however, withdrawn, subject to a condition that a scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water drainage, incorporating infiltration, should be submitted and agreed in writing before occupancy of any part of the proposed development took place, in order to ensure a satisfactory method of surface water drainage.

Norfolk Constabulary had recommended that a two metre high fence was erected at the rear of the development to reduce the chances of crime occurring.

The representative for the applicant stated that extensive work had been carried out to ensure that the application was suitable and that, as a result, Norfolk County Council Highways had not objected to the proposal. He added that, despite the concerns expressed, it would not be possible to develop the land behind the site due to its existing layout. Members were informed that the applicant would be happy with the request for the single storey property on plot two.

One of the Ward Councillors for West Flegg spoke of concern about the increase in traffic that this development would create, stating that 1,000 pupils and 90 staff attended Flegg School and used White Road, and that the extra traffic from the original proposal of 16 dwellings seemed reasonable, but that 40 did not.

**RESOLVED:**

That Application Number 06/06/0875/F be approved subject to Officers negotiating a phased development in order to deal with the sewage and drainage works, plot 2 being changed to a single storey property with the windows in plots 1, 3 and 4 being moved to side elevations to reduce overlooking, the requirements of the Environment Agency and a Section 106 Agreement being entered into, in order to accord with Policies HOU4, HOU5, HOU7, HOU8, HOU9 and HOU14 of the Borough Wide Local Plan.

### 3. PLANNING APPLICATIONS - APPLICATIONS LIST

- (a) **Application Number 06/07/0246/SU – Erection of a 2.4 metre high galvanised steel palisade fencing to boundaries following demolition of the buildings at Business Units, Main Cross Road, Great Yarmouth**

The Committee received details of the application for a 2.4 metre high galvanised steel palisade fencing to the boundaries of the Business Units at Main Cross Road, Great Yarmouth.

**RESOLVED:**

That Application Number 06/07/0246/SU for a 2.4 metre high fence be deferred to enable further consultation on a proposal to install a 3.0 metre high fence and that officers be granted delegated authority to determine the application.

### 4. APPEAL DECISIONS AND OMBUDSMAN COMPLAINTS

- (a) The Committee noted that there were no appeal decisions.
- (b) The Committee received details of the following complaints dealt with by the Ombudsmen:-
- 31 Yarmouth Road, Caister  
.....dismissed.
  - Martham Road, Hemsby  
.....dismissed.

### 5. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

- (a) **Planning Applications cleared in May 2007 following determination by the Development Control Committee**

The Committee received the Head of Planning and Development's schedule in respect of applications received during May 2007 following determination by the Development Control Committee.

- (b) **Planning Applications cleared in May 2007 following determination by the Head of Planning and Development under Delegated Powers**

The Committee received the Head of Planning and Development's schedule in respect of applications cleared during May 2007 under delegated powers.

### 6. WEST ROAD CAISTER

The Development Control Manager informed the Committee that a letter had been received from GO-East stating that the Secretary of State, having considered the referral of the application, was not minded to call it in and had decided the Borough should determine the application. It was suggested that Officers be granted delegated authority to deal with the outstanding matters and to approve the application in accordance with the Committee's earlier resolution.

RESOLVED:

That Officers be granted delegated authority to deal with the outstanding matters and to approve the application in accordance with the Committee's earlier resolution.

**7. CLOSURE OF MEETING**

The meeting ended at 8.05 pm.