

**Thorpe St Andrew Town Council  
Minutes of the Plans Committee meeting held on  
12 June 2017 at 7.30pm**

**1 Present:**

Mr J Fisher (Chairman)  
Mr P Berry Mr F Bowe Mr R Robson Mr D Sears Mr S Snelling

**Apologies:**

Mr N Hancock

**In attendance:**

Mr T Foreman (Town Clerk) Mrs D Matthews (Committee Officer)

There were 18 members of the public present.

**2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

Member	Minute No & Item	Nature of Interest
Mr S Snelling	5. REF: BA/2017/0051/CU – Point House, 42 Yarmouth Road	Had previously been involved in the purchase of the property but no current interest.
Mr P Berry	5. REF: 20170885 – 7 Henby Way	Lived next door.

**3 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 15 May 2017 were agreed and signed as a true record subject to the reference to Chairman in Minute 2 being amended to read Vice-Chairman.

**4 PLANNING ITEMS RAISED BY RESIDENTS**

The following matters were raised by residents present in relation to applications on the agenda:

REF: 20170749 – 18 Stanmore Road

The resident from 16 Stanmore Road raised concerns about the property being in a conservation area which implied the need for preservation of the character of the area. The proposal sought to demolish a habitable bungalow with history. The area was comprised of a mix of different dwellings. The second storey was of a light weight construction which was not in keeping with the conservation area and raised concerns about the ability of the foundations to take the weight of the second storey. The proposal would result in a historical loss to the area and overlooking of other properties including 90% of his property. He invited the Town Council to support these concerns.

The resident from 18A Stanmore Road raised concerns that the application included incorrect statements, for example the claim that there were no specific constraints to the site which was not the case as it was a conservation area and the plans indicated

ownership by the applicant of areas of land which were in the ownership of the Highway Authority. He urged the Town Council to not support the application.

The resident of no 12 Stanmore Road raised concerns about the proposals for on-site parking stating that these were inadequate for a 4-bedroomed property and that cars would be forced to park on the highway which would exacerbate existing difficulties with traffic and pedestrians. He did not believe the carparking provision met the Highway Authority advisory parking standards.

On behalf of the applicants, their architect stated that amended plans had been submitted to the District Council that day which would address some of the issues raised. The boundary of land ownership had been redrawn to exclude land owned by the Highway Authority. He believed that the provision for carparking met the standards required but if needed additional provision could be made within the site. The second storey was of timber construction with a 6mm cladding which was in keeping with other properties in the vicinity and building regulations would ensure the foundations were capable of supporting the second storey. Amendments had been made to the balcony to remove the issue of overlooking and he did not believe that the proposal would overlook adjoining properties to the degree claimed. Planning officers had indicated that a 2-storey property such as that proposed would be in keeping with the area and indeed a bungalow was not. All materials had been chosen to reflect existing buildings.

It was noted that the property was referred to as 3 bedroomed but that there was facility for a fourth bedroom at ground floor. In response to a question, the Chairman pointed out that a further period of consultation would likely take place if amended plans had been submitted.

REF: 20170777 – 76 Thunder Lane

The resident of 78 Thunder Lane raised concerns about the mature trees on the site which would be affected by the proposals.

The resident of 80 Thunder Lane also raised concerns about the impact of the proposals on the trees and concerns about the single access road for two dwellings. The access road was close to her boundary fence and she was concerned about the impact on wildlife and the impact on the fence which might have to be removed. There were issues of overlooking and the bungalows could in the future be converted to houses.

The resident of no 20 Boulderside raised concerns about increased traffic with at least 2 cars per dwelling plus visitors and the potential pollution from fumes.

The applicant stated that the 2 bungalows were aimed at first time buyers/retired people. The existing fence was over 7 ft. tall and so there was no overlooking. A consultant had been commissioned to assess the impact on fauna and flora and there were no plans to disturb the 2 trees on the site which were only Sycamore which was a weed. He did not wish to cause any noise disturbance with cars and was willing to consider a no parking condition to help this.

**5 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

- (i) REF: 20162185 – 16 A/B Harvey Lane – extension and alteration to existing offices. Change of use to 8 flats comprising first floor extension, French balconies at first floor level and ground floor double doors – Members noted that the amended plans had been requested by the Historic Buildings officer to amend the design of the balcony. Members had no concerns about the amendments. **NO OBJECTION.**
- (ii) REF: 20170648 – 288 Plumstead Road – two storey rear extension with single storey lean to and single storey side extension – Mr Berry commented that he had no concerns about the proposal and no objections from the neighbour he had made contact with. He did however raise concerns about potential issues of construction vehicles parking on Plumstead Road which would be dangerous. **NO OBJECTION** and a request be made that construction vehicles park off road during construction.
- (iii) REF: 20170743 – 26 Primrose Crescent – two storey side extension and associated works. There were no concerns raised about this proposal. **NO OBJECTION.**
- (iv) REF: 20170747 – 46 Furze Road – loft conversion, small rear extension and front porch - Mr Robson reported that he had no concerns with the extension and the front porch but was concerned about the proposed dormer windows in the loft conversion which were at roof height. Members supported these concerns about the design of the dormer windows which did not comply with the District Council design guide. **NO OBJECTION** to the extension and front porch but **OBJECTION** to the design of the dormer windows which did not meet the District Council design guide.
- (v) REF: 20170749 – 18 Stanmore Road – proposed demolition of single storey bungalow style residential property. Existing foundations to be retained and utilised where possible. Construction of new two storey private residential property. No change of use. Concerns were raised about the balcony included as part of the proposals. There was also concern that the proposed onsite parking provision was inadequate for the size of the dwelling. Having regard to the fact that amended plans had been submitted it was agreed to **DEFER** consideration of this application pending receipt of the amended plans.
- (vi) REF: 20170770 – Roffensis, 16 Boulderside Close – first floor extension over garage to front of property - Mr Robson confirmed there was no objection from the neighbour at no 14. **NO OBJECTION.**
- (vii) REF: 20170773 – 1 Royalist Drive – single storey side extension- Mr Robson reported no concerns with the proposal. **NO OBJECTION.**
- (viii) REF: 20170777 – 76 Thunder Lane – Erection of 2 no. 3 bed detached dwellings – Mr Fisher commented that this was a rather cramped back garden development. The bungalows were 3 bedroom which did not suggest first time/retirement accommodation and there would be no control over who would purchase the bungalows. Members were concerned about the size of the plot and the long single width access drive. They agreed to raise an **OBJECTION** on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site and inadequate access.

- (ix) REF: 20170785 – Thorpe St Andrew School – proposed demolition of existing classroom block and construction of a new 3 classroom block – Mr Bowe had no concerns about the proposal which was well screened within the school campus. **NO OBJECTION.**
- (x) REF: 20170807 – Oaklands, 89 Yarmouth Road, – change of use from store room to florist – Mr Fisher reported no concerns with the proposal. **NO OBJECTION.**
- (xi) REF: 20170811 – 27 Yarmouth Road - Part demolition, part conversion and addition of two floors to existing office to provide 25 flats with associated car parking and landscaping – The Town Clerk reported that representations had been made by residents to the Town Council about the impact of the height of the proposal on the view across the river and questioning if the proposal was in keeping with the conservation area. Mr Fisher commented that, in accordance with recent government guidance, permitted development rights allowed for the conversion of the current office space to 14 flats without planning permission. The current proposal would see a much more enhanced construction incorporating 25 flats which required planning permission. Having viewed the plans, members did not believe the proposal would be visible across the river to any great extent and would be an improvement on the existing structure. There were however concerns that the proposal did not offer sufficient parking spaces for the number of bed spaces being provided. **NO OBJECTION** subject to additional carparking provision.
- (xii) REF: 20170815 – 75 Desborough Way – single storey side extension – Mr Robson reported no neighbour objections. **NO OBJECTION.**
- (xiii) REF: 20170883 – 14 Thunder Lane – erection of detached garden room – Mr Snelling raised concerns about access to the garden room which the applicant commented was via a public right of way. He commented that the size of the proposed garden room was the full width of the plot and could be used as accommodation as it would have toilet/shower facilities. The applicant who was present was allowed to comment on the proposal stating that the garden room was intended for her use but also to accommodate her uncle and her grandchildren when they came to stay and would include a toilet and shower. It did not include a separate bedroom but a sofa bed would be provided. Members commented that the proposal was more than a garden room and whilst the building was not out of keeping with other buildings in adjoining gardens, there was a need for some control over use of the building. It was therefore agreed to raise **NO OBJECTION** subject to conditions to restrict use of the building to the family of the main residence.
- (xiv) REF: 20170885 – 7 Henby Way – first floor extension over existing garage (revised proposal) Mr Sears reported no concerns about the proposal. **NO OBJECTION.**

#### **PERMISSIONS GRANTED BY BROADS AUTHORITY**

- (xv) REF: BA/2017/0051/CU – Point House, 42 Yarmouth Road – change of use to holiday let – Class C3 - **NO OBJECTION.**

Tree Works – for information only:

REF: BA/2017/0080/TCAA – Rushcutters, 46 Yarmouth Road, tree and stump removal: T1 Conifer – reduce by 2', T2 Fig - remove overhanging branches and those pushing on brick wall, T3 Plum - remove, T4 Pittiporum – reshape and remove deadwood. Noted.

REF: BA/2017/0108/TCAA – 4 Yarmouth Road – T3 and T4 Holly – remove. Noted

The Town Clerk reported that, following complaints from residents of the Island about noise nuisance from works being carried out at The Rushcutters, he had sought agreement from Green King to carry out work at more acceptable times of the day.

**ENFORCEMENT NOTICES – CONFIDENTIAL**

Members noted the update on confidential and non-confidential enforcement matters.

New Process for Plans Applications:

The Chairman asked how Members were managing without paper copies of plans and some Members reported difficulties caused by not having plans available on site. Potential solutions were raised including the purchase of a laptop for use by members when visiting sites or members downloading plans at home. Members agreed to persevere with the current arrangements for the time being in view of the fact that Plans could be obtained from Broadland Council if necessary but that the matter be kept under review.

**DATE OF NEXT MEETINGS**

3 July 2017	Town Council
10 July 2017	Plans Committee

*The meeting closed at 09:00pm*

*Signed: .....*

*Dated: .....*