

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

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**21 April 2009 – 6.00 pm**

**PRESENT:**

Councillor Reynolds (in the Chair); Councillors Barker, Blyth, Castle, Collins, Cook, M Thompson, D Thompson, Jeal, Jermay and Linden.

Mr T Major (Assistant Development Control Manager), Mrs E Helsdon (Technical Assistant), Miss S Davis (Senior Member Services Officer).

**1. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 February 2009 were confirmed.

**2. PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

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

- (a) **Application Number 06/09/0127/F – Erection of a Pair of Semi-Detached Bungalows with Parking/Loading Area at Darby's Hard, Riverside Road, Gorleston**

The Committee was informed that this application was an amended version of one previously withdrawn for the erection of a pair of semi-detached houses and one bungalow. The current application had been amended in an attempt to overcome objections. It was noted that the site was not presently within a Conservation Area but was within the proposed extended Gorleston Conservation Area which had not yet been formally designated. The Highways Authority had no objections subject to standard conditions and 1st East had indicated that the site was broadly acceptable for an intensification of residential use. Norfolk Landscape Archaeology had requested that, if permission was granted, a condition be imposed for a programme of archaeological works bearing in mind the site lay on historic river frontage adjacent to the site of the Augustinian Priory. The Great Yarmouth Port Company had no objection regarding the design of the building but raised concern that the proposal would see Darby's Hard used as a parking area. GYB Services had expressed concern that the storage areas appeared to be located in a position that would have Health and Safety implications for residents when presenting bins for collection. 19 letters of objection had been received from residents and there was concern that the car park was adjacent to the river, the impact of the development on adjoining properties and the issues of flooding on Riverside Road. The objections also included photographs showing the real height of the proposed bungalows against the existing properties. The Officer reported, however, that this was in fact the ridgeline shown and taking into consideration that this

would be set closer towards the river there would be less impact than being shown on the photographs. It was also proposed to rebuild the existing steps to reach the High Street to the north and the public steps to the south would be pedestrian access with further access in the middle of the site to the forecourt terrace in front. He added that there appeared to be some discrepancy regarding the heights and levels referred to and he would discuss these further with the objector. He concluded that this was considered to be a cramped form of development on this site with minimal private amenity space and would not enhance the appearance of the area. It was also felt there would be an adverse outlook of residents with nearby dwellings despite the reduction in the height of the proposed bungalows. Clarification was sought as to the materials for the proposed development and it was noted that there would be brickwork and flint panels to reflect the design of the adjacent properties.

An objector provided Members with a letter and photograph showing some of the history of his property which lay behind the development site, together with a drawing which showed the roof height of the proposed bungalows and the impact this would have on his property. He added he felt this was an inappropriate design for a two storey building and was an over-development of the site. He stated that the height on the plans was misleading and, if granted permission, would end up with the roof height of the bungalows being two metres above his patio and windows thereby blocking his light and views. Members were informed that his property dated back to the early 1600's and was a Public House in the 1800's. He stated that he wanted to protect the property which had had views of the North Sea for over 300 years. Whilst he accepted development around the property he did not feel it appropriate for further development in front of it as it would block the view from his property and also of his property. He referred to the fact that the applicant had stated there would be no trees or shrubs removed, however, he pointed out that they had actually been removed in February 2007. He concluded that he felt the two storey bungalows would have a detrimental effect on his property and the area and asked Members to refuse the application. Clarification was sought as to what the objector would like to see on the land taking into account it was currently neglected. The objector responded that an amenity area for local people with gardens or grass would be preferred.

Councillor Barker, Ward Councillor, expressed concern that the proposed development would obscure the flint work of the existing buildings together with the fact that the road was liable to flood. Councillors Blyth and Cook, also Ward Councillors, agreed with the concern expressed and added that the proposed development would be out of place within the proposed Conservation Area Extension.

The point was made that there was a need to consider the future of the area and, in view of the need to defend the river, some development should be allowed to provide the funding, however, it was felt that this particular proposal was not suitable and would spoil the character of the area.

**RESOLVED:**

That Application Number 06/09/0127/F be refused as being contrary to Policy HOU15, BNV16 and Criteria (A) and (E) of the Borough-Wide Local Plan and PPS25.

**3. PLANNING APPLICATIONS - APPLICATIONS LIST**

**(a) Application Number 06/09/0169/F – Construction of Detached Garage including Driveway from Road Edge to Front of Garage at 35 Elmgrove Road, Gorleston**

The Committee received details of the application and it was noted that one letter of objection had been received from a neighbour who lived immediately to the west of the site.

The Officer explained that Councillor B Walker had asked for the application to be considered by the Committee. He also stated that, if the proposed garage had a flat roof, it would not need planning permission. In order to overcome some of the objections, discussions had been held with the applicant to move the garage further away from the boundary, however, the applicant had stated that he wished the application to be considered in its submitted form. The objector's other concern at the possible over-development of the site was not felt to be substantiated as the property would still retain a reasonable size garden. The objector had also referred to the impact of the garage on the light to his own garage, however, it was felt that this would be minimal bearing in mind the objector's garage also had a window and door on the other side.

**RESOLVED:**

That Application Number 06/09/0169/F be approved in accordance with Policy HOU18 of the Borough-Wide Local Plan.

**4. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

**(a) Planning Applications Approved in February 2009 Following Determination by Development Control Committee**

The Committee received the Head of Planning and Development's Schedule in respect of applications cleared during February 2009 by the Development Control Committee.

**(b) Planning Applications Cleared in February and March 2009 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 the applications cleared during February and March 2009 under delegated powers.

**5. OMBUDSMAN AND APPEAL DECISIONS**

**(a) Application Number 06/07/0838/F – Provision of Four Additional Apartments on the Second Floor at 165/165A High Street, Gorleston**

Members noted the Ombudsman's decision in relation to the above application.

**(b) Members Noted the Following Appeal Decisions:-**

- Application Number 06/08/0397/CU – Conversion of Hotel to Ten Apartments at Hazelhurst Hotel, 8/9 Norfolk Square, Great Yarmouth.  
.....allowed (Committee decision).
- Application Number 06/08/0474/F – Subdivision of Existing Dwelling to Form Two Residential Dwellings at 23 Rollesby Road, Martham.  
.....dismissed (Officer delegated).
- Application Number 06/08/0145/F – Change of Use from House to Five Residential Flats at 59 Clarence Road, Gorleston.  
.....allowed (Committee decision).

- Application Number 06/08/0275/F – Demolish Existing Flat Roofed Garage and Construct New Garage with Separate Unit of Accommodation at First Floor at Westdene, Church Road, Burgh Castle.  
.....dismissed (Officer delegated).
- Application Number 06/08/0216/F – Vary Condition 4 of Planning Permission 06/02/0443/F to Alter Side Windows at Holland and Barrett, 31 Market Place, Great Yarmouth.  
.....dismissed (Officer delegated).
- Application Number 06/08/0452/CU – 8 Viburnum Way, Gorleston – Retrospective Application to Change Use of Gym to One Bedroom Bungalow.  
.....dismissed (Officer delegated).

**6. CLOSURE OF MEETING**

The meeting ended at 6.45 pm.