



Planning Applications Committee

09:30 to 17:45

27April 2023

Councillors Driver (chair), Sands (M), Champion, Davis, Galvin¹
Grahame, Lubbock, Peek, Sands (S), Stutely, Thomas (Va), Thomas
(Vi) and Young

1. Procedural matters

Some members expressed concern that there had been insufficient time for them to read the report in full (item 3, Application no 22/00434/F – Anglia Square, including Land and Buildings to the North and West, Norwich) because of its size. It was noted that members had had access to the papers online and that the agenda had been published within the statutory timescale. Paper copies of the agenda had been available for members to collect from City Hall but had not been posted, and a member considered that these should have been couriered to members. A member also suggested that the committee would benefit from a site visit.

Councillor Stutely moved, and Councillor Davis seconded, that consideration of the planning application for Anglia Square be deferred to provide members with an opportunity to read the papers fully and conduct a site visit. Discussion ensued. On being put to the vote with 4 members voting in favour (Councillors Stutely, Davis, Peek and Grahame) and 9 members voting against (Councillors Driver, Sands (M), Sands (S), Champion, Galvin, Lubbock, Thomas (Va), Thomas (Vi) and Young) the motion was lost.

(The committee had a short adjournment at this point whilst legal advice was sought and reconvened at 10:10 with all members present, as listed above.)

The Head of Legal and Procurement (Monitoring Officer) advised the committee that officers would provide a comprehensive presentation to the committee. Following the presentation, members would then have an opportunity to consider whether to proceed to determine the application or could decide to defer the decision for a site visit and/or a future meeting. If the committee agreed to proceed and an individual member considered that they did not have sufficient information to make an open and transparent decision, then they could withdraw from the meeting at that point.

The chair agreed with this proposal and reiterated the advice that a member could withdraw later in the meeting if they had insufficient information to make a decision.

¹ Appointed to the vacancy following Councillor Bogelein's resignation from the council

As a point of personal explanation, Councillor Stutely confirmed that he had read all the papers but had brought the motion because he had not been able to cross reference points with the relevant planning policies.

2. Declaration of Interests

There were none.

3. Application no 22/00434/F – Anglia Square, including Land and Buildings to the North and West, Norwich

The Senior Planner (case officer) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides and introduced the report. A full description of the site was appended to the report. The presentation took members through the proposals for the site, the phasing of the development and showed how the development would be viewed from the surrounding area.

The Development Manager read out the supplementary report of updates (which had been circulated to members of the committee in advance of the meeting and is available on the council's website with the papers for the meeting.) The report summarised two representations; a petition from Norwich Renters Collective, with 949 signatures; submission of letters and a summary report from private studio holders at Gildengate House; further submissions from Save Britain's Heritage (SAVE) and an alternative vision for Anglia Square by Ash Sakula architects, submitted during the planning process; and a representation from Councillor Carlo. All issues raised had been addressed in the main report. The supplementary report also contained corrections to the text and proposed an additional condition to remove permitted development rights for changes from commercial to residential to ensure the mix of uses supported the function of a large district centre.

A member referred to emails from Shelter which had been sent to members of the committee and asked whether its comments had been included in the committee report. The Development Manager explained that Shelter had not made a representation to the council as part of the planning consultation and therefore its comments were not included in the report.

The Head of Planning and Regulatory Services by way of introduction said that she had been involved with the team in the preparation of this application and was assisting the Executive Director of Development and City Services with the Housing Infrastructure Funding (HIF) from Homes England associated with this application. She then presented each of the main issues as set out in the report.

(The committee adjourned for a break and reconvened with all members present, as listed above.)

A representative of Historic England addressed the committee and outlined its objections to the proposed development. Historic England would like to see the Anglia Square quarter developed and considered the removal of unsympathetic buildings and partial reinstatement of the street pattern an improvement on the previous scheme. This scheme would not deliver a development that the city deserved. The height and massing of the proposed development was not in keeping with the character of the historic city and would cause a high-level harm to the

significance of St Augustine's Church and 2-12 Gildencroft and harm to other listed buildings in St Augustine's Street, Magdalen Street and Doughty's Hospital, and the Norwich City Centre Conservation Area. She referred to the provisions to protect conservation areas and heritage assets under the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990 and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and said that development should not be at the cost of the character of the city.

A representative of Save Britain's Heritage (SAVE) addressed the committee and outlined its objections to the proposed development including that it did not allay its concerns about the previous application, which included that 1100 homes was too many for the site and a third more than allocated, resulting in a scheme that was out of scale and capable of providing good quality affordable homes. The 12 large blocks necessary to provide the dwellings, 50 per cent of which would be single aspect, harmed the character of the City Centre Conservation Area, characterised by 2 to 3 storey buildings. It also proposed to bulldoze a historic building in Pitt Street. This scheme was in receipt of the largest public housing grant in Homes England's history, was likely to be exempt from paying CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) and the affordable housing contribution was reduced by 23 per cent. It was not the only viable solution. A conservation led approach submitted by Ash Sakula Architects provided an alternative. It was a poor example for other developers considering brownfield sites in Norwich.

A representative on behalf of the Norwich Society addressed the committee and said that he understood the council's position after 13 years of austerity and, the financial constraints of the council, but this was not the only viable option for development of this site, despite the committee team being told that it was twice in 4 years. The developer had been inflexible in changing aspects of the development scheme. The Norwich Society concurred with the views of Historic England and SAVE. It considered that there were viable options like the alternative proposal offered by Ash Sakula Architects and that should members approve the application at this meeting, other options would be lost. A scheme based on the site allocation for 800 homes would provide a city development that the city could be proud of.

Councillor Osborn, Mancroft ward councillor, addressed the committee and acknowledged that many residents wanted to see the site developed. Anglia Square had a unique function for the local community. This proposal did not offer good quality affordable housing, with single aspect, poorly lit flats that would get worse with climate change. He was aware that the public subsidy could be lost but supported the local community views concerned about the lack of affordable housing and considered that a better scheme could come forward rather than regret the approval of this one.

A resident addressed the committee objecting to the scheme on heritage and housing grounds. This included concerns about the: massing and height, density to achieve 1100 homes on the site, that 50 per cent of homes would be single aspect and would require air conditioning to remove excess heat; too many one bed flats and energy efficiency and level of affordable housing; and the viability of the scheme.

A representative of Norwich Renters Collective spoke in support of the nearly 1,000 signatories who had signed its petition opposing the development on the grounds that it should provide 33 per cent of affordable housing, at a time when it was more

important, given the housing crisis with people struggling to rent, high energy costs and rents in the private rental sector, and questioned that the viability of a development that could not be brought forward for development without public funding, reduced affordable housing and exemption from CIL, given increased land values, and that the committee should consider an alternative development scheme.

A representative of the private studio holders at Gildengate House addressed the committee and outlined her objections to the scheme, referring to the community who used Anglia Square daily, calling for the committee to reject the proposal and consider a viable alternative space. The scheme was not in the best interests of the city and would take “decades” to unravel if the committee approved it.

A local resident confirmed that he supported the previous comments on heritage issues regarding the issue of the possible remains of St Olave’s church in the southwest of the site. A listing application for the flint stable block contained fabric from the church and evidence of early burials had been found and it should not be demolished.

(Copies of a representation made by Councillor Schmierer, Mancroft ward councillor, were circulated at the meeting and it is available on the council’s website with the papers for the meeting.)

A representative for Weston Homes addressed the committee in support of the planning application. He referred to the planning history of the previous application which had been approved by the committee and recommended for approval to the Secretary of State by the Planning Inspector. The developers had taken the comments of the Secretary of State on the call-in application seriously and consulted a wide range of stakeholders to bring forward this application. It was a comprehensive scheme that had been designed from scratch and would be brought forward by Weston Homes as the single developer. He then outlined how this scheme differed from the previous one, including reduced floor space and car parking spaces. The 3 to 8 storey buildings fell below the skyline reducing the impact on long distance views across the city and were spread across the site, and the overall scale and mass of the development had been reduced. Many objections failed to provide an alternative. The development would provide 288 direct jobs with a further 292 individuals joining from Norwich and the eastern counties and would bring in £36 m into the local economy; 1100 new homes of which 10 per cent would be affordable meeting the needs of the city. The scheme also provided a community hall, Changing Places facilities, a larger Anglia Square, community gardens, 200 trees and an 85 per cent biodiversity net gain, improvements to the yellow pedalway, energy efficient homes, with 50 per cent having air source heat pumps. A strong recommendation for the developers was its customer satisfaction level was 91 per cent. The company was experienced at providing quality homes and had committed £6m over the last 7 years, and expected to develop the scheme over the next 7 to 8 years.

(At the request of the Head of Legal and Procurement, members confirmed that they had all the information required to determine this application and that the presentations had supplemented their reading of the report.)

(The committee adjourned for lunch from 13:15 to 14:00. The committee reconvened with all members present, as listed above.)

Discussion ensued in which then Senior Planner, Head of Planning and Regulatory Services and Development Manager answered members' questions, together with the other officers in attendance as appropriate.

Members sought further information on the viability assessment for affordable housing and the mechanisms to review it at 30 per cent/60 per cent/90 per cent occupation of the development. The Development Strategy Manager explained that these percentages were closely aligned to the phasing of the development and an opportunity to review the affordable housing provision on site at 90 per cent occupation elsewhere in the city. Viability would also be assessed at the reserved matters stage. Later in the meeting, the Development Strategy Manager said that he considered the phasing of the reviews based on occupation was in his experience unique within the city, due to the size and scale of the development. The Development Manager said that the reviews would be set out in the S106 agreement with the developer. There had been incidences where reviews increased the developer's contribution, but it was important to note that the level of affordable housing delivered on this site would not go down.

The Senior Planner explained the application of the vacant building credit to this development and that it had the effect of reducing the policy compliant affordable level from 33 per cent to 22.6 per cent. Members were also advised that allocation of affordable housing was worked out in units rather than total floorspace. In reply to a suggestion that land values varied, the Development Strategy Manager said that the valuation was made on the current land use plus 15 per cent profit.

The Senior Planner advised members that in the first phase the affordable housing would comprise 11 two bed houses and the remainder flats (35 one bed flats).

In reply to a question, the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services said that limited weight should be given to the Ash Sakula scheme, previously put forward by Historic England, for 600 homes, and by SAVE, now for circa 780 homes. The proposal did not include assessments for viability, habitat or heritage amongst other things. In August 2022, she and the Development Manager, had met to discuss it with SAVE. Requests for information on viability had not been provided in the intervening period. Compulsory purchase was not an intervention that the council could make. In reply to a question, the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services said that a previous planning application for the site, before the call-in application, had been predominantly retail and commercial, including a supermarket, and had been deemed unviable because of changing market conditions. The Development Manager referred members to paragraph 258 of the report which set out the reasons for the failure to unlock this site for development.

A member referred to the deterioration of the site and asked what powers the council had to enforce the owners to maintain the site. The Development Manager said that the authority could place a S215 compliance order (Town and Country Planning Act 1990) on the site and a charge on the land if they did not comply which would affect future viability. A planning application had been submitted and it was better that the site was developed which would address these issues. There were parts of the site that were no longer in use including the multi-storey car park which were unsafe, and the roof of the former nightclub had been fenced off.

In reply to a member's question regarding the land evaluation given that a public subsidy was required to bring it forward, the Development Strategy Manager said the basis of the land evaluation in line with the standard Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) guidance, had taken the existing land use with a premium to bring that site forward. In true viability terms, 10 per cent affordable housing was above what the developer would be expected to offer. In policy terms (JCS4 and the NPPF), 33 per cent affordable housing was a starting point for negotiation and these policies allowed for reconsideration.

The Development Manager reiterated that there had been insufficient information to carry out an independent assessment on the Ash Sakula scheme, put forward by SAVE.

A member referred to paragraph 205 of the report and the wider income generated by the regeneration of Anglia Square and asked for further information on the likelihood of the private sector delivering this in the coming years. The Development Manager said that the three sites mentioned in the report (Barrack Street, St Mary's Works on George Street, and St Georges Street) were allocated for housing in the North City Centre Area Action Plan. The regeneration of Anglia Square could bring forward a further 700 to 750 dwellings on these sites and if delivering the Greater Norwich Local Plan level of affordable housing, 21 to 28 per cent more affordable housing. Anglia Square would improve the value of residential dwellings in this area and the viability of the adjacent sites. It was possible that the council owned site could be brought forward for development by the council's wholly owned company.

In reply to a member's question on the 5 per cent contingency cost, the Senior Planner said that the developers had their own inhouse contractors and could control costs. The Development Strategy Manager confirmed that costings were based on the Building Cost Information Service Construction Data (BCIS). Members were assured that the costs were verified by Avison Young on the council's behalf. A member suggested that due to rising costs there should be a viability review at 70 per cent. The Senior Planner said that the proposed occupation review levels worked as 30 per cent would be triggered part way through phase 2 allowing scope for all onsite provision of additional affordable housing within phase 3. Viability impacted the following phase. The Development Strategy Manager said that the phasing enabled the developer to finance the affordable housing.

The Head of Planning and Regulatory Services, in reply to a question, advised members that receipt of the HIF from Homes England was uncertain. She referred to paragraphs 226 and 227 of the report. If the committee approved the planning application, the council would need to apply for a deed of variation on the contract and enter into discussions with Homes England. These conversations should take place by the end of the summer. Members were advised that the HIF was not transferrable to another site. This could result in reputational damage to the council and reduce its credibility to bid for external funding in the future.

In reply to a question, the Development Strategy Manager confirmed that the evidence in the Housing Needs Assessment 2021 supported the need for one and two bed flats. There were more flatted developments in the city centre. The Local Plan minimum number of dwellings on this site was 800 and these were most likely to have been flatted development. The council's Home Options Team advised that 60 per cent of all applicants on the housing waiting list required one bed

accommodation. This scheme would also provide affordable housing for families with 11 two bed houses provided to the north of the site. The Senior Planner commented that the site was surrounded by the strategic road network and was a large district centre, and that flatted development was more suited to the location than traditional forms of family housing.

Members were advised that commercial use was predominantly on the ground floor in the detailed application. The outline application would deliver more ground floor access to residential accommodation. Images of town houses or duplexes at ground floor level had been shown in the pre-application drawings, particularly in the four storey blocks G and J with parking at the front, which would be considered at the reserved matters stage. Town houses had not been discouraged as part of the scheme.

In reply to a member's question, members were advised that the 555 cycle spaces were for the 365 dwellings delivered in the detailed part of the planning application. There was a minimum provision of one space per 1 bed flat and two spaces for the 2 bed larger flats. Bike stalls would be co-located with principal entrances into the flats. Members noted that there was no policy requirement to provide electric charging facilities for cargo bikes.

Discussion ensued on the Secretary of State's view that the use of single aspect dwellings was "a significantly sub-optimal design solution" and noting that the current application reduced this by a third. Members sought clarification that each dwelling would have adequate daylight/sunlight. It was considered that dual aspect would be more beneficial. The Development Manager said that each flat had been assessed for daylight/sunlight levels, some were fine and others marginal. Consideration had been made to other amenities, which included access to the communal gardens and balconies. Most flats had access to external amenity space. Members were advised that the safety of balconies would be covered by Building Regulations. The Senior Planner assured members that the number of single aspect dwellings was less than the call-in application and that each flat had been assessed individually. The level of amenity was considered satisfactory. The developers confirmed that single aspect flats were saleable.

The Policy Project and Transportation Manager confirmed, in response to a question from a member, that the use of different surfaces and a small kerb would make it clear where to walk or ride a bike on the extended section of St George's Street, which forms part of the yellow pedalway. There would be points where the cross movement of pedestrians meant the design would not separate pedestrians from cyclists. The width of the cycle path on St George's Street would be 3 metres (on the revised landscape plans) and designed for two-way cycle movements.

The committee considered the provision of car club spaces. It was noted that it was the same provision as for the call-in scheme, which was up to 5 spaces as requested by the car club. Members were advised that the site was in a sustainable location which encouraged a modal shift to sustainable modes of transport.

The Senior Planner answered members' questions on the provision of car parking for residents, pointing out that 11 spaces would be for the 11 dwellings (houses) and that the remainder of parking spaces would be sold to residents individually.

In reply to a question, the Development Manager referred to the report and explained that this scheme did not provide capital costs for the provision of health care for potential residents. The Greater Norwich Growth Partnership forecast provision for development. Under the S106 agreement floor space would be held for the NHS for a period of 6 months and would be available at the market rate.

Members were advised that additional bus stop provision would be in phase 2 of the development.

In reply to a question, the Senior Planner referred to paragraph 775 which set out the details of the proposed surface water strategy that would result in a betterment to the Anglia Water network and met its requirements.

A member asked what the economic and social benefits would result from the scheme. The Economic Development Officer - Policy and Projects and the Economic Development Manager advised the committee on the benefits which included the creation of apprenticeships and other opportunities in construction, new job opportunities in shops and other businesses, from increased footfall, and wider benefits to the locality and wider area. Members were assured that the figures submitted by the applicant had been measured against the industry standard.

(The committee adjourned for a short break between 15:45 and 16:00, and reconvened with all members present, as listed above.)

A member asked that members were consulted on the S106 agreement in detail to consider the management of the community hub, its capacity and location of fire exits, as it effected the viability of the space and its success depended on its management. The Development Manager said that the S106 agreement was a contract which set out the obligations of the developer, as set out in the table in the report, was subject to negotiation and drafted so that it was enforceable. However, authority was delegated to officers to finalise the exact wording of the agreement. The S106 covered the provision of the space for the community hub and, whilst capacity was an issue for fire and building regulations, officers negotiating the fitting out of it could refer to capacity to ensure that the hub was a usable space.

The Senior Landscape Architect acknowledged that it was a challenge to get planting podiums right but was aware that the developers were experienced. The irrigation and care of the plants was covered by condition. There would be careful selection of plants including drought proof ones. The scheme would provide 200 new trees and make a significant contribution through street planting and green roofs to the green infrastructure links, with the nearest green open space at Gildencroft Park. The Development Manager drew members' attention to the developer's obligations under S106 to pay the Norfolk Green Infrastructure and Recreational Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (GIRAMS) which was a countywide contribution, to mitigate for the additional growth and impact on designated sites. Natural England was satisfied that a condition be applied to planning consent. The applicant was also contributing to enhancements to facilities at Wensum Park and Gildencroft Park.

The committee then considered the heritage assets. The Policy, Projects and Transport Manager commented on the significance of the medieval Grade I listed St Augustine's church; only medieval church surviving in that part of the city centre,

with an intact form plan and tower, refaced with brick in the 18th century, that featured as a landmark in the local area. Any harm that would be caused to its fabric or in the case of this application to its setting had to be given great weight in the assessment. Other features taken into consideration were its setting surrounded by a large churchyard and in relationship to the cottages at 2-12 Gildencroft, as the parish church for the area and the surrounding street pattern.

In reply to a question, the Policy, Projects and Transport Manager commented on the buildings listed in paragraph 12 of the report where applications had been made in the last 12 months for the statutory listing of buildings. Members were advised that when considering the justification for the demolition of buildings in Pitt Street the council had applied the same reasoning to 43-45 Pitt Street which was locally listed and the brick and flint warehouse building to the rear of 47-51 Pitt Street.

The Head of Planning and Regulatory Services referred to the NPPF and said that the officers' assessment was that the development would cause less than substantial harm to St Augustine's church, which was at the lower end of the scale, and that harm had been weighed against the wider public benefits of the proposals.

The Historic Environment Senior Officer (Strategy and Advice), Norfolk County Council, said that he had advised council officers on both this and the call-in application. In 2005 he had been involved in a survey of the brick and flint building to the rear of Pitt Street. There was no doubt that it was within the churchyard of the former St Olave's church. The survey provided no evidence that the fabric of the building was medieval and that materials were later than burials found at the site. He referred members to paragraph 14 of the report and said that as there was a remote possibility that some medieval fabric was present, specific conditions had been requested as well as a wider archaeological survey. The Development Manager said that the archaeological significance of this part of the site was recognised which was why it would be in the first phase of the development.

Discussion ensued on the massing of the buildings in the proposed scheme in comparison to the call-in scheme and considering the Secretary of State's judgement on the call-in scheme, informed by the Planning Inspector through the public inquiry (as set out in table at paragraph 487). A member asked for the justification of the massing of the blocks, acknowledging the development required density to achieve viability. The Policy, Projects and Transport Manager referred to the views that had been displayed in the presentation and that this demonstrated that the current scheme was invisible from the Cathedral Meadows. The Secretary of State had considered the call-in scheme had a neutral impact on the conservation area. Members had to be mindful that the reduced scale of the current scheme could therefore be considered beneficial. The community review panel indicated that the unique character of Anglia Square was appreciated. The Head of Planning and Regulatory Services said that the council did not agree with the organisations that considered that any development should defer to a low-rise benchmark that predates the current buildings on site and read out paragraph 517 in its entirety. Members were advised that the planning authority was in broad agreement with the Secretary of State and Planning Inspector in relation to the previous application and had used it as the benchmark for the current application.

Further discussion ensued on the impact of Sovereign House and large-scale development of the site in the 60s and 70s. Members were advised that the

proposed blocks were modulated across the site to achieve the density of housing required and minimising the impact on the historic environment. Paragraph 486 set out the beneficial change to the character of the conservation area that could be achieved by this development.

In reply to a question, the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services said that the assessment on the impact of the scheme on heritage assets was detailed and defensible. The Development Manager commented that officers had adjusted their assessment where the Secretary of State and Planning Inspector, considering the call-in application, had indicated that the level of harm had been underestimated.

Members then asked several questions on the report. This included: confirmation that the assessment of £25k as a median salary was considered accurate; noting that some flats would have more than one occupant; that there would be post boxes in the lobby areas of the apartment blocks and Amazon collection boxes at the community hub. Members were advised that the private studio use at Gildengate House did not meet the definition to require protection of community facilities under policy DM22.

Members also sought reassurance that the phasing of the construction would allow businesses to remain open and operational and limit the scale of demolition and construction taking place at any point in time. A medium sized retail food store was proposed for Block M as well as smaller retail units, suitable for the district centre use.

The Senior Planner provided clarification that the heat source pumps were to provide hot water for the new homes not space heating. There was scope for solar panels, but these had not been specified. All the flat roofs would be green. The scheme delivered biodiversity net gain and sustainable drainage. The developer had exceeded the policy requirement.

Members were advised that the planning consent for the previous under the flyover scheme had lapsed. There was provision under the S106 agreement for a public realm scheme to be delivered by the developer or by the council.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations, as set out in the report, with the additional condition as set out in the updates report.

Discussion ensued in which members commented on the application.

Members commented that many elements of the scheme came down to viability. It was regrettable that no more than 10 per cent affordable housing could be achieved on the site. The development would provide more homes and some affordable homes. No other viable alternative had been presented. The scheme would regenerate a deprived area of the city centre and improve its appearance. The scheme delivered much needed housing in the city.

Other members considered that they could not support the application and that there could be a better scheme available in the future. Concern was expressed that the scheme did not deliver more affordable housing and that privately rented properties were too expensive for many residents. The proposal lacked parking for carers, did not provide cycle parking for all residents, and should include solar panels. Members

also expressed concern on heritage grounds in relation to the demolition of buildings in Pitt Street. The design of the scheme with its single aspect windows, was more “Riverside” than a reflection of the Brutalist buildings that currently comprised Anglia Square.

During discussion a member sought clarification on the policy position regarding funding of healthcare. Members were advised that funding was through general taxation and did not allow for CIL or S106 to be used to fund health provision.

The chair and several members of their committee expressed their gratitude to the officers for the work they had put in to bring this application to the committee.

RESOLVED with 8 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Sands (M), Sands (S), Peek, Galvin, Thomas (Va), Thomas (Vi) and Lubbock) and 5 members voting against (Councillors Stutely, Davis, Champion, Grahame and Young) to approve application no. 22/00434/F - Anglia Square including land and buildings to the north and west and grant planning permission, subject to the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement to include provision of affordable housing and matters listed in paragraph 784 of the report and subject to the following conditions:

- 1 Time limits
- 2 In accordance with plans, drawings and details
- 3 Details to be approved (detailed blocks) – external materials, windows/ reveals, eaves and verges, louvres, doors, balconies, external flues etc, rainwater goods, street signs and lettering and shopfronts,
- 4 Details to be approved (detailed landscape) – hard and soft, play, ecology enhancements, public art, street furniture and management arrangements
- 5 Details to be approved - new canopy for Anglia Square
- 6 Detailed blocks - noise attenuation (for dwellings)
- 7 Details to be approved - Block B: boundary wall treatment /gateway leading to St Leonard play area
- 8 Blocks B - small mammal gaps
- 9 Outline elements – reserved matters to be approved layout, external appearance and landscaping
- 10 In accordance with parameter plans – additional details at RM, noise assessment (external spaces), BNG report, fire statement, Arboricultural Impact Statement formation of access from St Crispins Road
- 11 In accordance with phasing plan
- 12 Limits - maximum quantum of floorspace and dwellings
- 13 Reserved matters for blocks G, H and E to include a minimum amount of floorspace for commercial uses: Block G – min 420sqm GIA on the Anglia Square/Botolph Street frontage; Block H – min 360sqm GIA on Anglia Square frontage + min of 160sqm GIA on Botolph Street frontage; Block E – min 80 sqm GIA on Botolph Street frontage
- 14 Block M - provision of foodstore (min 559sqm) limitation on sale % non-convenience goods
- 15 Block D – provision of community hub floorspace (550sqm hub, 146sqm community hall)

- 16 Block A and KL - provision of 3 x large format units - limited to Class E(a)
- 17 Provision - minimum of 200 sqm. (Gross Internal Area (GIA)) of floorspace for purposes within Use Class E(b) food and drink and/or Sui Generis drinking establishments with expanded food provision
- 18 The commercial floorspace shall include a minimum of ten units, each with a ground floor area between 70 and 150sqm (NIA)
- 19 Construction and Environmental Management Plan – submission, approval, implementation
- 20 Demolition statement - submission, approval, implementation
- 21 Clearance of trees/hedges etc - outside of nesting season (standard condition)
- 22 Demolition and Construction Traffic Management Plan and Access Route
- 23 Archaeology - requirement for written scheme of investigation (WSI). Implementation in accordance with WSI
- 24 Warehouse to rear of 47-51 Pitt Street - historic building recording – bespoke, to be agreed
- 25 Warehouse to rear of 47-51 Pitt Street – requirement for WSI for the controlled and supervised dismantling
- 26 Three parish boundary markers on the side wall of 53-55 Pitt Street - to be stored and reinstated on the new buildings in as close to the same location as possible
- 27 Lifting, safe storing and re-using of the cobble setts on Botolph Street

- 28 Contamination - investigation, remediation, verification
- 29 Unknown contamination – standard condition
- 30 No drainage system for the infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground is permitted other than with the express written consent
- 31 Piling operations requirement for Piling Method Statement shall be submitted to and approved
- 32 Surface water drainage / flood risk condition as required by LLFA
- 33 Flood warning and evacuation
- 34 Scheme for on-site foul water drainage works, including connection point and discharge rate,
- 35 Phases 3 and 4 – further noise impact assessment to establish noise attenuation requirements
- 36 Phase 4 – further air quality monitoring to establish need for mitigation measures
- 37 Conditions required by local highway authority in relation to phasing of off –
site highway works
Including (but not limited to):
Phase 1 – New Botolph Street and Edward Street crossings
Phase 2 - Magdalen Street improvements including to bus stops and passenger waiting and new crossing
Phase 3 - Cherry Lane and new St Crispins access
Phase 4 - Pitt Street frontage

Plus: street frontage improvements, protection of visibility splays
- 38 Details (each phase) bike and bin stores

- 39 Details (each phase) Delivery and Servicing Management Plan
- 40 Electric vehicle charging provision
- 41 Limitation on use of residential parking - no use as commuter or contract parking
- 42 Demolition of Sovereign House prior to any part of Blocks E, EF, F
- 43 Details - crime prevention measures
- 44 Details - flues/extraction for any food/drink uses
- 45 No PD - Plant/machinery – details required
- 46 No PD – Communication apparatus /antennae
- 47 Compliance - 10% - M4(2) of the 2015 Building Regulations for accessible and adaptable dwellings.

- 48 Compliance - 110 litres/person/day water efficiency set out in part G2 of the 2015 Building Regulations for water usage.

- 49 Scheme – water efficiency for non-residential units
- 50 Compliance – National described space standards
- 51 Travel plan - residential
- 52 Travel plan - commercial
- 53 Scheme – Heritage interpretation
- 54 Remove permitted development rights for changes of use from commercial to residential.

Informatives, including:

Norwich airport information relating to procedure for crane notification.

None of the development (business or residential) will be entitled to on-street parking permits offered by the council.

Those required by local highway authority and utility operators.

CHAIR