

Planning Applications Committee: 10th May 2018

Updates to reports

Application: 18/00058/F

Item: 4(d) Page: 61

Address: 41 – 43 St Augustines Street

Further representations

Two further letters of representation have been received from a neighbouring resident and business. These were both sent earlier in the process but unfortunately do not appear to have been received by planning services. Nevertheless the representations are summarised below:

1. The provision for bin storage and collection is wholly unsatisfactory, and clearly contradicts Appendix 3 of the Development Management Policies which sets out specific requirements for bin storage.
2. The very intense form of development will have impacts on neighbours' and future residents' amenity (overlooking, overbearing, limited natural light and lack of outdoor space), as well as intensify local problems, such as visitor parking, obstructions of the pavement (from bins being left there or vehicles parking illegally outside this property) and fly-tipping/waste (DM2 + others). Clearly little or no thought has been put to the practicality of operating a business from the retail unit, and the developer is clearly just trying to squeeze as many flats into a site that just isn't big enough for them.
3. The design is not in keeping with the character of the conservation area which at this point is characterised by small-scale yards and diminutive medieval-character properties (DM9) and fails to satisfy the requirements of DM3.
4. The retail unit lacks a rear access for deliveries and space for storage, kitchen or staff welfare area.

Response:

On review the matter of refuse storage requires some further investigation and discussion with City Wide Services to clarify that they would collect directly from the store to the rear of the site. It is therefore now recommended that the matter is deferred.

Application: 18/00325/F

Item: 4(f) Page: 105

Address: Land adjacent to 25-27 Quebec Road, Norwich

Update to the report:

Revised plans and elevations have been received removing a bedroom window from each of the ground floor side elevations. This will serve to further reduce overlooking to properties on Quebec Road and Primrose Road. These bedrooms are still afforded with adequate light from large double doors at the rear which lead out to the

gardens. The revised plans have been circulated and are shown on the officer's presentation.

Application: 12/01598/VC

Item: 4(g) Page: 121

Address: Civil Service Sports Ground Wentworth Green

Updates to the report:

There are some updates to the report as per the below:

- Condition 3 will include a requirement for a meeting on site with the developers/management company's arborist to review the first phase of tree maintenance works and any measures required to complete the maintenance requirements of the first phase of tree replacement works.
- With regard to site drainage, since completion of the site there has been an issue with drainage of the play area on site which suffers from standing water after heavy rain. Officers have inspected the play area several times in the last week and it is clear that this is an issue for some time following heavy rainfall. Given that this variation (albeit now retrospectively) is agreeing the drainage solution for the site it is recommended that condition 4 is amended to seek a resolution to the matter within a certain timescale of the issue of consent. Persimmon have indicated their willingness to work with us towards a solution.
- Officers are also now exploring the possibility of the management company being party to the S106 agreement. This would involve payment of sums to the management company and for them to expend the sums on the tree works and drainage. It is recommended that authority is given to officers to explore this option.

Further Representations:

Since publishing the report officers have been contacted by a number of local residents. 8 written representations have been received. The comments raised have been summarised in the table below along with responses:

Comment	Response
Concern over the loss of trees and loss of biodiversity on the site.	<p>When originally planted the beech trees were planted in clusters of 5-7 trees probably as a hedge. However as a result of lack of management rather than being short and wide-spread they have grown tall in search for light with branches to the outside of the group. This means failure of one tree can expose all the remaining group to being blown over by high winds, and their height has made them more flexible.</p> <p>Fortunately none of the beech trees appear unhealthy or seriously damaged at the moment, so group core strength should be adequate to ensure</p>

	<p>their continued safe short-term growth.</p> <p>However, over the long term the beech trees will become a poor landscape feature and make safe thinning and management impossible. They are of an identical age, so will all fail at around the same time, and mixed woodland under-storey growth has been compromised by their dominance.</p> <p>Whilst they look attractive and healthy at the moment, their appearance conceals a deeper long-term problem and does not host as much wildlife as could be expected of such impressive woodland. The mono-species will also expose the whole tree belts to the effects of climate change and/or disease, and other beeches in Norwich are already known to suffer from drier summers and intense rainfall.</p> <p>Removal and replacement was therefore considered to be a more effective long-term solution to the woodlands landscape and biodiversity value.</p>
<p>Concern expressed over the delay in issuing the decision and progressing with tree works.</p>	<p>Officers are aware of the delays with the case and are seeking to press forward with the determination of the case as soon as possible.</p> <p>The delay has not caused a delay to the tree felling programme as phase 1 of the programme has been undertaken and phase 2 is due to take place in 2019.</p>
<p>A number of residents have raised concern over any proposals to curtail the tree felling programme.</p>	<p>There are no proposals to curtail the programme which remains as it was proposed in late 2012, involving a 16 year felling programme.</p>
<p>A resident has queried paragraph 41 of the report and in particular the last sentence which refers to the solution not being 'watertight'.</p>	<p>Paragraph 41 is dealing with concerns from residents of the new development that they would be hit by increased service charges. It is not the ability to enforce the replacement tree programme that is not water tight, it is our ability as a Council to have control over the service charges on the development. Via the S106 agreement we are requiring that sums are expended on tree belt maintenance by Persimmon (and their subsidiary company). This does not however prevent the management company from increasing service charges. We have no control in relation to the latter and it is a matter between the residents of the new development and the management company.</p>

	Therefore, putting service charges to one side, the conditions would be enforceable against the land owner.
A request that an Oak Tree proposed for retention in the plan towards to the northern end of Donkey Lane (adj. to 31 Wentworth Green) should be removed for safety reasons (part of it previously suffered from storm damage).	The council's tree officer has been out to site to inspect the oak. It was not possible to carry out a full assessment, as the tree is covered in ivy, but his view was that the reduction work to address the defect looks reasonable. The ivy should have been removed as part of the tree works, so we would suggest that we seek that they remove the ivy from the tree and from there undertake a further inspection. Ultimately the condition of the tree is the responsibility of the owner, however if they removed the ivy, and found they couldn't retain the tree in a safe condition, the tree officers view is that he would not object to an application to fell-it. This matter will be taken up separately and it is not considered necessary to amend the proposals at this stage.
Concern raised in relation to a section of fencing in the southern corner of the site, its integrity and security of the land behind. The comment advises that part of the fence fell down over winter and there have been issues with the security of a gate which provides access to a small strip of land between the boundary fences and numbers 119-123 Greenways.	This boundary to the south of the site does not form part of this planning application. Landscaping and boundary treatments were approved as part of a discharge of condition application 12/01034/D. If fence panels were blown down over the winter an inspection has identified that these are now back in place. The boundary at this part of the site is in accordance with the approved layout plan for the site.

Application: 18/00485/F
Item: 4(h) Page: 157-168
Address: 24 Judges Walk, Norwich NR4 7QF

Updates to the report:

To be added to other alterations in paragraph 13:

- g) north-east facing 2-pane window on north-west wing of house to be converted to double glazed-doors (no increase in width)

The applicant has indicated that he has had discussions with two of the neighbours since their objections:

- One of the three objections has since been withdrawn. This referred to the raised roof increasing the size of the property and the double storey window as being not in keeping with the local area or the character of the conservation area. Similar points have, however, been made in one other objection. The objector indicated the applicant's agreement to plant shrubs and trees to further obscure her view.
- The applicant advised that the issues raised referring to the size and height of windows facing 392 Unthank Road (see paragraph 37) had now been resolved with the objector and that they wished to withdraw their representation, but we have not heard independently from the objector so this has not been actioned.

A further representation has been received from the applicant responding to points raised by an objector. This can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed works will not alter the character and appearance of the area, as the extension replicates the design of the existing dwelling.
 - The proposed works will not increase the footprint of the property.
 - Only 18.8% of the dwelling's ridge lengths are to be raised. The rear ridge height once raised will still be lower than the ridge height of the dwelling's main section.
 - As windows are also to be removed, the increase in glazing on the rear section of the house will be less than 50%.
 - There are many other examples of properties in the area with much larger areas of glazing.
 - Dormer windows with flat roofs are consistent with dormer windows to the rear of properties along Unthank Rd.
-