

NORTH WALSHAM TOWN COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE
27 June 2017

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 27 June 2017

Present:

Chair:	Cllr M Seward
Members:	
Cllr G Bull	Cllr F Choudhury
Cllr P Edge	Cllr A Fryer
Cllr R Harris	Cllr B Hester
Cllr J Melville	Cllr R Murphy
Cllr S Stuckey	Cllr E Wheeler

The meeting opened at 18:30

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllrs Sims, Turner and Witte.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Cllr Melville reported that she had visited the site of planning application ref. PF/17/0677 (22 Cromer Road) following a letter of objection which was annexed to the minutes of the meeting held on 13 June. She reported that the letter was factually inaccurate.

It was agreed that the objection to planning applications ref. PF/17/0756 and LA/17/0757 should refer to the **area** rather than the **site**, and that the objection from the Town Council stood.

As proposed by Cllr Hester and seconded by Cllr Choudhury, it was **RESOLVED**

That, subject to the amendment to the comment on PF/17/0756 and LA/17/0757, the minutes of the meeting held on 13 June 2017 be agreed as a true record of the meeting.

4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

As proposed by Cllr Hester and seconded by Cllr Choudhury, it was **RESOLVED**

That the meeting be adjourned in accordance with Section 1(2) of the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 to permit public participation.

A note of the contributions from members of the public can be found at Annex A.

As proposed by Cllr Seward and seconded by Cllr Harris, the meeting returned to session.

5. CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The following Planning Applications were considered:

PF/17/0287 6 MARKET STREET

Applicant: Dr R Lysaght

As proposed by Cllr Melville and seconded by Cllr Bull, it was **RESOLVED** by majority vote

To enter no objection to the application.

LA/17/0288 6 MARKET STREET

Applicant: Dr R Lysaght

As proposed by Cllr Bull and seconded by Cllr Melville, it was **RESOLVED** by majority vote

To enter no objection to the application.

**PF/17/0549 LAND BETWEEN AYLSHAM ROAD & GREENS ROAD
(amended application)**

Applicant: MLN (Land & Properties) Ltd, Mr S Rossi, Ms K Beardshaw and Mr N Rossi

It was noted that the Highway Engineer would be attending the meeting of the Town Council following this meeting, and would be available to answer questions on highways matters. However, discussion indicated that the application was premature as it was outwith the existing LDF and the replacement Local Plan had not yet been completed. Serious highways concerns, particularly around safety, also remained. As proposed by Cllr Hester and seconded by Cllr Stuckey, it was **RESOLVED**

To enter strong objections to this application on the grounds the application was premature, it raised a number of very serious highways concerns that required further investigation, and the primary reasons for the NNDC Development Committee rejecting the original application still stood.

PF/17/0648 19A MUNDESLEY ROAD

Applicant: Mr P Miller

As proposed by Cllr Bull and seconded by Cllr Murphy, it was **RESOLVED**

To enter no objection to the application.

PF/17/0851 25 SUFFIELD CLOSE

Applicant: Mr S Wright

As proposed by Cllr Murphy and seconded by Cllr Bull, it was **RESOLVED**

To enter no objection to the application.

PF/17/0889 41 HAPPISBURGH ROAD

Applicant: Mrs A Dunk

As proposed by Cllr Bull and seconded by Cllr Stuckey, it was **RESOLVED**

To enter no objection to the application.

PF/17/0917 HALF MOON COTTAGE, 7 MANOR ROAD

Applicant: Mr A McGuinness

As proposed by Cllr Murphy and seconded by Cllr Melville, it was **RESOLVED**

To enter no objection to the application.

**C/1/2017/1003 BOUNDARY PIT, off SANDY HILLS, OLD YARMOUTH ROAD
(reapplication)**

Applicant: Carl Bird Ltd

It was noted that the road surface was in need of repair due to heavy use by commercial vehicles, which had caused the road to deteriorate and caused some difficulties for North Walsham residents wishing to access the tip. As proposed by Cllr Bull and seconded by Cllr Fryer, it was **RESOLVED**

To enter no objection to the application subject to a condition that the road surface be repaired.

6. NOTICES OF DECISION

Notices in relation to the following applications were received:

ADV/17/0358 (14 CHURCH STREET): Display of hanging sign – CONSENT

PA/17/0425 (SEWAGE WORKS, MARSHGATE): Prior notification of intention to erect 25m high lattice tower with telecommunications antennae and dishes and ground-based apparatus within fenced compound - APPROVED

PF/17/0602 (45 HAMILTON CLOSE): Erection of single storey rear extension – PERMIT.

The meeting closed at 18:58

Summary of discussions during Item 4: Public Participation

Application ref. PO/17/0549

Land between Aylsham Road and Greens Road (amended application)

Mr B Marfleet made the following observations and comments:

- The amended application included a larger roundabout at the junction of Aylsham and Greens Roads, noted in the application as being “phase 1” of the bypass. This was very presumptuous, as this was something for the Local Plan currently being drafted, and a route had not yet been agreed/decided.
- The application also now includes a dropped-kerb footpath within the carriageway. The application claimed this would enable cars travelling at slow speed to pass safely in dual direction traffic.
- The Safer Neighbourhood Action Panel was seeking evidence relating to the whole area impacted by this application. Police had conducted a traffic volume survey and radar speed checks. Residents had been asked about problems including incidents and near misses. Highways had commented that there was little evidence of “bad injury accidents”, which was its basis for not objecting.
- A pedestrian survey would be conducted, and bus, haulage and litter collection companies would also be contacted for their input.

Mrs E Addison supported these comments, adding that there was no spare space for a footpath. She noted that the road safety audit included in the application saw “no problems”, and felt strongly that the developer had not taken the real situation into account including the additional traffic which would be generated by the proposed development. Children and parents would be placed at risk; the proposal amounted to a health and safety risk for everyone.