

difficulties accessing their properties.

- Highway concerns – there were strong concerns about the number of vehicles which would be using Roxley Close. Workers were likely to have vans which would be coming and going throughout the day in an area where children played. Access onto Yarmouth Road was already hazardous and this would increase.
- The proposal was a very poor quality development of a building which had significant local history and was close to a conservation area. A more sympathetic proposal was needed. A comment was made that any proposals for the windows of the building should be sympathetic and ideally replicate the original sash windows.
- The detrimental impact of the proposal on nearby residents' amenity, including privacy, overlooking and noise disturbance, particularly as this was a quiet area.
- A range of more appropriate hotels were located nearby which would be better placed to provide accommodation for workers and there was doubt that there was a need for the type of accommodation proposed to serve the business park.
- The proposal for flats for security/maintenance purposes raised concerns that there was a perceived need for security staff. Hotels did not generally require security flats. Hotels usually had some form of reception which did not appear to be included with this proposal.
- Questions were raised about the ambiguity of the proposals: the application stated it was for a hotel (C1 use) but the plans did not appear to reflect this and, instead, indicated rooms more commonly associated with a hostel/HMO. The proposed room sizes and the lack of facilities available did not support the intended use as a hotel. The lack of demand for this poor quality accommodation would lead to alternative uses being sought including accommodation for asylum seekers, ex-offenders, or HMO/hostel accommodation. Previous use of the premises as an old people's home had ceased because the rooms were unsatisfactory.
- Concerns were raised about the real intended use of the building and fears this was not for hotel residents.
- The standard of accommodation proposed was such that it would not appeal to any worker looking for somewhere to stay; there were no ensuite facilities and no amenities either on site or locality to cater for them.
- Concerns were raised that users of Roxley Hall included young children and vulnerable people and there was little control over who could potentially be staying at the proposed premises.
- A business plan was needed to set out the intended use of the premises and detail the demand/clientele for the facility.

Reference was made to a recent publication from Broadland District Council referring to its work with town and parish councils to support local communities to maintain their areas as highly desirable places to live and work and this application was not in keeping with that aim.

The agent commented that a number of spaces would be allocated for carparking on site and he would assume if there was a problem that planning conditions would be needed to control on-street parking. He added that some workers would travel by train and not all would have use of vans - a point which was challenged by local residents. With regard to the windows, these were UPVC at present and there was no proposal to change these or change the aperture of the existing windows. The agent commented that the applicant had been asked by planning officers to confirm the nature and proposed use of the building and he had confirmed the proposal was for a 17-bedroom hotel including two flats with the aim of providing longer-term lettings for workers, for example, those from the business park taking out 6-month tenancies. It was not a hostel or a HMO. With regard to the standard of the letting rooms, these complied with the guidance given by a Broadland District Council officer.

The Chairman added that if permission was granted for a hotel and use of the premises was in breach of this, enforcement action would be taken and Broadland District Council enforcement officers were active in the area. Some residents raised concerns as to how they would be able to monitor use of the building and identify any misuse.

The Town Clerk commented that, having previously occupied office accommodation at Roxley Hall, the Town Council had an understanding of the issues raised by residents in relation to carparking in the surrounding area and access to Yarmouth Road. Use of Roxley Hall was managed in such a way as to try to minimise disruption to local residents.

It was explained that if a material change to the application was made, a re-consultation would take place. Nearby local residents stated they had not been consulted by the District Council on the original proposals and had instead relied on neighbours and the Town Council to learn of the proposals. The Chairman explained that planners were required to formally consult adjoining neighbours only but that a notice had been erected in the area.

Cllr J Emsell spoke as one of the local district councillors and said that he had serious concerns about the application and its proposed use and would be raising these concerns at the District Council Planning Committee. Whilst workers in London might need accommodation of this nature having regard to the costs of accommodation in the City, there was no demand for this type of accommodation in Thorpe St Andrew. Suitable, affordable hotel accommodation already existed.

Having regard to the fact that those present at the meeting had been asked not to repeat views already expressed, residents were keen this did not imply only a minority present had those views. All present had the same fears and concerns about the proposal and this was demonstrated by a call for a show of hands to confirm agreement to the objections raised and there was a unanimous show of hand amongst the 52 members of the public present.

The Chairman thanked all those present for presenting their views and encouraged them all to make representations to the District Council about the proposal. In

response to a question, he advised that the District Council would be making the decision on the application and the Town Council was a consultee and would be making its views known following the public speaking. The District Council's Planning Committee was a public meeting and there was an opportunity for public speaking on any application by the applicant, objectors, district councillors and the Town Council subject to time limits. He urged those present to make good use of their allocated time and perhaps appoint a spokesperson(s) to speak on their behalf.

5 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

- (i) REF: 20181886 – Roxley House, 68 Yarmouth Road – change of use of office building to 17 bed hotel (C1 use) and 2 security/maintenance flats. Members raised a number of concerns about the proposals:
- The nature and intended the use of the building,
 - the poor standard and small size of the rooms,
 - the lack of suitable parking spaces and the impact of this for on-street parking,
 - lack of amenities/facilities,
 - highway safety,
 - noise disturbance,
 - impact on neighbours,
 - overdevelopment of the site,
 - inappropriate location for a facility of this nature,
 - lack of public transport,
 - the proximity of the property to the conservation area,
 - the proposal was not in keeping with the current local plan which noted the building was one of interest and therefore needed sympathetic use.

Having regard to the views of local residents and the concerns listed above, it was agreed to raise STRONG OBJECTIONS to the application on the grounds that the proposal had serious implications in terms of the lack of suitable parking spaces, the impact on the amenity of adjoining neighbours, the impact on highway safety, the impact of the proposed use of the building on the local area and the proposal was not sustainable.

- (ii) REF: 20181809 – Thorpe St Andrew School – removal of mobile classroom and installation of 2 classroom modular building – Members noted that classrooms would now not be used as music rooms. **NO OBJECTION but query raised about part of the construction being over an existing gas main and request the resiting of the two air conditioning units adjacent to the residential property.**
- (iii) REF: 20190141 – 60 Spinney Road – single storey rear extension with flat roof - **NO OBJECTION.**

BROADS AUTHORITY

BA/2019/0020/TCAA – 15 Thorpe Hall Close - T1 Elder - remove, T2 Common Box – remove, T3 Eucalyptus – partial removal - **NO OBJECTION.**

Approval subject to conditions:

BA/2018/0407/HOUSEH – 6 Ferrymans Court – ground floor single storey extension and balcony. New bay windows front and rear to second floor. New roof lights, regrade rear terrace – **NOTED.**

ENFORCEMENT NOTICES – CONFIDENTIAL

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

DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS

Town Council	4 March 2019
Plans Committee	18 February 2019

The meeting closed at 09:10pm

Signed:

Dated: