



Planning applications committee

9:30 to 12:25

26 March 2015

Present: Councillors Gayton (chair), Sands (M) (vice-chair), Ackroyd, Blunt, Bradford, Button, Henderson (substitute for Councillor Grahame), Herries, Jackson, Neale and Woollard

Apologies: Councillor Boswell and Grahame

1. Declarations of interest

Councillor Herries declared an other interest in item 3, Application no 1500225F – 1 The Moorings and item 12, Application no 1500044F - 1A Oak Street, Norwich, NR3 3AE.

2. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 26 February 2015.

3. Application no 1500225F - 1 The Moorings, Norwich, NR3 3AX

(Councillor Herries had declared an other interest in this item.)

The planner (development) presented the report with plans and slides.

Two local residents addressed the committee and outlined their objections to the scheme which included concerns that the revised application did not address their concerns about the mass and size of the proposed extension and its proximity to 19 Indigo Yard.

The applicant explained the design principles of the proposal and pointed out that he had over 50 years' experience as an architect in Norwich. He had shown the trees in a "denuded state" in his drawings to display the design which could work well without the trees but would always be covered by the vegetation of the tree canopy. There was a gap between 1 The Moorings and 19 Indigo Yard and the two terraces were not aligned. He considered that Indigo Yard was already overlooked.

The planner referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports, which was circulated at the meeting, and advised members that it contained summaries of two further letters of representation from neighbouring residents and additional correspondence from the applicant.

Discussion ensued in which the planner referred to the report and answered members' questions. He confirmed that the tree in front of 1 The Moorings was

owned by the council and that it needed some maintenance work but would not be felled or heavily pruned.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to refuse application no. 15/00225/F - 1 The Moorings Norwich NR3 3AX for the following reason:

The proposed first floor extension would partially fill the wedge-shaped gap between the host dwelling and 19 Indigo Yard, and this would detract from one of the positive elements of the adjacent Riverside Walk and conservation area. A key element of the attractiveness of this section of the Riverside Walk is the spatial relationship between the public walkway and the residential development blocks fronting it, with gaps between buildings adding to the variety and interest of the street scape. As a result of its scale and massing the addition sits incongruously at the end of the attractively designed terrace, and in this specific location partially in-filling the gap in the river frontage, it fails to respect or respond to the character and local distinctiveness of the area and accordingly the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character of the City Centre conservation area, contrary to the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2014) and Norwich Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 policies DM3 and DM9.

Article 31(1)(cc) statement

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations. Whilst a scheme had previously been given a recommendation for approval by officers, elected members considered for the reasons outlined above that on balance and in light of the above policies that the application was not acceptable. The applicant has made attempts to address these concerns but officers do not feel this addresses the fundamental concerns clearly raised by members. Should the applicant be aggrieved by any decision of the local planning authority, the applicant's attention is drawn to the right of appeal.

4. Application no 14/01615/FT - Telecommunications mast in front of 47 - 69 Newmarket Road, Norwich

The planner (development) presented the report with plans and slides. He referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports circulated at the meeting, which summarised an additional letter of objection from a neighbour who was unable to attend the committee meeting and the officer response. Members also noted the objections that had been raised by a number of residents.

Discussion ensued in which members sought clarification from the planner about the location and size of the proposed cabinets and mast and that noise from the cabinets was acceptable. A member said that he had noted the views of the Norwich Society on street clutter in conservation areas, but he considered that the proposed removal of the large cabinet and its replacement with two new cabinets, increasing the cabinets to three, would reduce the visual impact. Members were advised that the cabinets would be colour coordinated and a standard dark green colour, typical for utility cabinets.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 14/01615/FT – Telecommunications mast in front of 47 - 69 Newmarket Road Norwich and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Works done in accordance with National Joint Utilities Group No.4;
4. Mast to be finished in colour live Drab (RAL 6022);
5. Cabinets to be finished in Fir Green (RAL 6009).

Article 31(1)(cc) statement

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations, following negotiations with the applicant and subsequent amendments the application has been approved subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

5. Applications nos 14/01604/F and 14/01605/L - The Cottage, 2 The Crescent, Chapel Field Road, Norwich NR2 1SA

The planner (development) presented the report with plans and slides. He referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports, which was circulated at the meeting, and set out corrections to the report and proposed that conditions 3 and 4 of the listed building consent should be amended as well as a recommended reason for approval. The updates report also summarised two follow-up letters of representation and the officer response.

The immediate neighbour of the adjacent property addressed the committee and outlined her concerns about the proposal, using photographs to illustrate her points. This included concern about the proposal to insert a window in the gable end in an original wall and that no assessment had been made of the impact of the proposal from her property. She was also concerned about glare from the solar panels and the applicant's ability to maintain the proposed green barrier. She pointed out that there was potential for ground source energy in The Crescent in the future. There was also concern that some residents in Coach and Horses Row had not been notified about the planning application and therefore had not commented.

The applicant explained that the application was to increase the energy efficiency of the building and bring it back into use.

The planner, together with the planning development manager, referred to the report and responded to the issues raised by the speakers and members' questions. Solar panels were designed to absorb glare not reflect it. Members were advised that nos 6, 8 and 10 to 28 (evens) Coaches and Horses Row had been sent a notification letter about the proposal. The Norwich Society had not submitted any comments on this application.

Discussion ensued in which the members expressed concern that the proposal was in the curtilage of a listed building and that it was proposed to insert a window into the gable end of an original wall of The Cottage. Several members considered that the current application was unacceptable and that a better solution could be provided

to get this building back into use in a way that was more sympathetic to the building and the area. A member suggested that false gables could be added to improve the appearance of the solar panels. The planner advised members that the window in the gable end and the roof lights would provide light to a dark room but that it was up to members to decide whether the measures were excessive. The particular window could not be installed under permitted development rights.

One member pointed out that the garage on the premises was built in the 60s and that the gable end needed essential maintenance. He considered that the proposed alterations would enhance the building rather than cause harm, considering the improvements it would bring to some apparently deteriorated parts of the listed curtilage building.

Councillor Jackson moved and Councillor Neale seconded that the application be refused on the grounds that it would be contrary to national and local planning policies to protect listed buildings in conservation areas, and it was:

RESOLVED, with 9 members voting in favour of refusal (Councillors Jackson, Neale, Ackroyd, Blunt, Button, Bradford, Henderson, Herries and Woollard), 1 member voting against (Councillor Sands) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Gayton) to refuse application nos 14/01604/F and 14/01605/L - The Cottage, 2 The Crescent, Chapel Field Road, Norwich NR2 1SA on the grounds that the proposals are detrimental to the amenity of a listed building and conservation area and to ask the head of planning services to provide the reasons in planning policy terms.

(Reasons for refusal subsequently provided by the head of planning services:

Reason for refusal for 14/01604/F:

Despite the mitigation measures, the proposed PV solar panels projecting above the flat roof would appear as incongruous in a number of views, detracting from the character and setting of not only the adjacent listed curtilage building but also the listed terrace and the nearby listed curtilage buildings. By undermining the significance of these statutory listed buildings, this also devalues the contribution they make towards the character of the wider conservation area. Combined with the harm caused by the changes to the cottage, this compounded less than substantial harm is not considered to be outweighed by the benefits of the proposals. The development is therefore contrary to the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2014) and Norwich Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 policies DM3, DM4 and DM9.

Reasons for refusal for 14/01605/L:

1. The changes proposed to the cottage are considered to cause unacceptable harm to the character of the listed curtilage building, particularly through the loss of historic fabric as a result of the new side elevation window. The extent of the alterations are not considered necessary to secure the building's optimum viable use as there are apparent alternatives which would bring it back into a more usable

state without causing the level of harm identified. For these reasons the public benefits of the proposal are not considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm, particularly given the detrimental impact these changes will have on the listed curtilage building's contribution to the character of the conservation area. The proposal is therefore contrary to the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2014) and Norwich Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 policies DM3 and DM9.

2. Despite the mitigation measures, the proposed PV solar panels projecting above the flat roof would appear as incongruous in a number of views, detracting from the character and setting of not only the adjacent listed curtilage building but also the listed terrace and the nearby listed curtilage buildings. By undermining the significance of these statutory listed buildings, this also devalues the contribution they make towards the character of the wider conservation area. Combined with the harm caused by the changes to the cottage, this compounded less than substantial harm is not considered to be outweighed by the benefits of the proposals. The development is therefore contrary to the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2014) and Norwich Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 policies DM3, DM4 and DM9.

6. Application no 1500147VC - 240 Hall Road, Norwich,NR1 2PW

(Councillor Henderson was absent from the room for the duration of the item and did not take part in the decision making.)

The planner (development) presented the report with plans and slides.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 15/00147/VC - 240 Hall Road Norwich NR1 2PW and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Details:
 - (a) Bricks – TBS Waveney red blend
 - (b) Tiles – Imerys Monopole Clay tiles
 - (c) Render textured finish and colour to match 240 Hall Road.
 - (d) Bay window – plain tiled with lead rolled hips to match 240 Hall Road.
 - (e) Rooflights – standard top hung Velux units
 - (f) Paving – Driveway Drivesett tegular priora porous paving
 - (g) Paving – rear garden patio Bradstone Grey Textured slab or similar
 - (h) Bin and cycle store as per drawing no. RS/3538/14/01 Rev BDetails to be provided as per above prior to occupation and retained as such unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
4. Water conservation measures.

Article 31(1)(cc) statement

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations, following negotiations with the applicant and subsequent amendments at the application and pre-application stage, the application has been approved subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

7. Application no 1500188F - 24 Ipswich Road, Norwich, NR2 2LZ

(Councillor Henderson was absent from the room for part of this item and did not take part in the decision making.)

The planner (development) presented the report with plans and slides. She referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports and said that the Norwich Society objected to the alterations to the front of the property.

The resident of the adjacent neighbouring property addressed the committee and outlined his concerns about the impact of the proposed extension on his property, which included loss of light and noise, and that the measurements in the plans were incorrect.

The architect said that the proposal was an extension for a four bedroomed house and was not as large as the extensions to the neighbouring houses.

The planner referred to the report and responded to the issues raised by the speakers and answered members' questions. The extension next door projected out more than the proposed extension there was less impact. The windows were to the rear of the building and as a residential property, noise was not a consideration. The hipped roof was the highest point from the boundary. The planner had not measured the distances, however had taken 6m from the plan.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 15/00188/F - 24 Ipswich Road Norwich NR2 2LZ and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. First floor side facing windows to be obscure glazed and non-opening except at 1.7m+ above finished floor level.
4. Replacement tree in front garden.

8. Application no 1500195F - 414A Dereham Road, Norwich, NR5 8QG

The senior planning technical officer presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. The applicant had provided additional information on the management of the property.

During discussion the senior planning technical officer and the planning team leader referred to the report and answered members' questions. Members were advised that the building had previously been used as a half-way house and that the proposal was to increase the number of bedrooms by four. Discussion ensued on whether there was an adequate provision of washing and toilet facilities. Members also

considered the adequacy of the parking facilities and that the number of cars owned by the residents would be greater than the provision on site.

The applicant was invited to address the committee at the chair's discretion. He explained that the building was a purpose built hostel and that it had a large kitchen and garden. The tenants would be students, occupying single rooms, and it was not expected that parking would be a problem, as only one in four students had a car and most students would walk, cycle or use the bus. There was parking in Tollhouse Road as most of the houses had driveways. He confirmed that there were adequate provision of toilets and washing facilities. The amenities met the current guidelines.

Councillor Blunt, as ward councillor for Wensum, sought reassurance that approval of the application would not exacerbate parking problems for local people in the area. Members were advised that car ownership among students was around 8 to 9%. The senior technical planning officer said that he had visited the site on two occasions and gauged the parking and traffic each time. He considered that the changes to the property would not cause a significant impact on the parking. The properties adjacent to the site had been consulted. Councillor Sands pointed out that future residents could be young working people with cars.

Councillor Sands proposed and Councillor Blunt seconded that the committee deferred making a decision to allow a review of the parking situation. However the committee was advised that any further provision on site would contradict the council's policy standards for car parking for houses in multiple- occupation. The proposal was then withdrawn.

A member pointed out that the house was already in use as a house of multiple-occupation and that increasing the bedrooms by four would not have a significant impact on parking.

RESOLVED with 10 members voting in favour (Councillors Gayton, Ackroyd, Blunt, Bradford, Button, Henderson, Herries, Jackson, Neale and Woollard) and 1 member voting against (Councillor Sands) to approve application no. 15/00195/F - 414A Dereham Road Norwich NR5 8QG and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans
3. Condition restricting number of full time occupants.

9. Application no 1401841F - 36 - 50 Drayton Road, Norwich

The planner (development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. He referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports which was circulated at the meeting and contained a summary of an additional representation and further additional / revised information from the applicant and associated officer responses. The council had received a petition, signed by seven people, in support of the application the previous day.

Discussion ensued in which the planner referred to the report and, together with the planning development manager, answered members' questions about pedestrian

access, access to the riverside and that bollards would be placed on the road to prevent the parking of heavy goods vehicles, waiting to access the car dealership site further up the road, from parking. Members considered that the proposals would enhance the site and that part of the retail footprint would be restricted to the sale of bulky goods. Members were advised that there was no provision in planning policy to stipulate that local people were given preferential employment opportunities.

A representative, on behalf of the applicant, confirmed that the company would safeguard the pedestrian walkway to the boundary of the site and would consider resurfacing the path if it were necessary.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 14/01841/F - 36 - 50 Drayton Road Norwich and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions, which are summarised as follows:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans
3. Unit 2 to be restricted to restricted retail only i.e. bulky goods
4. Opening and delivery hours 0800 to 2200 and 0700 to 2300 respectively
5. No commencement until the following has been approved in writing:
6. Revised junction layout.
 - (a) Details of pedestrian refuge to bus stop (subject to 278 agreement and feasibility)
 - (b) Revised parking and soft / hard landscaping including surface materials
 - (c) Details of new boundary treatment to the east boundary
 - (d) Revised cycle storage layout
 - (e) Details of bat friendly lighting
7. Landscape schedule, implementation and management plan
8. Arboricultural implications, method statement and tree protection plan
9. Submission of a delivery management plan
10. Details of lighting, site security and control of anti-social behaviour
 - (a) Closure of access gates and servicing areas
 - (b) Position and coverage of on-site CCTV
 - (c) Litter management protocol
 - (d) Position, luminance and spread of internal / external lighting, to minimise light spill upon bat habitat.

Informatives:

1. Highway guidance relating to junction improvements and provision of a pedestrian refuge to serve the bus stop
2. Add police guidance re security
3. Informative with regard to Japanese Knotweed.

Article 31(1)(cc) statement

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations and has approved the application subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined above.

10. Application no 1500095F - 18 Jessopp Road, Norwich, NR2 3QA

The planner (development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 15/00095/F - 18 Jessopp Road Norwich NR2 3QA and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans
3. Side windows to be obscure glazed.

Article 31(1)(cc) statement

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations, following negotiations with the applicant and subsequent amendments the application has been approved subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined above.

11. Application no 1500113F - 20 Grosvenor Road, Norwich, NR2 2PY

The planner (development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. He referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports, which was circulated at the meeting, and contained a further comment from Councillor Carlo, ward councillor for Nelson ward. In response to objections to students living in the property, the committee was advised that any resident of the premises could hold parties and barbecues in the rear garden and that there had not been a report of antisocial behaviour at this address since 2011.

The planner referred to the report and answered members' questions. The application would enlarge the kitchen and improve facilities for the residents.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 15/00113/F - 20 Grosvenor Road Norwich NR2 2PY and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. First floor bathroom window to be obscure-glazed to an acceptable standard.

Article 31(1)(cc) statement

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations, following negotiations with the applicant and subsequent amendments the application has been approved subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

12. Application no 1500044F - 1A Oak Street, Norwich, NR3 3AE

(Councillor Herries had declared an other interest in this item.)

The planning development manager presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

The planner (development) answered a member's question about the cycle store which was an existing one and part of the current facilities on the site. The applicant was not seeking to alter the existing cycle store as part of this application.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 15/00044/F - Julian Housing Support Trust 1A Oak Street Norwich NR3 3AE and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Guardrail to have matt black finish;
4. Provision of cycle stands and refuse storage prior to occupation;
5. No trade deliveries or collections before 7000 hours and after 22000 hours Monday to Saturday. None on Sundays or Bank or Public Holidays;
6. Ventilation units installed in accordance with approved drawings and maintenance scheme to be submitted.

Article 31(1)(cc) statement

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations and has approved the application subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

CHAIR