

Report to	Planning applications committee 14 November 2019	Item
Report of	Area development manager	5
Subject	Performance of the development management service; progress on appeals against planning decisions and updates on planning enforcement cases.	

Purpose

This report updates members on the performance of development management service; progress on appeals against planning decisions and progress on planning enforcement action.

Recommendation

To note the report.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priorities people living well, great neighbourhoods, housing and environment and inclusive economy.

Financial implications

There are no direct financial implications arising from this report.

Ward/s: All wards

Cabinet member: Councillor Stonard

Contact officers

Mark Brown, Development Manager (Outer) 01603 212542

David Parkin, Development Manager (Inner) 01603 212505

Background documents

None

Report

Background

1. On 31 July 2008 the planning applications committee considered a report regarding the improved working of the committee which included a number of suggested changes to the way it operates. In particular it suggested performance of the development management service be reported to the committee and that feedback from members of the committee be obtained.
2. The committee has also asked to be informed on the outcome of appeals against planning decisions and enforcement action.
3. The last performance report was presented to committee on 09 May 2019.

Performance of the development management service

4. The cabinet considers quarterly reports which measure the council's key performance targets against the council's corporate plan priorities. The scrutiny committee considers the council's performance data regularly throughout the year and will identify any areas of concern for review.
5. This report will only highlight trends or issues that should be brought to the attention of the planning applications committee for information.
6. In quarter one of 2019-20, 163 applications out of 181 decisions were dealt with by officers (a delegation rate of 90 per cent) and 18 applications were dealt with by committee.
7. For quarter two 2019-20, 186 applications out of 204 were dealt with by officers (a delegation rate of 91 per cent) and 18 applications were dealt with by committee.
8. For the 2018-19 year in total the delegation rate was 90%, this compares to a delegation rate of 91.4% in 2017-18, 86.4% in 2016-17 and 90.6% in 2015-16.

Appeals

9. There are currently 19 pending planning appeals as listed within the appendix to this report.
10. Since the last performance report 9 appeals have been dismissed, three have been cancelled or withdrawn and 2 appeals have been allowed. One appeal has been part allowed and part dismissed.
11. A brief summary of the appeals which have been dismissed is provided below:

a) 9 Normans Buildings – Demolition of existing workshop and redevelopment of the site to provide 4 No. town house – Delegated refusal

A former planning permission was granted at appeal relating to this site in 2016 for four one bed apartments. This appeal related to the refusal of a revised scheme with increased height providing for 4 town houses.

The main issues in the appeal were the effect on the setting of the Grade I listed St Peter Parmentergate Church and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area; the living conditions of neighbouring residents; and the living conditions of future residents of the proposed houses.

On the first issue the inspector considered that the proposed building would be closer to the road than the existing workshop and considerably taller and as a result would intrude on views of the Church Tower from Normans Buildings and along the section between Raleigh Court and Scoles Green. Whilst the trees would limit this impact this would only be the case when in full leaf and the proposal would require some pruning of the trees to facilitate development. As such the inspector concluded that the proposal would have a negative effect on the setting of the listed church and the character and appearance of the conservation area including trees, where the public benefits would not outweigh the harm to the significance of these designated heritage assets.

On the second issue the inspector concluded that given the height and proximity of the proposed building to neighbouring properties it would have a negative effect on the outlook of neighbouring residents.

On the third issue the inspector considered that the new houses would have a poor level of light and outlook given the northern orientation and relationship with trees and given the internal layout of the proposed houses which differed materially from the earlier scheme.

The inspector took account of housing supply and the benefits of housing provision but determined that the harm would clearly and demonstrably outweigh these moderate benefits, however given the harm to designated heritage assets the presumption in favour of sustainable development would not apply.

b) 18 Brentwood – Fell 4x Scots Pine – Delegated part approval / part refusal

The appeal related to a proposal to fell 4 scots pines which are protected by a TPO. The inspector considered that the trees contributed to the character of the area and there was no evidence that they were diseased or lacked structural integrity. The appellants case was on the basis of 'liveability issues' resulting from the trees at the rear of a short garden. The inspector considered that the pines did not cast heavy shade and their canopies are raised sufficiently to allow outlook beyond the dwelling's rear boundary. The inspector concluded that there was no justification for the pines' removal. The inspector also noted that the pines predated the dwelling and that the limitations of the TPO should have been apparent when the appellant elected to move to the property.

c) 21 Sotherton Road – Single storey extension with associated alterations to create 7 bed large HMO (Sui Generis) – committee refusal.

The main issues for the appeal were the effects on the living conditions of neighbouring dwellings with particular regard to noise and general disturbance and the impact on highway safety.

The inspector considered that the proposal for a seven-bedroom HMO within a quiet suburban cul-de-sac would result in a significant increase in noise and disturbance compared to the existing three-bedroom family dwelling, which would harm the living conditions of the occupants of No. 19 which has an entrance door in close proximity and, to a lesser extent, other residents in the cul-de-sac.

Secondly, the inspector considered that it has not been demonstrated that the parking demands of the appeal scheme could be accommodated on the constrained site served off a shared driveway, which would result in pressure for on-street parking for occupants and visitors. Combined with anticipated increased vehicle movements this would increase congestion and obstruction of the road and pavement within the cul-de-sac, reducing safe movement and visibility for drivers and pedestrians.

The inspector goes on to suggest that even in the absence of a five year supply of deliverable housing sites and the 'tilted balance' of paragraph 11 of the NPPF engaged the adverse impacts of the proposals would outweigh any planning benefit associated with additional housing capacity and dismisses the appeal.

d) 2 Edgeworth Road – Single storey rear extension and change of use from dwellinghouse (Class C3) to 7 bedroom HMO (Sui Generis) – delegated refusal.

The main issues for the appeal were the effects on the living conditions of neighbouring properties in terms of noise and general disturbance and the impact of traffic generation and parking. The inspector noted during the site visit that some of the internal and external alterations had already taken place, however the rear extension had not commenced and not all of the bedrooms were inhabited.

The inspector considered that the proposed development would result in up to seven unrelated occupants, markedly intensifying the level of activity at the property compared to a dwelling/house. Due to the modest rear garden sizes and proximity of neighbouring properties this would likely result in significant harm to the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring dwellings in respect of noise and general disturbance. In addition, seven unrelated occupants will likely result in a relatively high level of car ownership compared to the previous use of the site as a family dwelling. The development would likely result in more car movements, and more cars required to be parked than can be accommodated within the single remaining parking space on the appeal site. This would be likely to lead to significant increases in pressure upon parking on surrounding streets and be likely to result in conditions significantly harmful to highway interests in terms of parking demand.

e) 22 North Park Avenue – Single storey rear extension and change of use to 7 bed HMO (Sui Generis) – Delegated refusal

An appeal against the refusal of consent for an extension to an existing six bedroom HMO and increase in scale by one bedroom. The main issues for the appeal were the effects on the living conditions of neighbouring properties in terms of noise and disturbance and the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area. The inspector considered that by increasing the occupancy of the appeal site, the level of activity at the property would be increased above that of a typical residential dwelling and the position and proximity of surrounding

dwellings would likely have a significant adverse impact in terms of noise and disturbance on neighbouring occupants.

The character and appearance issues surrounding the loss of grass verge required to create a wider vehicle cross-over was not something that the inspector considered to be readily noticeable in this location due to the number of cross-overs already present and therefore the inspector did not consider the proposals to result in harmful impacts upon the character and appearance of the area.

The inspector therefore dismissed the appeal solely in relation to the harmful impacts on living conditions of neighbouring properties.

f) 36 Primula Drive – Change of use and conversion of garage to 10 bed HMO (Class Sui Generis) – Delegated refusal

The main issues for the appeal were, whether acceptable living conditions could be provided for existing and future residents, the effects on the living conditions of neighbouring properties in terms of noise and disturbance and whether the arrangements for car parking to the frontage would harm the character and appearance of the area.

The inspector considered the proposed layout to be sub-standard as a result of the lack of communal space provision for the number of occupants proposed and poor levels of amenity, overall, failing to provide acceptable living conditions for occupants. The inspector considered that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupants of the adjacent neighbouring residential property, No 35 Primula Drive, with particular reference to noise and disturbance as a result of external activity within the rear garden area and comings and goings at the frontage of the property at the intensity proposed. On the final point the large area of hard standing to the frontage to provide 6 parking spaces, although not out of character with the area would have potential for a significant level of additional parking on the hard standing in comparison with other properties, cluttering the frontage and providing an unattractive appearance in a prominent corner position, detracting from the overall quality of the area. The inspector found the car parking arrangements on the site to be unsuitable.

g) 11 Press Lane – First floor front, side and rear extensions and separation of single dwelling into 2 No. dwellings. New wall cladding, doors and windows – Delegated refusal

The main issues for the appeal were the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the streetscene and whether adequate living conditions could be provided for the occupants of the proposed two bedroom dwelling, with regard in particular to outlook and natural light.

The inspector considered that the extensions would overwhelm the property at the front and rear due to their bulk, height and overall mass and would add significantly to the scale of built development at the appeal site. Also, the use of narrow vertical windows and vertical timber boarding would appear at odds with the neighbouring property and with the streetscene generally. Overall, the extensions would appear incongruous and unsympathetic to the existing building and to the streetscene. In

addition the subdivision of the site would lead to a cramped and congested entrance to the site, resulting in a form of development which is harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the street scene. The appeal was therefore dismissed on the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the streetscene alone.

On the second matter of adequacy of living conditions the inspector concluded that although outlook and levels of natural light to the kitchen area of the proposed two bedroom dwelling would be restricted, the main aspect of the dwelling would be towards the rear garden and together with the dual aspect of the open plan ground floor area would not be unacceptably harmful to living conditions of proposed occupants.

h) Land Adjacent To Former Shoemaker PH Enfield Road – Construction of building containing eighteen student flats with new refuse compound – Delegated refusal

The main issues for the appeal were;

- 1) The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area,
- 2) Whether the proposed development should make provision for affordable housing,
- 3) The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of future occupants, with particular regard to outlook, light, and internal and external living space,
- 4) Whether the proposal would increase flood risk, and
- 5) Whether the proposal would make adequate provision for refuse storage and collection.

Although the four storey height of the proposed building would have a unifying 'bookend' effect in combination with four storey elements on adjacent development, the inspector concluded that the scale of the proposed building would result in a stark interface with Twenty Acre Wood public open space, which would harm the character and appearance of the area.

On the matter of affordable housing provision the inspector concluded that the proposed development has sufficient characteristics of C3 accommodation, such as self-containment, physical separation and lack of management and operation arrangements with existing Shoemaker Court student accommodation complex adjacent, for affordable housing requirements to apply. The proposal does not make provision for affordable housing and as such conflicts with development plan policy in this regard.

In respect of future occupants, the inspector found that the proposal would not provide sufficient internal living space and demonstrably certain access to sufficient outdoor amenity space. The proposal would have a minor adverse effect in terms of outlook of one of the units. It would not provide sufficient adaptable accommodation. The absence of harm in respect of receivable light would not outweigh the combined harm to living conditions of future occupants.

On the matter of increased downstream flood risk the inspector concluded that it is not guaranteed that the proposed drainage approach would be practicable or

effective and therefore it could not be demonstrated that the proposal would not give rise to increased flooding downstream.

On the matter of adequacy of refuse storage and collection facilities the inspector concluded that this had also not been demonstrated.

In overall conclusion although the scale of development would give rise to substantial benefits in terms of housing supply and choice of accommodation and economic benefits during and after construction, these would not outweigh the significant identified harm.

i) Land Between 18 And 20 West Parade – 2 No. three bedroom dwellings with new access, parking, amenity spaces and landscaping – Committee refusal

The main issues for the appeal were whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Heigham Grove Conservation Area and the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of No.18 West Parade, with regards overbearing and light issues.

The inspector highlights the significance of the conservation area being an exemplification of 19th century development, with West Parade characterised by medium sized houses set within fairly tight plots with high hedges, railings and walls defining boundaries, with existing trees remaining important landscaping features, which together with boundary hedgerows, low garden walls and railings contributing to attractive street views.

The inspector identifies a separation gap between buildings and their side site boundaries at least at first-floor level and in some cases at ground floor level also as being a prevailing and distinctive characteristic of West Parade which results in a spaciousness, with regular gaps between buildings contributing to the character of the conservation area.

The proposed location of the full depth of the substantial two-storey core of the new building flush with the site's southern side boundary, without a separation gap, would result in a continuity of built mass from the proposed dwellings to the dwellings at No.20 West Parade which would be discordant with the prevailing separation pattern and the somewhat narrow gap between the two-storey northern side elevation of the proposed building and the boundary with No.18, would result in the proposed development appearing 'shoehorned' into the site.

In addition the openness of the proposed double-width parking bays, fronting onto the street, would be contrary to the prevailing use of various front boundary shrubs, trees and walling to soften the visual impact of parking and protect the front garden character of the street adding to the proposal's discordance with the prevailing distinctive character of the area.

He concludes on the first matter that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area which would be significant, relative to the site and the immediate surroundings of the proposal. However, this would constitute less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area as a whole. The public benefits in terms of contribution to local housing supply

and benefits to the local economy do not outweigh the great weight given to the conservation of the conservation area and the less than substantial harm to its significance, the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the conservation area.

On the second matter, the inspector found that the proposal would be detrimental to the living conditions of occupants of No.18 in terms of the substantial mass of the building being overbearing and detrimentally restricting light to an attic bedroom window of the neighbouring property at No.18 West Parade.

The inspector concludes that even in the absence of a five year supply of deliverable housing sites and the 'tilted balance' of paragraph 11 of the NPPF engaged the adverse impacts of the proposals would significantly and demonstrably outweigh benefits associated with additional housing capacity and dismisses the appeal.

12. A brief summary of the appeals which have been part allowed and part dismissed is provided below:

a) 80 Cambridge Street – Single storey extension, 1 No. bay window and loft conversion with dormer windows – Delegated refusal

The application was refused due to the impact of the changes to the roof and dormer window which were considered to be harmful to the character of the conservation area. This heritage impact was therefore the main issue in the appeal. The proposals included raising the eaves and height of the roof as well as a number of dormer windows. Given the uniformity of terrace roofs in the area the inspector considered that the roof extensions would appear incongruous and prominent in the street scene causing harm to the conservation area which was not outweighed by any benefits of the proposal. The refusal did not raise objection to the bay window and single storey extension and the inspector considered them to be acceptable and divisible from the changes to the roof. As such a split decision was made whereby the inspector allowed the single storey extension and bay window but, dismissed the appeal and upheld the council's decision with respect to the changes to the roof.

13. A brief summary of the appeals which have been allowed is provided below:

a) 18 The Crescent – Roller shutter doors in garage doorway and re-forming car port roof – Delegated refusal

The application related to the installation of a roller shutter door and alterations to a car port to the rear of 18 The Crescent which is the end property to the southeast corner of The Crescent adjacent to Chapelfield Road. The refusal was on the basis that the alterations would harm the setting and significance of the grade II listed dwelling and result in a commercial character to the rear Loke. The inspector gave weight to the existing character of the rear boundaries of other properties along the Loke which have varying roof heights and types/materials of doors. The inspector considered that the roller shutter door would be large and utilitarian but no more so than others on the Loke. The inspector considered that it would still be possible to define and differentiate the historic workshop and courtyard in views of the Loke. Ultimately the inspector considered that there would not be harm to the listed building as a result of the alterations.

b) Car Park Adjacent To Sentinel House 37 – 43, Surrey Street – Redevelopment of site to provide 252 student bedroom development with associated access and landscaping – Committee refusal

There is some history to this site as follows:

- Members refused a scheme for a 285 bed development on the site in December 2017 on the basis of impact on the amenity of properties at Carlton Terrace and Sentinel House and on the impact of the development on the conservation area. This decision was appealed.
- Prior to the appeal relating to the 2017 decision being determined a revised scheme for a 252 bed development was submitted and also refused in June 2018. This scheme was refused in June 2018 on the basis of impact on the amenity of properties at Carlton Terrace and on the impact of the development on the conservation area. Due to changes in the scheme and unlike the 2017 decision it was not refused on the basis of impact on the amenity of properties at Sentinel House.
- In August 2018 the appeal decision relating to the first 2017 decision was received. The appeal was dismissed on the basis of the impact of the proposal on the amenity of properties in the recently converted Sentinel House. The inspector did not uphold the other two reasons for refusing the scheme, being impact on the amenity of Carlton Terrace and impact on the conservation area.

Although the second decision was not refused on the basis of harm to the amenity of properties at Sentinel House the inspector gave regard to the earlier appeal decision and also considered this matter. The inspector concluded that there would be a degree of harm in terms of outlook from Sentinel House, however, in terms of loss of light, given that the height along this elevation had reduced the inspector did not find that this impact was any longer a ground on which to dismiss the appeal.

The inspector agreed with the earlier inspector with respect to the impact on Carlton Terrace and the Conservation Area concluding that there was not harm.

In making a balanced decision the inspector did not consider that the harm in terms of outlook from Sentinel would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme and therefore the scheme was allowed.

Enforcement action

14. All items that have been referred to committee or where committee has required enforcement action to take place, since April 2013 are listed in appendix 2 with an updated on the current status. Items are removed once resolved and the resolution has been reported to committee.
15. At the committee meeting of 11 October 2018 members approved a revised scheme of delegation which provided delegated powers for the issue of enforcement notices. Going forward therefore enforcement notices which have been issued will be included on the table so that members are aware of action which has been taken.

Appendix 1 – Current Appeal Cases and Decisions

Pending Planning Appeals and Recent Appeal Decisions								
Application Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Proposal	Type of Appeal	Start Date	Decision	Decision Level	Officer
18/00006/REF Application No. 17/01136/L	APP/G2625/Y /18/3197928	18 The Crescent	Roller shutter doors in garage doorway and re-forming car port roof.	Written Reps	19/02/2019	Allowed	Delegated	Maria Hammond
18/00018/REF App no 18/00102/F	APP/G2625/ W/18/320740 8	9 Normans Buildings	Demolition of existing building and erection of a two storey building comprising 4 No. apartments.	Written Reps	19/02/2019	Dismissed	Delegated	Joy Brown
18/00021/TA1 App No 18/00836/TPO	APP/TPO/G2 625/6903	18 Brentwood	4x Scots Pine - fell.	Written Reps	16/08/2018	Dismissed	Delegated	Mark Dunthorne
18/00022/REF App No 17/02024/F	APP/G2625/ W/18/320978 7	Bowthorpe Road Methodist Church	New church hall	Written Reps	07/06/2019	Decision awaited	Committee	Stephen Polley
18/00026/REF App No 18/00437/F	APP/G2625/ W/18/321100 4	Car Park Adjacent To Sentinel House 37 - 43 Surrey Street	Redevelopment of site to provide 252 student bedroom development with associated access and landscaping.	Written Reps	01/05/2019	Allowed	Committee	Joy Brown
18/00027/REF App No 18/00544/F	APP/G2625/ W/18/321226 4	21 Sotherton Road	Single storey extension with associated alterations to create 7 bed large HMO (Sui Generis).	Written Reps	09/04/2019	Dismissed	Committee	Stephen Polley
18/00028/REF App No 18/00521/F	APP/G2625/ W/18/321496 2	Land Adjacent To Former Shoemaker PH Enfield Road	Construction of building containing eighteen student flats with new refuse compound.	Written Reps	09/04/2019	Dismissed	Delegated	Maria Hammond
18/00030/ENFPLA Enf Ref 15/00046/CONSR V/ENF	APP/G2625/C /18/3217628	13 Magdalen Street	Removal of six number single glazed, vertical sliding sash windows of white painted timber construction and the installation of PVC-u double glazed casement windows	Written Reps	21/08/2019	Pending	Delegated	Samuel Walker

Pending Planning Appeals and Recent Appeal Decisions

Application Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Proposal	Type of Appeal	Start Date	Decision	Decision Level	Officer
19/00001/REF App No 18/00112/F	APP/G2625/ W/18/321906 0	Land Between 18 And 20 West Parade	2 No. three bedroom dwellings with new access, parking, amenity spaces and landscaping.	Written Reps	09/04/2019	Dismissed	Committee	Katherine Brumpton
19/00002/ENFPLA Enf Ref 18/00052/ENF	APP/G2625/C /19/3219894	2 Quebec Road	Alteration of the flat roofed side extension not in accordance with 17/00095/F.	Written Reps	27/08/2019	Pending	Delegated	Lara Emerson
19/00003/TA1 Ref. 18/01769/TPO	APP/TPO/G2 625/7343	3 The Crescent	Oak (T1): Fell.	Written Reps	01/05/2019	Pending	Delegated	Mark Dunthorne
19/00004/REF App No. 18/01721/F	APP/G2625/ W/19/322303 3	2 Edgeworth Road	Single storey rear extension and change of use from dwellinghouse (Class C3) to 7 bedroom HMO (Sui Generis).	Written Reps	01/05/2019	Dismissed	Delegated	Charlotte Hounsell
19/00005/REF App No. 18/00979/F	APP/G2625/ W/19/322408 4	22 North Park Avenue	Single storey rear extension and change of use to 7 bed HMO (Sui Generis).	Written Reps	18/04/2019	Dismissed	Delegated	Stephen Polley
19/00006/REF App No. 18/01478/F	APP/G2625/D /19/3224347	80 Cambridge Street	Single storey extension, 1 No. bay window and loft conversion with dormer windows.	Written Reps	24/04/2019	Part allowed / part dismissed	Delegated	Stephen Little
19/00007/CALLIN App No. 18/00330/F	APP/G2625/V /19/3225505	Anglia Square	Part Full/Outline application for the comprehensive redevelopment of Anglia Square	Public Inquiry - Called in application	21/03/2019	Pending	Committee	Tracy Armitage
19/00008/ENFPLA Ref No. 18/00016/ENF	APP/G2625/C /19/3225581	Bowthorpe Road Methodist Church	Appeal against Enforcement Notice for the construction of a church hall	Written Reps	07/06/2019	Decision awaited	Committee	Stephen Polley
19/00009/ENFPLA Ref No. 19/00034/ENF	APP/G2625/C /19/3225666	4 Fieldview	Appeal against Enforcement Notice for operating as a 7 bed HMO at 4 Fieldview	Written Reps	07/06/2019	Decision awaited	Committee	Charlotte Hounsell
19/00010/REF App No. 18/01892/F	APP/G2625/ W/19/322621 4	11 Press Lane	First floor front, side and rear extensions and separation of single dwelling into 2 No. dwellings. New wall cladding, doors and windows.	Written Reps	25/04/2019	Dismissed	Delegated	Charlotte Hounsell
19/00011/ENFPLA Ref No. 18/00052/ENF	APP/G2625/C /19/3219895	2 Quebec Road	Appeal against Enforcement Notice for alteration of the flat roofed side extension not in accordance with planning permission 17/00095/F.	Written Reps	27/08/2019	Decision awaited	Delegated	Lara Emerson

Pending Planning Appeals and Recent Appeal Decisions

Application Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Proposal	Type of Appeal	Start Date	Decision	Decision Level	Officer
19/00012/ENFPLA Ref No. 17/00190/ENF	APP/G2625/C /19/3227490	16 Lushington Close	Appeal against Enforcement Notice for the erection of a single storey rear extension at 16 Lushington Close without planning permission.	Written Repts	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Delegated	Stephen Polley
19/00013/TA1 Ref. No. 19/00268/TPO	APP/TPO/G2 625/7430	31 Roe Drive	2no. Lime (G7): Reduce height from 70ft to 50ft or reduce by 3m.	Written Repts	21.05.2019	Pending	Delegated	Mark Dunthorne
19/00014/REF Ref. No. 18/01583/U	APP/G2625/W/19/323103 5	36 Primula Drive	Change of use and conversion of garage to 10 bed HMO (Class Sui Generis).	Written Repts	24.06.2019	Dismissed	Delegated	Charlotte Hounsell
19/00015/REF Ref. No. 19/00307/L	APP/G2625/Y /19/3232169	8 Hardy Road	Internal alterations to living space and kitchen including removal of separating wall.	Written Repts	12.08.2019	Pending	Delegated	Chris Brownill
19/00016/ENFPLA Ref. No. 18/00149/ENF	APP/G2625/C /19/3233542	8 Marston Lane	Erection of fence	Written Repts	Awaiting Start Date	Pending	Delegated	Stephen Polley
19/00017/REF Ref. No. 19/00679/F	APP/G2625/W/19/323386 7	Pump House East of 85 Hall Road	Conversion to dwelling (Class C3) and single storey side extension.	Written Repts	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Delegated	Maria Hammond
19/00018/ENFPLA Ref. No. 18/00003/ENF	APP/G2625/C /19/3233917 and 3233918	Plane View Holt Road	Unauthorised caravan and other development	Written Repts	Awaiting Start Date	Pending	Committee	Rob Webb
19/00019/ENFPLA Ref. No. 18/00068/ENF	APP/G2625/C /19/3234468	Land at corner of Sweet Briar Road and Hellesdon Hall Road	Unauthorised Bill Board	Written Repts	Cancelled	Cancelled	Delegated	Charlotte Hounsell
19/00020/REF Ref. No. 19/00540/F	APP/G2625/D /19/3234926	155 Christchurch Road	Loft Conversion	Written Repts	09.09.2019	Pending	Delegated	Charlotte Hounsell
19/00021/TA1 Ref. No. 19/00853/TPO	APP/TPO/G2 625/7568	380C Unthank Road	Deodar Cedar (G1): Remove.	Written Repts	27.08.2019	Pending	Delegated	Mark Dunthorne
19/00022/REF Ref. No. 18/01801/F	APP/G2625/W/19/323683 1	18 Earlham Green Lane	Rear annexe and change of use to HMO (Class Sui Generis) (Retrospective).	Written Repts	04.10.2019	Pending	Delegated	Steve Polley
19/00023/REF Ref. No. 19/00063/U	APP/G2625/W/19/323687 4	36 Primula Drive	Change of use and conversion of garage to 8 bed HMO (Class Sui Generis).	Written Repts	04.10.2019	Pending	Delegated	Charlotte Hounsell

Pending Planning Appeals and Recent Appeal Decisions

Application Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Proposal	Type of Appeal	Start Date	Decision	Decision Level	Officer
19/00024/REF Ref. No. 19/01059/F	APP/G2625/ W/19/323792 8	Pump House East of 85 Hall Road	Conversion to dwelling (Class C3) and single storey side extension.	Written Reps	Awaiting Start Date	Pending	Delegated	Maria Hammond
19/00025/TA1 Ref. No. 19/01140/TPO	APP/TPO/G2 625/7638	67 Mill Hill Road	2no. Lime (T1 & T2): Fell and remove additional 1m stump, replace with 1no. tree of smaller species.	Written Reps	09.10.2019	Pending	Delegated	Mark Dunthorne
19/00026/REF Ref. No. 19/01048/F	APP/G2625/D /19/3239070	7 Violet Road	Second Storey Rear Extension	Written Reps	Awaiting Start Date	Pending	Delegated	Steve Polley

Appendix 2 – Enforcement Action Update

Enforcement Action Update on Enforcement Notices					
Case Ref.	Location	Development	Date referred to committee	Current Status	Lead Officer
13/02087/VC & 13/02088/VC	Football ground & adjacent flatted development	River bank, landscaping, street trees, etc	6 March 2014 & 08 December 2016	Revised landscaping proposals and timeframes for provision were agreed at the committee meeting of 08 December 2016. The decision has not yet been issued due to difficulties in agreeing wording of the Section 106 agreement. Despite the above the first phase of landscaping works along Geoffrey Watling Way have been undertaken. Riverside works which were required were undertaken this year. Other works have been delayed in part by recladding works related to the NR1 blocks. The matter is still moving forward and a revised timetable for remaining works is to be agreed.	Tracy Armitage
17/00076/ENF	1A Midland Street	Erection of two fabrication units and associated works	10 August 2017	The enforcement notice was appealed. By negotiation, an extension to the compliance period was agreed until the end of October. The spray booths have been removed through the implementation of an earlier consent. This has now been resolved and will be closed.	David Parkin
17/00157/ENF	5 Nutfield Close	Subdivision of dwelling to create four residential units	12 October 2017 & 12 April 2018	The enforcement notice was served on 11 December 2017. At the meeting on 12 April 2018 members resolved to withdraw the above notice and issue a revised notice requiring the implementation of revised approval for two residential units on the site (permitted via reference 18/00005/F). The former notice was withdrawn and new notice served on 22 May. The notice required the property to change into two dwellings by 22 February 2019. The latest discussions with the owners indicate that they may now wish to convert the unit back to a single dwelling. Certain internal works have taken place however a further visit is required to consider if a further revised notice is required.	Stephen Polley
15/00046/CON SRV/ENF	13 Magdalen Street	Removal of timber sash windows and installation of uPVC windows.	12 April 2018	Notice served 19th November 2018 and subsequently appealed. Appeals started 21 August, awaiting decision.	David Parkin
17/00068/ENF	1 Magdalen Street	Painting of listed building without consent	12 July 2018	Enforcement notice served 12 July 2018, this notice has now been complied with.	Lara Emerson

Enforcement Action Update on Enforcement Notices

Case Ref.	Location	Development	Date referred to committee	Current Status	Lead Officer
18/00003/ENF	Land at Holt Road, Norwich	Siting of residential caravan.	09 August 2018 & 11 October 2018	Enforcement notice was served on 05 July 2019 with a 12 month compliance period following consideration at the June Planning Committee. This notice has been appealed and a start date is awaited.	Rob Webb
17/00151/ENF	137 Unthank Road	Construction of building not in accordance with approved plans and pre-commencement conditions that have not been discharged.	13 September 2018	The enforcement notice for the main works to the building has been served on 19 November 2018 and has been complied with. A further notice requiring the undertaking of landscaping works was served on 05 June 2019 requiring landscaping works to be undertaken. Whilst the compliance period has passed works are being undertaken on site (currently to the rear). The situation is being monitored.	Charlotte Hounsell
16/00167/ENF	Café Britannia, Britannia Road	Without planning permission the change of use of the land to café (A3), shop (A1) and function rooms (D1).	13 September 2018	The use has now ceased and as such there is no longer a planning enforcement issue.	Rob Webb
18/00052/ENF	2 Quebec Road	Development not in accordance with planning permission 17/00095/F.	08 November 2018	Notice issued requiring compliance with approved plans. Notice takes effect on 08 January with 180 day compliance period. Notice appealed via written representation route, start date was 27 August 2019 decision is awaited.	Lara Emerson
18/00016/ENF	Bowthorpe Road Methodist Church	Erection of church hall without consent (not in accordance with approved plans)	12 July 2018	Notice served requiring alteration to the roof. This notice has been appealed and a decision is awaited.	Stephen Polley
19/00034/ENF	4 Fieldview	Operating as a 7 bedroom HMO without consent.	10 January 2019	Notice served requiring use to revert to C3/C4 by mid August. The notice has been appealed and a decision is awaited.	Charlotte Hounsell
16/00095/ENF	145 Hall Road	Erection of two storey extension.	Delegated	Notice served requiring demolition of an unauthorised two storey extension or implementation of a revised single storey extension which has been granted consent. Compliance is required by March 2020.	Rebecca Prideaux
17/00190/ENF	16 Lushington Close	Rear extension	Delegated	A notice was served requiring removal of the extension due to impact on neighbours. A revised proposal has now been approved. The notice is therefore to be withdrawn and reserved requiring the alternative proposal to be implemented.	Stephen Polley

Enforcement Action Update on Enforcement Notices

Case Ref.	Location	Development	Date referred to committee	Current Status	Lead Officer
18/00068/ENF	Land North Side Of Junction With Sweet Briar Road Hellesdon Hall Road	Erection of billboard.	Delegated	Notice served for the removal of an unauthorised billboard. The notice has been complied with.	Maria Hammond
18/00069/ENF	Land at junction of Boundary Road, Drayton Road and Sweet Briar Road	Erection of billboard.	Delegated	Notice served for the removal of an unauthorised billboard. The notice has not been complied with and further action is being considered.	Maria Hammond
18/00136/ENF	20 Beatty Road	Outbuilding possibly being used for business use.	Delegated	Notice served requiring use to cease. The notice has been complied with.	Charlotte Hounsell
18/00149/ENF	8 Marston Lane	Erection of fencing to front of property	Delegated	A notice has been served requiring removal of 2m fencing to the front of the property, the notice has been appealed and a start date is awaited.	Stephen Little
18/00202/ENF	70 Vincent Road	Erection of fence adjacent public footpath over 1m tall.	Delegated	Notice served requiring removal of fence by 25 November 2019.	Stephen Little
19/00050/ENF	1 Wheeler Road	External alterations to dwellinghouse and boundary treatments including erection of fence and gate.	Delegated	Notice served requiring boundary fence and gates to be reduced in height with compliance date of 03 August 2019. The fence has been reduced in height but we have asked for the fence posts to also be reduced in height.	Stephen Little
19/00083/ENF	2 Somerleyton Street	Breach of conditions of permission 17/01515/F	Delegated	Breach of condition notice served requiring compliance with conditions relating to cycle storage, bin storage, site management plan, landscaping, security and materials. The notice requires implementation of various works on site by 02 October 2019. Most works have been undertaken we are just waiting for bin stores to be completed before closing the case.	Lara Emerson
19/00091/ENF	10 Brigg Street	Unauthorised installation of shopfront and adverts.	Delegated	Enforcement notice served requiring removal of the unauthorised shop front by 01 February 2020. An application for a revised shop front is expected shortly.	Lara Emerson
19/00132/ENF	8 Weston Road	Installation of large front fence.	Delegated	Enforcement notice served requiring removal of a tall fence by 20 October 2019. The notice has been complied with.	Stephen Little
19/00144/ENF	Former Eastern Electricity Board Site Duke Street	Unauthorised use of the site as a car park.	Delegated	Breach of condition notice served requiring the car park use to cease by 17 September 2019. The notice has not been complied with. Further discussions are taking place with the landowner before taking further action.	Lara Emerson

