



**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

**9.00 a.m. to 5.30 p.m.**

**11 December 2008**

Present: Councillors Bradford (Chair), Llewellyn (Vice-Chair), Collishaw (to end of item 6), Bearman, Driver (to end of item 12, other Council business), Little (S) (not on site visit), Lubbock and Stephenson (to end of item 12, other Council business)

Apologies: Councillor Little (S) (for site visit only) and Councillors Banham, Lay and George

**1. SITE VISIT – ANGLIA SQUARE**

The Committee undertook a site visit in respect of Application Nos 08/00974/F and 08/00975/C - Anglia Square.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Bearman said that as she was not present for the presentation on Application No 07/01427/O – Land at Dowding Road on 13 November 2008, she had not attended the site visit in respect of this application on 8 December 2008 and would therefore not be taking part in the determination of this application.

**3. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 13 November 2008.

**4. APPLICATION NOS 08/00974/F AND 08/00975/C - ANGLIA SQUARE**

The Head of Planning and Regeneration Services and the Senior Planner (Major Developments) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans. Members were advised that subsequent to the report's production the Environment Agency had removed its objection to planning permission being granted, provided a condition was imposed requiring a scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water drainage to be agreed with the planning authority before commencement of the development and that this scheme should be constructed before the commencement of any occupancy of any part of the proposed development. The Committee was also advised that a typographical error in paragraph 198 of the report should be amended by deleting the word 'enhance' from the third sentence and replacing it with the words 'detract from'. It was also proposed that the S106

item relating to the provision of land for roads may not be required as this could eventually be arranged through alternative procedures. It was also proposed that additional conditions should be applied to any approval of the Conservation Area Consent, to require (i) works to commence within 5 years, (ii) a contract for the redevelopment of the site to be in place prior to demolition, and (iii) a site management plan to be approved to include waste and traffic management. Members were also advised that a health facility would only be provided dependent on there being a demand for it. Two further letters of representation had been received from members of the public, raising the following concerns in addition to those described in paragraphs 41-43 of the report:

- Block A and its relationship to the city centre;
- Impacts on amenity of increased pedestrian movements down Calvert Street;
- The pedestrian crossings over St Cripsin's Road;
- Cycle storage stand materials;
- Cycling through the square;
- Canopy and benches in the Square should be retained;
- Pedestrian crossings over Magdalen Street and Pitt Street;
- Art should be provided in the scheme;
- Environmental standards of the employment and retail construction;
- Sustainability levels for the residential developments;
- The type of Travel Plans to be used;
- Need for pedestrian priority measures to be used at junctions and crossings;
- Using solar-power for lighting;
- Maintenance of open spaces.

These additional concerns were addressed by the Senior Planner (Major Developments) in a verbal update to members. The Head of Planning and Regeneration Services, the Senior Planner (Transport) and the Senior Planner (Major Developments) responded to detailed questions from members on the report.

A member of the public then addressed the Committee about an issue unrelated to this application and was asked to refrain. He then left the room.

Councillor Holmes (Ward Councillor for Mancroft Ward) then addressed the Committee and said that residents supported the scheme overall, he outlined some of his concerns which included the gyratory road system and the effect that this would have on pedestrians and residents to the north west of Anglia Square; the reduction of the affordable housing percentage to 20%; that the combined heat source system if extended to the whole site instead of just the food store would bring significant energy efficiency savings; and that the cycling and pedestrian routes were very important.

The applicant then responded in support of the application for the mixed use regeneration of Anglia Square. Public consultation and workshops had identified the site as the preferred location for a food store. All of the affordable housing would be much needed family housing. The Square would be a public focal point and the new north/south route and the Calvert Street and Botolph Street routes would link the communities of St Augustine's Street and Magdalen Street. The scheme included an enhanced bus facility and a family medical centre.

Detailed discussion ensued in which members were advised that the conditions attached to planning permission being granted alleviated most of their concerns. Councillor Stephenson suggested that there should be greater density of housing on

the site, suitable for a city centre site. The reduction in the percentage of affordable housing was a concern for some members but another called for a 'pragmatic approach' in the current economic climate. Concern was expressed that only half of the large foodstore would be food and about the effect on other retailers. Councillor Lubbock considered that the foodstore would be the 'economic driver of the development. Members generally welcomed the pedestrian and cycle links and the public square. Councillor Lubbock said that although she had not been in favour of the gyratory road system but was now comforted that the design would make it more pedestrian and cycle friendly and that air quality would be improved. Councillors Llewellyn and Little expressed concern that the energy efficiency standards of the scheme were less than those encouraged in the emerging Northern City Area Action Plan and called on the developers to reuse materials during construction. An amendment to condition relating to energy efficiency was agreed. Councillor Stephenson suggested that public works of art should be incorporated into the scheme. Councillor Lubbock suggested that artwork similar to the 'totem pole' at Gildencroft Park would be appropriate.

Councillor Driver proposed that the conditions be amended to ensure that the siting of the housing 'Block F' to the west of Edward Street was fixed in the plans with the other blocks. It was noted that the opening times of the public conveniences might be restricted to prevent anti-social behaviour.

**RESOLVED**, with 5 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Lubbock, Bearman, Collishaw and Driver), with 3 members abstaining (Councillors Stephenson, Little and Llewellyn) to approve Application Nos 08/00975/C and 08/00975F – Anglia Square and:-

- (1) grant conservation area consent for the demolition of the elements proposed within the Conservation Area Consent application 08/00975/C, subject to the following conditions;
  - (i) works to commence within 5 years;
  - (ii) a contract for the redevelopment of the site to be in place prior to demolition;
  - (iii) a site management plan to be approved by the Local Planning Authority to include waste and traffic management.
  
- (2) grant planning permission subject to the approval of the Government Office for the East of England in accordance with the Shopping Direction and the signing of a Section 106 Agreement that will include provision for a financial reappraisal of the scheme and associated community contributions following completion of the development, to include the following minimum contributions:
  - (a) Provision of land required for the construction of the link road;
  - (b) 40 dwellings for affordable housing;
  - (c) £195,000 for transport improvements;
  - (d) £130,000 for open space improvement and play equipment provision;
  - (e) £160,000 for local education demands;
  - (f) £40,000 for community facility works;

and the following conditions:-

Confirmation of approval:-

1. The siting of Blocks B, C, D, E and F, and all ground floor units shall be fixed to the positions approved under the submitted plans.

2. Fixed heights of blocks B, C, D and E.
3. Block F shall contain a minimum of 18 x family houses and its layout shall facilitate access to the Rose Yard / Leonard Street area and through its siting and design shall have regard to the safety and security of the children's play area at Leonard Street.
4. Reserved Matters should ensure the provision of a D1 health centre within Block E to include a minimum floorspace as indicated.
5. In the event that the site to the north of Edward Street as suggested for Class D1 Use is developed, the use within Use Class D1 shall be restricted.
6. The detailed elements to be commenced within 5 years.

Timing and delivery:-

7. Submission of Reserved Matters applications within 3 years.
8. Commencement of Reserved Matters within 5 years.
9. The development shall be constructed across three development blocks, which do not need to be built in a particular sequence or be dependent on delivery of either of the other elements:
  - (a) The Anglia Square central area;
  - (b) The housing permitted under Block F;
  - (c) The potential Surrey Chapel.
10. All the conditions to follow shall apply to all three of the construction blocks.
11. The foodstore shall not open until the following criteria have been met:
  - (a) Residential units in Blocks B and C to be externally completed;
  - (b) All residential units in Block F to be completed in readiness for occupation;
  - (c) All ground-floor retail units to be finished to the "practical completion of the landlords works";
  - (d) All hard landscaping to be completed to an agreed plan;
  - (e) The car parking beneath the foodstore shall open to the public concurrently with the opening of the foodstore;
  - (f) Land has been made available for the construction of the link road;
  - (g) The whole Gyratory scheme should be 'substantially complete'.
  - (h) Public toilets should be provided to an agreed location and size.
  - (i) The subway under St Crispin's Road should remain available for use until suitable replacement surface crossings are available for public use, and these shall be required within 6 months of the opening, and the subway closed within 6 months of the completion of the crossings;
  - (j) All soft landscaping works shall be completed within 12 months with the exception of the area to the east of the square.

There shall be no occupation of the development until:

12. The Pitt Street pedestrian and cycle routes are constructed and available for use.
13. The land required for the bus interchange facilities on Edward Street has been made available.
14. On-street service bays agreed and available for use.
15. Covered and secure cycle and motorcycle parking for staff has been provided and more generally available public cycle and motorcycle parking provided for each part of the development.
16. The dog-leg on Anne's Walk has been removed and full, unimpeded access from Magdalen Street made possible.
17. Details of the engineering has been submitted and agreed with the LPA and, thereafter constructed, for:
  - (a) All vehicular access and egresses

- (b) ramps and gradients into the site
  - (c) bridge works onto the St Crispin's Road flyover
  - (d) gates used across the accesses where they join public highways
18. Occupation of each 'construction block' until servicing and turning areas provided and available for use to an agreed scheme.
19. Bin stores for household refuse and recycling provided within the designated storage areas.
20. CCTV coverage and management plan detailed and implemented across the whole site.

Travel Plans:

21. Both an Interim and a Full Travel Plan will be required, and be subject to:
- (a) No occupation on site until the Interim Travel Plan has been submitted and agreed and implemented;
  - (b) Full Travel Plan to be submitted within 12 months of first occupation;
  - (c) Full Travel Plan to be implemented as per the approved scheme and its timetables and shall be reviewed and modified on a regular basis.

Prior to commencement of development:

22. Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water drainage incorporating details outlined in the FRA by Clarke Bond, ref. EL/00936/R3 Rev E, dated August 2008, including a hydrobrake discharging at 646l/s and attenuation storage of 1000m<sup>3</sup> shall be submitted and agreed, in writing, with the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be constructed and completed before occupancy of any part of the proposed development."
23. Landscaping scheme to be submitted, to include, but not be exclusive to:
- (a) All hard and soft treatments, including performance facilities in the Square and to include temporary measures for the void created by the removal of Gildengate House;
  - (b) External lighting plans;
  - (c) Street furniture;
  - (d) Off-street signage;
  - (e) Public art;
  - (f) Notice board area for community use within the Square;
  - (g) Landscaping materials;
  - (h) Screening walls proposed adjacent to the foodstore access ramp and in the area vacated by the demolition of Gildengate House;
  - (i) Means of enclosure;
  - (j) Surfacing materials for roads, paths and cycle paths;
  - (k) Any proposed water feature designs and management plans.
24. Arboricultural Method Statements for both works to existing trees and new planting of trees proposed in the landscaping plan.
25. Landscaping maintenance will be required for 5 years, to include replacement planting of any losses within 12 months of their removal.
26. Site investigation works needed for feasibility of Pitt Street tree planting.
27. Subject to construction investigations into the feasibility for planting along Pitt Street, and subsequent written agreement by the LPA, any off-site landscaping works needed shall be subject to an approved scheme and provided within 2 planting seasons of any subsequent approval.
28. Parish markers on site shall be salvaged and repaired and restored.
29. Further archaeology works needed to a plan agreed with the LPA and subject to the following criteria:

- Construction works to be monitored under archaeological supervision and any finds recorded if necessary;
  - Particularly significant archaeological finds on site should be recorded, interpreted and published if considered necessary;
  - If necessary, excavations works shall be tied to a specific brief and methodology to be provided by the LPA and archaeological authority.
30. Construction vehicle access and servicing arrangements to be agreed.
  31. Construction traffic management plan to be approved and implemented.
  32. Construction vehicle wheel washing facilities to be provided.
  33. Fire hydrants to be provided to an agreed scheme and specification.
  34. Sound proofing measures for construction process.
  35. Dust suppression measures for construction and demolition process.
  36. Noise mitigation measures concerning superstore access and servicing.
  37. Noise mitigation and glazing specification for Edward Street dwellings, with glazing and ventilator unit specifications to include manufacturers sound reduction ratings.
  38. Surface water drainage scheme to be submitted and approved.
  39. Foul water disposal scheme to be submitted and approved.
  40. Public sewerage system schemes to be submitted and approved.
  41. Water efficiency measures to be submitted, approved and implemented.
  42. Energy saving and generation measures to be submitted, approved and implemented.
  43. Site investigations to be undertaken to assess risks of contamination on site and risk to receptors off site, with further contamination reported to Council and remediated as per a revised and approved scheme that shall include provision for longer-term monitoring and mitigation management.
  44. Contamination management plan to be submitted and approved.
  45. Construction waste management plan to be submitted and approved and adhered to, and shall include:
    - (a) waste materials being recycled;
    - (b) disposal of contaminated material to licensed sites;
    - (c) re-use within the site construction where possible.
  46. Environmental Management Plan to be submitted and approved.
  47. Plan to demonstrate the continued provision of cycle and pedestrian routes into and through the Square during demolition and construction to be submitted and approved.

#### Retail criteria

48. A minimum of 2,350 sq m of convenience retail goods shall be provided at all times within one single unit within the foodstore block.
49. Minimum requirement for the provision of a specified proportion of units of up to 200 sq m across the site.
50. Minimum requirement for the provision of a specified proportion of units of between 200 and 500 sq m across the site.
51. Prior to occupation, proposals for a revised retail frontage zone at ground floor level shall be submitted to and agreed by the LPA.
52. A minimum of 70% of the revised Anglia Square ground-floor retail frontage zone (as agreed under Condition 50) shall be used for A1 Use Class retailing.
53. Environmental health and licensing:-
54. Opening hours to be restricted for A3, A4, A5 and D1 uses.
55. Management Plan for the Square to be agreed, to include the following:
  - (a) Outdoor seating for A3, A4 uses

- (b) Use of Square for events and performances
  - (c) Servicing arrangements for all units
56. Air quality mitigation to include air ventilation and glazing details.
  57. Details of all the plant and machinery, including the CHP and air source heat pumps, and their sound reduction measures and screening proposals are to be submitted and approved.
  58. A final waste management plan to be agreed.
  59. A servicing management plan to be agreed, to include times and access.
  60. Public toilets should be available for use between 08:00-18:00 Mon-Sat and 11:00-17:00 Sundays.
  61. Landscaping proposals for the Square shall include electricity connections and other services necessary to facilitate outdoor events productions.
  62. Any inclusion of a public television screen within the reserved matters applications shall be subject to the submission and approval of a management plan to include broadcasting content and hours of operation.
  63. Storage of materials on site to be controlled.
  64. Electric substations to be repositioned in a location and to a design specification submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.
  65. Recycling bins and litter bins to be provided in the public area to an approved plan, and should be retained in perpetuity.
  66. Car parking and access:-
  67. Car parking provision to accord with the details set out in the Transport Assessment with the following inclusions:
    - The amount of car parking shall at no time exceed 961 spaces.
    - 197 shall be provided for private residential parking.
    - The closure of the 118 surplus spaces shall be carried out before occupation of the foodstore and remains such until agreed otherwise.
  68. All the spaces within the foodstore car park, and the spaces retained in the existing multi-storey car park as public spaces shall be available to the general public irrespective of their patronage of a particular retailer or other business. A minimum of 5% of these spaces shall be marked and allocated for disabled drivers.
  69. A car parking management plan shall be submitted and approved prior to first occupation of the car park, to include:
    - (a) Tariffs (which shall favour short and medium stay use over long stay);
    - (b) Opening hours;
    - (c) Permitted users;
    - (d) Restrictions enforcement;
    - (e) Availability of access from Pitt Street into the foodstore car park.
  70. There shall be no car parking at first floor level in the newly-created area where Gildengate House would have stood.
  71. Car park surface water drainage shall pass through a petrol and oil interceptor, built to a scheme to be approved.
  72. Accesses shall be constructed with adequate drainage to prevent surface water run-off onto the public highway, built to a scheme to be approved.
  73. All public access into and out of the Square shall not be closed off.
  74. Design criteria:
  75. All glazing on ground-floor unit frontages to be blast resistant to a specified standard unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA.
  76. Roof top garden management plans to be submitted and approved prior to residential occupation of the relevant accommodation blocks, and shall include the use, access to and maintenance arrangements.

77. Trees and landscaping:
78. Prior to removal of trees, a biomass content assessment is needed to inform landscaping proposals.
79. The comprehensive landscaping scheme shall demonstrate an overall increased biomass and shall provide green links (including along Pitt Street and St Crispin's Road) in the general areas indicated in plans.
80. Green wall criteria to be submitted and agreed if site investigations require it to be necessary following Pitt Street investigations.
81. Planting schemes shall detail:
  - the species;
  - size at planting;
  - detailing of planting pits;
  - proposals for underground landscaping;
  - management plans for landscape maintenance, irrigation, pruning etc.

(Reasons for approval:- The recommendations have been made with regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, including policies of the adopted East of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy, saved policies of the adopted Norfolk Structure Plan and saved policies of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, relevant Planning Policy Guidance, Planning Policy Statements, Supplementary Planning Guidance and Supplementary Planning Documents.

The demolition works proposed within the Conservation Area are justified as being necessary to the completion of the wider redevelopment, the proposal for which will provide redevelopment along the principles of 'saved' Local Plan policy SHO5 and CC7 to reinforce the vitality and viability of the Large District Centre allocation made under policy CC6. It is broadly consistent with the mix of uses required by CC7 and provides a residential proposal in excess of the allocations under policy HOU9, providing a higher density city centre residential development as part of a comprehensive mixed use scheme.

Having considered all of the above and other material planning considerations, it is considered that subject to the conditions listed and the contents of the Section 106 Agreement that the proposals accord with the provisions of the Development Plan by reinforcing the viability and vitality of the designated Large District Centre, offering improved access to services and local facilities and regeneration of the wider area.)

## **5. APPLICATION NO 07/01427/0 - LAND AT DOWDING ROAD, TAYLORS LANE AND DOUGLAS CLOSE**

(Councillor Bearman left the room for the duration of this meeting.)

The Senior Planner (Development) (Outer) referred to the presentation at the previous meeting and the subsequent site visit undertaken by the Committee on 8 December 2008 and said that the applicant had amended the application so that layout was now a reserved matter. The layout on the plans was therefore indicative. Old Catton Parish Council had given notification that it no longer wanted the part of Taylors Lane just outside this site to be adopted. It was recommended that the developers changed the name of the other part of Taylors Lane to avoid confusion. The internal roads on the site were all adopted and new footpaths would be put in.



The Council's Tree Protection Officer considered that the oak tree was dangerous and was satisfied that it could be removed. The Senior Planner and the Planning Development Manager answered members' questions. A revised planning showing the correct boundaries of the site was circulated.

A resident then addressed the Committee with his concerns about this development using urban greenspace, increased traffic and the fact that the layout of the houses was 'indicative'. He called on the City Council to take over the management of the green areas.

The agent on behalf of the applicant then spoke in support of the application and explained that the application had been amended so that layout was indicative in order to resolve the questions that had been raised as to the retention of the hedgerow and to turn around the houses in order to protect the privacy of existing residents. The cycle path had been required by officers. There would be no objection to renaming that part of Taylors Lane that was within the development site. The green spaces were privately owned and landscaping was a reserved matter for the detailed planning application.

Discussion ensued in which members stated their support for the full retention of both sides of the hedgerow and sought further explanation about the indicative layout. Councillor Stephenson expressed concern about the loss of the green space in area C of the proposals and the effect of this part of the amenity of neighbouring properties. The importance of the green links for biodiversity was noted but the maintenance of these by the Council was a matter for the Head of Community Services. Members also discussed play provision in the area and it was suggested that some play equipment could be provided on the site for small children.

**RESOLVED**, with 6 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Lubbock, Little, Llewellyn, Collishaw and Driver) and 1 member voting against (Councillor Stephenson) to approve Application No 07/01427/O L – Land at Dowding Road, Taylors Lane and Douglas Close and grant planning permission subject to:-

(1) signing of a S106 to include the following:

1. Affordable Housing as required by HOU4 and the Affordable Housing SPG.
2. Children Play Space a contribution of £1104 per child bed space for off-site provision in accordance with policies SR4, SR7 and the Open Space and Play Space SPD.
3. Provision and management of Public Open Space (land to remain in private ownership).
4. Transportation matters in line with policies TR11 and the transportation contributions SPD:
5. Footpath link contribution to enable the link to the adjacent areas (sum to be determined)
6. Library contributions as required by HOU6.

(2) the appropriate conditions:-

1. Standard outline time limit;
2. Reserved matters shall relate to the Appearance and Landscaping of the proposed development;

3. Details of approved plans;
4. Submission of a landscaping details, including all hard and soft treatments, also including lighting plans and the provision of offsite landscaping on highway land;
5. Landscaping to be maintained and any new trees/shrubs lost to be replaced;
6. Submission of an Arboricultural method statement;
7. Scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water drainage to be submitted;
8. Scheme for the provision and implementation of foul water drainage to be submitted;
9. Scheme for the provision and implementation of pollution control to be submitted;
10. All surface water from the car park to be passed through a petrol/oil interceptor;
11. Scheme to manage contamination to be submitted;
12. Scheme for water, energy and resource efficiency measures to be submitted;
13. Details for the provision of 10% of the sites energy from decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources;
14. Scheme for provision of sufficient capacity in the public sewerage system to meet the needs of the development to be submitted;
15. Details and specifications for all plant and machinery to be submitted;
16. Submission of a Waste management plan;
17. Submission of a servicing management plan, including details of proposed delivery times;
18. Submission of full details of cycle storage;
19. Submission of a fire strategy including details for the provision of fire hydrants;
20. Vehicular access to be constructed to Norfolk County Council Specification;
21. Servicing, turning areas to be provided prior to first occupation;
22. Scheme for drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the highway;
23. Construction traffic management plan to be submitted;
24. Construction traffic is to comply with the details of the construction traffic management plan agreed;
25. Submission of a bat survey;
26. Submission of a reptiles and amphibian survey.

Note. The above conditions are paraphrased and it may be necessary to merge or split some of the above conditions although the principle content will remain the same.

(Reasons for approval:- Having considered all of the above and other material planning considerations it is considered that subject to the conditions listed and the contents of the S106 agreement that the proposals are inline with the provisions of the Development Plan. The proposal would result in an appropriate and satisfactory form of development that would enhance this site. As such, the proposal would comply with SR3, HOU4, HOU13, NE3, NE8, EP16, EP18, EP20, EP22, SR1, SR2, SR6, SR12, TRA6, TRA7, TRA11, TRA14 and TRA15 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan Adopted Version, November 2004 and policy ENG1 of the East of England Plan, Adopted May 2008.

The proposal is considered to make more efficient use of the land by introducing additional housing and provide sustainable development in line with policy guidance within PPS1 and PPS3. It is also considered that the proposals would enhance this part of the City and improve the buildings relationship with the surrounding public realm. Consideration has also been paid to the Government guidance provided in PPG17.)

(The meeting adjourned for lunch at 1.20 p.m. and reconvened with all members present at 1.45 p.m.)

## **6. APPLICATION NO 08/00980/U – 58 PRINCE OF WALES ROAD**

The Senior Planner (Development) (Inner) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans. One further letter of objection on the grounds that the proposal would have an adverse affect on safety and that it would be more likely to draw people to the area from other parts of the city. A further letter supporting the application had also been received commenting that the additional taxi firm would be beneficial to the safety of the area. The Central Norwich Citizens' Forum had also written commenting that refusing the application would increase the time that people remained in the area and as such the likelihood of antisocial behaviour. The letter commented that as there was a separate base at Whiffler Road there would be no need for cabs to wait in this area only to stop and pick up as they do at the moment and therefore traffic congestion would not be significantly increased. The letter also comments that the provision of a waiting room and marshal would increase safety. On this basis the Forum supports the application. A letter from the Norwich Hackney Trade Association, which had been sent to members of the Committee, had also just been received. This commented that the in practice private hire vehicles would pull up on the section of double yellow lines between the two parking bays on the north side of Prince of Wales Road which would hinder egress from the hackney carriage taxi rank. The Association also raised concern over misuse of the taxi bays and congestion by parking on the street and that enforcement was insufficient to control this. The use of Whiffler Road as a base for cabs was also questioned as being impractical. The Council's Community Safety Manager had provided further statistics, for the 11 month period for October 2007 to August 2008, there were there were 507 acts of antisocial behaviour in the area between the hours of 9.00 p.m. and 4.00 a.m. Although based on the statistics supplied there was no evidence that the behaviour was in any way linked to private hire taxi firms.

Representatives of the Norwich Hackney Carriage Association and the Transport and General Workers Union then addressed the Committee outlining their objections stating that their opposition was not based on concern about loss of trade but out of concern to ensure that the 'unhindered operation of our members'. The objections included the use of the taxi bays and congestion caused by parking preventing access by emergency vehicles, anti-social behaviour and that parking enforcement was not available after 1.00 a.m. which was also the busiest time. Another objector then addressed the Committee objecting on the grounds of lack of parking in the area and the difficulty for the space for private hire vehicles to wait whilst picking up a job.

A representative of the Central Norwich Citizen's Forum then addressed the Committee in support of the application. There were over 17,000 people in the city

on a Friday and Saturday night and it was important to facilitate people leaving and entering the city as quickly and safely as possible.

The applicant responded and explained how the taxi firm would operate. His company already picked up people in Prince of Wales Road and he referred to the previous application in Rose Lane which had been refused on the grounds that it would have an adverse effect on the residents. This building was in the middle of the evening economy area. The firm had a good record of safety measures such as voucher systems, text booking and was one of the only ones prepared to pick up fares from the SOS bus.

Discussion ensued in which members considered the location of the parking bays and existing private hire taxi firms on Prince of Wales Road. Although members considered that the safe dispersal of people was important they were concerned about the lack of parking adjacent to the building and road safety. Councillor Driver pointed out that the road was very narrow near to the building and that the proposal was in the wrong place on Prince of Wales Road.

Councillor Lubbock proposed and Councillor Driver seconded that the application should be refused on the grounds of lack of parking adjacent to the office and concerns that this would be detrimental to road safety.

**RESOLVED** with 5 members voting in favour of refusal (Councillors Bradford, Lubbock, Little, Llewellyn and Driver), 1 member voting against (Councillor Stephenson) and 2 members voting abstaining (Councillors Bearman and Collishaw) to refuse Application No 08/00980/U - 58 Prince of Wales Road and ask the Head of Planning and Regeneration Services to draft reasons for the refusal on the grounds of lack of parking and would have a detrimental impact on road safety.

(Reasons for refusal:- Due to the lack of parking or pickup facilities for private hire taxis in the vicinity the operation of the site could impede traffic flow along Prince of Wales Road and have a detrimental impact on highway safety contrary to criteria (v) of saved policy EMP1 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan and the objectives of PPG13.)

(Councillor Collishaw left the meeting at this point.)

**7. APPLICATION NO 08/00590/F – LIND BMW SITE, BER STREET (84-110 AND 147-153 BER STREET)AND MARINERS LANE CAR PARK, MARINERS LANE**

The Team Leader (Development) (Inner) presented the report with the aid of slides, plans and diagrams showing the elevations of the proposed development, and answered questions. He reported that a further letter of representation had been received and that most of the following issues raised had been covered in the report: loss of daylight and privacy of neighbouring properties; concerns about security from the entrance into Mariners Lane, loss of general amenity; parking and fears about subsidence from the chalk works. Members were advised that the Tree Protection Officer was not concerned about the loss of 11 trees on the site which would be replaced as part of the landscaping. Members were advised that the energy efficiency statement had been enhanced and would include solar water heating, photo-voltaic panels, and possibly air-source heat pumps. An additional condition to

ensure that the developers complied with the 10% energy efficiency standard from renewables was suggested.

A local resident then addressed the Committee outlining her objections to the scheme which concerns about loss of light, privacy and access.

During discussion members were advised that the City Centre Conservation Appraisal document did not identify the retention of the façade of the older buildings fronting Ber Street as necessary. Members considered that Ber Street was becoming more residential and that this development reflected the existing one for over 55s. Councillor Lubbock suggested that the appearance of the scheme would be softened by the planting of street trees. Councillor Stephenson considered that the developers could achieve more than the 10% reduction in energy efficiencies.

**RESOLVED** to approve Application No 08/00590/F – Lind BMW Site, Ber Street (84-110 and 147-153 Ber Street) and Mariners Lane Car Park, Mariners Lane and grant planning permission subject to:-

- (1) the signing of a S106 agreement to include:-
  - (a) a transportation contribution or equivalent highway works as set out in an approved scheme;
  - (b) affordable housing provision on site;
  - (c) child play space contribution;
  - (d) open space contribution;
  - (e) funding alterations to TRO on Ber Street;
  - (f) heritage interpretation;
  
- (2) the appropriate conditions, including the following:
  1. Commencement within 3 years;
  2. Samples of materials (including colours);
  3. Boundary walls and fences;
  4. Prior details to include
    - a) vehicle access points
    - b) cycle stands
    - c) refuse storage
    - d) windows, doors, eaves, railings, balconies
    - e) ventilation features, external stairs
  5. Land Stability;
  6. Contamination;
  7. Archaeology;
  8. Prior to commencement to seek approval of a scheme to include highway improvements (along the principles indicated on the drawing) and to implement prior to first occupation;
  9. Car parking to be used by residents only;
  10. Tree Protection on adjacent site;
  11. Landscaping/planting/site treatment works (including planted terraces);
  12. Replacement tree planting;
  13. Maintenance of planting;
  14. 10% energy efficiency from renewables.

(Reasons for approval: The decision to grant planning permission has been taken having regard to saved policies HOU2, HOU5, HOU6, HOU12 A34, HOU13, HBE3-4, HBE8, HBE12, HBE13, EP1, EP2, EP18, EP22, SR4, SR7, NE9, TRA11, TRA15 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted November 2004) and policies SS1, SS2,H1, H2, E5,ENV7,ENG1 and NR1 of the East of England Plan and all material considerations.)

**8. APPLICATION NO 08/00935/O – 29 – 31 BISHOP BRIDGE ROAD**

**RESOLVED** to note that this application had been withdrawn.

**9. APPLICATION NOS 08/01079/F AND 08/01084/C – 126-140 KING STREET**

The Senior Planner (Development) (Inner) presented the report with the aid of slides, plans, diagrams showing the elevations and perspectives.

The Chair said that the proposed development would be a significant improvement to the streetscene.

**RESOLVED** to:-

(1) approve Application No 08/010179/F 126 – 140 King Street and grant planning permission subject to:-

(a) the completion of a S106 agreement by 9 January 2009 to include the provision of contributions to child play space and transportation:

(b) the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. Samples of bricks, mortar, render colour, roof materials
3. Details of external joinery and dormer windows
4. Rainwater goods to be cast iron or cast aluminium
5. Details for the provision of 10% of the sites energy from decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources;
6. Submission of a scheme for the provision and implementation of water, energy and resource efficiency measures;
7. Contamination Investigations;
8. Cycle storage and bin storage to be provided prior to first occupation;
9. Hard and Soft landscaping scheme;
10. Upkeep and maintenance of landscaped areas;
11. Details of obscure glazing to the second bedroom windows on the northern elevation at first and second floor level;
12. Details of obscure glazing to the window on the eastern elevation of the outbuilding;
13. Archaeological Evaluation.

(2) where the S106 is not completed prior to 9 January 2009 that delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning and Regeneration Services to refuse planning permission for the following reason:

In the absence of a legal agreement or undertaking relating to the provision children's play space and transportation contributions the proposal is contrary to saved policies HOU6, SR7 and TRA11 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan.

(Reason for approval as set out in resolution (1): The recommendation has been made with regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application including policies ENV7, ENG1 and WM6 of the adopted East of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy, saved policies NE9, HBE3, HBE8, HBE12, EP1, EP16, EP18, EP22, HOU6, HOU13, HOU15, SHO3, CC11, SR7, TRA5, TRA6, TRA7, TRA8 and TRA11 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, PPS1, Supplement to PPS1, PPS3, PPG13, PPG15 and PPS22.

Having considered all of the above and other material planning considerations it is considered that subject to the conditions listed and the contents of the S106 agreement that the proposals are an appropriate redevelopment of a central brownfield site in a sustainable manor which would enhance the surrounding Conservation Area.)

- (3) approve Application No 08/01079/F – 126 – 140 King Street and grant Conservation Area Consent subject to the approval of planning permission and the following conditions:
1. Standard time limit;
  2. Contracts for the redevelopment of the site to be in place prior to any demolition of the site.
- (4) where planning permission 08/01079/F is refused, delegate authority to the Head of Planning and Regeneration Services to refuse Conservation Area Consent for the following reason:

In the absence of acceptable and detailed plans for the redevelopment of the site, the demolition of all those buildings identified to be demolished would have a negative impact on the character of the surrounding Conservation Area and as such the proposal is considered to be contrary to the objectives of saved policy HBE8 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan and PPG15.

(Reason for approval of Conservation Area Consent as set out in resolution (3): The recommendation has been made with regard to the provisions of saved policy HBE8 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, PPG15 and other material planning considerations, it is considered that subject to the conditions listed and the redevelopment of the site the demolition is acceptable.)

## **10. APPLICATION NOS 08/01086/F AND 08/01085/C – 70 – 72 SUSSEX STREET**

(Councillor Driver was out of the room for part of this item and abstained from voting.)

The Chair agreed to take the following question from Councillor Holmes, :-

'Residents in Sussex Street are concerned about the partial removal of the roof of the warehouse at 70 - 72 Sussex Street Norwich NR3 3DE . Can Officers please update the committee on the state of the building particularly if asbestos is involved - and what action if any is being taken by Enforcement Officers.'

The Planning Development Manager provided the following response:-

'We were made aware that construction works had started on site and advised the applicant to stop works until they had conservation area consent. The works were then stopped. In planning terms there has not been significant enough demolition on site to take further action.

In relation to asbestos, we are currently unaware if there is asbestos on site and whether this has been disturbed. If there is asbestos on site this has to be removed in line with the Health and Safety Executive's guidelines and the Control of Asbestos Regulations by a licensed contractor. The Health and Safety Executive are the enforcing body for this.'

The Senior Planner (Development) (Inner Area) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans, including those showing the elevations.

Members were advised that a letter of support for the application from the applicant's solicitor had been received which commented that the buildings on the site were identified as negative in the Conservation Area appraisal and therefore demolition would have a positive impact on the area and letter reiterates certain points made by consultees which were detailed in the report and noted that the Quality Panel's response has not been updated following amendment. The applicant's solicitor also contended that in terms of housing policy there was support for the development on this site, and that all other aspects of the scheme other than design are noted as acceptable in the report. The solicitor also commented that PPS1 states that planning authorities should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative. In response the Senior Planner agreed that the buildings on the site were identified as negative in the Conservation Area Appraisal. However it was considered that the retention of the buildings was preferable to an empty site and therefore in the absence of a scheme for the site's redevelopment, demolition of the buildings was not considered to be appropriate. This was a position which had recently been supported at the appeal on 113-114 Oak Street (The Talk) site. The report identified that certain matters or issues were acceptable and hence there were not more reasons for refusal. However, it was not considered that this outweighs the considered negative impacts that the proposal's elevational design and scale would have on the surrounding Conservation Area. It was considered necessary to clarify in the reasons for refusal that the proposals were considered to have a negative impact on the surrounding Conservation Area. With reference to PPS1 this identified that Local Planning Authorities should not seek to hinder certain design forms or styles and this was shown on page 134 of the report, paragraph 4, and it was not the case that that a particular approach (traditional or contemporary) of was of concern. PPS1 goes on to state that it was proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness particularly where this was supported by clear plan policies or supplementary planning documents on design. The concern here was that the two approaches and the scale of form of the corner block bear no relation to their context and hence the reasons for refusal.



The Senior Planner also reported that seven further letters of objection from neighbours raising the following concerns and objections: loss of light; noise pollution; overlooking; that the height of the development was unacceptable and out of scale with the surroundings; concern about increased traffic congestion; design did not reflect the character of the area and was out of keeping with the area; overdevelopment, concern about whether wheelie bin storage would be provided; inconsistencies in how neighbouring properties were shown in the architect's drawings; and concern over potential misuse and anti-social behaviour within communal areas. A local letting agent had raised concerns about the overdevelopment of the site; that the design was out of keeping with the area and would have a negative impact on the character of the area. In addition a petition with 50 signatures had been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds: that the development was too dense and out of character with the surrounding area and that the development would adversely affect the amenities of those living adjacent to the scheme and would not enhance the quality of the Conservation Area. In response the Senior Planner said that most of these issues were covered in the report but pointed out that bin stores were provided at ground floor with access off Sussex Street. It was not considered that on planning grounds the application could be refused on the basis of anti-social behaviour. There was a slight discrepancy in the illustration of an existing adjacent property, which was not considered to be so significant that it was fundamental to the determination of the application. Referring to the picture of the property in question it was pointed out to members that number 2 Chatham Street did not have a blank gable to Chatham Street.

Members were also advised that since writing the report a signed undertaking had been submitted to attempt to overcome the third reason for refusal. This demonstrated the applicant's willingness to enter into an agreement but legal advice to the Council was that it did not satisfactorily secure the required contributions. It was therefore recommended that reason for refusal three was amended to 'satisfactory' between 'a' and 'legal' and would therefore read 'In the absence of a satisfactory legal agreement.....'

Councillor Holmes (Ward Councillor for Mancroft Ward) then addressed the Committee and said that from conversations with residents of Chatham Street and Sussex Street he had not come across anyone who objected to residential development on this site but it was the size and density that people objected to. A resident who had organised the petition then addressed the Committee and concurred that residents were not against development but objected to the size and scale of the development.

The agent then responded and said that the development would bring many benefits to the community through the Section 106 agreement and considered that the design was not overbearing when seen in the context of other buildings in St Augustine's Street.

Discussion ensued in which members were advised that it was possible to achieve the required density of housing units without the scale and height of this proposal by providing smaller units and not large duplexes. Councillor Little considered that the proposals for energy efficiency were good but that it was important that the design of the development was in context with the surrounding area.

**RESOLVED** with 2 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford and Little), 1 member against (Councillor Stephenson) and 4 members abstaining (Councillors Lubbock, Bearman, Llewellyn and Driver) to refuse:-

- (1) planning permission for Application No 08/01086/F 70 – 72 Sussex Street for the following reasons:-
  1. It is considered that by virtue of the varied form and elevational treatment of the proposals the design would fail to respect the form and character of the area. As such the proposals are considered to be contrary to the objectives of saved policies HBE8 and HBE12 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, policy ENV7 of the adopted East of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy and the Northern City Centre Area Action Plan.
  2. It is considered that by virtue of its commercial appearance, scale and relationship with surrounding buildings that the corner block on Oak Street would be overtly dominant and would fail to successfully integrate with the surrounding historic environment, detracting from the character and townscape of the surrounding area. As such the proposals are considered to be contrary to the objectives of saved policies HBE8 and HBE12 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, policy ENV7 of the adopted East of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy and the Northern City Centre Area Action Plan.
  3. In the absence of a legal agreement or undertaking relating to the provision of children's play space and transportation contributions the proposal is contrary to saved policies HOU6, SR7 and TRA11 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan.
  
- (2) Conservation Area Consent for Application No 08/01086/C 70 – 72 Sussex Street the following reason:
  1. In the absence of acceptable and detailed plans for the redevelopment of the site, the demolition of all those buildings identified to be demolished would have a negative impact on the character of the surrounding Conservation Area and as such the proposal is considered to be contrary to the objectives of saved policy HBE8 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan and PPG15.

#### **11. APPLICATION NOS 08/00971/F AND 08/00973/C – 23 – 25 MAGDALEN STREET**

The Planning Team Leader (Development) (Inner Area) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans. He reported that there had been one further letter of representation from the residents of 17/17A Magdalen Street concerning loss of light, privacy and loss of security from the private pedestrian access. The Environment Agency had confirmed that it had withdrawn its objections subject to conditions being attached to planning permission relating to the need for a flood response plan; flood-proofing measures and finished floor levels above 3.2 AOD. The Team Leader suggested that the item be deferred in order to pursue revisions regarding the alleged loss of light to 27 Magdalen Street from the height of the new floor on 23/25 Magdalen Street and the concerns regarding security and rights of access through Red Lion Yard.

A proxy for a neighbouring resident then addressed the Committee and outlined his reasons for concern about the pedestrian access to the site and that this could affect the security of the neighbour's property; the loss of light and privacy from the height of the proposal; and that the binstores would be adjacent to his front door.

The applicant then said that he had been unaware that the officer would request that the application be deferred and that this was not what he wanted.

Discussion ensued in which the Planning Development Manager advised members to consider deferral of the application or to approve in principle and delegate determination to the Director of Regeneration and Development subject to the resolution of the outstanding issues relating to the mitigation of the height of the building adjacent to 27 Magdalen Street and the rights of way through the Yard.

Councillor Lubbock moved and Councillor Driver seconded that the Committee approved the application in principle and delegated to the Director of Regeneration and Development to determine the application subject to the resolution of the issues about the height of the roof and right of way, and appropriate conditions.

**RESOLVED** with 6 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Bearman, Lubbock, Little, Llewellyn and Driver) and 1 member voting against (Councillor Stephenson) to approve in principle Application Nos 08/00971/F and 08/00973/C – 23 – 25 Magdalen Street and delegate determination of the applications to the Director of Regeneration and Development, to grant planning permission and conservation area consent subject to the resolution of the outstanding issues relating to the height of the roof and the rights of way in Red Lion Yard, the signing of a section 106 agreement and the appropriate conditions as set out in the report.

## **12. APPLICATION NO 08/01119/F - 2 ST MILDREDS ROAD**

The Planning Team Leader (Development) (Outer Area) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans, and said that the proposed extension met a genuine need for the residents. Members were advised that planning permission would be conditional on the annex being used as part of the main dwelling.

Two local residents then addressed the Committee and explained their concerns that the extension was for investment purposes and that the intention was that the house would be used as a house of multiple occupation and would affect parking.

Councillor Lubbock requested that the officers ensured that enforcement action was taken if the applicants broke the condition requiring that the annex was part of the main dwelling.

**RESOLVED** with 6 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Lubbock, Bearman, Stephenson, Little and Llewellyn) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Driver) to approve Application No 08/01119/F - 2 St Mildreds Road.

(Councillors Stephenson and Driver left the meeting at this point because of other Council business.)

## **13. APPLICATION NO 08/01034/F – 223 EARLHAM ROAD**

The Planning Team Leader (Development) (Outer Area) presented the report with the aid of slides, plans and drawings showing the elevations, and answered members' questions.

Representations were made by three residents who objected to the scheme on grounds that included concerns about road safety and the access to the site; need for traffic calming; overlooking of neighbouring houses; loss of green space; concerns about parking. Photographs of the site were circulated at the meeting. Councillor Ramsay (Ward Councillor for Nelson Ward) then spoke on behalf of the other Ward Councillors for Nelson Ward and residents and outlined their objections to the scheme, which included the access at the bend in the road and that the three houses in the proposal were inappropriate.

Discussion ensued in which members asked detailed questions on the report. Councillor Lubbock pointed out that the authority did not have a policy on development of garden land. Members were advised that this could be pursued through the local development framework process.

Councillor Llewellyn moved that the application be refused but this was not seconded. He said that he supported the residents who opposed this application in terms of safety and expressed concern that as this site was near to Earlham Cemetery, the development would be detrimental to the natural area's biodiversity.

Councillor Lubbock suggested that, to mitigate the problems of parking, consideration was given to putting down yellow lines but residents present opposed this suggestion.

**RESOLVED** with 3 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Lubbock and Bearman), 1 member against (Councillor Llewellyn) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Little) to approve Application No 08/01034/F – 223 Earlham Road and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Time limit.
2. Precise details of external materials.
3. Hard and soft landscaping scheme, including tree planting, to be agreed.
4. Landscaping to be carried out and maintained.
5. Tree protection.
6. Provision of bin storage, cycle storage, access, parking and turning areas prior to first occupation of any dwelling and retention thereafter.
7. Precise details of rainwater harvesting, solar panels and passive ventilation measures to be submitted and agreed.
8. Surface water drainage details for the site to be submitted and agreed.

(Reasons for approval:- The principle of the development in this area is considered acceptable and would not have a detrimental impact on the form, character and appearance of the area or on the character of the adjoining Historic Park. The details of the scheme are such that the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its impact on pedestrian and vehicular highway safety and unlikely to be detrimental to the living conditions of existing or future occupiers. The loss of the trees on site is considered acceptable subject to suitable replacement planting and the loss of biodiversity is, on balance, considered acceptable in this instance subject to additional landscaping. Therefore the proposal is considered to meet the requirements of PPS1, PPS3, PPG15, PPS9, East of England Plan policies H1,

ENV7 and WM6 and saved policies HOU1, HOU13, EP22, EP16, EP18, EP20, HBE12, TRA5, TRA6, TRA7, SR8, NE7, NE8 and NE9 of the City of Norwich Replacement Plan 2004.)

**14. APPLICATION NO 08/01013/F AND 08/01012/C - SUSSEX HOUSE, SUSSEX STREET**

**RESOLVED** to note that these applications had been withdrawn.

**15. APPLICATION NO 08/001132/F – DIGNITY FUNERALS LTD**

Councillor Little pointed out the residents' concerns about noise from people going to the premises during the night or early morning.

**RESOLVED** having considered the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration Services to approve Application No 08/001132/F – Dignity Funerals Ltd and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard three years time limit.
2. Noise restriction so that the level of noise emitted shall not exceed 38dB at any time, as measured at any point on the rear boundary of the site adjoining the dwellings on Tamarind Mews.

(Reasons for approval: The decision is made with regard to policies EP22, HBE8 and HBE12 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan Adopted Version November 2004 and all material considerations. The extension is small and to the rear of the building, and will preserve the character of the Conservation Area. The design is in keeping with that of the existing building on the site and will not be detrimental to the character of the area. The level of noise generated by the condensing unit is not considered likely to be detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers.)

**16. APPLICATION NO 08/01061/F – 131 MAGDALEN STREET**

The Planner requested that the condition relating to the colour of the flue be amended.

**RESOLVED** having considered the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration Services to approve Application No 08/01061/F – 131 Magdalen Street and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard time limit.
2. Hours of use limited to 07:00am to 23:30pm
3. No deliveries or collections, including trade waste, between 19:00pm and 07:00am Monday to Saturday, and no collections on Sundays or Bank Holidays.
4. Flue to be installed as per specification on plans received.
5. The colour and finish of the flue and ductwork to be agreed.
6. Maintenance schedule of flue to be submitted and agreed.
7. Details of anti-vibration mountings to attach the flue and ductwork to the building to be submitted and agreed.

(Reasons for approval:-

- 1) The proposed hot food takeaway is not considered to lead to an adverse impact on adjacent residential amenity, by virtue of the fact the site is located in an existing busy street and the extraction flue venting at ridge level to ensure the dispersal of cooking fumes. The proposed change of use is therefore considered to be in accordance with saved policies EP22 and SHO22 of the City of Norwich Replacement Plan, Adopted Version (November 2004).
- 2) The proposed hot food takeaway is not considered to lead to an adverse impact on highway safety, by virtue of the likelihood of customers visiting the unit on foot as it is located in a highly accessible, sustainable location and by virtue of the fact there is a lay-by to enable short stay parking opposite the site. The proposed change of use is therefore considered to be in accordance with saved policy SHO22 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, Adopted Version (November 2004) and Planning Policy Statement 1.
- 3) The proposed hot food takeaway use is not considered to have a significantly adverse affect on the character and setting of the Conservation Area, by virtue of the small amount of the extraction flue that will be visible to the surrounding Conservation Area and by virtue of the existing character and use of this area of the Conservation Area. The proposed change of use is therefore considered to be in accordance with saved policy HBE8 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, Adopted Version (November 2004), ENV6 of the East of England Plan (May 2008) and Planning Policy Statement 15.)

(Informative Note: The hours of use may require a separate licence application if the unit is to operate outside the existing retail hours of 08:00 to 18:00.)

CHAIR