



PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

9.00 a.m. – 4.40 p.m.

11 September 2008

Present: Councillors Bradford (Chair), Llewellyn (Vice-Chair), Banham, Bearman, Collishaw, Driver, Lay, Little (S), Lubbock and Stephenson

Apologies: Councillor George

1. SITE VISIT – THE GREAT HOSPITAL, BISHOPGATE

The Committee undertook a site visit in respect of Application Nos 06/01005/f, 06/01006/L, 07/00453/L, 08/00341/C, The Great Hospital, Bishopgate.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Stephenson referred to the applications for The Great Hospital, Bishopgate (item 4 below) and said that as she would be speaking on behalf of residents she would leave the room during Committee's debate.

Councillor Little referred to Application No 08/00255/O – Norwich City College (item 11 below) and said that as he would be speaking on behalf of residents he would leave the room during the Committee's debate.

All members declared a personal interest in Application No 08/00745/F – 138 Trafford Road in that the applicant was a member of the Council and therefore known to them.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 21 August 2008.

4. APPLICATION NOS 06/01005/F, 06/01006/L, 07/00453/L, 08/00341/C, THE GREAT HOSPITAL, BISHOPGATE

(Councillor Stephenson stood down from the Committee for this item and left the meeting during the debate.)

The Senior Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. Additional plans were circulated to members at the meeting. Members were advised that copies of all the correspondence had been available to members of the Committee and the public since before the previous meeting. Appendix 1 of the report had been updated to include additional correspondence. The Great Hospital provided accommodation for 120 people, comprising sheltered, extra-care and residential care. There was a minimum waiting list of two years, with 13 people on the list and 20 people turned away each year. The proposals would help the Hospital provide a greater level of care and support for residents in their own homes as their needs changed over time. The demolition of Holme Cottages was the most controversial element of the four applications, but officers considered that, on balance and taking into account the details provided in support of the application, this was justified and the new two-storey building on the site of the cottages was acceptable and the development would be of a provide substantial benefit to the community and met the tests as set out in the Government's guidance. The Senior Planner (Development), the Conservation Design Officer and the Planning Development Manager responded to member's questions.

A resident of the Great Hospital then addressed the Committee, referring to the petition to preserve Holme Cottages, and outlining her objections to the proposals and suggesting alternatives for the development. The Chair then read out a letter on behalf of a member of the public who objected to the scheme and was unable to attend the meeting due to ill-health. A representative of English Heritage and Councillor Stephenson then addressed the Committee, in which they opposed the proposal to demolish Holme Cottages and suggested alternative sites for the new building on the site.

Three residents then addressed the Committee in support of the proposals and said that Holme Cottages provided unsuitable accommodation and were difficult to heat and maintain.

A Trustee of the Great Hospital then spoke on behalf of the proposals and addressed issues raised by the previous speakers. The proposed development would ensure that the Hospital could continue to provide care for residents in their own homes and not on an institutional basis. There was no alternative for a new building on the site and all options had been evaluated. The Trust had sold agricultural land at Cringleford to provide the capital for the proposed development. The replacement of Elaine Herbert House as suggested by the objectors was not an option. The proposed building in the middle of the site would provide for the most dependent and frail residents and the Trust did not want to put them on the periphery of the site but in the heart of their community. The garages were on a floodplain and it was not a suitable site for a residential building.

During discussion there was general agreement that the site visit had been useful. Members considered that there was a fine balance of the needs to redevelop to meet the future needs of the Hospital and ensure its 'duty of care' to residents against the retention of the cottages which whilst of historic interest did not meet current expectations of accommodation. It was important that the development was in the heart of the site and the community. Some members considered that there was a variety of styles and roof heights on the site and that the proposed new two storey building would not be detrimental to existing buildings.

Discussion ensued on the design of the new building. Members noted that slate rather than pantiles would be used on the roofs and that the surrounding buildings had either slate or pantile roofs. Councillor Little considered that the design of the building was disappointing and would alter the character of the Great Hospital and suggested that planning permission should be refused on planning terms. He also said that the porches of Holme Cottages were very distinctive. Councillor Banham suggested that there should be a memorial of the Cottages on the site. The Chair pointed out that the historic context of the cottages should be considered alongside the fact that the front doors were not originals and there were terraced house type bathroom and kitchen extensions to the back of each Cottage.

RESOLVED, with 8 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Llewellyn, Banham, Lay, Bearman, Lubbock, Collishaw and Driver) and 1 member voting against (Councillor Little) to approve in respect of the Great Hospital the following planning applications:-

- (1) Application No 06/01005/F and grant planning permission subject to:-
 - (a) to a section 106 agreement concerning provisions relating to any archaeological remains of national importance that may be found;
 - (b) the following conditions:
 1. Time limit (3 years);
 2. Contamination;
 3. Flood risk;
 4. Landscaping;
 5. Archaeological matters;
 6. Materials – Timber cladding and finish to the windows of Prior Court;
 7. Lighting;
 8. Phasing;
 9. Provision of car and cycle parking and refuse storage;
 10. Energy efficiency measures;
 11. Details of rainwater harvesting storage tanks and drainage details;
 12. Heritage interpretation.

- (2) Application No 06/01006/L and grant listed building consent subject to:-
 - (a) to referral to Go-East:
 - (b) the following conditions:
 1. Time limit (3 year);
 2. Archaeological matters covering the opening or otherwise of the niches and details of any treatment thereafter;
 3. Preventing the opening of the central arch, notwithstanding the details shown of submitted plans;
 4. Material samples for agreement;
 5. Joinery details to be agreed;
 6. Details of the frameless glazing to the 'new' openings and exact positions, for agreement;

7. Demolition of laundry block to be monitored by an archaeological contractor;
 8. Provision and agreement of a detailed method statement for the removal of the cementitious plaster on the eastern wall of the cloister and the work overseen by an archaeological contractor;
 9. Schedule of works agreed for any repairs that may be required to the stone reveals of the cloister arches including details of materials.
- (3) Application No 07/00453/L and grant listed building consent subject to:
- (a) referral to Go-East;
 - (b) the following conditions:
 1. Time limit (3 year);
 2. No demolition to take place until planning permission has been granted and a contract for the erection of the new accommodation building has been made;
- (4) Application No 08/00341/C and grant conservation area consent subject to the following condition:
1. Time limit (3 years)

(Reasons for approval for the four applications:-

1. The four aspects of the development scheme for the site are considered to have successfully addressed the constraints imposed by the location and historic nature of the site, to have proposed acceptable new buildings in terms of scale, height, massing, materials and design that will have a positive impact on the character and appearance of the area and the setting of the listed buildings and, in the case of the demolition of Holme Cottages, to have demonstrated that the demolition of the building is justified in this exceptional case by virtue of the substantial community benefit that would result from the provision of new accommodation on the site and the quality of the new building.
2. Therefore, the demolition of the garage blocks and the erection of the workshop building, reconfiguration of the car park and provision of bicycle and bin storage are considered to meet the requirements of policy WM6 of the East of England Plan and saved policies HBE8, HBE12, EP17, TRA5, TRA6 and TRA7 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan 2004. The extension of Prior Court is considered to meet the requirements of ENG1 of the East of England Plan, and saved policies HBE2, HBE3, HBE8, HBE12, EP1, EP12, EP16, EP18, EP22, HOU1, HOU5 and HOU19 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan 2004. The demolition of the laundry block and the erection of a new community hall are considered to meet the requirements of policy ENG1 of the East of England Plan and saved policies HBE2, HBE3, HBE8, HBE9, HBE12 and EP18 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan 2004. The demolition of Holme Cottages and the erection of the new accommodation building is considered to meet the requirements of policy ENG1 of the East of England Plan and saved policies

NE9, HBE2, HBE3, HBE8, HBE9, HBE12, EP1, EP12, EP16, EP18, EP22, HOU1, HOU5 and HOU19 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan 2004.)

(Councillor Stephenson was readmitted to the meeting at this point.)

5. APPLICATION NO 08/00493/RM - LAND AND BUILDINGS WEST OF (AND INCLUDING) 89 RACKHAM ROAD

(The agent attended the meeting for this item.)

The Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans and said that the current application was for reserved matters . In response to a member's question the Planning Development Manager said that it would not be possible to impose the current policy levels of energy efficiency because planning permission had already been granted and this was not on of the reserved matters under consideration.

RESOLVED to approve Application No 08/00493/RM – Land and buildings west of (and including) 89 Rackham Road and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:-

1. Statutory time limit;
2. Details of landscaping to be submitted for approval;
3. Maintenance of landscaping;
4. Details and samples of materials to be submitted for approval;
5. Hedges and fences to be erected before occupation;
6. Car parking/cycle and bin storage to be laid out prior to occupation;
7. Materials to be removed from site if not reused;
8. Remediation scheme submitted where contamination is found;

(Reasons for approval: The decision is made with regard to policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan and HBE12, EP22, HOU5, HOU19, TRA5, TRA6, TRA7, TRA8 and TRA12 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan Adopted Version November 2004 and all material considerations. The reserved matters are considered to be acceptable, not detrimental to the visual amenities, and will not detract from the character of the area.)

6. APPLICATION NO 08/00523/F – 13 – 25 LONDON STREET

The Senior Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of slides, plans and artist's impressions and answered members questions. There had been one further response to the re-consultation on the amended application from the Central Norwich Citizens' Forum who queried whether the retail development was good for the City and would have an impact on London Street and Swan Lane; supported city centre flats; considered the design more in keeping with its surroundings; and that it would be commercial sense to make more of the frontages in Little London Street.

The Chair of the Norwich Society's Planning Greater Committee then addressed the Committee with the Society's misgivings about the proposed design of the building which was considered to be 'bland' and that the distinctive architecture of the building would be lost.

Discussion ensued in which the positive points of the application of the accommodation being car free and that 10% of energy would be from renewable sources were noted. Councillor Lubbock considered that the windows on the first floor would add to the vitality of London Street. Other members considered that the proposed design did not enhance the street scene and would be out of keeping with the existing buildings. It was proposed to retain the colonnades but these would not be as subtle as at present. An entrance from Little London Street would enhance the street scene.

Councillor Llewellyn moved and Councillor Stephenson seconded that planning permission be refused because the design was inappropriate in the context of a conservation area and the elevations of buildings in London Street and Bedford Street and that the design of the colonnades was unattractive and that there was a lack of transport contributions and children's play space in the section 106 agreement.

RESOLVED, with 3 members voting in favour of refusal (Councillors Llewellyn, Stephenson and Lay), 4 members voting against (Councillors Bradford, Little, Lubbock and Driver) and 3 members abstaining (Councillors Banham, Bearman and Collishaw) the motion was lost.

The Chair then moved the officers' recommendations.

RESOLVED, with 4 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Little, Lubbock and Driver), 3 members voting against (Councillors Llewellyn, Stephenson and Lay) and 3 members abstaining (Councillors Banham, Bearman and Collishaw) to approve Application No 08/00523/F – 13 – 25 London Street and grant planning permission subject to:-

- (1) the signing of a S106 agreement to include transport contributions and play space contribution;
- (2) the following conditions:-
 1. Standard time limit;
 2. Cycle and Bin Stores to be provided prior to first occupation of any residential unit;
 3. Glazing to the retail units is to be kept transparent and free of any obstruction which would prevent views into the retail units floorspace or shop front display;
 4. The following details to be submitted:
 - (a) Scale sections of windows, including details of colour/s of powder coating;
 - (b) Scale sections of Doors, including details of colour/s of powder coating;
 - (c) Loading Bay Door;
 - (d) Trespa Cladding Colours;
 - (e) Bricks samples;
 5. Landscaping details for the landscaped flat roof at second floor. Landscaping to be carried out within 6 months of the first occupation of any residential unit.

6. Details of any screening or fencing around the landscaped areas and retail tenants plant zone;
7. Full details of all plant or machinery to be submitted;
8. Exact details and scaled drawings of the solar thermal panels. Panels to be provide prior to first occupation of any residential unit.

(Reasons for approval:-

The recommendation has been made with regard to policies ENV7 and ENG1 of the adopted East of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy, saved policies SHO7, SHO9, HBE3, HBE8, HBE12, HBE15, EP18, EP22, HOU6, HOU15, TRA7,TRA8, TRA11 and TRA24 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, PPS1, PPS3, PPS6, PPG15 and all other material planning considerations.

The proposals are considered to improve the retail units within the building, whilst introducing new residential units on upper floors, such a mix of uses is in line with policy guidance within PPS3 and PPS6. It is also considered that the proposals would enhance this part of the City Centre Conservation Area and substantially improve the buildings relationship with the surrounding public realm.)

7. APPLICATION NOS 08/00582/F – 6, 8, 10,12 AND 12A MILLERS LANE

The Planning Development Manager and the Planner introduced the report with the aid of slides and plans, and answered questions.

Members considered that the brick work should reflect that of the neighbouring buildings and that this should be agreed by officers.

RESOLVED to approve Application No 08/00582/F – 6, 8, 10,12 and 12A Millers Lane and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Provision of Refuse and recycling storage prior to first occupation.
3. Details of external lighting.
4. Details of hard and soft landscaping.
5. Replanting within 5 years if plants are damaged/die.
6. Details of materials;
 - (a) Boundary walls and fences
 - (b) New doors and windows;
 - (c) Solar collectors;
 - (d) Positioning of pedestrian paths from the car park to the rear access doors.
 - (e) The development shall then be constructed in full accordance with the agreed details and retained as such in perpetuity.
 - (f) Brick work.
7. Provision, design, layout and maintenance of off-site play space.
8. Details of measures for the improvement of off-site City-wide transport infrastructure to meet the needs of the development.

(Reasons for approval:- The decision to grant planning permission has been taken having regard to National Policy contained in PPS1, PPS3, PPG13, PPG17 and PPS22, Regional Policies ENV7 and ENG1 of the East of England Plan (May 2008)

and saved policies HBE12, EP18, EP19, EP20, EP22, TRA6, TRA7, TRA11, HOU13, HOU18, SR7 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted Version November 2004).

The proposals will have a positive impact on the surrounding area and street scene. The development is considered to be in keeping with the scale and height of existing residential dwellings in the area. The following are considered to have met a high standard; the amenity and living environment for future occupiers, the design of the development and its energy efficiency.)

8. APPLICATION NO 08/00631/F – GRAPHICS HOUSE, 60 BETHEL STREET

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

RESOLVED to approve Application No 08/00631/F – Graphics House, 60 Bethel Street, subject to the following conditions:-

1. Air Conditioning units to be served and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendation.
2. Air conditioning units only to be operational between 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday and at no time on Saturday or Sunday. Any variations on these times are to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
3. Within six months of this decision, details of planting/landscaping to be used in the planters on the rear roof shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and permanently retained thereafter.

(Reasons for approval:- The proposed air conditioning units are not considered to have a detrimental affect on surrounding residential amenity through noise. The proposed planters will help reduce any noise issues further and improve the visual appearance of the roofscape. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in accordance with policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan (May 2008) and saved policies HBE8, HBE12 and EP22 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted Version November 2004).)

9. APPLICATION NO 08/00632/L – MAIDS HEAD HOTEL, 20 TOMBLAND

RESOLVED, having considered the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration Services), to approve Application No 08/0632/L – Maids Head Hotel, 20 Tombland subject to the following conditions:-

1. The works must be commenced within three years of the date of this permission.
2. Any damage to the fabric of the building resulting from the carrying out of the works hereby permitted shall be made good, to the reasonable satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority in writing within six months.

(Reasons for approval: The reduction in height of the chimney stack will not have a detrimental impact upon the character or fabric of the Listed Building. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with National Policy PPG15, Policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan (May 2008) and saved policies HBE8, HBE9 and HBE12 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted Version November 2004).

10. APPLICATION NO 08/00745/F – 138 TRAFFORD ROAD

(All members of the Committee had declared a personal interest in this item.)

The Planner introduced the report with the aid of slides.

RESOLVED to approve Application No 08/00745/F – 138 Trafford Road subject to the following condition:-

1. Development must be begun within 3 years of the date of this permission.

(Reasons for approval: The decision to grant planning permission has been taken having regard to policy EP22 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan 2004 and all material planning considerations. The proposal is not considered to be detrimental to the residential amenity of the area.)

(The Committee then adjourned for lunch and reconvened at 2.00 p.m.)

11. APPLICATION NO 08/00255/O – NORWICH CITY COLLEGE, IPSWICH ROAD

(Councillor Little stood down from the Committee for this item and left the meeting during the debate.)

(Councillor Driver declared a personal interest in this item because a member of his family was currently a student at the College.)

The Planning Development Manager presented the report with the aid of slides and plans. Colour copies of the plans attached to the report were available at the meeting. The Planning Development Manager said that the proposals were for outline planning permission and suggested that condition 5 should be amended to allow for a longer time scale for the submission of reserved matters of 7 years rather than the standard time limit of 3 years; condition 7 to specifically refer to building heights an additional condition relating to the building/construction hours; and, relating to the closure of access at the Thetford Building, except for emergency/maintenance vehicles. Approval was also subject to the signing of Section 106 agreements and a written confirmation from English Heritage that they have no objections to the application but have verbally said that they would like to see the reserved matters before approval.

There then followed 14 objectors, including a representative of College Redevelopment Concerns, and Councillor Little, who outlined their objections to the proposals for outline planning permission. These included concerns about the use of a generator; access and car parking; the scale of the redevelopment being disproportionate to need; affect of residential amenity; lack of detail on the massing and scale of buildings; disturbance for residents during construction; and querying the need to demolish the buildings and the detrimental affect this would have on its carbon footprint.

The Principal of the Norwich City College then at the discretion of the Chair addressed the Committee giving reasons for supporting the application, which included increased educational attainment, providing a coherent site suited to the

curriculum and reducing maintenance and fuel costs. Alternative sites such as a split site had been considered but this would increase the costs. This was a once in a lifetime opportunity for the college and the city.

There then followed three representations in support of the planning application to ensure that the College was fit for purpose and would meet future educational needs.

Discussion ensued. Councillor Collishaw referred to the wider vision for the City and that she pointed out that the site was a mishmash of buildings that had been developed over time. Councillor Driver considered that the demolition of the existing buildings would benefit the deprived young people in the City and assist them in their educational attainment. Councillor Lubbock suggested that St Andrew's House, which provided first class teaching conditions, was an example of how the College could successfully integrate within the City. The Government was encouraging new build through its funding rather than using existing buildings. The Norfolk Building was only 12 years and could be retained and the Norwich Building was of a similar age City Hall which was listed. The gains of the redevelopment should be balanced against the loss of amenity to the residents. Other members shared these views.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration Services, the Planning Development Manager and the Transportation Manager then responded to the issues raised. Members were advised that the application that was before them was for outline planning permission, for educational uses. Some residents would benefit from improved residential amenity as some buildings would be further from the periphery of the site. The site was not in a conservation area. The College was well served by public transport and car parking provision, which had been reduced and was considered adequate. It would be possible to add a condition to ensure that material from demolition was used as hardcore on site. Storm drainage would be covered at the detailed application stage and by planning regulations. Construction noise would be conditioned and covered by standard hours of construction. The environmental impact assessment would provide the detail of the carbon footprint and it was noted that the energy efficiency level aspired to BREEAM rating 'excellent'. Officers at the County Council had conducted a safety audit and the access arrangements were the best possible solution. The issue of funding was not a material planning consideration. It was questionable whether the Norwich Building met the criteria for listed building status.

Councillor Lubbock moved and Councillor Llewellyn seconded that Application No 08/00255/O – Norwich City College be refused on the grounds that the scale and height of the proposed buildings would have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the area; the demolition of the Norfolk Building, a relatively recent building was contrary to policy EP20; that the Norwich Building was an iconic building and should be retained and that the traffic access to Ipswich Road were too close together.

RESOLVED, with 4 members voting in favour of refusal (Councillors Lubbock, Llewellyn, Bearman and Stephenson) and 5 members voting against (Councillors Bradford, Banham, Lay, Collishaw and Driver) the motion to refuse the application on the grounds given above was lost.

The Chair then moved the officers' recommendations.

RESOLVED with 5 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Banham, Lay, Collishaw and Driver) and 4 members voting against (Councillors Llewellyn, Stephenson, Bearman and Lubbock) to approve Application No 08/00255/O – Norwich City College and grant planning permission subject to:-

- (1) the signing of a S106 agreement to include the funding of traffic orders and travel plan implementation;
- (2) confirmation from English Heritage that they have no objections;
- (3) the following conditions:-
 1. A detailed scheme for off-site highway improvements as indicated on the approved drawings;
 2. Off site highway improvement works referred to in condition 1 shall be completed prior to first occupation;
 3. Submission of travel plans;
 4. Interim travel plans as detailed in condition 3 to be implemented prior to first occupation. Full travel plans to be submitted within the first year of operation and implemented;
 5. Submission of reserved matters within 7 years;
 6. Reserved matters shall relate to the Siting, Means of Access, Design, Landscaping and External Appearance;
 7. Details of approved plans including building heights as specified.
 8. Submission of a development phasing plan to be agreed;
 9. Phasing conditions to be agreed by officers;
 10. Submission of a landscaping details, including all hard and soft treatments, also including lighting plans and the provision of offsite landscaping on highway land;
 11. Landscaping to be maintained and any new trees/shrubs lost to be replaced;
 12. Submission of an Arboricultural method statement;
 13. Scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water drainage to be submitted;
 14. Scheme for the provision and implementation of foul water drainage to be submitted;
 15. Scheme for the provision and implementation of pollution control to be submitted;
 16. All surface water from the car park to be passed through a petrol/oil interceptor;
 17. Scheme to manage contamination to be submitted;
 18. Scheme for water, energy and resource efficiency measures to be submitted;
 19. Details for the provision of 10% of the sites energy from decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources;
 20. Scheme for provision of sufficient capacity in the public sewerage system to meet the needs of the development to be submitted;
 21. Details and specifications for all plant and machinery to be submitted;
 22. Submission of a Waste management plan;
 23. Submission of a servicing management plan, including details of proposed delivery times;

24. Submission of full details of cycle storage;
25. Submission of a fire strategy including details for the provision of fire hydrants;
26. Vehicular access to be constructed to Norfolk County Council Specification;
27. No gates shall be erected across the access unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority;
28. Servicing, turning areas to be provided prior to first occupation;
29. Scheme for drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the highway;
30. Construction traffic management plan to be submitted;
31. Construction traffic is to comply with the details of the construction traffic management plan agreed.
32. Closure of the Thetford Building access.
33. Timings of construction/demolition

(Reasons for approval:- The proposal would result in an appropriate and satisfactory form of development that would further enhance educational facilities at the City College Norwich. The buildings would relate well to surroundings and would enhance the visual amenities of the Campus. Subject to the legal agreement and having regard to the Travel Plan, the proposal would adequately address the transportation consequences. As such, the proposal would comply with Policies HBE12, EP18, EMP19, TRA6, TRA7 and TRA11 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan Adopted Version, November 2004 and policies, E1, ENV7, ENG1, NR1 and SS2 of the East of England Plan, Adopted May 2008.)

(Councillor Little was readmitted to the meeting.)

12. APPLICATION NO 08/00806/F – 55 MILL HILL ROAD

The Planning Development Manager presented the report with the aid of slides and drawings and said that the application was recommended for refusal. A statement received from Councillor Ramsay (Ward Councillor for Nelson Ward) giving his reasons for the Committee to approve the application, which would not affect the neighbours and would fill in the gap between the building.

The agent then addressed the Committee and requested approval be given to the application as it would be a good use of an unpleasant space, enabling his client to have a bigger kitchen and was 85m from the nearest house on Park Lane. It was not a 'balcony' at second floor level but a roof terrace.

Councillor Lubbock moved and Councillor Banham moved that the application be approved subject to the usual conditions and that materials be agreed.

RESOLVED to approve Application No 08/00806/F – 55 Mill Hill Road subject to the appropriate conditions (including agreement of materials).

13. SITE VISIT - DUKE'S WHARF

RESOLVED to undertake a site visit to Duke's Wharf at the start of the next meeting.

CHAIR