



**Planning Applications Committee**

**09:30 to 14:50**

**21 March 2024**

Present: Councillors Driver (chair), Sands (M) (vice chair), Calvert, Haynes, Hoechner, Lubbock, Oliver, Peek, Sands (S) and Young

Apologies: Councillors Prinsley (other council business) and Thomas (Va)

**1. Declarations of interests**

Councillors Calvert, Hoechner and Young each declared an other interest and a predetermined view in regard to item 4 (below) Application no 22/00762/F Land and Buildings, Including 70 – 72 Sussex Street & Land North Side of 148 Oak Street, Norwich, NR3 3DE, because interested parties were known to them. As such they would leave the meeting during the discussion and determination of this item.

Councillor Haynes asked that it was recorded that she had attended a presentation on Carrow Works by the developers in her capacity as ward councillor for Thorpe Hamlet. It was in the early stages and she was not predetermined on Item 3 (below), Application no 22/00879/F Carrow Works, King Street, Norwich.

**2. Minutes**

**RESOLVED** to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 2024, subject to item 3, Application no 23/00479/F – Fieldgate, Town Close Road, Norwich, Resolution, deleting the first “against” and replacing with “in favour” so that the resolution now reads as follows:

**RESOLVED**, with 7 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Sands (M), Sands (S), Thomas, Haynes, Peek and Lubbock) and 5 members voting against (Councillors Hoechner, Oliver, Calvert, Young and Prinsley) to approve application no. 23/00479/F Fieldgate, Town Close Road, Norwich, NR2 2NB and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions (etc)”

**3. Application no 22/00879/F Carrow Works, King Street, Norwich**

**Proposal:** Hybrid (Part Full/Part Outline) for the comprehensive redevelopment of Carrow Works. A full planning application comprising the construction of the principal means of access, the primary internal road and associated public

spaces and public realm, including restoration and change of use of Carrow Abbey to former use as residential (Use Class C3), alteration and extension and conversion to residential use, (Use Class C3) of the Lodge, Garage and Gardener's Cottage and the Stable Cottages, development of the former Abbey Dining Room for residential use (Use Class C3), adaptation and conversion for flexible uses (Class E and/or C2 and/or C1 and/or C3 and/or F1 and/or F2 and/or B2 and/or B8 and/or Sui Generis) for buildings 207, 92, 206, 7 (7a, 8 and 8a), 209, 35, the Chimney and Class E and/or B2 and/or B8 for the retained Workshop (Block 258), (providing a combined total of up to 143 residential units and 17,625sqm of flexible commercial business, service and local community and learning floorspace), enhanced access to Carrow Abbey and Scheduled Ancient Monument and associated ancillary works and an outline planning application for demolition of existing buildings and replacement with phased residential-led development up to 1,716 units (Use Class C3 and/or Class E and/or F1 and/or F2 and/or C1 and/or C2 and/or B2 and/or B8 and/or Sui Generis), (total of 9,005sqm of commercial, business, service, local community and learning and Sui Generis floorspace) landscaping, open space, new and modified access.

The chair adjourned the meeting for 20 minutes to provide members with an opportunity to read through the submission that the applicants had sent the council the previous evening (available on the [council's website](#) with the committee papers for this meeting.)

(The committee reconvened at 10:05 with all members listed present, as above.)

The Head of Planning and Regulatory Services explained that the submission included three documents: an email requesting deferral, representation in response to the reasons for refusal as set out in the report, and the applicant's representations on the approved East Norwich Masterplan. There was no case for an open-ended deferral of this application. There were substantial issues which would take time to resolve and would cause confusion if addressed through amendments to the current application. It would be much clearer and easier if there was a new application. The applicant had been aware of the officer recommendation to refuse the application for several weeks, and had not taken the opportunity to engage with officers. Some aspects of the application were totally flawed. The reference in the submission to emails from senior officers was not relevant to the determination of the application. Members were strongly urged to determine the application at this meeting.

The committee considered whether to defer further consideration of this application at this point, or to continue to consider the officer report with a view to determining the application at this meeting. Members considered that overall, there was no case to defer at this point, and that the committee should consider the officer report and presentation before determining the application. In reply to a member's question, the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services said that the applicant had asked for an

open-ended deferral. If members were minded to defer, the council could seek a time-limit for the resolution of these issues, but she advocated determination.

The Head of Planning and Regulatory Services introduced the presentation by providing an overview. East Norwich represented the biggest regeneration site in the East of England and was a once in a lifetime opportunity to transform this part of the city to form a new quarter, with its residential and commercial uses complemented by community facilities, with connectivity created between the Broads National Park and the city centre, supported by the Stage 1 and Stage 2 Master Plan demonstrating the infrastructure required to support the development of this new community. The council had given significant time and investment to the realisation of this opportunity through its budget setting and the adoption of the Greater Norwich Local Plan. It was therefore disappointing to report to the committee on this site, Carrow Works, with a recommendation for refusal. The application submitted in July 2022 was incomplete. Over a period of 18 months, there had been no meaningful engagement with the applicant or its agents to address these issues. She referred to the conclusions contained in the report and the duty of the council as the Local Planning Authority to refuse an application that deviates from adopted policy.

The Planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides, and referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports (which had been circulated at the meeting and available on the council's website with the papers for the meeting) which contained clarification on the status a Stage 2 of the Masterplan for East Norwich and also some wording updates in the report, including corrections to the reasons for refusal, number 8.

During discussion the Planner, Head of Planning and Regulatory Services, Development Manager, together with the county council's Highways officer, Major and Estate Development Team Manager, and the city council's Development Strategy Manager and Landscape and Conservation Officer, answered members' questions, referring to the report and the presentation. These included:

- An explanation that the Bracondale/Martineau Lane roundabout was inadequate for the single access for a development of this size. The proposed second access on Bracondale was not appropriate for left in left out vehicular access and the existing road was one of the most congested in the city. The applicant had not provided sufficient information to model the impact on the highways network from the development. This included alternative access to the site, sustainable links to local facilities including access to schools. The Highway Authority did not have the information to make an assessment on this application.
- Concerns were expressed over the separation between the Abbey and Priory. This would cause harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, including the Conservation area. The group value, connections, and associations between designated heritage assets on the application site and beyond was important. For example, Carrow House had been home to the Colman family in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and there had been no significant development affecting the Abbey since then. The high buildings along the river would have an impact on the Abbey grounds; the screening effect of trees was mentioned as an important factor which contributed to the secluded character of the Abbey.

There was also concern about visibility of development above the trees and loss of trees.

- Members were advised that there was no provision of affordable housing in the development. The Development Manager said that it was not appropriate to secure affordable housing by condition as it did not provide certainty that affordable housing would be delivered. It was usual to secure this through a S106 agreement.
- There was a whole raft of measures for this part of the development (East Norwich) that could be done to promote active travel. Improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junctions at King Street/Carrow Bridge and the Bracondale/Martineau Lane junction were schemes that might come forward. The applicant had given no indication how this development could contribute to this.
- Members noted that the applicant's noise and air quality assessments were not adequate to assess the impact of the works of the asphalt plant and rail head on acceptable land uses. Also, the air quality assessment did not consider the culminative impact of this development alongside the allocation of other large housing developments in the city and therefore there was no confidence in the mitigation measures required.
- The committee was referred to the report regarding the policy requirement for a primary school on the site. The proposed development on the Carrow Works site was self-contained and took no account of the other developments that were coming forward. East Norwich was a large regeneration site and facilities on Carrow Works would be part of the wider infrastructure of the whole development. The applicant's position on the school was symptomatic of this.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendation to refuse as set out in the report (with the amendment to reason 8 as set out in the supplementary report).

During discussion members commented on their concerns about this application. Members considered that it did not join up with the other developments coming forward as part of the East Norwich regeneration project and made no provision for infrastructure such as the school and doctors, or provided links to the River Wensum and Whitlingham Lane and Broad. The development would contribute to increased traffic congestion particularly in the area around Martineau Lane and Bracondale.

Members also commented on the applicant's lack of engagement with officers and that a lot of time and wasted resources had been spent by officers trying to engage and resolve issues. A member commented that this site had historic and economic importance for the city and that it was hoped that in the future a proposal that provided housing and mixed use on this site came forward connected and integral to the East Norwich Regeneration Project.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to refuse application no. 22/00879/F Carrow Works, King Street for the following reasons:

1. The application fails to deliver many of the requirements of the site-specific policy

that are necessary to ensure a highly sustainable mixed-use community is delivered at East Norwich. Many of the deficiencies in the application would also prejudice future development and restrict options across the remainder of the ENSRA due to the poor connectivity and limitations to movement that would arise as a result. The application is therefore contrary to policy GNLP7.1 and GNLPSTR.01 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan 2024.

2. In the absence of any contrary evidence, the housing types proposed and particularly the predominance of flats is not consistent with the Greater Norwich Local Housing Needs Assessment. This along with the total lack of affordable housing results in an unsustainable housing development proposal, whereby the mix of dwellings by type and tenure fail to promote the creation of a mixed, diverse, inclusive and equitable community, contrary to GNLP 5, GNLPSTR.01 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan 2024, and policy DM1, DM12 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 and the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).
3. In the absence of a detailed economic strategy of proposed non-residential uses and their location across the site and the contributions that these will make to job creation, together with a demonstration of how the retail and leisure and office uses can be achieved without impacting on existing town centre use provision or office accommodation on sites designated for such uses nearby or encouraging car dependency for access, it is not possible to conclude that the non-residential uses proposed would comply with the detail set out within policy GNLP4, GNLP6, GNLPSTR.01 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan 2024 and policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014.
4. An Appropriate Assessment has concluded that insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that this proposal would not result in an increase in nitrate and/or phosphate levels which would further adversely affect the current unfavourable status of the Broads Special Area of Conservation. In adopting a precautionary approach, the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that the proposal will not adversely affect the integrity of this habitats site and the application is contrary to Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017; policy GNLP3 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan 2024; policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014; and paragraphs 8, 11, 180, 186 and 188 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).
5. An Appropriate Assessment has concluded that insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that this proposal would not result in an increase in recreational disturbance due to the impact of additional visits to Special Areas of Conservation (SACs and SPAs) in the Wash, Norfolk Coast and the Broads. There is a lack of a mechanism to secure payment of the RAMS (Recreational Access Mitigation Strategy) tariff, together with insufficient new on-site and enhancement of off-site green infrastructure provision both in terms of quantity and function to meet the informal recreational needs of the new residents. In adopting a precautionary approach, the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that the proposal will not adversely affect the integrity of these habitats sites and the application is contrary to Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017; policy GNLP3 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan 2024; policy DM3, DM6 and DM8 of the Development Management Policies

Local Plan 2014; and paragraphs 8, 11, 180, 186 and 188 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

6. The lack of certainty of mitigation to prevent adverse effects on the integrity of habitats site could cause significant, permanent negative impacts on the environment of international scale as identified within the Environmental Statement. The application is therefore contrary to policy GNLP3 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan 2024; policy DM3, DM6 and DM8 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014; and paragraphs 8, 11, 180, 186 and 188 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).
7. The individual buildings comprising the application site are distinguished by their significant architectural and historic interests; moreover, the group value of all heritage assets deriving from their links and associations with each other and this unique context, further reinforces their significance. The proposals have been found to result in high levels of harm to the setting and significance of a number of designated and non-designated heritage assets. The high levels of individual and cumulative harm caused is 'less than substantial harm', which is without clear and convincing justification and is not sufficiently outweighed by public benefits, and as such the application is contrary to policy GNLP3, GNLP7.1 and GNLPSTR.01 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan 2024; policy DM9 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014, paragraphs 201, 203, 205 - 208 of the NPPF and Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
8. The fundamentals of the application surrounding design, heritage and access and movement remain to be resolved, it cannot be concluded that the design of the development fully respects or enhances the character and context of the local area or delivers a beautiful and well-designed exemplar of high quality, high density and locally distinctive design which respects its context and setting.

Delivery in isolation without facilitating connectivity between the sites in the wider strategic regeneration area or providing co-ordinated delivery of new essential infrastructure would be prejudicial to delivery across the wider master planned area and would fail to make a positive contribution to high quality placemaking.

Outstanding issues surrounding design and heritage impacts will have implications for the interrelated land use, demolition, proposed heights, and public open space outline parameters plans. The outstanding access and movement matters will greatly impact on the access and movement outline parameters plan and as site access is demonstrated across all of the parameter plans it impacts on these also. In addition, the detailed Design Code is based on key layout principles set out on a Regulatory Plan which takes information from the outline parameters plans which are not considered acceptable.

The application is therefore contrary to policy GNLP2, GNLP3 and GNLPSTR.01 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan 2024; policy DM3 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 and the design principles as set out in section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

9. The access proposed at the A1054 Bracondale / Martineau Lane roundabout is unsatisfactory to serve the proposed development by reason of inappropriate design contrary to current guidance and would be to the detriment of highway

safety, contrary to policy GNLP7.1 and GNLPSTR.01 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan 2024; policy DM30 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 and, NPPF paragraph 8 and Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

10. The proposed development includes a new access at A1054 Bracondale, a strategic road that carries significant traffic movements. The vehicular movements associated with the use of the access would lead to conflict and interference with the passage of through vehicles and introduce a further point of possible traffic conflict, being detrimental to highway safety, contrary to policy GNLP7.1 and GNLPSTR.01 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan 2024; policy DM30 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 and paragraph 8 and Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).
11. The proposed development does not adequately provide on and off-site facilities for pedestrians / cyclists / people with disabilities (those confined to a wheelchair or others with mobility difficulties) to encourage walking and cycling/wheeling to connect with and permeate through the site and link with adjacent sites and local services, contrary to policy GNLP4, GNLP7.1 and GNLPSTR.01 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan 2024; policy DM3, DM12, DM13, DM28, DM30, DM31 and DM32 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 and paragraph 8 and Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).
12. The proposal fails to demonstrate that improved public transport access to the site can be achieved, to maximise sustainable transport opportunities which together could lead to reduced car dependency and a corresponding reduced level of car parking provision across the site. The application is therefore contrary to policy GNLP4, GNLP7.1 and GNLPSTR.01 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan 2024; policy DM1, DM3, DM12, DM13, DM28, DM30, DM31 and DM32 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 and paragraph 8 and Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).
13. The proposal does not provide adequate access for all modes and would be likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to safe sustainable development in transport terms, contrary to policy GNLP4, GNLP7.1 and GNLPSTR.01 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan 2024; policy DM3, DM12, DM13, DM28, DM30, DM31 and DM32 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 and paragraph 8 and Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).
14. The application is not supported by sufficient highways and transport information, including a travel plan and parking strategy to demonstrate that the proposed development will not be prejudicial to the safe and satisfactory functioning of the highway or that the proposed development represents a sustainable form of development, contrary to policy GNLP4, GNLP7.1 and GNLPSTR.01 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan 2024; policy DM3, DM12, DM13, DM28, DM30, DM31 and DM32 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 and paragraph 8 and Section 9, including paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).
15. There is no provision within the application for social infrastructure in the form of a serviced site for a two form entry primary school on this strategic development site. The application is therefore contrary to policy GNLP4, and GNLPSTR.01 of

the Greater Norwich Local Plan 2024 and paragraph 99 of the NPPF which requires sufficient choice of school places with great weight given to the creation, expansion or altering schools to meet the needs of existing and new communities. The application is also contrary to policy DM1 which requires provision to be made for enhanced and accessible education opportunities.

16. There is currently no provision within the application for improvements to health care infrastructure in the form of provision of land for a health facility sufficient to serve the East Norwich development as a whole. The application is therefore contrary to policy GNLP4, GNLP7.1 and GNLPSTR.01 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan 2024. The application is also contrary to policy DM1 which requires provision to be made for improved health and well-being opportunities and NPPF paragraph 97 which requires decisions to provide social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, ensuring an integrated approach to their location.
17. The application does not provide sufficient information to allow the impact of height and associated impacts on daylight and sunlight on residential amenity of existing and future occupiers of the development or on areas of private and public amenity space including riverside paths to be determined. In the absence of this information, it must be concluded that the application is contrary to policy DM2, DM3, DM12 and DM13 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014; and paragraph 135(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).
18. The application does not provide sufficient information to fully assess the impact of noise on residential amenity of future occupiers of the development. It is therefore not possible to determine whether mitigation measures are required to secure an appropriate standard of amenity for the occupiers of the new development without prejudicing the continued operation of the adjacent safeguarded mineral railhead site to the east. In the absence of this information, it must be concluded that the application is contrary to policy GNLP2, GNLP7.1 and GNLPSTR.01 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan; policy DM2, DM3, DM11 and DM13 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014; policy CS16 of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy 2011; criterion (f) of paragraph 135 and paragraph 191 and 216(e) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).
19. The application does not provide sufficient information to fully assess the air quality impacts on the residential amenity of future occupiers of the development. It is therefore not possible to determine whether mitigation measures are required to secure an appropriate standard of amenity for the occupiers of the new development without prejudicing the continued operation of the adjacent safeguarded mineral railhead site to the east. In the absence of this information, it must be concluded that the application is contrary to policy GNLP2, GNLP7.1 and GNLPSTR.01 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan 2024; policy DM2, DM3, DM11 and DM13 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014; policy CS16 of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy 2011 and paragraph 192 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).
20. The application does not provide sufficient information to fully assess the green infrastructure, open space and landscaping provisions of the development. In the absence of this information, it must be concluded that the application is contrary



to policy GNLP2, GNLP3 and GNLPSTR.01 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan 2024; policy DM3, DM6, DM7 and DM8 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 and paragraph 88, 97, 102 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

21. The application proposes the loss of visually significant protected trees that has not been justified as it would not result in a substantially improved overall approach to the design and landscaping of the development. The development is contrary to policy GNLP2, GNLP3 and GNLPSTR.01 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan 2024; policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 and paragraph 136 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).
22. The application does not provide sufficient information to fully assess the biodiversity impacts of the development and determine whether significant harm will result from the development taking place. It is not possible to determine whether mitigation measures are required to protect and secure an enhancement of biodiversity such that a net gain in biodiversity is achieved. In the absence of this information, it must be concluded that the application is contrary to policy GNLP3, GNLP7.1 and GNLPSTR. 01 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan 2024; policy DM3 and DM6 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014; paragraph 180(d), 185 and 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).
23. The application does not provide sufficient information to demonstrate satisfactory management of flood risk from all sources and to ensure that the sustainable drainage systems proposed will operate as designed for the lifetime of the development to prevent flooding in accordance with paragraph 173 and 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023); policy GNLP2, GNLP7.1 and GNLPSTR.01 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan 2024 and policy DM3 and DM5 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014.

(The chair agreed to move consideration of Application no 23/01574/F 77A Vincent Road, Norwich, NR1 4HQ to the final item on the agenda.)

#### **4. Application no 22/00762/F Land and Buildings, Including 70 – 72 Sussex Street & Land North Side of 148 Oak Street, Norwich, NR3 3DE**

**Proposal:** Demolition of existing structures and construction of 34 low energy cohousing dwellings and ancillary shared facilities, with associated landscaping and car and cycle parking.

(Councillors Calvert, Hoechner and Young having declared an interest in this item, left the meeting following the speaking of members of the public/applicant and did not take part in the determination of this application.)

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 is available on the council's website with the agenda papers for this meeting) and contains further comments already considered in the main report.

A local resident addressed the committee. Other buildings in the area were three-storeys, with a pitched roof. This proposal was for a four-storey building which would

cause significant harm to the character of the area without justification, and would cause loss of light and sunlight to the terrace houses in Chatham Street, to the east of the site. This four-storey development would lead to others in Oak Street. It was a “brick monolith”. The loss of the Willow tree would be detrimental to biodiversity, which was good in this area including nesting birds and muntjac deer.

Another resident addressed the committee and explained his concern that the development would be detrimental to his residential amenity from loss of light to his balcony and loss of privacy from overlooking. The noise from construction was also a concern. A previous application for a two-storey building on this site had been refused.

The owner of the Great Hall said that whilst he welcomed the development of this site, he was concerned that a four-storey building would block light to the Great Hall, which had two small windows on that side. Other four storey buildings to the north of the Great Hall but these were much lower. He considered that the apartment block should be a three-storey building with a pitched roof.

Two representatives spoke on behalf of the applicants and explained the principles of co-housing provision, including shared spaces, bedrooms for visitors and garden space, on this central brownfield site. During their presentation they pointed out how the development reflected local architectural features and that a flat roof was required for solar panels. This co-housing scheme could be something that the city could be proud of.

(Councillors Calvert, Hoeckner and Young left the meeting at this point.)

The Planner responded to the issues raised by the speakers. She referred to paragraphs 266 to 273 which address the issue of loss of light and overshadowing, and explained that the flats in Sussex Street had windows recessed into the balconies and the daylight level was below target level but still considered to be acceptable. She had visited the Great Hall, and it was triple aspect with ample light from the other windows in the room. It was acknowledged that the development of a vacant site would have an impact from any building developed on it. Members were advised that there had been other reasons for refusal of an application for the development of this site in 2008/9 and loss of light was not one of them. The design of the building had the support of Historic England and the Norwich Society, and it reflected architectural features in the area. The harm to the conservation area and Great Hall was less than significant and outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme. Members were also advised that two affordable housing units were provided on site and there was a mechanism for an affordable housing viability review through the S106 agreement.

During discussion the Planner and the Development Manager referred to the report and presentation and answered members' questions. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) definition of community led development was set out in paragraph 160 of the report. The applicants were a not-for-profit organisation to provide co-housing to meet the needs of its members. Members sought reassurance that whilst the loss of the Willow tree was regrettable, the mitigation involved a combination of trees planted both on and off site, including off-site planting proposal of an 8-tree contribution. Members were advised that Biodiversity Net Gain did not apply to this application because it was submitted prior to 12 February 2024. Access

to the site would be controlled to prevent anti-social behaviour and maintenance of the gardens and communal areas would be the collective responsibility of the residents. The height of a three-storey pitched roof with a dormer would be similar in height to a four-storey building and, in some cases, could be higher. A member commented that the large block resembled flats in London which she considered out of character in Norwich. Members were also advised that the development met the requirement for 20 per cent adaptable or accessible units for people with disabilities.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations in the report.

During discussion this application for co-housing was welcomed by members as it would bring a vacant site into use and provide 34 sustainable new dwellings and was the first community led cohousing project in Norwich providing accommodation for people with a sustainable lifestyle. One member commented on the value of cohousing schemes to solve housing issues and suggested that neighbours and ward councillors were consulted on the scheme's management plan. Another member said that his view of the flat roof had changed now that he appreciated that it was required for solar panels.

**RESOLVED** with 6 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Sands (M), Haynes, Lubbock, Oliver and Peek) and 1 member voting against (Councillor Sands (S)) to approve application no. 22/00762/ Land and buildings including 70-72 Sussex Street and land north side of 148 Oak Street and grant planning permission subject to the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement to include provision of co-housing, affordable housing viability review, payment of the GIRAMS tariff, a contribution to enhanced green infrastructure, payment for nutrient neutrality mitigation credits and a contribution for mitigatory tree planting and subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit.
2. In accordance with plans.
3. Phasing plan to be agreed.
4. Construction management plan, including parking.
5. Archaeological written scheme of investigation.
6. Detailed drawings for off-site highway improvements to be agreed.
7. Nesting bird season.
8. Contamination remediation.
9. Air quality best practice.
10. Surface water drainage strategy.
11. Foul drainage strategy.
12. Renewable energy provision.
13. Detailed design of corner shopfront and chimney features.
14. Fascia signage design.
15. Material and brickwork details.
16. Detailed landscape and biodiversity scheme and management plan.
17. Heritage interpretation.
18. Noise specification.
19. Mechanical ventilation.
20. Sound insulation of plant and machinery.
21. Anti-vibration mountings for plant and machinery.
22. Car parking management plan
23. Bin store collection arrangements

24. 20% accessible and adaptable dwellings.
25. Water efficiency.
26. Small mammal access.
27. Unknown contamination.
28. Imported material.
29. Access, parking, EV charging, cycle stores to be provided prior to first occupation.
30. Off-site highway improvements to be completed prior to first occupation.
31. Fibre to the property provided prior to first occupation.
32. Removed permitted development rights for curtilage structures and extensions to houses.
33. Access gates hung to open inwards.

**Informatives:**

- No parking permits for future occupiers;
- Street naming and numbering;
- Asbestos;
- Works within public highway;
- Permits required for hoardings and traffic management.

(The committee adjourned for a short break. Councillor Hoekner rejoined the meeting. Councillors Calvert and Young did not return to the meeting as they had other commitments.)

**5. Application no 22/01417/F – End House, Church Avenue East, Norwich**

**Proposal:** Demolition of existing house and construction of replacement house and stand-alone garage (revised proposal).

The Planner presented the report with plans and slides.

During discussion, the Planner with reference to the slides answered questions on the neighbours' concerns about overshadowing and overlooking by the replacement building. She also explained that the enlargement of the driveway was to provide the radius for a fire appliance to turn in accordance with building regulations. The appearance of the drive would be improved. The replacement garage was a double one and there was a relatively small space for one car to be parked on the drive.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations in the report.

There was no further discussion, and it was:

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to approve application 22/01417/F – End House, Church Avenue East and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Construction management plan;

4. Bird Nesting Season;
5. Compliance with ecological mitigation measures;
6. Works on site in accordance with arboricultural impact assessment, method statement and tree protection plan;
7. External material details, including samples, flint and brickwork panels, soffit, verge and gable details and all metalwork colours to be agreed;
8. Landscape scheme to be agreed;
9. Surface water drainage scheme to be agreed;
10. Details of solar PV and air source heat pump, including noise, to be agreed;
11. Biodiversity enhancements to be agreed;
12. Parking, access, turning space, cycle storage, bin storage and EV charging completed prior to first occupation;
13. Flood resilience measures;
14. Flood response plan prior to first occupation;
15. Small mammal access in new boundary treatments;
16. Minimum floor level of 29.51m AOD;
17. Bathroom and en suite windows to be obscure glazed;
18. Water efficiency;
19. High speed internet;
20. Garage provided and retained for car parking;
21. Removed permitted development rights for roof extensions and alterations.

**Informatives:**

- Protected Species
- Asbestos

(Councillor Lubbock left the meeting at this point.)

**6. Application no 23/01620/F 25 Hill House Road, Norwich**

**Proposal:** Alterations to loft conversion (Retrospective)

The Development Manager presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. The supplementary report of updates to reports contained a correction to the measurements. The height of the dormer window should read 163mm in accordance with the most recent plans. Members were advised that the application had been called in by Councillor Worley otherwise it would have been determined under officer delegation in the same way that the original application had.

The adjacent neighbour addressed the committee and said that the dormer window blocked the light to his house and that he wanted to revert to how it was before.

A second local resident pointed out that the replacement ridge tiles were higher than the original ones and that as slate tiles were not used was out of character with the terrace buildings in the area. The dormer represented two rooms which was an over extension of the building so that it could be used as a house in multiple occupation (HMO) rather than a family home.

The Development Manager then read out a statement on behalf of a neighbour concerned that about the overbearing structure that cuts out light and was

unsympathetic to the existing environment, overlooking several properties and visual to several and had negative architectural merit. The resident also commented that a family home had been turned into an HMO.

The owner of the property (the applicant) addressed the committee and said that the proliferation of comments about this retrospective application were about the use of the house as an HMO. The internal head height of 2178mm was approved in the first application. Following building control's requirement to relocate 50cm of insulation above the ridgeline, they had managed to remove 28mm in height from the construction process. The remaining internal head height was 2100mm and therefore the dormer was lower in height. The house had a north/south aspect and therefore the sun did not rise over its roofline.

(Councillor Haynes left the meeting at this point.)

The Development Manager commented that this was an unusual case as the height of the dormer was higher than what was previously approved and references from drawings showed this and formed the basis of the officer assessment. Internal head height did not hold material planning consideration in this matter. A dormer window could be allowed under permitted development rights. The difference in the size between the approved plans (July 2023) and what had been built out was relatively small and officers recommended approval of this retrospective planning permission. Members were reminded that small HMOs did not require planning permission.

Discussion ensued in which the Development Manager answered members questions and gave assurances that the impact of the loft conversion and use of tiles other than slate on the building would be subject to building regulations. The impact on daylight from the extension varied only slightly from the permission granted in July 2023 and therefore the affect was minimal. The roof ridge was only 16 cm higher than the original. The original permission required the dormer window to be obscure glass.

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

During discussion members commented on the concerns of residents about the appearance and one member suggested that a less obtrusive cement should be used.

A member also acknowledged that due to permitted development rights there was nothing that members could do to prevent the change of use from a residential house to an HMO.

**RESOLVED**, with 2 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver and Sands (M)) and 4 members abstaining (Councillors Hoechner, Oliver, Peek and Sands (S)) to approve Application no 23/01620/F, 25 Hill House Road, Norwich and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Obscure glazed windows.

## 7. Application no 23/01574/F 77A Vincent Road, Norwich, NR1 4HQ

**Proposal:** Change of use of first floor accommodation (C3) to mixed use (E).

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

During discussion the Planner and the Development Manager answered members' questions. The use of obscure glass or film had not been proposed for the first-floor windows as concerns about overlooking were mitigated by the fact that there were bedrooms opposite with less use than other living spaces.

Discussion ensued on whether a condition could be added to require provision of cycle storage. It was noted from the slides that the curtilage of the building might accommodate cycle storage. Members considered that this could mitigate residents' concerns about the change of use exacerbating existing parking problems.

Councillor Hoechner moved and Councillor Sands (M) seconded that a condition be added to require prior to commencement of use of the first floor, details of cycle parking to be submitted for installation in the premises curtilage on Vincent Road, but on being put to the vote and on the chair's casting vote, with 3 members voting in favour (Councillors Sands (M), Hoechner and Oliver) and 3 members voting against (Councillor Driver, Peek and Sands (S)) the proposal was rejected.

Councillor Hoechner then requested that an informative be added to ask the applicant to consider the installation of cycle storage and all members concurred.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to approve application no 23/01574/F at 77A Vincent Road Norwich NR1 4HQ and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Development to facilitate the change of use of the first floor shall not commence until the extensions as approved under application reference 22/01219/F have been completed;
4. The first floor shall only be used by customers between the hours of 9am-6pm Tuesday-Saturday and shall not be used on Sunday and Monday;
5. Use of the first floor as a hairdresser's only. No other use within Class E shall be permitted without written permission from the Local Planning Authority.

### **Informative**

Provision of cycle storage.

CHAIR