



Planning Applications Committee

09:30 to 11:25

11 January 2024

Present: Councillors Driver (chair), Sands (M) (vice chair), Calvert, Haynes, Hoechner, Lubbock, Oliver, Prinsley, Peek, Sands (S), Thomas (Va) and Young

(The composition and membership of the committee was reviewed at an extraordinary meeting of the council (10 January 2024) and has been amended.)

1. Declarations of interests

There were no declarations of interest.

2. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 14 December 2023, subject to deleting the reference to Councillor Ackroyd at the end of item 2, Minutes.

3. Application no 23/00479/F – Fieldgate, Town Close Road

Proposal: Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of dwelling with detached double carport/single garage.

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

(During the following representations slides provided by the residents were displayed.)

Four of the neighbouring residents addressed the committee with their objections to the proposed development. These included concern about the scale and design of the proposed new dwelling and carport/garage, which was considered to have an overbearing effect on the setting of the conservation area; that the footprint of the building would exceed the existing footprint by 60 square metres and the increased hard standing on the site, with concern about the impact on the local ecology; that the visual effect of the proposal would be detrimental to the setting, heritage, and unique character of the street scene and to the houses opposite and to the east; whilst appreciative of the implementation of tree protection orders on the site, there was concern about the revised arboricultural report and damage to trees from the increased hardstanding from the proposed garage, house and heated pool, and that

planting to form screening would not mitigate visual loss from the streetscene and historic environment, particularly when viewed from the first floor of adjacent houses; that the design of the proposed house, garage, heated pool and gate was mediocre and unsympathetic to the existing street scene and character of the area.

Councillor Stutely, ward councillor for Town Close, addressed the committee and outlined his objections to the proposed scheme, on the grounds that the design was more suited to an agricultural/rural setting and not a historic city centre conservation area, that the proposal was detrimental to an area that was a haven for people and wildlife; was larger than the previous application and had greater detrimental impact; and that he was concerned that the applicant did not intend to maintain the trees and boundary hedge from correspondence circulated by the consultant; and that permission should be refused as he considered that it was contrary to local and national planning policies.

In response to the issues raised by the speakers, the planner confirmed the size and scale of the development and that the carport/garage which would be detached from the house. The footprint for this application was 60 square metres larger than the existing footprint on this site, and referring to the comparison of the carport/garage being equivalent to a small house by one of the speakers said that it was nearer to the size of a one-bedroom flat and considered acceptable. The trees protected by tree preservation orders (TPOs) were a cherry, sycamore and a hawthorn. The sycamore had been reclassified from category C to B and the arboricultural assessment had been subsequently revised and resubmitted. TPOs provided additional protection to trees in a conservation area.

The Planner, together with the Development Manager, referred to the report and answered members' questions. This included clarification that details of the hard and soft landscaping and surface water drainage would be agreed by condition. The character of the area was for open driveways and therefore the design of the gate would be included in the landscaping condition to ensure that it was of an open design that could be seen through when closed. Members were also advised that the existing planning permission on the site was a material planning consideration, as there were similarities between the two applications; and where this proposal would have no greater impact than the approved application, it would be unreasonable to refuse. The landscaping plan would ensure that the hedge was undamaged by the close board fencing and that the planting was maintained over a five-year period. The committee also sought confirmation of the materials for construction (as set out in paragraph 21 of the report), and noted that as there was mixed development in this area, and taking account of the existing planning permission for the location of the garage, the siting of the development in front of the prevalent building line was considered acceptable. Members were advised that the proposed condition 10 removed permitted development rights to change the garage into a habitable space and this would apply for the lifetime of the development. Officers were not suggesting any changes to make the development compliant with current car parking policies. The Development Manager explained that the revised arboricultural survey had been reviewed by the council's Tree Protection Officer which had led to the conclusions as set out in the report.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations as set out in the report.

During discussion, members pointed out the merits of the development. This was a modern house that replaced a 1950s house, and its design and use of material complemented the surrounding 19th century dwellings. The proposal improved the thermal energy efficiency of the building and encouraged biodiversity with its bat boxes, and the use of permeable hardstanding improved its green credentials. Modern dwellings did not need to be in the same style as the existing houses.

Members who opposed the application considered that it was out of keeping with the streetscene and in the wrong location, and some members remained concerned about the preservation of the trees on this site.

Members also considered the precedence the approval of a similar application by the committee in November 2021 and that this could still be built out if this application was refused.

RESOLVED, with 7 members voting in favour¹(Councillors Driver, Sands (M), Sands (S), Thomas, Haynes, Peek and Lubbock) and 5 members voting against (Councillors Hoechner, Oliver, Calvert, Young and Prinsley) to approve application no. 23/00479/F Fieldgate, Town Close Road, Norwich, NR2 2NB and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Arboricultural works to be carried out by a suitably qualified arborist;
4. Works on site in accordance with arboricultural impact assessment, method statement and tree protection plan;
5. Compliance with ecological mitigation measures;
6. External materials to be agreed;
7. Hard and soft landscape scheme to be agreed, notwithstanding any details shown in application (to include gate design, boundary treatments and external lighting);
8. Surface water drainage scheme to be agreed;
9. Details of solar PV and air source heat pump, including noise, to be agreed;
10. Parking, access, turning space, cycle storage, bin storage and EV charging completed prior to first occupation;
11. Implementation of biodiversity enhancement strategy;
12. Swimming pool to be used incidental to use of dwelling only;
13. Water efficiency.

(The committee adjourned for a five minute break at this point, and with all members listed above as present reconvened.)

4. Application no 23/13232/F 72 Britannia Road, Norwich, NR1 4HS

Proposal: Single storey rear extension and alterations.

The Planner (case officer) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. The application was being brought to committee because the applicants were close

Minutes to be approved subject to correcting the resolution to record that "7 members voting in favour ... and 5 against"

relatives of an officer and would normally have been determined under delegated powers.

The Development Management Team Leader answered a member's question about the perspective of the plans to show the roof drainage.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations in the report. A member who had previously lived in a same style terrace house, said that such a similar extension would have been a welcome addition to their family home.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 23/01312/F - 72 Britannia Road, Norwich, NR1 4HS and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans.

CHAIR