



Planning applications committee

9:40 to 13:20

10 January 2019

Present: Councillors Driver (chair), Maxwell (vice chair), Bradford, Button, Malik, Lubbock (substitute for Councillor Wright), Peek, Raby, Sands (M), Stutely and Trevor

Apologies: Councillor Henderson, Ryan and Wright

(The chair asked that the committee had 10 minutes to read the supplementary report of updates to reports which was circulated at the meeting. The commencement of the meeting was therefore adjusted accordingly.)

1. Declarations of interest

Councillor Peek, as Wensum ward councillor, declared an interest in item 10 (below), Application no 18/01430/F - 373 Bowthorpe Road, Norwich, NR5 8AG, because he had a predetermined view in that he had called in the application and would speak in support of the applicant.

Councillor Sands declared an other interest in item 7 (below), Application no 18/01453/U - 547 Earlham Road, Norwich, NR4 7HW, because he had raised officer's awareness to a planning enforcement issue associated with this property, but did not have a predetermined view in the planning application.

2. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meetings held on:

- (a) 6 December 2018, subject to the following amendments to item 3, Application no 18/00330/F - Anglia Square including land and buildings to the North and West, Norwich:
 - (i) 27th paragraph, at the request of Councillor Trevor, to insert footnote as follows:

“¹ Amended at planning applications committee, 10 January 2019, to include the reasons Councillor Trevor was minded to refuse the application because of her concerns about: use of space, lack of mixed communities, lack of trees and green space, air quality and daylight.”
 - (ii) 28th paragraph, 3rd sentence, insert *Her Majesty's* in front of *the Stationery Office*.
- (b) 13 December 2018.

3. Application no 18/00956/F - Magdalen Street, Norwich

The senior planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

The senior planner referred to the report and answered members' questions. Members sought confirmation that subject to viability, this scheme could be brought forward irrespective of decisions on the wider Anglia Square site. The land was in the ownership of Columbia Threadneedle (the applicant) and the city council, and would contribute to the district shopping centre. The applicant would manage the site and would be required to submit a management plan as conditional to the grant of planning permission. Three of the four proposed access points would be closed off during the evenings to allow access to the area to be managed and mitigate noise to local residents and the Doughty Hospital. Emergency procedures would be part of the management plan. The temporary permission for 10 years reflected the durability of the containers and was a beneficial use for land that was either difficult to develop or awaiting a permanent use. There would be toilets and baby changing facilities as part of the scheme. The facility would be suitable for pop-up kitchens and other catering production. The containers could be fitted appropriately with external ventilation. It was expected that the scheme would proceed this year if it was viable.

The chair and vice chair moved the recommendations as set out in the report.

Discussion ensued in which members welcomed the proposal which would assist local businesses and start-up companies, bring vibrancy to the area and deter anti-social behaviour, and provide accessible toilets. A member referred to the objections from the Doughty Hospital said that he considered that the noise mitigation was satisfactory. He said that he considered that the name of the scheme, *Under the Flyover*, could be more imaginative.

Councillor Malik said that he considered that this was a fantastic scheme but that he would abstain because he was concerned that it was dependent on the wider application for Anglia Square. Another member shared this concern. The area development manager (inner) said that there was an indirect link between this application and the wider application for the development of Anglia Square. However it was a separate application to be determined in its own right and was a temporary scheme because of the nature of the structures (containers) that would be used on the site.

In reply to a question from the chair, the senior planner said that the Magdalen Street Area and Anglia Square Traders Association had not commented on the planning application.

RESOLVED with 10 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Malik, Lubbock, Raby, Button, Trevor, Peek, Stutely, Sands and Bradford) and 1 member abstaining from voting (Councillor Malik) to approve application no. 18/00956/F - Magdalen Street Norwich and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Temporary time limit - 10 years;
2. Remediation Plan – scheme for the site following the cessation of the temporary use.
3. In accordance with plans;

4. Prior to commencement requirement for Archaeological Mitigation Strategy;
5. Prior to commencement detailed surface water drainage scheme;
6. Stop work if unknown contamination found;
7. Agreement of detailed landscape scheme - hard, soft and features;
8. Full details: noise mitigation measures (to include site sound system/noise limiter);
9. Full details: flood mitigation including evacuation plan;
10. Provision of extraction scheme – maintenance/management arrangements to be secured;
11. Site management plan to be agreed – to include detailed site management/ maintenance arrangements of the public realm and structures; public access arrangements; leasing strategy; community access arrangement; site security and management; events strategy.
12. Limit 50 % of total floorspace for food and beverage uses: A4 limit 20% no more than two containers;
13. Trading hours – Sun to Wed 07:00 – 21:30; Thurs to Sat 07:00 – 22.30;
14. No entertainment/event /use of amplified sound system after 21:30 on any day;
15. Flexibility for up to 12 later events a year with the prior written approval of the local planning authority;
16. Provision of public cycle parking.

Article 35(2) statement

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations, following negotiations with the applicant and subsequent amendments the application has been approved subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

4. Application no 18/01524/F - Mary Chapman Court, Norwich

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. She referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports which was circulated at the meeting and contained a summary of a relevant appeal decision on a nearby site (Car Park Rear of Premier Travel Inn) and the officer response.

A proxy, acting for two residents, and three local residents addressed the committee and outlined their objections to the proposed scheme. This included concerns that the massing and height of the development would create a negative impact on the conservation area and cityscape; that the seven storey block was too high and that an alternative would be to arrange more the accommodation evenly across the site; and, that the development was contrary to local planning policies. The development was considered to have a detrimental impact on the residents of Dukes Palace Wharf. Residents were concerned that the development would overshadow the flats at Dukes Palace Wharf, blocking out daylight to the flats and balconies (the only outdoor space for residents) and that the assessment of the height of the development in relationship to Dukes Palace Wharf, as set out in paragraph 61 was incorrect, and the assessment of number of storeys at Dukes Palace Wharf did not take into account the mezzanine floors of the corner flats. One of the speakers commented that it would not be difficult for a scheme to be an improvement on the current arrangements and was not sufficient to recommend the scheme. A resident commented that the appeal decision on the nearby site had been available before

Christmas and should have been included in the papers for the meeting rather than circulated at the meeting.

A representative of Norwich University of the Arts (the applicant) explained that this was an important development for the university as it would provide a lecture theatre and teaching space to meet the current needs and medium-term needs of the university. The proposal was to replace an existing building. The scheme took into account the adjacent Barnard's Yard development. In terms of height and massing the scheme reflected the height of the planning permission (now lapsed) for the former Eastern Electricity Board building. Historic England and Norwich Society had provided helpful advice. Proposals to replicate a warehouse style building on the river bank had been discounted to provide public access to the river and open up the public space.

The planner commented on the speakers' representations and explained that the measurements for Dukes Palace Wharf quoted in the report had been taken from Duke Street.

The planner, together with the area development manager (inner) referred to the report and answered members' questions. These included an explanation of the height and massing of the development and its relationship with nearby buildings. Members were advised that the maximum height of the new building was 22 metres and in comparison Dukes Palace Wharf was 21 metres. A member commented on the Eastern Electricity Board's lapsed planning permission and it was noted that the images used were prior to the lapse in the permission in December 2018 and should have been amended accordingly. Members noted the proximity to Barnard's Yard to the existing building at Mary Chapman Court and that, under this proposal, there would be a wider space between the buildings. A member asked about the disused undercroft parking and was advised that it had potential to provide 72 parking spaces. Members considered the importance of the heritage interpretation of the former ironworks and noted the etchings and symbols for the window surrounds and the use of metal colonnades on the ground floor, comprising non-reflective metal which would develop a patina as it weathered. Members also sought confirmation about the management of the public space to deter antisocial behaviour and that there would be staff on site at all times.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations as set out in the report.

During discussion, several members commented in support of the application which would open up the site, reflected the height and massing of adjacent heritage buildings, benefited the residents of Barnard's Yard, provided new facilities for the university and replaced the current poor student accommodation. It was noted that the Norwich Society had supported the scheme.

Councillor Trevor said that she had taken account of the speaker's objections and could not support the proposal. Councillor Raby also said that he was concerned about the height and massing of the scheme, and having listened to the speakers, considered that the scheme could be redesigned to redistribute the mass across the site and reduce the seven storey block by two storeys.

RESOLVED, with 9 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Maxwell, Lubbock, Button, Malik, Peek, Stutely, Sands and Bradford) and 2 members voting against (Councillors Raby and Trevor) to approve application no. 18/01524/F - Mary Chapman Court, Norwich and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Materials to be agreed;
4. Landscaping scheme to be agreed, including demarcation of ownership boundary;
5. Heritage interpretation scheme to be agreed;
6. Details of bicycle storage to be agreed;
7. Refuse collections to take place with use of a reversing assistant;
8. Details of dropped kerb;
9. Street trees to be provided;
10. Travel plan to be shared;
11. Written scheme of investigation to be submitted;
12. Site management plan to be agreed, including arrangements for student drop off and pick up, provision of CCTV;
13. Construction method statement;
14. Contamination preliminary risk assessment to be submitted;
15. Stop works if unknown contamination found;
16. No drainage to the ground without express consent;
17. No piling without express consent;
18. Flood warning and evacuation plan to be submitted;
19. SUDS implementation;
20. Ecological mitigation measures to be implemented in accordance with report;
21. Specification and locations of 8 bat boxes to be agreed;
22. No site clearance during bird nesting season without express consent;
23. All boundary treatments to include small mammal access;
24. Lighting scheme to be submitted (to protect wildlife and light the open space);
25. In accordance with Arboricultural Impact Assessment;
26. Renewable energy to be provided in accordance with Design and Access Statement.

Informatives:

1. Caution must be exercised when demolishing buildings on the site due to the slight possibility that bats may be present. Further inspection of the loft spaces at the site should be carried out prior to demolition. If any bats are found on site during site clearance, works should stop immediately and a licenced bat ecologist must be contacted.
2. The Landscape Management Plan will be expected to set out the overall objectives of a landscape scheme and the steps (e.g. legal arrangements including ownership and management responsibilities, planned maintenance tasks, phased works, monitoring procedures etc.) that will be taken after implementation to ensure that the scheme becomes successfully established and reaches maturity.
3. Construction working hours & considerate construction.
4. Asbestos to be dealt with as per current government guidelines.

5. A planning brief for the archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation will be provided by Norfolk County Council, Historic Environment Service.
6. The loading bay will require a 'loading only' restriction to be established with associated signage. This will entail a Traffic Regulation Order fee of £1995 plus any signage/post costs
7. The costs involved in the relocation of any street furniture (such as road signs or street lights) need to be met by the applicant.
8. Street naming and numbering; the council has a statutory responsibility with regard to postal addressing, if a building name is required to be used formally please contact us for advice.
9. As the footway will need to be reconstructed to ensure it is strengthened for vehicular use and repaved for an embedded loading bay this will require a S278 agreement.
10. A 30 year maintenance fee is applicable for each street tree (payable via the S278 agreement).
11. Anglian Water has assets close to or crossing this site or there are assets subject to an adoption agreement. Therefore the site layout should take this into account and accommodate those assets within either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this is not practicable then the sewers will need to be diverted at the developers cost under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991 or, in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement, liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the diversion works should normally be completed before development can commence.

(The committee adjourned for a short comfort break at this point. The committee reconvened with all members.)

5. Application no 18/01377/VC - 174 Aylsham Road, Norwich NR3 2HJ

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. She advised members that residents had reported an issue of staff leaving the loud speaker on at night but this issue had been resolved. A condition required that the loud speaker was only used in emergencies.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no 18/01377/VC - 174 Aylsham Road, Norwich, NR3 2HJ and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. In accordance with the landscaping details approved within application 18/00086/D, all hard and soft landscaping works shall be retained in perpetuity and shall be managed and maintained as set out within condition 3 of 17/01329/F.
4. The bicycle parking details approved within application 18/00086/D shall be retained in perpetuity.
5. Between the hours of 11pm and 7am on any day:
 - (a) There shall be no customer access to the shop, and all sales shall take place at the night pay hatch; and

- (b) There shall be no use of the fuel pumps other than those on the two pump Islands closest to the shop; and
- (c) There shall be no use of external lighting except the recessed lights set within the underside of the canopy above the two active pump islands; and
- (d) There shall be no use of the vacuum, air or water facilities; and
- (e) There shall be no deliveries to the site.
- (f) There shall be no use of the loudspeaker except in the case of an emergency (i.e. a situation that poses an immediate risk to health, life, property, or environment).

6. Application no 18/01402/VC - 286 Dereham Road, Norwich, NR2 3UU

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. She referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports, which was circulated at the meeting and said that a further representation had been that fully endorsed the recommendations and that the applicant had submitted a document with 26 signatures in support of the proposal. Members were advised that condition 6 as set out in the report was not required as travel plans were covered in condition 9 and should be deleted.

Councillor Stonard, as a local resident and also as cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth, spoke in support of the application. He said that the Norwich and Norfolk Muslim Association was an excellent neighbour and that even when Friday prayers were taking place there was sufficient parking at the centre and in adjacent roads. He said that the adverse literature opposing the application was not representative of the local residents. The proposal regulated an ambiguity in the original planning consent to permit prayer as part of the activities at the centre. There had been no breach of planning consent. The association provided regular community events, including school visits, food bank and clothes donations.

Councillor Maguire said that he had discussed the application with all the local members for Wensum (with the exception of Councillor Peek as a member of this committee) and that they were all fully in support of the application.

A representative of the Norwich and Norfolk Muslim Association, on behalf of the applicants, addressed the committee. In 2011, the applicants had received permission to use the former public house for community events and, as they prayed five times a day, were seeking formal permission to conduct prayers at the premises. It was a small community which was very welcoming and invited residents to open days and arranged regular school visits to build up an understanding of Islam. The members collected food for the foodbank and clothing for homeless people. There were regular community events and a meal once a month.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations as set out in the report.

During discussion the vice chair apologised to the applicants that anyone in this city could circulate a racist leaflet in the area. Other members strongly supported her statement and noted that the police had been informed. Members welcomed the

proposal and considered that the use of the former public house for a community centre was a good use of the premises.

Councillor Peek, Wensum ward councillor, said that, when canvassing in the area, he had not come across any opposition to the applicants' use of the premises.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 18/01402/VC - 286 Dereham Road, Norwich, NR2 3UU and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. In accordance with plans;
2. The use of the premises hereby approved shall be limited to use only as a community centre and place of worship, with ancillary creche, play group or day nursery and education use only and for no other use (including any other purpose in Class D1 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order (with or without modification). For the avoidance of doubt, no use of the premises as a clinic, health centre, art gallery, museum, library, law court or non-residential education and training centre shall take place without further permission being granted.
3. The use of the premises which form the subject of this permission and which are outlined in red on the location plan shall not take place between the hours of 2300 hours and 0700hours on any day, except during the Ramadan period when the use shall cease not later than 3 hours after sunset, or 23:00 whichever is the later.
4. No loudspeaker, amplifier, relay or other audio equipment shall be installed or used outside the building.
5. No installation of any amplified sound equipment shall take place within the application premises unless details of the maximum noise levels, expressed in dB LAeq (5 minute) and measured at a point 2 metres from any loudspeaker forming part of the amplification system, together with details of any noise limiting devices, such as a microphone controlled sealed noise limiting device, have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the maximum noise levels from any amplified sound equipment within the premises shall not exceed those approved at any time. No amplified music shall be played on the premises unless the doors and windows to the premises remain closed.
6. No use shall take place other than in accordance with the hereby approved travel plan dated March 2016.
7. No external lighting or security measures, including CCTV if required, shall be used or installed on the premises unless in accordance with a scheme which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any measures as approved and installed shall be retained thereafter.
8. No fixed plant or machinery shall be installed on the site unless in accordance with a scheme which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
9. Within three months of the date of this permission:
 - (a) provision shall be made for travel information to be publicised to staff and potential future users of the premises; and

- (b) the details of this provision, including the different methods to be used for publicity and the frequency of review shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority; and
 - (c) the travel information shall be made available in accordance with the provision as agreed. This information shall include details of the public transport routes and services available within half a mile walking distance of the site, cycle parking provision and facilities for cyclists on site and any other measures which would support and encourage access to the site by means other than the private car.
10. Within three months of the date of this permission, an up to date management plan shall be submitted to and agreed by the local planning authority to include measures to minimise impacts upon the surrounding area, in particular in terms of noise and car parking. The use shall be operated in accordance with the approved management plan thereafter.

Article 31(1)(cc) statement

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations and has approved the application subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

7. Application no 18/01453/U - 547 Earlham Road Norwich NR4 7HW

(Councillor Sands had declared an interest in this item.)

The planner presented the report with plans and slides. She explained that the application was separate from the planning enforcement in relation to the use of the premises as a restaurant, which did not preclude the determination of this application to change the use of the premises into a bed and breakfast establishment.

The planner, together with the area development manager (outer), referred to the report and answered members' questions, which included reassurance that there were trees on the boundary and at the rear, that a licensing application would be required if the applicant were to sell alcohol on the premises, that the proposal was for a five bedroom bed and breakfast, with staffing accommodation, and was not currently operating as a bed and breakfast. The dining facilities shown on the plan were for guests of the bed and breakfast. Several previous applications for planning consent had not been implemented.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded that the recommendations as set out in the report.

Discussion ensued in which the planner and the area development manager (outer) advised that at this stage of the investigation there was no evidence that the applicant was currently using the premises as a restaurant or any material change of use had occurred. Enforcement action was being considered for the removal of the large sign on the front of the building. A member pointed out that there were other similar businesses and bed and breakfast establishments in the vicinity.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 18/01453/U - 547 Earlham Road Norwich NR4 7HW and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Details of any extraction/mechanical ventilation;
4. Hours for refuse collection and deliveries;
5. Submission of management plan;
6. Bin and bike stores;
7. No use of the rear curtilage for car parking;
8. Use of the premises shall be as a B&B.

Article 35(2) statement

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations, following negotiations with the applicant and subsequent amendments the application has been approved subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

8. Application no 18/01278/U - 4 Fieldview, Norwich, NR5 8AQ

The planner presented the report with plans and slides.

The applicant addressed the committee and said that the application was for seven occupants and could accommodate six people without planning permission. He disputed the measurements of the smallest bedroom and said that the measurements stated in the report were incorrect. The house had two communal areas and was over and above what was usual for a house in multiple- occupation (HMO) with a separate dining room and living room. There was also a garden space with the ground floor bedrooms having patio doors to access this space.

The planner explained that the extension had been granted under a household planning application. Officers had taken the measurements for the bedroom which was below the minimum space standard from the plans submitted by the applicant.

In reply to a member's question, the planner said that there had been a change to the licensing regulations for HMOs and that the council was taking a consistent approach to HMOs in the light of the outcome of the issues raised by the planning inspector in relation to a recent appeal. During discussion the planner and the area development manager (outer) referred to the report and answered members' questions. Planning permission was not required for up to 6 occupants. Members were advised that there were material differences to the property at no 2 Fieldview, which was on a larger plot, with more communal areas and amenity space and two access/egress points. Members noted that this was a retrospective application and asked what the implications would be if it was either approved or refused; and were advised that the applicant could appeal.

Councillor Malik referred to the officer's conclusions in the report and asked an explanation of how the conclusion that it was "border-line" had been reached. The planner said that the recommendation to refuse was consistent with the approach that the council was taking following changes to licensing legislation for HMOs and

the outcome of a recent planning appeal where the planning inspector raised a number of issues in regard to an HMO.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations as set out in the report.

RESOLVED, with 9 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Maxwell, Lubbock, Raby, Button, Trevor, Stutely, Sands and Bradford) and 2 members voting against (Councillors Malik and Peek) to refuse application no. 18/01278/U - 4 Fieldview, Norwich, NR5 8AQ for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development by virtue of the number of occupants, the character of the local area, the size of the property and its relationship to neighbouring properties would cause significant harm to the residential amenity for occupants of nearby dwellings in terms of noise, and general disturbance. The development does not accord with development plan policy in terms of Policies DM2 and DM13 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014. These include provisions to protect residential amenity in terms of noise disturbance, and to ensure that larger HMOs do not have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers.
2. The property provides 7 bedrooms of which one is below nationally described space standards for single bedrooms and is also below minimum space requirements within the Licensing of Houses in Multiple Occupation (Mandatory Conditions of Licences) (England) Regulations 2018, both are considered to be material considerations in this case. Policy DM2 and DM13 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 require a high standard of amenity for future occupiers and although the internal living space is reasonable, given the small size of the room in question and the limited external amenity space the proposal is not considered to provide suitable living accommodation for seven occupants and is therefore contrary to the above referenced policies.

Article 35(2) Statement:

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations. The proposal in question is not considered to be acceptable for the reasons outlined above.

9. Application no 18/01016/U - 2 Fieldview, Norwich, NR5 8AQ

The senior planner presented the report with plans and slides.

The senior planner answered members' questions and explained that the garage was used by the landlord when servicing properties in the area and was not used as habitable space. The recommendation was that this brick building was not used for sleeping accommodation. Members were also advised that there was a condition to prevent the premises being occupied by more than 7 permanent residents.

During discussion members considered that this application was clearly different from the previous application.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 18/01016/U - 2 Fieldview Norwich NR5 8AQ and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. In accordance with plans;
2. Dropped kerb to be provided next to parking area on northern side of property within 6 months of decision.
3. Landscaping scheme to be submitted within 2 months of decision to details of improvements to rear garden and insertion of gate in fence next conservatory. Approved details to be implemented within 3 months of approval of details and rear garden to be made available and retained as such in perpetuity.
4. Vehicle and cycle parking retained for use of the occupants in accordance with plan
5. Brick outbuilding (former garage) not to be used for sleeping accommodation;
6. Development to be occupied by no more than 7 permanent residents.

Article 35(2) Statement:

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations and has approved the application subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

10. Application no 18/01430/F - 373 Bowthorpe Road, Norwich, NR5 8AG

(Councillor Peek, having declared an interest in this item, spoke as a member of the public and then left the room. He did not take part in the determination of the application.)

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

The applicant addressed the committee and explained the family's circumstances and need for an additional bedroom and larger kitchen so that the family could eat together. The applicant said that they would be willing to plant a hedge or provide landscaping to screen the extension from the road.

Councillor Peek read out a letter from an occupational health therapist in support of the application to extend the property and meet the needs of a family member.

(Councillor Peek left the room at this point.)

During discussion, the planner and the area development manager (outer) referred to the report and answered members' questions. He explained that the planning permission for the extension at the front of no 371 Bowthorpe Road had been granted in 2006 before the current development plan had been adopted, which sought to retain the features of the original estate, such as the junction at Beverly Road. Members pointed out that in this case the symmetry and open aspect had been lost when no 371 had been extended and the hedge installed. Members sought confirmation about the size of the family and noted that the extension would fulfil the family's long term needs.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded, contrary to the officer recommendation, that the application be approved.

Discussion ensued in which members commented in support of the planning application. Members in reaching their conclusions took into consideration the personal circumstances of the applicants; that there was no alternative to extending the house to the front; that the houses were poorly designed for modern family use; that the character of the area had been harmed by the permission granted to no 371 and a precedent set; that the applicant could consider a hedge or fence or other boundary treatments to screen the extension and reflect the hedge at no 371.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 18/01430/F - 373 Bowthorpe Road, Norwich, NR5 8AG and grant planning consent subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans.

11. Tree Preservation Order [TPO], 2018. City of Norwich Number 541; 74 Upper St. Giles Street, Norwich, NR2 1LT

The arboricultural officer presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. In reply to a member's question, the area development manager (outer) explained that the process for this tree preservation order had started before the committee approved changes to its delegations.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to confirm Tree Preservation Order [TPO], 2018. City of Norwich Number 541; 74 Upper St. Giles Street, Norwich, NR2 1LT, without modifications.

CHAIR