



PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

10.00am to 11.40am

21 July 2011

Present: Councillors Bradford (chair), Gee (vice chair), Ackroyd, Gayton, Grenville (substitute for Councillor Banham), Haynes (from item 2), Kendrick, Little, Lubbock, Offord and Sands (S)

Apologies: Councillors Banham and George

1. MINUTES

RESOLVED to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 30 June 2011, subject to the following amendment, in relation to item 6, application no 11/00860/T proposed telecommunications mast opposite 161B Bowers Avenue, Norwich, to record that Councillor Haynes voted in favour of refusal and therefore to amend the resolution so that it reads:

RESOLVED with 6 members voting in favour of refusal (Councillors Gayton, Banham, Gee, Haynes, Little and Offord), 2 members voting against refusal (Councillors Kendrick and Lubbock), and 2 members abstaining (Councillors Bradford and Ackroyd) to refuse Application No 11/00860/T proposed telecommunications Mast Opposite 161b Bowers Avenue, Norwich and to ask the head of planning services to draft the reasons for refusal on visible intrusion in a highly visible public area in policy terms.

2. APPLICATION NO 11/00799/F 17 WELSFORD ROAD, NORWICH, NR4 6QA

(Councillor Haynes joined the meeting during this item.)

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

The agent, at the discretion of the chair, explained that much of the proposed development was within permitted development rights and pointed out that condition 3, relating to the use of obscure glazing, applied to the west elevation only.

RESOLVED with 10 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Gee, Ackroyd, Gayton, Grenville, Kendrick, Little, Lubbock, Offord and Sands) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Haynes, having arrived just after the presentation had commenced) to approve Application No 11/00799/F, 17 Welsford Road, Norwich, and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard time limit;
2. Development in accordance with the submitted plans;
3. Rooflights to be obscure glazed on the west elevation and fixed as shown on the amended plans.

(Reasons for approval: The decision has been made with particular regard to saved policies HBE12 and EP22 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan and policy 2 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk. Having considered relevant policy and other material considerations, it is considered that the proposed dormer window and rooflights are of a sufficiently good design and will not have an adverse impact on the neighbouring properties.)

3. APPLICATION NO 11/00819/ET SITE OF PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME IVY ROAD, NORWICH

The development planning team leader presented the report with the aid of plans and slides and, together with the planning development manager, answered members' questions.

During discussion members noted that the natural areas officer had not been requested to comment on this application. The planning development manager said that it was unlikely that wildlife would have become established since 2009 when the original planning permission had been granted. Members considered that an informative to advise the developer of legislation to prevent the harm to the habitat of protected species would be appropriate. Members also requested clarification on condition 15, "drawings", and were advised that it related to the requirement for the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans.

RESOLVED to approve Application No 11/00819/ET site of proposed residential care home, Ivy Road, Norwich and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:-

1. Commencement of development within three years;
2. Details of sample materials;
3. Details of external lighting; windows and ventilation systems;
4. Details of access road, site links, car parking, cycle storage, bin stores
5. Details of boundary treatment, walls and fences
6. Details of landscaping, planting and site treatment works
7. Landscape maintenance
8. Details, installation and maintenance to ensure that at least 20% of its energy requirement is achieved through decentralised and renewable or low-carbon sources
9. Tree Protection Scheme
10. Retention of tree protection
11. Plant and machinery
12. Details of fume and flue
13. Restriction on use to care home only
14. Water efficiency
15. Drawings (development in accordance with the submitted plans).

Informative: to advise the applicant of legislation to prevent harm to the habitat of protected species.

(Reasons for approval: It has been shown that the development, subject to conditions, accords with the changes in policy and material considerations arising since the previous grant of permission in 2009. The redevelopment of this site to provide a care home has previously been accepted in principle. The proposed development would also retain the potential for previously approved employment uses and principle of providing ancillary facilities and appropriate landscape space. The development would relate well to the surrounding area and builds on the ongoing regeneration of the former school site. The proposed scheme is considered acceptable and would represent an appropriate form of redevelopment for the site, which would not have a detrimental impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents and would result in an acceptable form, design and layout of development that would be in keeping with the surrounding character of the area and meet the relevant criteria policy.

The proposals are therefore considered to meet the relevant criteria of PPS1 and PPS3, policies ENG1, ENV7 and WM6 of the East of England Plan, policies 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 9 of the Joint Core Strategy March 2011 and saved policies NE8, NE9, HBE12, HBE19, EP16, EP18, EP20, EP22, EMP1, HOU11, HOU19, SR12, TRA6, TRA7 and TRA8 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, Adopted Version, November 2004 and to all other material considerations.)

4. PERFORMANCE OF THE DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT SERVICE, APRIL - JUNE, 2011 (QUARTER 1, 2011-12)

The planning development manager presented the report and answered members' questions.

During discussion Councillor Lubbock said that she was pleased that the council had reorganised staffing resources to meet the demands of the development management service and acknowledged that there would be a lapse in time before performance indicators were reached. However she pointed out that it was important that the council provided a good service especially if it intended to increase the groups of people that were charged for its services. Councillor Gayton said that the service should be flexible to meet peaks and troughs in demand.

The planning development manager advised that meeting deadlines for processing planning applications was a simplistic performance indicator and that a customer satisfaction model was a better indicator of quality of service. From a customer satisfaction point of view, it was better to negotiate with the applicant to get the application right than refuse an application to meet the deadlines for processing an application and requiring the applicant to submit another application. There also needed to be a balance between taking staffing resources from planning policy to development management to meet demand.

RESOLVED to note the report.

**5. PERFORMANCE OF THE DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT SERVICE:
APPEALS: 1ST APRIL TO 30TH JUNE 2011 (QUARTER 1: 2011 – 2012)**

The planning development manager presented the report and answered members' questions. The committee was advised that notification had been received this month that the planning inspectorate had dismissed the appeals for 16 Grassmere Close and 35 Denton Road.

Councillor Kendrick commented on the low level of appeals. The planning development manager pointed out that this could in part be attributed to the current market conditions which meant that commercial developers were not inclined to fight an appeal.

RESOLVED to note the report.

CHAIR