



MINUTES

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

9.00 a.m. – 2.25 p.m.

2 October 2008

Present: Councillors Bradford (Chair), Llewellyn (Vice-Chair), Banham, Bearman, Collishaw, Driver, Lay, Little (S), and Stephenson

Apologies: Councillors George and Lubbock

1. **SITE VISIT – DUKE’S WHARF - APPLICATION NOS 08/00742/C AND 08/00743/F – FORMER EASTERN ELECTRICITY BOARD SITE, DUKE STREET**

The Committee undertook a site visit in respect of the Applications Nos 08/00742/C and 08/00743/F – Former Eastern Electricity Board Site, Duke Street for the development at the Former Eastern Electricity Board Site, Duke Street.

2. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 11 September 2008, subject to the following amendment, Item 11, Application No 08/00255/O – Norwich City College, Ipswich Road, the inclusion of the following sentence in the first paragraph after the first sentence:-

‘One resident, whose family had medical problems which would be aggravated by demolition, construction and future overlooking objected because of the proximity of the buildings to their property. This was a relevant medical consideration.’

3. **APPLICATION NOS 08/00742/C AND 08/00743/F – FORMER EASTERN ELECTRICITY BOARD SITE, DUKE STREET**

The Planning Team Leader (Development – Outer Area) presented the report with the aid of slides, plans and computer generated images. The Committee also viewed a model of the proposed development, which had been available for public view in the Planning Services reception for several weeks. There had been 3 further representations received. The first of these was a letter, copies of which was available at the meeting, from a resident of Peel Mews, Anchor Quay, whose objections included: overlooking of existing properties in Anchor Quay; concerns about access, massing of the proposed southern boundary building and loss of light, lack of affordable housing and the principle of the mixture of uses proposed on the

site. There had also been a further letter from a neighbouring resident expressing strong concerns that the scheme was not in accordance with the adopted policy for the site, would result in a loss of vegetation, a lack of open space and traffic problems. These issues had been addressed in the report. There had also been a letter received in support of the proposals but expressing concern about the impact of the construction on businesses. These would be controlled by conditions and environmental health controls. The applicant had requested an extension of the standard time for the commencement of development to 5 years on the grounds of the complex nature of the site and the mix of uses proposed, topography, the need for archaeological exploration and the current economic climate. However the recommendation was that it should remain at the standard time of 3 years for commencement.

Three residents of the adjacent Anchor Quay then addressed the Committee outlining their objections to the proposed development. These included concerns about the height of the buildings and loss of light; that the development was contrary to PPG 15 – Planning and the Historic Environment and that the ‘Boardman’ buildings should be retained.

Councillor Holmes (Ward Councillor for Mancroft Ward) then addressed the Committee outlining his objections to the scheme on the grounds of massing, limited amount of green space and loss of trees, the access arrangements. He suggested that consideration be deferred to allow a better scheme to come forward which would meet the future needs of the city and incorporate use of the river for transport.

The agent then addressed the Committee and said that the proposals were for a high quality mixed use in a key city centre site which had been vacant for many years. The applicants had worked closely with officers and received considerable input from the Environment Agency, Norwich Society, English Heritage and local residents. The applicant would continue to manage the development in the long term.

The Planning Team Leader (Outer) then responded to the issues raised above with the aid of plans and slides and explained that the height of buildings in Duke’s Street would be approximately 26m above street level, and would therefore be 7m higher than the existing flats opposite of about 19½m. The use of the river for transport had been an option looked at by the developers and floating pontoons were being considered but would be subject to planning permission from the Broad’s Authority.

The Planning Team Leader (Outer), the Principal Planner (Transport) and the Conservation and Design Officer, then answered members’ questions on the report. Copies of the ‘Sunpath analysis’ were circulated at the meeting. Members were reminded of their duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area in determining the applications.

Discussion ensued in which members noted that the façade of the ‘Boardman’ buildings would be retained and be an integral part of the development. Councillor Lay considered that use of the river transport was a good idea but was not a sufficient reason to defer consideration of this application. Councillors Little,

Stephenson and Llewellyn expressed concern about the small amount of housing being provided on the site, which was a departure from policy and under the threshold for affordable housing, and would result in more houses being built on Greenfield sites elsewhere. The parking provision on the site of 93 spaces was considered to be over generous. The high energy efficiency incorporated into the design was welcomed. Councillor Collishaw expressed sympathy for the residents of Anchor Quay but pointed out that the site had always been an employment site and that the city needed high quality office accommodation.

RESOLVED, with 8 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Lay, Banham, Llewellyn, Stephenson, Bearman, Collishaw and Driver) and 1 member voting against (Councillor Little) to approve Application Nos 08/00742/C and 08/00743/F – Former Eastern Electricity Board Site, Duke Street, and:-

- (1) grant planning permission, subject to:-
 - (a) a Section 106 agreement, covering a transport contribution and public access to and discovery of national or international archaeology;
 - (b) referral to the Government Office for the East of England (GO-East) as a departure application for consideration;
 - (c) the following conditions:-
 1. Standard time limit for commencement (3 years);
 2. Flood protection measures including flood storage, flood defence, finished floor levels, flood management plan, lockable gates and barriers to basement areas & warning notices;
 3. Drainage details;
 4. Details of riverside walkway;
 5. Contamination – further investigation, detailed remediation strategy and verification report;
 6. Precise details and timetable for implementation of water, energy and resource efficiency measures during the construction and occupational phases of the development;
 7. Ventilation – location and specification;
 8. Noise protection details, including from car park, adjoining uses and the stand-by generator;
 9. Air quality – details of demolition and construction work management and dust suppression;
 10. Plant and machinery;
 11. Details of site management relating to refuse and recycling storage and collection, biomass fuel deliveries and collection of ash;
 12. Specification and schedule of repairs for Boardman buildings;
 13. Historic interpretation of site;
 14. Details of signage within the site;
 15. Precise details of certain elements of the scheme e.g. glazing, fenestration, art components, the roofscape addition to the Boardman building, etc;
 16. Precise details of all external materials and provision of sample panels;

17. Hard and soft landscaping scheme, planting plans, specifications (including genera and species, provenance of indigenous stock, plant handling standards, soil amelioration), implementation timetable, maintenance and management scheme, including irrigation and formative pruning and to relate to all aspects of the scheme including the landscaping on the buildings and the landscape buffer to the western boundary;
18. Provision of cycle parking, showers, car parking, refuse and recycling prior to first occupation of any part of the site;
19. Precise details of access and exit points, including ramps, gradients, cross-over details and security methods.
20. Requirement to undertake off-site transport improvements around the site as detailed in the scheme, including the improvements to footways and crossing points etc
21. Provision of bat boxes
22. Removal of vegetation and trees on site with prior agreement to timing to avoid impact on foraging bats and minimise impact on adjoining residents
23. Archaeological evaluation and mitigation
24. Provision of acceptable Travel Plans to include appropriate details of arrangements for monitoring and implementation
25. Public access through the site (24 hours) and public access to riverside walk and sculpture park (restricted hours)
26. CCTV on site & maintenance of on site management arrangements

(2) grant conservation area consent subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard time limit (3 years);
2. No demolition to take place until precise details of a scheme agreed to prevent the premature clearance of the site without adequate mitigation measures in place to prevent the creation of an unsightly 'gap' within the streetscape;
3. Air quality – details of demolition and construction work management and dust suppression;
4. Removal of vegetation and trees on site with prior agreement to timing to avoid impact on foraging bats and minimise impact on adjoining residents.

(Reasons for approval: The proposal is considered to be in accordance with PPS1, Supplement to PPS1 – Planning and Climate Change, PPS3, PPS6, PPS9, PPG13, PPG15, PPG16, PPS22, PPS23, PPG24, PPS 25 and to meet the relevant criteria of East of England Plan 2008 policies NR1, E1, ENG1, WM6, and ENV7 and saved policies HOU1, HOU2, HBE3, HBE7, HBE8, HBE9, HBE12, HBE13, HBE19, EP1, EP2, EP5, EP6, EP10, EP12, EP16, EP17, EP18, EP19, EP20, EP22, NE8, NE9, EMP1, EMP16, SHO3, SHO7, SHO22, TRA3, TRA5, TRA6, TRA7, TRA11 and TRA12 and the relevant accompanying supplementary planning documents.

It is considered that the scheme has adequately addressed concerns expressed and that, with the imposition of conditions and subject to a legal agreement, represents an acceptable form and type of redevelopment of this vacant city centre brownfield site, which is an appropriate departure from the local plan. Furthermore, the visual impact of the scheme, including its scale and massing and design details, is

considered acceptable and to enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the loss of the existing trees and vegetation on site will be adequately mitigated by a landscaping scheme that will also enhance the appearance and setting of the development. Additionally, the scheme is considered to relate positively to the neighbouring properties around the site and unlikely to have a detrimental impact on the living conditions of the adjoining residents. Taking all issues into account, the scheme is therefore considered acceptable and is consequently recommended for approval.)

4. APPLICATION NO 08/00712/F – LAND BOUNDED BY PIGG LAND, PALACE STREET AND BEDDING LANE, INCLUDING 1-2 ST MARTIN AT PALACE PLAIN

The Planning Development Manager and the Planning Team Leader (Development - Inner Area) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans and answered questions. Members were advised that the energy efficiency credentials of the development had been received and conformed with the East of England Plan policies ENG1 and building regulations, and incorporated measures such as low energy glazing, air-sourced heat pumps, optimising natural sunlight, and thermal water heating. The Team Leader suggested a further condition should be added to ensure that the energy efficiency measures were implemented.

A local resident then addressed the Committee with his objections to the scheme which included concern about surface drainage on the site.

The applicant addressed the Committee during which he listed the energy efficiency measures and said that the building would meet drainage requirements.

Discussion ensued. Councillors Collishaw and Little considered that the proposed design was too large for a narrow lane and incongruous with surrounding buildings. Councillor Bearman suggested that rainwater harvesting would alleviate the concerns about surface water drainage.

RESOLVED, with 8 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Lay, Banham, Llewellyn, Stephenson, Bearman, Collishaw and Driver) and 1 member voting against (Councillor Little) to approve Application Nos 08/00712/F, 08/00718/L, 08/00711/C – Land Bounded By Pigg Land, Palace Street And Bedding Lane, Including 1-2 St Martin At Palace Plain and grant:-

- (1) planning permission for Application No 08/00712/F, subject to the following conditions:-
 1. Commencement within 3 years;
 2. Materials;
 3. Details to be agreed (including windows, doors, eaves detail, canopies, details of the glazed link, car park treatment, bin storage details;
 4. Groundwater contamination mitigation;
 5. Attenuation of any increased public surface water provision;
 6. Heritage Interpretation;
 7. Cycle Parking and bin storage;
 8. Travel Plan;

9. Landscaping, planting, site treatment;
10. Car parking a cycle parking to be provided and available for use prior to first occupation of Bedding Lane office;
11. Plant and machinery details;
12. Fume and flue outlet points details;
13. Energy Efficiency measures

(Reasons for approval: The decision to grant planning permission has been taken having regard to saved policies HOU12, C35, CC5, HBE3, HBE8, HBE9, HBE12, EP16, EP18, EP20, EP22, EMP1, TRA6, TRA7, TRA12 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted November 2004) and all material considerations.)

- (2) listed building consent for Application No 08/00718/L, subject to the following conditions:-

1. Commencement within 3 years;
2. Method of attaching the listed building to the new building;
3. No works to remove floors or ceilings until an agreed structural solution has been agreed with the LPA
4. Schedule of repairs.

(Reasons for approval: The decision to grant listed building consent has been taken having regard to saved policies HBE8, HBE9 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted November 2004) and all material considerations.)

- (3) conservation area consent for Application No 08/00711/C, subject to the following conditions:-

1. Commencement within 3 years;
2. Bona-fide contractual arrangements with known occupier to be in place prior to demolition.

(Reasons for approval: The decision to grant conservation area consent has been taken having regard to saved policies HBE8 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted November 2004) and all material considerations.)

5. APPLICATION NO 08/00972/F AND 08/00870/A – 88 COLMAN ROAD

The Planning Development Manager presented the report with the aid of slides and responded to members' questions. The application was recommended for approval with an additional condition and that the business would not operate between 23.30 hours to 07.00 hours.

A proxy made representations on behalf of Councillor Wright (Ward Councillor for Eaton Ward) and expressed concerns about the impact of another takeaway on residents and the need to retain diversity to ensure the vitality of the shopping parade.

The officer then read out a statement from an objector, who apologised to the Committee for having to leave the meeting, expressing concern about health and

safety and whether there was a need for another pizza takeaway. The Chair reminded the Committee that competition was not a planning consideration.

The agent then addressed the Committee and said that the application would mean that the number of non-retail units was 36.4% and therefore within the threshold outlined in policy SHO15. The majority of the business would be in the evenings after 6.30 p.m. where traffic and parking would not be a problem. Around 80% of the business would be deliveries with 20% takeaways. Pizzas were more likely to be eaten at home and therefore resulted in less litter and conformed with policy EP22.

Discussion ensued in which members expressed concern about the affect that a third takeaway out of a parade of 11 would have on local residents, traffic, litter and increased anti-social behaviour. Members queried the high threshold contained in the policy and it was noted that a change of policy could not be made through a specific planning application.

Councillor Bearman proposed and Councillor Lay seconded that the permission for change of use should be refused on the grounds of loss of residential amenity, litter and noise of people congregating, and coming and going to the premises.

RESOLVED, with 4 members voting in favour of refusal (Councillors Lay, Bearman, Little and Driver), 2 members voting against (Councillors Bradford and Collishaw), and 3 members abstaining (Councillors Banham, Llewellyn and Stephenson) to refuse planning permission for Application No 08/00972/F – 88 Colman Road.

(Reasons for refusal:- The proposal is considered to be detrimental to residential amenity, in that the proposed hot food take-away is considered likely to lead to significant adverse residential amenity conditions, litter in the adjacent and surrounding area, and noise from customers particularly late at night, within an area with a high level of residential occupancy. The proposal is therefore considered to contravene saved policy EP22 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (adopted November 2004)).

(Members were advised that the recommendation was to approve planning permission for Application No 08/00870/A but that conditions and reasons for approval had been omitted from the report. Therefore the application was deferred to the next meeting for consideration.)

6. APPLICATION NO 08/00858/F – PREMIER TRAVEL INN

RESOLVED, having considered the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration Services, to approve Application No 08/00858/F – Premier Travel Inn, subject to no overriding objection being received from the outstanding consultee, and to grant planning permission subject to:-

- (1) the signing of a S106 agreement to include the matters detailed in the report;
- (2) the following conditions:-

1. Commencement within 3 years;

2. Submission of samples of materials
3. Boundary treatment;
4. Prior approval of details:-
 - (a) Roof, eaves and verge, water goods;
 - (b) Windows, doors, décor panels;
 - (c) Rainwater harvesting
5. Surface water disposal;
6. Surface water - maintenance scheme;
7. Pollution prevention;
8. Surface water drainage;
9. Cycle/refuse storage provision details
10. Landscaping planting and site treatment scheme;
11. Maintenance of landscaping;
12. Plant and machinery details;
13. Details of external lighting.

(Reasons for approval:- The recommendation has been made with regard to saved policies HBE12, EP8, TVA6, NE9, TRA6, TRA7, TRA11 And TRA12 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, PPS1 and all other material considerations and it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and in line with National and Development Plan Policy.

The proposed layout and design takes account of the relationship with adjacent buildings and uses and would be consistent with the relevant policies contained in the Replacement Local Plan. The requirements for transport infrastructure improvements created by the development can be adequately secured through a legal agreement between the Applicants and the Local Planning Authority.

The proposal is considered to make more efficient use of the land by introducing additional bedrooms and provide sustainable development in line with policy guidance within PPS1. It is also considered that the proposals would enhance this part of the City and improve the buildings relationship with the surrounding public realm.)

7. APPLICATION NO 08/00513/F – BAYER CROPSCIENCE LTD, SWEET BRIAR ROAD

The Planning Development Manager introduced the report and answered questions. In relation to the comments received from Councillors Read and MaKoff (Ward Councillors for Wensum Ward), the proposed storage tanks would be in the centre of the site and a long way from the nearest residential dwellings. It was a small development in a large site. The company held twice yearly forums with the local community and ward members.

RESOLVED to approve Application No 08/00513/F – Bayer Cropscience Ltd, Sweet Briar Road, and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:-

1. Commencement within three years of the date of permission.
2. Contamination assessment post demolition, remediation report and any mitigation measures prior to construction.

3. If contamination is found during construction, scheme to be submitted to deal with contamination and works completed before development continues.

(Reason for approval:- The proposal would not detract from the amenity of the area and would be of an appropriate nature and design in this industrial setting. The decision to grant planning permission has been taken having regard to saved policies EP1, EP3, HBE12, EP3 and EMP7 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan Adopted Version, November 2004, and to all other material planning considerations.)

8. APPLICATION NO 08/00906/F – 20 PARSONS MEAD

The Planning Development Manager presented the report with the aid of slides and said that there had been no further representations received, and replied to members' questions.

A local resident then addressed the Committee outlining his objections to the proposed extension and then on behalf of another neighbour circulated copies of statement and photographs showing the view from the neighbour's kitchen.

RESOLVED, with 6 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Llewellyn, Bearman, Little, Collishaw and Driver), 1 member voting against (Councillor Stephenson) and 2 members abstaining (Councillors Lay and Banham) to approve Application No 08/00906/F – 20 Parsons Mead.

(Reasons for approval:- The decision to grant planning permission has been taken having regard to Regional Policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan (May 2008) and saved policies EP22 and HBE12 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted Version November 2004). The proposal is considered in keeping with the scale and height of existing residential dwellings in the area and to relate positively to the design and form of the existing dwelling. Furthermore it is considered likely to have a minimal impact on the neighbouring properties in terms of living conditions of the residents.)

9. APPLICATION NO 08/00893/F – 64 ST BENEDICTS STREET

(Councillor Llewellyn declared a person interest in this item as the agent/architect was known to him through Ward case work.)

The Senior Planner presented the report with the aid of slides, computer generated images and plans, and together with the Planning Development Manager answered members' questions. Members were advised that the Norwich Society had responded to an earlier planning application for this site but had not responded to the consultation for this application. The proposal did not extend over the boundaries of the neighbouring properties and should not prevent the redevelopment of the neighbouring courtyard. An unsightly development however might deter other developers investing in the area. The reason for the recommendation for refusal was that the large dormer window roof extension was inconsistent with the surrounding buildings and would have a negative impact on the surrounding conservation Area and adjacent Grade II listed building. Members were advised that

the Quality Panel had not considered this proposal and would not normally consider such a small development.

The applicant then addressed the Committee and said that Councillor Holmes (Ward Councillor for Mancroft Ward) had planned to attend the meeting to speak in support of approving the application but due to the long duration of the meeting was unable to remain. The proposed extension would pump-prime the future development of Plough Yard.

The agent for the applicant then addressed the Committee and said that the Norwich Society's comments had been positive. The extension would not be visible from St Benedict's Street.

Discussion ensued in which Councillors Little, Stephenson and Llewellyn considered the positive impact of the proposal on Plough Yard which was in a dilapidated state and that the design lacked 'pretension'.

Councillor Stephenson moved and Councillor Llewellyn seconded that planning permission should be granted for this planning application. Officers advised that if members were minded to approve the application it should be subject to the following conditions: standard time for commencement of development; sample of materials being provided; method statement for replacement of flint works; details of joinery works and bin stores.

RESOLVED, with 3 members voting in favour of approval (Councillors Llewellyn, Stephenson and Little), 4 members voting against (Councillors Bradford, Banham, Collishaw and Driver), and 2 members abstaining (Councillors Lay and Bearman) planning permission for Application No 08/00893/F – 64 St Benedict's Street was refused on the following grounds:-

The proposed roof extension would interrupt the currently unaltered roof slope of the terrace and would be inconsistent with the form and character of the building range. The existing harmony and unity of the building group as a whole will be compromised by virtue of the interruption into the roof slope and as such the proposals are considered to have a negative impact on the character of the existing building. In addition, by virtue of its scale, height and irregular form the roof extension would be overly dominant and as such the proposals would have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding Conservation Area and the adjacent Grade II listed Plough Public House. The proposals are therefore considered to be contrary to saved policy HBE8 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, policy ENV7 of the adopted East of England Plan and the objectives of PPG15.

(The Committee adjourned for lunch at this point and reconvened at 2.15 p.m.)

10. APPLICATION NO 08/00497/F – WEST END RETREAT, BROWNE STREET

The Senior Planner (Development) presented the report. Members were advised that the recommendation for approval of this proposal was subject to a Section 106 agreement to pay for the traffic order to enable the construction of the access on to

Goldsmith Street. The scheme was below the threshold for a children's play area as suggested by members.

Councillor Little suggested that the maximization of water efficiency should be included in the conditions.

RESOLVED to approve Application No 08/00497/F – West End Retreat, Browne Street, subject to:-

- (1) subject to the signing of a S106 agreement to include the transportation matters detailed in the report;
- (2) the following conditions:-
 1. Standard time limit;
 2. Submission of sample of materials;
 3. Provision car parking, cycle storage and refuse stores prior to first occupation;
 4. Glazing to the specific windows to be obscured;
 5. Details of landscaping;
 6. Landscaping to be carried out within 6 months of the first occupation of any residential unit;
 7. Landscaping to be maintained and any new trees/shrubs lost to be replaced;
 8. Details of any fencing around the site and landscaped areas;
 9. Scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water drainage to be submitted;
 10. Scheme for the provision and implementation of foul water drainage to be submitted;
 11. Maximisation of water efficiency.

(Reasons for approval:- The recommendation has been made with regard to saved policies HBE 12, HBE 19, EP 16, EP 18, EP 20, EP 22, HOU 1, HOU 13, SR 3, TRA 6, and TRA 7 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, policies T14, WM6 and ENV7 of the East of England Plan, PPS1, PPS3, PPG17 and all other material considerations. Given the poor quality of the existing greenspace it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and in line with National and Development Plan Policy.

The proposed layout and design takes account of existing trees around the site and the relationship with adjacent housing and would be consistent with the relevant policies contained in the Replacement Local Plan. The requirements for transport infrastructure improvements created by the development can be adequately secured through a legal agreement between the Applicants and the Local Planning Authority.

The proposal is considered to make more efficient use of the land by introducing new residential units in line with policy guidance within PPS3 and provide sustainable development in line with policy guidance within PPS1. It is also considered that the proposals would enhance this part of the City and improve the buildings relationship with the surrounding public realm.)

11. APPLICATION NO 08/00723/F – 15 STANLEY AVENUE

The Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans and explained that the amended scheme was now acceptable.

RESOLVED to approve Application No 08/00723/F – 15 Stanley Avenue and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard time limit (3 years);
2. Materials to match existing.

(Reasons for approval: The decision is made with regard to policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan and HBE12 and EP22 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan Adopted Version November 2004 and all material considerations. The extension as amended will have a minimal impact on the amenities of the adjacent dwelling, and the design of the extension will not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the Thorpe Ridge Conservation Area as a whole.)

12. APPLICATION NOS 08/00884/F AND 08/00869/L – FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE, UPPER GOAT LANE

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

RESOLVED to approve:-

- (1) Application No 08/00884/F – Friends Meeting House, Upper Goat Lane, and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:-
 1. The development must be begun within three years of the date of this permission.
 2. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted samples of the bricks to be used in the construction of the plinth beneath the railings shall be submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be commenced in full accordance with the agreed details.

(Reasons for approval:- The recommendation has been made with regard to PPS1, PPG15, policy ENV7 of the adopted East of England Plan and saved policies HBE3, HBE8 and HBE9 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan and all other material planning considerations. It is not considered that the proposals would adversely affect the character or appearance of the Listed Building or the surrounding Conservation Area. Neither would the proposals have any archaeological implications.)

- (2) Application No 08/00869/L – Friends Meeting House, Upper Goat Lane, and refer it to the Government Office for the East of England and subject to them not calling in the application, grant listed building consent subject to the following conditions:-

1. The works must be commenced within three years of the date of this permission.
2. Prior to the commencement of the works hereby permitted samples of the bricks to be used in the construction of the plinth beneath the railings shall be submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The works shall then be commenced in full accordance with the agreed details.
3. Any damage to the fabric of the building resulting from the carrying out of the works hereby permitted shall be made good, to the reasonable satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority in writing within six months.

(Reasons for approval:- The recommendation has been made with regard to PPG15, policy ENV7 of the adopted East of England Plan and saved policy HBE9 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan and all other material planning considerations. It is not considered that the proposals would adversely affect the character or appearance of the Listed Building.)

13. APPLICATION NO 08/00870/A – 88 COLMAN ROAD

RESOLVED, having considered the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration Services, to consider Application No 08/00870/A – 88 Colman Road, at the next meeting.

CHAIR