



PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

10.00 a.m. – 11.20 a.m.

20 August 2009

Present: Councillors Bradford (Chair), Llewellyn (Vice-Chair), Banham, Driver, George, Jago, S Little, Lubbock, Sands (substitute for Councillor Lay), Stephenson and Wiltshire (from end of item 2)

Apologies: Councillor Lay

1. COUNCILLOR LAY

Members of the Committee expressed that their best wishes to Councillor Lay for a speedy recovery. Councillor Lubbock undertook to send a card on behalf of the Committee.

2. MINUTES

RESOLVED to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 30 July 2009, with reference to Item 6 Application No 09/00124/H – Bayer Cropscience Ltd, Sweetbriar Road, sixth paragraph, third sentence, inserting 'because not everyone believes in the evidence of government agencies' after 'Councillor Little said that' so that the sentence reads:-

'Councillor Little said that because not everyone believes in the evidence of government agencies the Committee should not rely on the evidence of government agencies and that he considered independent advice should be arranged before the application was determined.'

(Councillor Wiltshire was admitted to the meeting.)

3. APPLICATION NO 09/00590/F - 6A ALBION WAY

The Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. The Principal Planner Transport answered members' questions on the transportation issues.

RESOLVED to approve Application No 09/00590/F - 6a Albion Way and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. The unit the subject of this permission shall not be sub-divided;
3. Implementation of the travel plan on first occupation of the mezzanine floor;
4. Provision of a scheme of car park management for the site including a charging regime to be submitted and implemented within 5 years of first occupation of the mezzanine floor;
5. A flood warning and evacuation plan to be submitted.

(Reasons for approval: The principle of the development is considered acceptable; however any further development of the site which would lead to a more intensive use of the site by private car would be unacceptable. On balance it is considered that subject to the conditions listed below the transport implications of this development would be satisfactorily appeased and the proposals are therefore considered acceptable.

The application is considered to be in accordance with the objectives of PPS6, PPS25 and PPG13, policies T2, T4, T14 and NR1 of the East of England Plan (May 2008), saved policy T2 of the adopted Norfolk Structure Plan and saved policies SHO1, SHO3, SHO7, EMP2, TRA3, TRA6, TRA10, TRA11, TRA12, TRA21 and TRA22 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted Version November 2004).)

4. APPLICATION NO 09/00487/NF3 - 82 - 90 POTTERGATE

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

RESOLVED to approve Application No 09/00487/NF3 – 82-90 Pottergate and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit
2. The post attaching the dish to the wall will be painted to match the existing wall.

(Reasons for approval: The design and position of the dish have been carefully considered so as to reach an acceptable compromise between the visual appearance and the required position of the aerial to achieve a strong reception. The visual impact of the aerial and dish is further reduced by the reduction in height and use of a clear dish. Therefore the proposals are considered to be in accordance with PPG15, policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan (May 2008) and saved policies HBE8 and HBE12 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted Version November 2004).)

5. APPLICATION NO 09/00308/NF3 - 1 - 12 LEOPARD COURT

The Senior Technical Officer presented the report with the aid of slides and plans, and together with the Planning Development Manager and the Senior Planner (Development) answered questions.

A resident of the flats then addressed the Committee. He expressed concern that the summary in the report misrepresented his objections and that of his neighbours and that he fully supported the objections raised by the Norwich Society. There

were 10 people who were not happy with the proposed window replacement and he considered that there should be further dialogue with Housing Services to consider a proposal that was sympathetic to the building.

In response members were advised that the planning issues raised by the objectors had been summarised appropriately in the report. Other comments in the letters were considered to be non-planning issues and were not summarised in the report.

Discussion ensued in which members compared the existing windows at Leopard Court with replacement ones similar to those proposed installed at Brooke Place. Some concern was expressed that the replacement windows would lose the fenestration detail of individual panes. Members' attention was drawn to the fact that the windows at Leopard Court differed from Brooke Place in that some bedrooms did not have top opening casements. The glazing bars were similar.

The Chair proposed that the Committee undertook a site visit before determining the application but this was not seconded and therefore the proposal was rejected.

Councillor Stephenson proposed and Councillor Jago seconded that the application should be refused because the preservation of the style of original windows should be retained and that the design of the proposed replacement windows was unsatisfactory in that individual panes would be lost and replaced by glazing bars.

RESOLVED with 4 members voting in favour of refusal (Councillors Stephenson, Jago, Bradford and Sands) and 7 members voting against (Councillors Little, Banham, Lubbock, Llewellyn, George, Driver and Wiltshire) the amendment was lost.

The Chair then moved the recommendations contained in the report.

RESOLVED with 7 members voting in favour (Councillors Little, Banham, Lubbock, Llewellyn, George, Driver and Wiltshire) and 4 members against (Councillors Stephenson, Jago, Bradford and Sands) to approve Application No 09/00308/NF3 - 1 - 12 Leopard Court and grant planning permission subject to the following condition:

1. Standard time limit.

(Reason for approval: It is considered that the replacement windows will not have a detrimental impact on the building, street scene or wider Conservation Area. Therefore the proposal is considered to be in accordance with PPS1 and PPS1 Annexe; policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan (May 2008) and saved policies HBE8 and HBE12 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted Version November 2004).)

6. APPLICATION NO 09/00401/F - 13 - 21 STAFFORD STREET

The Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans and answered members' questions.

RESOLVED to approve no 09/00401/F - 13 - 21 Stafford Street and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement within 3 years.
2. Demolition of existing buildings prior to commencement.
3. External materials to be agreed.
4. Boundary treatment to be agreed.
5. Implementation of boundary treatment.
6. Landscaping scheme to be submitted.
7. Implementation and maintenance of landscaping.
8. Cycle storage.
9. Bin storage.

(Reason for approval: The decision is made with regard to policies HBE12, HOU13, TRA7 and TRA9 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan Adopted Version November 2004 and all material considerations. The replacement of the existing building with 5 houses is suitable for this residential area and will provide adequate amenities for the existing and proposed residential dwellings in the area. In addition the design and materials are considered to be acceptable for the development and will not be detrimental to the visual or residential amenities of the area as a whole.)

7. APPLICATION NO 09/00476/F - 1 LADYSMITH ROAD

The Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans and answered members' questions.

RESOLVED to approve Application No 09/00476/F – 1 Ladysmith Road and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Commence within 3 years.
2. The facing and roofing materials to match the existing.

(Reasons for approval: The decision is made with regard to policy HBE12 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan Adopted Version November 2004 and all material considerations. The good design and high quality materials will not have an adverse impact on the character of the area, and the extensions and garage will not be detrimental to the visual or residential amenities of the area as a whole.)

8. APPLICATION NO 09/00543/O - ST MICHAELS CHURCH HALL

The Senior Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans. He reported that since the report had been written two further letters of objection to the scheme had been received. The first from a resident in Hellesdon Close expressing concern that the conifers that would screen the site were not included in the revised plan and that 'my trees' were not being retained. The Senior Planner confirmed that the conifers would be retained for screening and that the Leylandii and Field Maple would be retained. The second letter was from a resident in Leas Court whose concerns were that: the revised proposal meant that her property would be overlooked, particularly from first floor windows; that the value of her property would be reduced; the development would lead to an increase in

noise and traffic; cars would be parked alongside her property and an increased risk in flooding; litter and disruption caused by the construction works. Members were advised that although the revised scheme had moved the first block nearer the road there it was a wide road and the first floor rooms would be used as bedrooms. Reduction in property values was not a planning consideration. The development would only increase traffic movements by 30 – 35 a day on a road which had 2,000 traffic movements daily. The proposed scheme provided 6 onsite parking places and there were no parking restrictions on Hellesdon Road. It was understood that Anglian Water had been involved in improvement works together with Norwich City Council but this was not a material consideration as far as this application was concerned. The other issues raised were also not material considerations.

RESOLVED to approve Application No 09/00543/O – St Michael's Church Hall and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard outline time limit.
2. Reserved matters to refer to access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.
3. Reserved matters to comply with broad parameters of D&A Statement and indicative plans.
4. Contamination.
5. Replacement planting.
6. Cycle/Refuse storage.
7. Root protection.
8. Car parking layout.

(Reasons for approval: - In coming to the above recommendation the following saved policies of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (2004) AEC3, NE8, HOU1, EP22 and SR12, together with relevant National and Regional Policies and any other material considerations. It is considered that the principle of residential development, of the scale and density proposed which respects its surroundings, is acceptable, thus complying with the aims of the aforementioned policies.)

CHAIR