

**THORPE ST ANDREW TOWN COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF THE PLANS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 30<sup>th</sup> JUNE 2008**

**PRESENT:** Mr J F Fisher (Chairman) Mr S Freeman-Pannett  
Mr D E Eley (Vice Chairman) Mr D R C Spooner  
Miss S Lawn Mr E A Newberry

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Mr S. J. Ford, Town Clerk.

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:** Mrs O M Campbell.

**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:** Mr J. F. Fisher and Mr D. E. Eley declared a non prejudicial interest in planning application 20080833 as friends of a neighbour and remained in the meeting when the application was discussed.

**MINUTES:** The minutes of the meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> May 2008 were approved and signed.

**PLANNING DECISIONS:** The list of recent planning decisions had not been received.

**URGENT MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA BUT PREVIOUSLY**

**NOTIFIED TO THE CHAIRMAN:** Amended plans had been received for 59 Beechwood Drive that had satisfied objections from neighbours. The clerk was delegated authority to raise "No objections" to the amended plan.

Amended plans had been received for a wooden cabin at Yarmouth Road that had been considered at a previous meeting. The amendments addressed concerns that had been expressed previously regarding the size of the building. The clerk was delegated authority to raise "No comments" to the amended plan detailed below.

<b>BA/2008/ 0037/FUL</b>	<b>Moorings opposite 51 Yarmouth Road</b>	<b>Erection of wooden cabin for leisure use</b>
------------------------------	---	---

No comments.

**PLANNING ITEMS RAISED BY RESIDENTS:** None.

**FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:** The Griffin railway bridge would be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

**ENFORCEMENT ACTION**

The contents of the monthly list of enforcement action being taken by the District Council had not been received.

**TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2008 (No 17)**

The Tree Preservation Order at 149 Yarmouth Road was supported and endorsed.

**MERIDIAN WAY BUS GATE**

The removal of the bus gate was not supported. It was considered that the traffic flow that would arise from the four hundred plus vehicles that would access directly onto the roundabout when another two office blocks that had been proposed were constructed had not been adequately taken into account. The current delays with traffic accessing this roundabout from the east would be exacerbated.

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

<b>20080772</b>	<b>66 Howard Close</b>	<b>Single storey side/rear extension</b>
-----------------	------------------------	--

No objections; however any separate occupation of the proposed extension should be integral to the main occupier of the property.

<b>20080781</b>	<b>46 Armstrong Road</b>	<b>Single storey rear extension</b>
No objections.		
<b>20080833</b>	<b>13 Stanmore Road</b>	<b>1. Two storey front extension. 2. Single storey &amp; first floor rear extensions 3. Two storey side extension 4. Demolition of garage</b>
No objections.		
<b>20080846</b>	<b>38 Broom Avenue</b>	<b>Single storey rear extension (Revised proposal)</b>
No objections.		
<b>20080851</b>	<b>38 Hillcrest Road</b>	<b>Replacement conservatory to rear.</b>
No objections.		
<b>20080963</b>	<b>25 Gordon Avenue</b>	<b>Conservatory to rear and new pitched roofs over existing flat roofs</b>

No objections.

<b>BA/2008/0190</b>	<b>Town House Hotel</b>	<b>Erection of four wall signs externally illuminated by existing lights. One wall sign externally illuminated by spotlights. One projecting sign externally illuminated by existing lights. Two wall signs non illuminated and two post signs non illuminated.</b>
---------------------	-------------------------	---

Objections to the style and colour of the proposed new signs. The design and colour of the existing signs is more in keeping with a listed building in a conservation area. There are strong objections to sign number six which is visually intrusive and very unsympathetic to the building. Signs 4, 5 and six are unnecessary; they are visually intrusive and unsympathetic. Consideration should be given to light pollution and any illumination permitted should be from above and be directed downwards. Consideration should be given to the use of low energy units on the illuminated signs such as LED lighting. Any concerns raised by the Conservation Officer would be supported.

<b>BA/2008/0191</b>	<b>Town House Hotel</b>	<b>Replacement signage to a listed building</b>
---------------------	-------------------------	---

Objections to the style and colour of the proposed new signs. The design and colour of the existing signs is more in keeping with the listed building in a conservation area. There are strong objections to sign number six which is visually intrusive and very unsympathetic to the building. Signs 4, 5 and six are unnecessary; they are visually intrusive and unsympathetic. Consideration should be given to light pollution and any illumination permitted should be from above and be directed downwards. Consideration should be given to the use of low energy units on the illuminated signs such as LED lighting. Any concerns raised by the Conservation Officer would be supported.