

Planning Applications Committee: 21 June 2012

Updates to reports for consideration.

Application No: 12/00959/T Page:17
Installation of 1 no. 11.8m high street furniture type telecommunications tower, 1 no. equipment cabinet, 1 no. meter pillar and all ancillary development hereto

Amendment to the report:

A section of the introductory - 2nd paragraph should read:

‘At the last meeting members wanted to defer making a decision until they could see further photos to enable them to determine the level of visual impact caused by the mast.’

Para 36: should also read:

‘Both the operators (Vodafone and Telefonica) have stipulated an absolute minimum operational requirement of at least 10.4 metres to the underside of the antenna. Given these constraints, the Saturn option was discounted by the applicant and the current design solution viewed as the best option.’

Further information:

In response to member concerns, a number of requests were made to the agent in an effort to help members assess the impact of the proposal, including further elevation views from Douglas Haig Road, photos and clarification that the photomontages are accurate.

The agent responded on 7th June confirming that the montages and elevations are an accurate reflection of the features within the immediate vicinity of the site. He also stated that the submitted montages make it very clear that there is planting within the private property to the east, all of which will help to absorb what little potential impact the proposal may have. Whilst you have requested the production of a revised drawing we fail to see the need for this when the detailed montages, specifically view 01, have been provided.

He went further by saying that the submission of 2no. montages for such a simplistic, small scale street furniture proposal is above and beyond what is required for a prior approval application.

Response:

The case officer is in agreement with the agent’s response and also believe that the montages and elevation provided offer a fair reflection of the visual impact of the proposal.

In an effort to assist members, the case officer has taken a series of photos which will be included in the PowerPoint presentation.

Additional Representations:

- Rep 1 – Concern about a rash of telecom masts proposed for the city of Norwich. Norfolk is a rural county and I am surprised that these masts should even be sited in the middle of the city.
- Rep 2 – the letter indicates that they have concerns about the health impact on children, disabled people and residents of Douglas Haig Road. It should be located in a less built up area.

Response:

- See paragraph 15
 - See paragraphs 15-17 of the report
-

Application No: 12/00011/F Page: 57
Retrospective change of use of basement, ground and first floors of premises from shop (Class A1) to a mix of uses including delicatessen, cafe and wine bar (Use Class Sui Generis), with addition of extract vent on rear elevation.

Additional consultation Response:

Environmental Protection Officer:

Has reviewed the updated information supplied by the agent regarding the repositioning of the extract flue and consider this to be a far better position than originally planned. The exit point is now placed as far to the south as possible on the building, which means it now discharges into a more open area behind the application premises and is not directed at the residential building opposite. This should allow adequate dispersal given the limited nature of the food preparation involved.

See paragraphs 20 and 21 in the report.

Application No: 12/00549/F Page: 65
Conversion of offices (class B1) to 47 unit apart-hotel (class C1), including the erection of bin store.

Response from applicant to objections:

Firstly, the apart-hotel will not cater for the 'stag-do / hen-do' type market. As with many other hotels and leisure establishments, the apart-hotel's booking policy will be to not allow group bookings for such parties. As shown in the application plans, the 47 units to be provided all include kitchenette facilities and more furniture than would normally be provided in a budget hotel room (e.g. sofa, arm chairs, desks). Therefore, occupation by more rowdy groups of clientele will not be permitted due to the potential costs incurred by damage to

the room's high quality facilities and furnishings. In light of this, the majority of apart-hotel residents will be business visitors or leisure (often family) visitors to Norwich. (See paragraph 30 in the report)

While it is stressed that the typical hotel residents will not be noisy party-goers, the Applicant is happy to encourage the use of the secondary entrance (as shown on drawing ref. 20512/102) in the late evening so as to minimise activity on St Faiths Lane. Signage and customer information will be installed within the apart-hotel to direct those leaving and entering the hotel in the late evening to do so via the pedestrian access onto Prince of Wales Road. Access to the secondary entrance and boundary gate into the hotel's courtyard will be controlled by resident's room key-cards. The pedestrian access onto Prince of Wales Road is the most direct route to the apart-hotel from the main entertainment and nightlife area of Norwich. As such it is considered that residents eating out etc. within Norwich will naturally take the shortest route back to the hotel. Encouraging residents to use this access will minimise late night pedestrian movement on St Faiths Lane and thus noise and disturbance experienced by existing local residents. (See paragraph 30 in the report)

It is noted that some comments have been received stating that the hotel market is in decline and therefore there is no need for hotel accommodation within Norwich. However, we would challenge this claim. Our experience of the hotel market shows it to be extremely buoyant at present, with increased demand throughout the country. This is reflected in the number of hotels currently being developed nationwide, all of which are being brought forward on the basis of a recognised demand. Furthermore Wales Square is proposed to be developed as an apart-hotel which is an entirely different and an under-supplied hotel segment catering for longer stay, principally corporate and leisure, guests seeking a 'home from home' environment.

Other local residents have raised concerns with regards to the lack of parking provision on site. It is considered that clearly offering no parking for residents (as opposed to a limited number of 'first come, first served' spaces) is the best deterrent to ensure people do not drive to the site in private vehicles. The site is extremely well located in relation to public transport and attractions within Norwich, for example it is approximately:

- 500 metres walk from Norwich railway station;
- 200 metres walk from main bus routes on Prince of Wales Road;
- 350 metres walk from Norwich Cathedral;
- 800 metres walk from Norwich Council's main building.

It is therefore considered that walking is an extremely viable option for most visitors to the site. However, as a sizeable city, Norwich also offers numerous taxi services which will be available to those who may not be able to walk to the railway station or other facilities. (See paragraphs 22-23 in the report)

Finally, the issue of delivery vehicles accessing the site has been raised. While there will be a requirement for some deliveries to site, these will be kept to a minimum. As the apart-hotel will not be offering breakfast, evening meals or any bar / café facilities, there will not be a need for daily food and drink

deliveries. The principal deliveries are laundry and refuse collection. All deliveries will be made during the day and measures can be put in place to ensure that deliveries are not made during peak morning and evening times. (See paragraph 25 in the report)

The applicant has also suggested that level access to a number of the ground floor apartments will be available. This can be conditioned.

Application No: 12/00801/F Page: 77
Installation of boardwalk to facilitate erection of a floating pontoon with a wooden ticket office and access via a gangway.

Amendment to the report:

Under 'Planning History' on page 78 of the report it quotes one of the Broads Authority conditions as 'Restricting Hours of operation (8.00am – 11.30pm). This was quoted from the Broads Authority report but this was amended in the minutes of the meeting so that the hours of operation on the decision notice are 8.00am till 10.00pm.

Response from applicant to the objection from anglers:

Applicant considers that the drawings show that a large proportion of the existing platform has been left accessible to ensure anglers can continue to pursue their activities. They are also prepared to offer the use of the pontoon to anglers free of charge. (See paragraphs 13 and 21 in the report)

Application No: 11/02104/O Page: 85
Outline application with details of access only (and indicative details relating to layout, scale, appearance and landscaping), for proposed redevelopment of vacant riverside site to provide a minimum of 208no. and maximum 250no. flats, maximum 140 car parking spaces and 190 m2 of commercial office space (B1a Use Class) with associated external works including the provision of a Riverside Walk and access road [- revised proposal description and extra information received].

Additional Representations:

The period of re-consultation for the public and stakeholders / consultees was held subsequent to the changes in description and submission of additional indicative drawings as discussed at paragraphs 44-46 of the report. This re-consultation period will end on 20th June. The following comments have been received:

- Natural England confirm that the revisions will not pose further or significant risk to those environmental assets considered initially. Previous comments made still stand (see paragraph 93 in the report).

Further information:

The applicant has submitted a draft design option for the access road, showing a linear route with small pavement islands where trees could be planted. This is not considered appropriate for either transportation purposes

(it does not help control speed sufficiently) no landscaping and amenity (the trees could be distributed better and a shared-surface arrangement should be investigated further, allowing easier access for pedestrians and cyclists), and does not go far enough to address the concerns described at paras 124-126. The plans do not remove the need for further work, required by condition 15.

The applicant has also been in discussions with architects for Taylor Wimpey, the developers of the adjoining Riverside Heights / NR1 site, regarding the design of the river edge to both sites from the Carrow Road bridge to the easternmost point of this application site. Designs remain confidential at this stage, but the initial suggestions are that at the interface areas should be integrated successfully and both parties seem to be thinking along the same lines in terms of materials palettes. The draft proposals do not constitute a formal part of the application submission but demonstrates that treatment of the riverside master planning concepts are coming forward in a joined up way which gives the LPA more encouragement. Further conditions applications will still be required as described at paragraphs 25, 153-157, 190 and 198.

Changes to conditions

The applicant has also suggested areas where conditions should be clarified, merged or removed. The list below describes the officer's proposed amendments to the list of conditions at pages 122-124:

- Condition 12 – Phasing plan affects this development site only, including the riverside walk and access road alongside the houses;
- 13 – Phasing plan to be required only for length outside the application site;
- 14 – Phasing plan for estate road delivery is for roads outside application site;
- 14 & 15 – to clarify, 14 is for timescales of when roads will be provided, 15 is for content and construction details of this site's access road;
- 14 – condition to be revised to include: "for delivery of 'adoptable standard' of access and estate roads..."
- 19 – amend to require reports only for use of imported soils;
- 37 – although a 'green wall' is suggested in the report as being a good idea by the Broads Authority (see para 68), the applicant has advised that it may not be provided [it was never a formally-proposed detail], so the condition is revised to say "including any possible green wall treatments" instead;
- 38 – to be merged into condition 12;
- Conditions 53 onwards are almost all subject to the agreement of earlier conditions regarding design details. Although the objective of these later conditions will remain, some or all may be moved and added into the end of each relevant earlier condition as appropriate, to reduce overall condition numbers.