



PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

10.00am to 11.40am

18 August 2011

Present: Councillors Bradford (chair), Gee (vice chair), Banham, Gayton, Haynes, Kendrick, Little, Lubbock and Offord

Apologies: Councillor Ackroyd, Sands (S) and George

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Little said that he could be considered to have a pre-determined view with regard to item 13 (below), application no 11/00994/NF3, The Pavilion Mousehold Heath, Gurney Road, Norwich, NR1 4HW as he was a member of the Mousehold Heath Conservators.

Councillor Bradford confirmed that he had a pre-determined view with regard to item 13, (below), application no 11/00994/NF3, The Pavilion Mousehold Heath, Gurney Road, as chair of the Mousehold Heath Conservators.

2. MINUTES

RESOLVED to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2011.

3. DRAFT NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

The planning development manager advised the committee that the government had published the draft National Planning Policy Framework on 25 July 2011 which was out for consultation for the next 3 months.

4. APPLICATION NO 11/00861/U FORMER EASTERN ELECTRICITY BOARD SITE, DUKE STREET, NORWICH

The senior planner (development) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans and referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports for consideration, which was circulated at the meeting. Members were advised of a typographical error in the list of tariffs in paragraph 15 and the recommendation and that "0-2 hours £2" should be amended to read "1-2 hours £2". The supplementary report also contained details of representations from: a resident of Anchor Quay in support of the proposal; a further representation from a neighbour who had responded to the consultation but was unable to attend the committee meeting and

wanted to reiterate his objections to the proposal; and comments received from the applicant in response to the comments made by the city council's strategic parking manager.

Councillor Stammers, as ward councillor for Mancroft Ward, and two residents of Anchor Quay addressed the committee with their objections to the proposal. These included concerns that the proposal was contrary to policy and did not promote the use of sustainable modes of transport in the city centre; that the view of the strategic parking manager that a car park was not necessary had not been taken into account; that the operating hours of the car park would exacerbate traffic congestion in the Westwick Street, St Benedict's and Dereham Road area; and that the proposal was at variance with the site allocation for mixed use development.

The applicant addressed the committee and explained that the previous scheme was economically unviable and that the proposal was to use the site as a car park in the short-term whilst further development plans were being prepared.

Discussion ensued in which the senior planner referred to the report and responded to the issues that had been raised by the speakers and answered members' questions. He said that the approved permission on the site included 93 car parking spaces and that it was not proposed to charge for cyclists to use the facilities.

Councillor Gee expressed concern about traffic congestion, particularly its impact on pedestrians and pointed out that there were older people resident in the area, and cyclists, and said that he was not convinced that a short stay car park would not generate more traffic movements than an office car park and that serious consideration should be given to the comments of the strategic parking manager that there was adequate parking provision in the city. The proposal was to generate income for the applicant and the hours of operation were wrong and not aimed at shoppers. He suggested that the application be refused on the same grounds as set out in 10.1 and 10.2 of the report.

Councillor Banham moved and Councillor Gayton seconded that if the committee was minded to approve the application a condition should be added so that access to the car park was restricted to Westwick Street only and egress from Duke Street only; and a further condition to ensure that cyclists could have free use of the facility.

RESOLVED that if the committee was minded to approve Application No 11/00861/U Former Eastern Electricity Board Site Duke Street, Norwich, to add the following conditions:

1. Vehicles may only enter the car park from Westwick Street and egress from Duke Street.
2. Clarify that there will be no charge for the use of the cycle stands.

Councillor Gee then formally moved and Councillor Little seconded that the application be refused on the grounds set out in paragraphs 10.1 and 10.2 of the report with an additional reason relating to highway safety at the junctions with Duke Street and Westwick Street with particular regard to the safety of pedestrians (particularly older people) and cyclists.

The senior planner and the planning development manager advised that the grounds as outlined in paragraph 10.2 of the main report should be removed as evidence of existing short stay car parks in the city (eg Castle Mall, Chapelfield) showed that there were very few cars entering the car park during hours of peak traffic congestion. In addition the redevelopment proposals previously granted by the council included a car park of 93 parking spaces linked to the office redevelopment which would be likely to create more traffic movements during the peak hours of traffic congestion. Councillor Gee did accept this and the amendment to refuse the application based on the grounds as set out in paragraphs 10.1 and 10.2, with the additional grounds relating to highway safety were put to the vote.

RESOLVED with 3 members voting in favour of refusal (Councillors Little, Gee and Haynes), 5 members voting against (Councillors Bradford, Banham, Gayton, Kendrick and Lubbock) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Offord), the proposal to refuse the application on the grounds stated above was lost.

Discussion ensued on the layout of the site and members were advised that the parking for the disabled was on the most level and accessible part of the site.

RESOLVED with 5 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Banham, Gayton, Kendrick and Lubbock), 3 members voting against (Councillors Little, Gee and Haynes) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Offord) to approve Application No 11/00861/U Former Eastern Electricity Board Site Duke Street, Norwich and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions (revised based on the summarised conditions in the report and the amendment agreed by the committee):

1. The permission shall expire on 16 March 2012 and unless on or before that date application is made for an extension of the period of permission and such application is approved by the Local Planning Authority the use hereby permitted shall be discontinued.
2. The car park hereby permitted and outlined in red on the approved location plan is to be used as a public pay and display car park only and all users of the pay and display car park (other than cyclists accessing cycle parking) shall be subject to the following payment tariff:
 - 0-1 hours £1
 - 1-2 hours £2
 - 2-3 hours £3
 - 3-4 hours £4
 - 4-6 hours £8
 - Over 6 hours £12
3. The public pay and display car park hereby permitted and outlined in red on the approved location plan shall only be open to the public between the hours of 08:00 to 20:00 on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Fridays and Saturdays, the hours of 08:00 to 21:00 on Thursdays and the hours of 09:00 to 18:00 on Sundays. Outside of these times there shall be no public access to the site.
4. Lighting within the site shall accord with the details provided within the approved lighting layout plan (drawing number DW/TCP-001). The lighting shall be directed away from the western boundary of the site and shall only be operational when the car park is in use. No other lighting or mobile lighting

shall be erected on the site without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

5. The use shall not commence until details to prevent public access and parking in the areas to the west of the application site (as outlined by the approved red line location plan) between the red line boundary and the boundary of the wider site with properties at Anchor Quay have been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include details of boundary treatments and signage designed to prevent public access to these areas. The agreed details including any signage and boundary treatments shall be completed in full prior to the first use of the site as a public pay and display car park.
6. Access to the site shall be via Westwick Street only with egress via Duke Street only. No egress shall be permitted via Westwick Street. The use shall not commence until details to prevent egress via Westwick Street have been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include details of boundary treatments and signage designed to prevent egress via Westwick Street. The agreed details including any signage and boundary treatments shall be completed in full prior to the first use of the site as a public pay and display car park.
7. The use shall not commence until the site has been laid out in full accordance with the approved layout plan (drawing number DW/TCO-002) with the exception that Westwick Street shall not be used as an exit from the site as stipulated by condition 6 above. The parking bays and non-parking areas shall be clearly lined out in full accordance with the layout plan prior to the first use of the site as a public pay and display car park.

(Reasons for approval: The decision has been made with regard to policies ENV7, T1, T2, T4 and T14 of the adopted East of England Plan (May 2008), policies 1, 2, 5, 6 and 11 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (March 2011) saved policies HBE8, EP22, HOU10, TRA3, TRA21 and TRA24 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (November 2004), PPS1, PPS4, PPS5, PPG13, PPG24, PPS25 and other material considerations.

Saved local plan policy TRA3, JCS policies 6 and 11 and East of England Plan policy T2 support the improvement of the bus, cycle and pedestrian networks although none of these specifically detail measures to control the demand for the private car or for a limit on parking. The relevant policies in terms of the restriction of parking are saved local plan policy TRA21, East of England Plan policy T14 and NATS policy 32 which seek to maintain parking levels at 1995 levels and ensure any new provision is on the basis of a short-medium stay tariff. The proposals would not increase parking beyond 1995 levels and a short-medium stay tariff has been proposed and is conditioned.

The proposals have the potential to generate further movements compared to the previous and approved uses, however on the basis of a short-medium stay tariff these movements would not be likely to occur during peak hours when congestion is at its highest in the area.

Matters of site layout, amenity, security, flood risk, impact on trees and shrubs and the impact on the conservation area have been considered and subject to conditions it is not considered that the proposals would have any detrimental impact.

The main issue to consider in this case is whether the proposals would prejudice or delay the objectives of the development plan for more comprehensive redevelopment of the site. On the basis that the existing scheme is not likely to be viable in the current market, given that the proposals conform with other policy and material considerations it is considered appropriate to allow a temporary use which will bring part of the site back into economic use whilst alternative proposals are being prepared. The temporary consent until 16 March 2012 will ensure that the permission does not delay or prejudice redevelopment and will allow the Local Planning Authority to review the situation and progress towards redevelopment in due course under any application to renew the consent.)

5. APPLICATION NO 11/01000/F FLAT 3 380 UNTHANK ROAD, NORWICH NR4 7QE

The planning development manager presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

A resident of Eaton House addressed the committee with her objections to the replacement windows which had been installed. Two other residents of Eaton House then spoke in favour of the application.

The applicant then spoke and explained that the replacement windows were sympathetic to the design of the building and that she had discussed the design with planners and the conservation design officers and on their advice had put in a retrospective planning application for the replacement of the windows.

Discussion ensued in which the solicitor explained that the flat was leasehold but that the issue of consent from the landlord was not a material planning consideration for this committee. Members considered that the replacement windows enhanced the appearance of Eaton House.

RESOLVED to approve Application No 11/01000/F, Flat 3, 380 Unthank Road and grant retrospective planning permission without conditions.

(Reasons for approval: The decision has been made with particular regards to saved policies HBE8, HBE12 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, Adopted Version November 2004 and policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy. Having considered relevant policy and other material considerations, it is considered that the three replacement windows enhance the appearance of the building and make a positive contribution to the conservation area.)

6. APPLICATION NO 11/01104/F 18 - 20 BISHOP BRIDGE ROAD, NORWICH NR1 4ET

The planner (development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides, which included photographs provided by the applicant.

The chair referred to a letter received from the operator of a neighbouring business premises, who had been unable to attend the meeting, and said that the issues raised in objection to the application had been addressed in the report.

Discussion ensued in which the senior planner and the planning development manager referred to the report and explained the reasons why a change of use was acceptable at this location. Members noted that the A1 use was not being lost and that the unit had been previously sub-divided under permitted development rights.

RESOLVED to approve Application No 11/01104/F, 18-20 Bishop Bridge Road, Norwich, and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:-

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which this permission is granted.
2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the plans and details as specified on this decision notice.
3. Details of any extract ventilation or fume extraction system, including its materials and colour of any flue, the position of ventilation, fume or flue outlet points and the type of filtration or other fume treatment to be installed and used in the premises in pursuance of this permission, shall be first approved by the Council and installed before the use hereby permitted commences and thereafter retained in full accordance with the approved details.
4. The installation of any plant or machinery on the premises shall be in accordance with a scheme approved by the council for the reduction, where necessary, of the level of noise and vibration emanating from the premises.
5. The type and positioning of external lighting, including security lighting, will be such as to not cause nuisance to local residents.

(Reasons for Approval:

1. The proposed change of use is considered acceptable. The premises at 18-20 Bishop Bridge Road has been subdivided under permitted development rights, so the A1 use is not technically being lost, just reduced in size. The addition of another unit to the local, centre is considered to add to the vitality and viability of the local centre and improve the range of services available to the community. Further, the addition of another unit to the local centre and indeed the provision of additional services to the community is considered to ensure the protection and enhancement of the local centre and improve the viability of the unit. The proposed change of use of number 18 Bishop Bridge Road to an A5 (hot food takeaway) is considered acceptable as it will result in a range of services being made available to the community, for which there is evidently a demand. It is not considered that any significant harm to the local centre will be borne as a result of this change of use being accepted. Therefore the proposals are considered to be in accordance with the objectives of PPS4 and Policy 2 of the Adopted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (March 2011). Whilst the proposals do not accord with the objectives of saved local plan policy SHO15, it is considered that the public benefits and improved vitality and viability that these proposals will result in for the local centre outweigh the benefits gained through strict adherence to the policy thresholds outlined in SHO15.

2. Subject to compliance with the conditions attached to this permission it is not considered that there will be any detrimental impact on the amenity of adjacent or surrounding residential units as a result of the change of use or installation of associated extraction flues. Therefore the proposals are considered to be in accordance with the objectives of PPG24 and saved policy EP22 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted Version November 2004).
3. The principle of the position of the flue is considered acceptable and there is not considered to be any detrimental visual impact on the character or appearance of the City Centre Conservation Area. Therefore the proposals are considered to be in accordance with the objectives of PPS1, policies ENV6 and ENV7 of the East of England Plan (May 2008), policy 2 of the Adopted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (March 2011) and saved policies HBE8 and HBE12 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted Version November 2004))

7. APPLICATION NO 11/00743/F 49 IPSWICH ROAD, NORWICH, NR2 2LN

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

Councillor Little said that he welcomed this proposal as acceptable but was disappointed that it exceeded the policy on parking provision.

RESOLVED to approve Application No 11/00743/F, 49 Ipswich Road, and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:-

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the plans and details as specified on this decision notice.
3. Details of bin and cycle storage
4. Bin storage, cycle storage and car parking provided before first occupation.
5. Access provided before first occupation.
6. The development hereby approved shall be designed and built to achieve a water consumption rate of not more than 105 litres/person/day, which is equivalent to Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes for water usage. No occupation of [any of] the dwelling[s] shall take place until a full Code for Sustainable Homes assessment which relates to that dwelling and which confirms that the development has been constructed in accordance with Level 4 for water usage has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. All completed water conservation measures identified shall be installed in accordance with the details as agreed and thereafter permanently retained.

(Reasons for approval: The principle of the erection of a new dwelling on part of this site is considered acceptable. The proposals are considered to provide appropriate vehicular access arrangements, an appropriate density, adequate provision of private amenity space for both the proposed and existing dwellings and good accessibility to shops, employment and bus services. The design of the proposed dwelling takes references from the exiting dwelling house but will remain visually subservient by virtue of its size, scale and height. There are not considered to be any

arising issues of loss of privacy or detrimental overlooking as a result of these proposals, nor is there considered to be any loss of natural light to any adjacent or surrounding dwellings. Sufficient car parking space is provided with suitable access and subject to compliance with conditions attached to this permission the provision of cycle storage and servicing arrangements are also considered acceptable. Therefore the proposals are considered to be in accordance with the objectives of PPS1 and PPS3, policies ENV6 and ENV7 of the East of England Plan (May 2008), policies 1, 2, 3 and 20 of the Adopted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (March 2011) and saved policies HBE12, EP22, HOU13, TRA6, TRA7 and TRA8 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted Version November 2004).

8. APPLICATION NO 11/01108/F 89 YORK STREET, NORWICH, NR2 2AP

The planner (development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides, which included details of the specifications of the roof light, and answered members' questions in relation to the report.

RESOLVED to approve Application No 11/01108/F 89 York Street and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which this permission is granted.
2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the plans and details as specified on this decision notice.
3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order)(with or without modification), unless shown on the details hereby approved, no window or other opening shall be installed at first floor level or above in any elevation, flat roof or roof slope of the existing dwelling house.

(Reasons for approval: The proposed design and position of the roof lantern is considered acceptable and is not considered to result in an alien or visually detrimental element in the street scene and is not considered to detrimentally interrupt the character and rhythm of the continuous street frontage in this area. There are not considered to be any arising issues of loss of privacy or light to neighbouring properties as a result of the proposed roof lantern given that the lantern's outlook is restricted and the lantern itself is non-openable. Therefore the proposals are considered to be in accordance with the objectives of PPS1, policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan (May 2008), policy 2 of the Adopted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (March 2011) and saved policy HBE12 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted Version November 2004).

9. APPLICATION NOS 10/01496/ET ALL AT SCOTTS YARD AND 113-121 BER STREET 10/01620/C, 10/01619/L, NORWICH

The planning team leader (development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. Members were advised of a couple of amendments to the report: in paragraph 3, the second sentence refers to a hi-fi centre which is now a wedding

shop; and the third bullet point in paragraph 7, the number of flats should be amended from three to four (13 units in total), so that it reads:

“Erection of two courtyard rear ranges comprising three houses and four flats”.

The planning team leader and the solicitor responded to members’ questions on the report.

RESOLVED:

- (1) to approve Application No 10/01496/ET and grant an extension of time permission, subject to:
 - (a) the completion of a satisfactory Deed of Variance to the original Section 106 Agreement by (15 September 2011) to include the provision of contributions to transportation and the cost of a TRO;
 - (b) subject to the following conditions:
 1. Further 12 Months only;
 2. Samples of materials to be used;
 3. Boundary walls and fences to be erected;
 4. Prior approval of details;
 5. Garages and car parking spaces to be made available to residents prior to occupation;
 6. Landscaping planting, site treatment works;
 7. Maintenance of planting;
 8. Refuse storage facilities;
 9. Plant and machinery;
 10. Extract ventilation details;
 11. Archaeological Agreement;
 12. Contamination risks study;
 13. Contamination Remediation strategy;
 14. Ground Conditions Survey;
 15. Energy efficiency and renewable energy measures to be installed and operational prior to first occupation;
 16. Scheme to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 for water;
 17. Carried out in accordance with approved drawings.
- (2) to approve Application No 10/01620/C and grant Conservation Area Consent, subject to the following conditions:
 1. Commencement within 3 years;
 2. Agreement of contractual arrangements;
 3. Carried out in accordance with approved drawings.
- (3) to approve Application No 10/01619/L and grant Listed Building Consent, subject to the following conditions:
 1. Commencement of work within 3 years;
 2. Details of how the new link building will be stitched into 121 Ber Street;

3. Details of how the new building will stitch into 103 Ber Street;
4. Any damage to be repaired;
5. Carried out in accordance with approved drawings.

10. APPLICATION NO 11/00481/F 2 JUDGES WALK, NORWICH, NR4 7QF

The planner (development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. She pointed out that there had been no letters received in response to the revised application, however, objections received to the previous application had not been withdrawn.

RESOLVED to approve Application No 11/00481/F, 2 Judges Walk, Norwich, and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. Development in accordance with the submitted plans;
3. Facing and roofing materials to match.

Informative:

1. Construction working hours.

(Reasons for approval: The decision has been made with particular regards to saved policies HBE8, HBE12 and EP22 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan and policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy. Having considered relevant policy and other material considerations, it is considered that the extensions are alterations are of good design and will make a positive contribution to the conservation area. Furthermore the proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the neighbouring properties.)

11. APPLICATION NO 11/00889/F 19 DELONEY ROAD, NORWICH, NR7 9DG

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

RESOLVED with 8 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Banham, Kendrick, Lubbock, Little, Gee, Hayne and Offord) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Gayton) to approve Application No 11/00889/F, 19 Deloney Road, Norwich, and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. Development in accordance with the submitted plans;
3. Fence to southern elevation to be reinstated prior to first use

Informative:

1. Ancillary use only.

(Reasons for approval: The decision has been made with particular regards to saved policies HBE12 and EP22 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan and policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy. Having considered relevant policy and other

material considerations, it is considered that the outbuilding is of acceptable design and will not have a significant adverse impact on the neighbouring properties.)

12. APPLICATION NO 11/00794/F 114 MAGDALEN ROAD, NORWICH, NR3 4AN

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

RESOLVED to approve Application No 11/00794/F, 114 Magdalen Road, Norwich, and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard time limit;
2. Development in accordance with the submitted plans;
3. Details/and or samples of material to be used in the development, including bricks, roof, windows, doors, fascias, trims, rainwater goods;
4. Details of the proposed finished floor levels of the building and the existing site ground levels;
5. Full details of hard and soft landscaping before commencement of development including means of enclosure, car parking areas, shed, bin store, hard surfacing materials, planting plans, details of plants and implementation programme ;
6. Provision of cycle store, parking areas and refuse storage areas prior to first occupation;
7. Boundary treatments erected prior to first occupation;
8. Removal of large shed to rear prior to first occupation;
9. Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 for water efficiency.

Informative:

Construction working hours.

Not eligible for parking permits.

(Reasons for approval: The decision has been made with particular regards to PPS1, PPS3 and saved policies NE9, HBE12, EP22, HOU13, TRA6, TRA7 and TRA8 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan and policies 2, 3 and 4 of the Joint Core Strategy. Having considered relevant policy and other material considerations, it is considered that the proposal meets development plan policy objectives and the proposals are considered to be acceptable. The principle of a traditional dwelling fronting onto Magdalen Road has already been established on the site, and it is considered that the amended scheme will not have any significant implications for neighbour amenity or visual impact.)

13. APPLICATION NO 11/00994/NF3 THE PAVILION MOUSEHOLD HEATH, GURNEY ROAD, NORWICH, NR1 4HW

(The vice-chair, Councillor Gee, in the chair.)

(Councillors Bradford had declared a pre-determined view in this item and Councillor Little had said that he could be perceived to have a pre-determined view in this item. Councillor Little left the prior to the commencement of the item. Councillor Bradford reserved his right to speak on the application and then leave the meeting before the committee discussed the item and made its determination.)

The planner (development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides, and referred to the comments of the tree protection officer as set out in the supplementary report of updates to reports for consideration (which was circulated at the meeting.) It was proposed that recommendation 2 in the report should be amended so that delegated powers were given to the head of planning services in consultation with the vice chair as the chair had declared a pre-determined view

Councillor Bradford in his capacity as chair of the Mousehold Heath Conservators said that the replacement of the building was necessary and that there was capital funding available for the scheme.

(Councillor Bradford left the meeting at this point.)

During discussion the planning development manager explained that due to an administrative oversight a notice had not been put up on site and therefore the consultation period had been extended to 31 August 2011. Work on the replacement pavilion needed to be commenced in time to provide facilities for footballers during the winter season.

RESOLVED:

- (1) Subject to no material planning objections being received by 31 August 2011, to approve Application No 11/00994/NF3, The Pavilion, Mousehold Heath, Gurney Road, Norwich, and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:-
 1. Standard time limit;
 2. Development in accordance with the submitted plans;
 3. Colour to match the existing building;
 4. Any tree conditions required.

(Reasons for approval: The decision has been made with particular regards to saved policies HBE12, NE1, NE7 and SE3 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy, Planning Policy Statement 1 and Planning Policy Guidance 17. Having considered relevant policy and other material considerations, it is considered that the proposed portable building will improve the changing facilities for the Fountains Football Ground, is of good design and will not have a detrimental impact upon the landscape or the environmental quality of the area.)

- (2) If any material planning objections are received by 31 August, 2011, delegated powers be given to the head of planning services to determine the application, in consultation with the vice-chair.

CHAIR