Planning Applications Committee: 8 March 2018

Updates to reports

Application: 17/01078/F
Item 4(a) Page 23-68
Car park to rear of Premier Inn, Duke Street

Additional neighbour comment:

I am the owner of no 23 Dukes Palace Wharf, and have submitted comments on the website over the past 6 months.

I have read your recommendation to the committee and am particularly surprised that you are suggesting it should be approved. I will limit myself below to what I see as the most fundamental problems with this development, although, as you outline in your report, there are numerous comments in the 92 objections.

You are aware that there has been a previous approval on this site for a mixed use development (restaurant and residential flats). If the committee would refresh their minds on the plans for this previous approval they will see that the massing is very significantly lower and very much more set back from the river. It is evident that this was a sympathetic proposal and I can appreciate why it was approved previously by the committee - exactly the sort of development that Norwich needs. This is very different than the unsightly building that is proposed.

The current proposal would not seem at all to be compliant with DM2 nor DM3 (in particular) in view of its Height, its massing, its scale, its form, its proximity to neighbours etc.

DM2 asks for particular regard to be paid to
1. prevention of overlooking and the loss of privacy
2. prevention of overshadowing and loss of light and outlook.

Dukes Palace Wharf is 5 storeys high (plus the parking underneath the flats) (NB this is contrary to your suggestion in your report that it is "6 to 7 storeys") whereas the plans for the new development are for 8 storeys - 2 storeys higher! - the visuals show quite clearly that it is much higher than any of the local buildings. The loss of light and loss of privacy will not affect our own flat but it will seriously affect many others at the Duke Street end of the block, with some flats becoming like a gold fish bowl from people looking out - just 25 yards away.

DM3 requires that:

"Developers should demonstrate that appropriate attention has been given to the height, scale, massing and form of the new development including the avoidance of dominant or incongruous extensions and alterations to existing buildings" .

As referred to under the DM2 comments above , the sheer scale and height of the proposed development will tower over the surrounding buildings - not only Dukes

Palace Wharf but also the Jane Austin College. It will look quite out of place on Duke Street. I would ask the meeting to bear in mind that this building is in a Conservation area, which according to the council are" areas of special architectural or historic interest where the character and appearance needs to be protected or improved" - it hardly can therefore be said to comply with Policy DM9.

There are many other comments that I have already made in previous submissions on the website but I am sure that others will emphasise some of these at the meeting (e.g. overlooking playground, extreme proximity to the river etc). I have tried to restrict my comments to what I see as key from my personal viewpoint.

Finally, I would ask the committee also to take into account what I believe to be the very high handed approach of the developer, who was asked to make amendments at an earlier stage to take account of the numerous suggestions made to improve the development, and they came back with such very minor changes, that it seems insulting.

We need to ensure that developments are sympathetic and in particular comply with the various policies in the Norwich City Council's excellent local plan.

Application: 17/01355/F & 17/01356/L
Item 4(d) Page 137-166
Marl Pit Public House, Hellesdon Road

Further consultation response received from the Environment Agency confirming that following the amendments to the scheme, which include the removal of the pavilion and glamping site, they withdraw their objection. A condition is recommended to ensure that flood mitigation measures recommended within the Flood Risk Assessment are implemented.

One further representation received in support of the proposal:

“On behalf of the Norwich and Norfolk branch of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) we would welcome the return of this pub. We were invited to look around and see what was to be done and the proposers have put forward very comprehensive and ambitious plans. The pub will have uses for the local community as well as helping to regenerate the river and Marriots Way that are close by. Too many pubs have closed in the area and this should be seen as an opportunity to reinstate a much needed Public House.”

Application: 17/01664/F
Item 4(e) Page 167-186
Land North West of 25-27 Surrey Street

Full and detailed comments have now been received from Conservation & Design, which conclude that a simple, contemporary form is preferred for this site so as not to detract from the classical form of the adjacent listed buildings. The form should also attempt to offer an additional level of interest to the setting. In this setting it is advised that this should be achieved through exemplary high quality design and finish rather than a singularly identifiable feature. It is considered that the proposed scheme has achieved this aim, but it is a result of continued discussion and some of the more complicated design elements such as the externally fixed sun screening will require conditioning. It is suggested that these conditions should be pre-commencement.

Application: 17/02024/F
Item 4(h) Page 207
Bowthorpe Road Methodist Church

A final representation has been made on behalf of the owners of the property closest to the proposed development, no. 10 Old School Close. The representation provides a thorough overview of the concerns raised during the course of the assessment which have largely been covered within the committee report. A summary of the concerns raised and our responses are listed as follows;

1) The design of the replacement church hall is overly large and is being constructed using materials which are not appropriate for the area.

   Response:
   - The materials being used within the development were not detailed within the originally approved application with conditions requiring that they were submitted for approval to the council prior to construction commencing. An application has been submitted with the details required which has not been formally determined as a result of the submission of the current application. The details of the materials have therefore been included within the current application. The materials are considered to be appropriate for the development even though they differ from neighbouring residential properties. There are considered to represent a contemporary interpretation of the previous building on the site.
   - The replacement church hall represents an enlarged version of the original building in terms of both height and footprint. The site has been in use since the 1950's as a church hall and as such has a long history of being different to the neighbouring residential properties, some of which neighbouring the site were only constructed during the 21st century. The increase in the scale of the building is therefore considered to be acceptable for the site and is not incongruous with the surrounding area.

2) The proposal as a result of being constructed closer to the shared boundary than previously thought will cause a loss of light to the conservatory of no. 10 Old

School Close. The exact height of the replacement hall has not been verified by the planning officer.

Response:

- Sections 27-33 of the committee report include a detailed assessment of the potential impacts upon the neighbouring conservatory and rear of 10 Old School Close.
- The planning agent for the application has stated that a recent site inspection confirmed that the building had been constructed to the correct height of 7.7m.
- Concern has been raised that the building would be overbearing in relation to neighbouring residential properties. As has been acknowledged within the committee report, the proposal will have an impact on some neighbouring properties, however on balance this is considered to be acceptable.

2a) The daylight/sunlight report and shadow analysis documents produced are flawed as they are based upon a site location plan included as section 3 which includes the original distances between site boundaries. The reports do not take into account an estimated change in ground level of 0.5m between the replacement church hall and no. 10 Old School Close.

Response:

- Sections 27-33 of the committee report include a detailed assessment of the potential impacts upon the neighbouring conservatory and rear of 10 Old School Close.
- The agent for the application has confirmed that the data collected when producing the daylight/sunlight and shadow assessments was sourced from site survey using a 3D laser scanner in December 2017. As the building had been constructed the site survey assessed the building constructed in relation to its surroundings. This site survey would account for any topographical differences with neighbouring properties. The plan included at section 3 of the daylight/sunlight report is intended to identify the site only and is not for taking scalable measurements from. The plans listed at section 4 were not used to model the position of the building in relation to neighbouring properties.

2b) The proposal will result in noise disturbance to the occupiers of no. 10 Old School Close as a result of the proximity of the building and an intensification in the use of the site and no noise assessment has been undertaken in line with the Councils validation requirements.

Response:

- Given the increased size of the Hall there is some scope for a more intense use of the site, certainly in terms of internal capacity. However the overall use of the site does not differ from its previous use as a church hall. The hours of operation stated are considered to be reasonable and typical for a church of this type and there are no hour's restrictions on the existing Church Hall.
- The Councils validation requirements are not mandatory and officers have discretion in requesting such information, they are not a legal requirement.

- In this case whilst the scale of the Hall is increasing, it will be a modern replacement and construction compared to the previous building on the site. The rear elevation facing no. 10 Old School Close is a blank wall with non-opening glazing panels within the apex only. Environmental Protection have confirmed that there are no records of any disturbances caused by noise within the recorded period of fifteen plus years and are satisfied that a noise impact assessment is not required in the particular circumstances of this case and taking into account the historic use of the site.
- The proposal also reduces the amount of open space to the rear of the site and which is available for any external events associated with the Church building, as such potential for harm from noise disturbance from use of the curtilage is considered to be a worst neutral and at best an improvement over the existing.
- For the above reasons it is not considered that a noise impact assessment is required and it is not considered that the proposals would lead to concern over increased noise concerns when taken in the context of the existing lawful use of the site.
- Section 36 of the committee report also covers concerns regarding noise.

Application: 17/02026/F
Item 4(k) Pages 251, 252 & 255
39 Constable Road, Norwich NR4 6RW

Para 4) 2nd line: “4.2m” should read “4.4m”
Summary Information (under para 10): Length should read “7.8m (at roof top)”
Para 32): “A small Juliet balcony…” should now read “A window 1.6m x 1.7m wide..” and on 3rd line “1.75m” should read “1.7m”