

## Planning Applications Committee: 17 May 2012

### Updates to reports for consideration.

---

**Application No: 12/00653/F Item 5(2) Page 155**  
**Creation of a community garden including allotments, communal gardens, community building, landscaping, storage facilities, a greenhouse and composting toilets.**

#### **Additional Consultation Response**

The Environment Agency have responded rising no objection subject to conditions. These conditions had already been included within the recommendation on the basis of the Environment Agencies response to the previous withdrawn application. However the Environment Agencies response indicates that condition 17 requiring a safe exit route would no longer be required given the relocation of the building to the south of the site adjacent to the sites main entrance which would be above the 1 in 100 year flood level. Condition 17 can therefore be removed.

The Environment Agency continue to recommend the authority consider imposing a condition for a flood evacuation plan and this has been dealt with at paragraphs 37 to 39 of the report on page 163 and recommended as a condition of any consent.

---

**Application No: 12/00594/FT Item 5(5) Page 221**  
**Installation of a radio base station consisting of a 17.5 metre slim-line column supporting 6 no. 3G antennas, 1 no. equipment cabinet and ancillary development.**

#### **Additional Representations:**

From resident of no. 20 Ivy Road, Norwich

Two additional letters of representation have been received dated 5<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> May 2012. In addition, two E-mails dated 13<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> May 2012.

- (1) The letter dated 5<sup>th</sup> May is a response to additional information (dated 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2012) submitted by the Agent. The detailed points raised relate to the particular nature of the proposed site, the believed differences in the needs of the two operators, the varying claims of coverage and the dismissal of alternative sites.
- (2) The letter dated 8<sup>th</sup> May refers to two valid applications for prior approval for telecommunications masts at Hutchinson Road (Application 12/00959/T) and at North Bound Lane, Farrow Road

(Application 12/00894/T). The concerns raised relate to differences between 3G coverage shown between the three applications and that the coverage for the proposed mast under application 12/00894/T would be as effective for the same area as the Application 12/00594/FT at Guardian Road.

- (3) E-mails dated 13<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> May 2012 relate to the clarification of public notification of the Planning Applications Committee. In particular, the request to individually notify local residents who had signed a standard letter.

From County Councillor Richard Edwards

(4) An E-mail stating that Councillor Edwards had signed the on-line petition and that he agreed with the local residents objections.

## **Response**

Agent's response to resident's letter dated 5<sup>th</sup> May 2012

The Agent highlights previous applications (08/01001/T and 11/00607/T) that were either refused or could not go ahead due to the Council's moratorium on telecommunications development on its own land/ buildings and reiterates why the existing '3' mast at Gypsy Lane was discounted. Emphasis is placed on the fact the proposed mast is needed not only for new/additional coverage but also capacity.

Additional representation response (1)

The Agents response above addresses the points raised by this objection letter and are generally addressed within the officers report.

Additional representation response (2)

The officer report addresses the issues raised by this objection letter in paragraphs 15, 18 and 19. The two applications for prior approval and the current application each need to be determined on their individual merits.

Additional representation response (3)

The Planning Service takes the view that identically worded correspondence from multiple addresses and that arrive in bulk, is treated as a petition, albeit, that separate sheets of paper have been used. Decisions are not made based on the numbers of objectors or supporters attending the Planning Applications Committee meeting, but relate to the planning issues raised.

Additional representation response (4)

The officer report addresses the issues raised by the local residents.

---

---

**Application No: 12/00276/F, 12/00277/L and 12/00319/C** **Item 5(1)**  
**Page 23**

**12/00276/F** Westlegate House 14 - 18 Westlegate, 20 Westlegate, Car Park Rear Of 14 - 18 Westlegate And Lion And Castle Yard, Timberhill Norwich

**12/00277/L** 20 Westlegate, Norwich, NR1 3LR

**12/00319/C** Former Club Building And Part Internal Car Park Structure Rear Of 14 - 18 Westlegate, Norwich

Additional Representations:

(1) From David Gallant:

The suggestion is made to view to tower from the Bell Hotel end of White Lion Street and consider the impact of the 2 additional storeys.

(2) From The Norwich Society:

A model of the whole area would allow greater understanding of the plans. The shields are suggested to be photographically recorded and if successfully dismantled they can be saved. We prefer retention in situ. We do fully support the project although we are not entirely happy with the cladding. Our previous comments on the massing still obtain.

Additional Representation Response:

(1) Paragraphs 72-77 of the officer report respond to Mr Gallant's comment.

(2) Paragraphs 98-101 of the officer report respond to the comments of the Norwich Society.