



Planning applications committee

09:35 to 15:25

8 March 2018

Present: Councillors Driver (chair), Maxwell (vice chair)(to end of item 7), Bradford, Button (to end of item 7), Carlo (to end of item 7), Jackson, Malik, Peek and Wright (to end of item 7)

Apologies: Councillors Henderson, Sand (M) and Woollard

1. Declarations of interest

Councillor Jackson said that he could be considered as having a pre-determined view in item 3 (below), Application no 17/01078/F – Car Park Rear of Premier Travel Inn, Duke Street, Norwich, in that he had commented on the site allocation as part of the Local Plan consultation.

Councillor Peek declared that he had a pre-determined view in item 6 (below), Application no 17/02024/F - Bowthorpe Road Methodist Church, Bowthorpe Road, Norwich, NR5 8AB, in that he had spoken with local residents and officers about this application.

Councillors Driver, Jackson and Wright declared an other interest in item 5 (below), Application nos 17/01355/F and 17/01356/L - The Marlpit Hellesdon Road, Norwich, NR6 5EQ during the item in that they were members of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) but had not contributed to the comments submitted by the organisation.

2. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 8 February 2018.

3. Application no 17/01078/F - Car Park Rear of Premier Travel Inn, Duke Street, Norwich

(Councillor Jackson having declared a predetermined view stepped down from the committee at this point. He remained in the room during the presentation and speakers and then left the room and took no part in the determination of this application.)

The area development manager (inner) presented the report with the plans and slides. He also referred members to the supplementary report of updates to reports which set out an additional comment from a resident of Dukes Palace Wharf.

Eleven local residents, a representative of the Inspiration Trust, and Councillor Bogelëin, proxy for the residents of three dwellings, addressed the committee and set out their objections to the proposals. These included concern that: the proposal should be set back from the river as it would have an adverse

impact on the natural habitat of otters and bats and the biodiversity of the riverbank; lack of landscaping and few trees; the size and massing was over development of the site, it would create a canyonising effect with Dukes Palace Wharf, and should be moved back from the river as it was too close to the river; that it would have an adverse impact on historic buildings; that residents would like to see development on the site and considered that the extant consent for mixed use development on the site was preferable; would have an adverse impact on the amenity of residents of Dukes Palace Wharf and cause loss of privacy as it would overlook the apartments, particularly to the residents whose apartments had full-length glass feature walls, and loss of view; concern about over studentification in the area and concern about congestion when students moved into or out of the accommodation; concern about antisocial behaviour: that it would have an adverse effect on the Jane Austen College causing loss of light to class rooms and raising concerns about safeguarding its pupils as bedrooms in the proposed development overlooked the school; concern about traffic and access; concern about access to the Riverside walk particularly for people dependent on wheelchair use; that the developers had not consulted the residents of Dukes Palace Wharf adequately; and concerns about noise and dirt from the construction. Speakers also referred to the comments of the Broads Authority and Historic England and their concern that the proposal to approve the application was contrary to national and local planning policies. During the presentations slides were used to illustrate the speakers' points.

Councillor Schmierer, Mancroft ward councillor, said that he had not heard from anyone who supported the application but there was agreement that the brownfield site should be developed. Over 100 students of Jane Austen College had signed a petition opposed to the proposed development. He called on the committee to reject the proposal as it did not comply with the council's own policies relating to overdevelopment, protection of the natural environment and the city's heritage assets.

The agent on behalf of the applicant addressed the committee in support of the application. He pointed out that there was market evidence that demonstrated the need for purpose built student accommodation in the city and that this which alleviate pressure on family homes, converted into student houses-in-multiple occupation. Residents of Dukes Wharf Palace had been notified about the public consultation events and only five people had attended. This would be a well-designed high quality development, which addressed flood risk. Most of its residents would walk, cycle or use public transport. The proposal would contribute to the extension of the Riverside walk and cycling routes as set out in the council's development plan.

(Councillor Jackson left the meeting at this point.)

The area development manager (inner) referred to the report and commented on the issues raised by the speakers. Historic England did not object to the proposal. The development adjacent to the Jane Austen College would be six storeys not seven as stated. Referring to the daylight assessment, the area development manager (inner) demonstrated that the minimum distance from the new development and Dukes Palace Wharf would be 25 metres and that the bend in the river meant that loss of privacy from window to window was not material. He also explained that the top floor apartments of Dukes Palace Wharf had been counted as two storeys in terms of height. The ecology report had identified a small triangle of land outside the

application site that was the habitat of otters and bats. The extension of the Riverside Walk was an agreed council objective.

Discussion ensued in which the area development manager (inner) referred to the report and answered members' questions. He explained that the 2004 permission on the site was extant and that if it were to be built out would not need to comply with current planning policy. Members asked questions about the loss of daylight to Dukes Palace Wharf and were advised that the curve of the river and the floor to ceiling glazing of the top apartments distorted the impact of the new development. Members were also advised that the extant planning permission had been taken into account when assessing the impact that the development would have on the natural environment and the mitigation that was required.

A member expressed concern about the proximity of the new development to Jane Austen College (5.5 metres) and asked what plans were there to manage the proposed student accommodation. The area development manager (inner) referred to the plans and said that there were no windows that overlooked straight on to the Jane Austen College other than a laundry and that the site would have a management presence on site.

The chair then moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations set out in the report. Discussion ensued in which members expressed their concern about aspects of the application. This included that it was overdevelopment of the site and that the concerns that had been raised on behalf of the Jane Austen College and the impact that it would have on the school were valid. Concern was also expressed about the impact that this development would have on the historic buildings in the city centre and natural environment, and on the residents of Dukes Palace Wharf, closest to the proposed development. The chair then withdrew his motion given the concern members had expressed about the detrimental impact that the scale and massing of the development and its proximity would have to amenity of the school. He advised against refusing the application on the grounds of the impact that it would have on the natural environment as it was a brownfield site with extant planning permission and mitigation to protect the riverside.

Councillor Carlo moved and Councillor Button seconded that the application should be refused on the grounds that it was contrary to policy in relation to: its scale, size and massing, loss of daylight and privacy to the school and impact on the conservation area. The area development manager (inner) said that it would be difficult to defend loss of privacy. The area development manager (outer) reiterated the reasons for grounds for refusal and it was:

RESOLVED, unanimously, to refuse Application no 17/01078/F - Car Park Rear of Premier Travel Inn, Duke Street, Norwich on the grounds of its scale, size and massing would have on the amenity of the Jane Austen College; that it would cause loss of daylight to the classrooms of the school and would be detrimental to the conservation area; and would have cause loss of daylight and amenity to some residents of Dukes Palace Wharf; and, to ask the head of planning services to provide the reasons in planning terms.

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

1. The proposal by virtue of its height, mass and proximity to the river would be inconsistent with the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and fails to respond sympathetically to neighbouring properties in the area, which include designated and non-designated heritage assets. The proposal would neither preserve nor enhance but would instead result in less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The benefits of the scheme are not considered to outweigh the level of harm caused. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies DM3 and DM9 of the adopted Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 and paragraphs 64 and 134 of the NPPF.
2. The proposal by virtue of its height and proximity to the eastern boundary of the site would have an overbearing impact and result in an unacceptable loss of daylight to the adjacent Jane Austen College including both to the building and to the associated play area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy DM2 of the adopted Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 and paragraphs 9 and 17 of the NPPF.
3. The proposal by virtue of its height and proximity to neighbouring residential properties would lead to an unacceptable loss of daylight to a number of properties to the south of the site at Dukes Palace Wharf, this would have an unacceptable impact upon the residential amenity of the occupants of those properties. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy DM2 of the adopted Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 and paragraphs 9 and 17 of the NPPF.

Article 35(2) 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 has 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 is advised that no further planning fee would be payable for any resubmission for development of the same character or description on the same site and by the same applicant within 12 months of the date of this refusal. The applicant is also advised of the Council's pre-application service, further details of which can be found at the following web link:

<http://www.norwich.gov.uk/Planning/pages/Planning-Pre-ApplicationAdviceService.aspx>

(The committee had a short break at this point. Councillor Jackson was readmitted to the meeting.)

4. Application no 17/01391/F - St Crispins House, Duke Street, Norwich

The area development manager (inner) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

A resident of Sherman House addressed the committee and highlighted the concerns that the residents had about the proposed change of use of St Crispins House. This included concern that student accommodation would create more traffic and noise, both from people entering and exiting the building at all hours and noise

from open windows. The windows at Sherman House were 8 metres away. The building should remain as office accommodation.

The applicant spoke in support of the application. He advised the committee that there would be a 24 hour management presence on the site and that the main access would be from Duke Street. He explained that the energy efficiency measures would improve the acoustics of the building and reduce the amount of glazing by 50 per cent. Landscaping would soften the appearance of the building. The current use of the building as office space was unsustainable and the proposal would rejuvenate it.

The area development manager (inner) referred to the report and explained that the office accommodation was open plan and too large for most business operations. He responded to the concerns raised by the speaker and said that the pedestrian access to the rear of the building would be closed off in the evening and confirmed that the main access would be via Duke Street. Sherman House would be screened by the building from most noise created within the proposed development. During questions, the area development manager (inner) said that the courtyard was accessible from inside St Crispins House and provided outside amenity space for the residents. Members were advised that there was space on the site for cycle storage and that developer would be expected to fund the required highway improvements.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations as set out in the report. The vice chair spoke in support of this application which would provide purpose built student accommodation, free up family homes and was near to the Norwich University of the Arts. She also pointed out that St Crispins House had accommodated 1,000 employees at its peak and many of them had travelled to work by car.

Discussion ensued in which members spoke in support of this application. Some concern was expressed about the loss of office accommodation and the need to ensure that the city had an adequate supply to meet the current demand. A member also expressed concern that St Crispins House was not on a direct bus route. Members considered that it was a good use of the building and welcomed the energy efficiency measures to improve it.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 17/01391/F - St Crispins House, Duke Street, Norwich and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Details and samples of materials;
4. Details of landscaping and planting including external lighting;
5. Tree protection measures for retained trees;
6. Implementation and retention of car parking and refuse storage facilities;
7. Full details of numbers, type and location of cycle parking facilities followed by implementation and retention of agreed facilities;
8. Details of off-site highway improvements and implementation thereof;
9. Full details of surface water drainage arrangements;
10. Full details of day-to-day management of the building including arrangements for start and end of term;

11. Scheme of archaeological investigation, works and recording;
12. Submission of a construction management plan;
13. Implementation in accordance with the submitted noise report;
14. Implementation in accordance with the submitted energy and resource use statement.

Article 35(2) 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 pre-application and application stage the application has been approved subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined within the committee report for the application.

5. Application nos 17/01355/F and 17/01356/L - The Marlpit Hellesdon Road, Norwich, NR6 5EQ

(Councillors Driver, Jackson and Wright had declared an interest in this item.)

The area development manager (outer) introduced the report which was presented by the senior planner with the aid of plans and slides. The senior planner referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports (circulated at the meeting) and said that the Environment Agency had withdrawn its objections to the scheme following amendments to remove the pavilion and glamping site, and a condition to ensure that flood risk assessments were implemented. The updates report also summarised a further representation in support of the proposal from the Campaign for Real (CAMRA). There had been a number of objections to the proposals which were addressed in the report.

As there were a number of speakers who had indicated that they would like to speak in support of the application the chair requested that a spokesperson was selected. The chair of the Wensum Community Centre spoke on behalf of residents and other community groups who had made written representations in support of the proposal. Councillor Bogelëin, Wensum Ward councillor, also spoke in support of the proposal and said that the applicants had taken on board the comments made by the council and members of the local community.

The senior planner referred to the report and answered members' questions. He confirmed that the new dwellings would each have small private gardens.

The chair moved and Councillor Jackson seconded the recommendations in the report.

Discussion ensued in which members spoke in support of the proposal which would bring a former public house back into use.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to:

- (1) approve application no. 17/01355/F - The Marlpit, Hellesdon Road, Norwich NR6 5EQ and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
 2. In accordance with plans;
 3. No occupation of the dwellings to take place until the works to the pub building (not including the works to the coach house) have been completed and the building is trading as a public house and open to the public.
 4. Standard contamination condition;
 5. Imported topsoil to be certified;
 6. Materials to be approved prior to development;
 7. Boundary treatments to be approved;
 8. Water efficiency;
 9. Surface water drainage scheme;
 10. Flood warning/evacuation plan;
 11. Finished floor levels;
 12. Landscaping in accordance with approved plan;
 13. No occupation of dwellings until parking has been provided;
 14. No occupation of dwellings until cycle parking and bin storage has been provided;
 15. No operation of bed and breakfast facilities and coach house, or occupation of dwellings to take place until TRO secured to make changes to parking/waiting restrictions on Hellesdon Road;
 16. Householder permitted development rights removed;
 17. Extract ventilation or fume extraction systems to be approved;
 18. No loudspeaker, amplifier, relay or other audio equipment to be installed or used outside the buildings;
 19. No use of the coach house as a bar and function room until sound insulation measures have been implemented;
 20. Opening hours restricted to the following:
 - (a) Monday to Saturdays between 08.00-12.00 for the main pub building and between 08.00-12.30 for the coach house
 - (b) Sundays and bank holiday Mondays between 08.00-11.00 for the pub and coach house (except on New Year's Eve or Sundays where the following day is a bank holiday, in which case the restriction is the same as for Monday – Saturday).
 21. Operations on site in accordance with tree protection plan, implications assessment and method statement.
- (2) approve application no. 17/01356/L - The Marlpit Hellesdon Road, Norwich, NR6 5EQ and listed building consent subject to the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement to include provision of affordable housing and subject to the following conditions:
1. Standard time limit;
 2. In accordance with plans;
 3. Details to be submitted including all materials to be used, new internal and external services, details of noise/acoustic insulation, new internal architectural features, details of new stairways;
 4. Listed building – making good;
 5. Work to match retained fabric;

Article 35(2) Statement:

The local planning authority in making its recommendation 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 applications are recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

6. Application no 17/02024/F - Bowthorpe Road Methodist Church, Bowthorpe Road, Norwich, NR5 8AB

(Councillor Peek having declared a pre-determined view in this item spoke as a member of the public and then left the meeting taking no part in the determination of the application.)

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. He explained that the distance of the building from the boundary had been inaccurate in the applicant's original plans.

The adjacent neighbour addressed the committee and expressed his objection to the new church being built so close to his boundary and the impact that this would have on his property. He also referred to the sunlight assessment not being to scale and concern that there would be increased noise from the church.

Councillor Peek, Wensum Ward councillor, addressed the committee and pointed out on the slide how close to the boundary the church was. Other residents in Field View had objected to the church building being so close to their boundaries. He said that the applicant should have stopped the building work when it was apparent that the agreed plans were wrong.

The agent for the applicant confirmed that measurements had been accurately recorded and any loss of daylight was within the BRE guidelines. There would be a reduction in noise to properties at the rear. The new church would be more suitable for the needs of the congregation. The words "not to scale" meant that the plans could not be scaled with a ruler.

(Councillor Peek then left the meeting at this point.)

The planner commented on the issues raised by the speakers. He said that the impact was to the north rather than to the properties to the west. The previous application had received no objections at all from residents of neighbouring dwellings in Fieldview and one objection had since been received. The impact of the proposal would be at the end of their large gardens rather than to living accommodation.

Discussion ensued. In response to the chair the planner said that steps were being taken to ensure that architects submitted accurate plans to prevent this situation occurring in future. Members were advised that the planner visited the site in November when the error was brought to his attention. The area development manager (outer) said that while the council could serve a stop notice the work had gone so far that a temporary stoppage of the works would not prevent harm to the adjacent neighbours. If members did not agree the planning application before them

then enforcement action could be taken. He pointed out that the officer recommendation was to approve and that there was some impact on the neighbouring property but it met the BRE daylight guidelines.

Discussion ensued in which the planner and the area manager development (outer) referred to the report and answered questions. Members considered whether it was feasible to find a solution to the concern which included a hipped roof or shortening the building. The chair proposed and Councillor Jackson seconded that the application be deferred to enable the planning officers to discuss with the applicant the feasibility of scaling back the building, and it was:

RESOLVED, unanimously, to defer consideration on Application no. 17/02024/F - Bowthorpe Road Methodist Church Bowthorpe Road Norwich NR5 8AB to allow for further information on the options available to the applicant to be reported back to a future meeting.

7. Application no 17/02026/F - 39 Constable Road, Norwich, NR4 6RW

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

Two local residents, who resided adjacent to the property, addressed the committee with their concerns about the design and extension of the proposal and that it would obscure light and outlook of Eaton Valley from their properties.

Councillor Lubbock, Eaton Ward councillor, also addressed the committee on behalf of residents and said that she considered that the applicant had not taken into account the needs of the neighbours with this extension. She said that the extension was a 47 per cent increase of the existing floor-print and would cause loss of view and light to the neighbours. She considered it contrary to policy DM3. She suggested that as it would be visible from the public realm that if it were to be approved then there should be a condition to ensure that the building was cladded with a suitable material so that the neighbours did not have to look out on to concrete.

The agent then addressed the committee and explained that the extension was to a contemporary approach to extend a family home and to enhance its views of the Eaton Golf Course. The applicant was willing to consider the use of real wood or wooden appearance cladding. He disputed that the extension would overshadow or be visible from inside no 37 and said that it would be a high quality extension which would rejuvenate this house.

The planner referred to the report and responded to the issues raised by the speakers and answered members' questions. He said that there was no significant harm to the area or amenity of the adjacent property to require a smaller scale extension.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations set out in the report. Discussion ensued in which Councillor Wright said that the proposal was not acceptable in that it was too large.

RESOLVED, with 8 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Maxwell, Button, Carlo, Jackson, Malik, Peek and Bradford) and 1 member voting against (Councillor Wright) to approve application no. 17/02026/F - 39 Constable Road Norwich NR4 6RW and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Details to be provided of materials and colour of vertical boarding.

(The committee adjourned for lunch at 14:00. Councillors Maxwell, Button, Carlo and Wright left the meeting at this point. The committee reconvened at 14:30 with the following members present: Councillors Driver, Bradford, Jackson, Malik and Peek.)

8. Application no 17/01664/F - Land North West Side of 25 - 27 Surrey Street Norwich

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

During discussion the planner referred to the report and answered members' questions about the lift access and the arrangements for adoption of the pavement. A member queried why this application had been referred to the committee as there had only been one objection. The planner explained that this was a major application which meant that the objection triggered consideration at committee.

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

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 17/01664/F - Land North West Side of 25 - 27 Surrey Street Norwich and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. SUDs including consideration of green roof;
4. Travel plan;
5. Agree location and number of cycle spaces;
6. No site clearance within bird nesting season;
7. External materials to be agreed;
8. Energy efficiency measures to be agreed;
9. Construction management plan to be agreed;
10. Security measures to be agreed, to include:
 - (a) Fire retardant, anti-graffiti and laminated glass at ground floor
 - (b) CCTV scheme to be agreed
 - (c) External lighting scheme to be agreed
 - (d) Details of the access rights of users of the various facilities and how this will be controlled
11. Acoustic measures to be agreed (windows and mechanical ventilation) for second-fourth floors including floor between hotel and apartment;
12. Highway works (including dropped kerb, line painting, works to pavement and relocation of street lights) to be agreed and implemented as agreed;

13. Refuse management plan to be agreed;
14. Water conservation measures to be agreed;
15. No plant and machinery to be installed without permission;
16. First floor to be spa and no other use within A1.

Informatives:

1. Not entitled to on-street parking permits;
2. Contact the city council regarding postal addressing of the scheme;
3. Should the applicant wish the highway authority to adopt the extended paving on Surrey Street under the overhang to the back of building line, this would require a S38 agreement (fees apply). This would also trigger the requirement for a building overhang license;
4. Adverts require separate consent.

9. Application no 18/00008/F - 82 Unthank Road, Norwich, NR2 2RW

The planner presented the report with plans and slides.

The chair moved the recommendations as set out in the report.

RESOLVED, with 4 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Jackson, Peek and Bradford) and 1 member voting against (Councillor Malik) to approve application no. 18/00008/F - 82 Unthank Road, Norwich, NR2 2RW and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Glass screens to be obscure glazed to a specification of not less than the equivalent of classification 5 of Pilkington glass and to be fitted and maintained prior to occupation of the rooms to which they relate.

10. Enforcement Case 17/00006/ENF – 17-19 Castle Meadow

The area development manager (inner) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

During discussion members noted that there was evidence that the basement had been used for accommodation.

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

RESOLVED, unanimously, to authorise enforcement action against the use of the basement as a single dwelling.

11. Application no 17/02023/MA - Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses, Clarke Road, Norwich, NR3 1JL

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

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

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 17/02023/MA - Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses, Clarke Road, Norwich, NR3 1JL and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Landscaping;
4. Details of materials of dwellings;
5. Removal of PD rights;
6. Water efficiency;
7. Bin and bike storage.

Article 35(2) 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.

12. Application no 17/00201/L and 17/00205/F - 24 Cattle Market Street Norwich NR1 3DY

The senior planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

During discussion the senior planner referred to the report and answered members' questions.

Councillor Jackson said that he was concerned that the recommended approval did not comply with the council's policy on cycle storage. He also expressed concern about the proposals for the façade which he considered was not a better solution and the fire escape arrangements.

The chair moved the recommendations as set out in the report:

RESOLVED, with 4 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Malik, Peek and Bradford) and 1 member voting against (Councillor Jackson) to:

- (1) approve application no. **17/00205/F** - 24 Cattle Market Street Norwich NR1 3DY and grant planning permission subject to the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement for a contribution of £213,614.09 toward off site affordable housing provision and subject to the following conditions:

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

3. Details of:
 - (a) all external windows and doors to include depth of reveal, details of heads, sills, lintels and glazing;
 - (b) Juliet balconies, balconies and roof terraces
 - (c) external flues, background and mechanical ventilation, soil/vent pipes and their exits to the open air;
 - (d) proposed meter and alarm boxes;
 - (e) eaves and verges at a scale not less than 1:20;
 - (f) all new external materials including manufacturer, product name and colour;
 - (g) brick work (sample to indicate brick, bond and mortar);
 - (h) rainwater goods (to be cast iron or painted aluminium);
- 4 Demolition/reconstruction statement relating to the rear flint/stone/brick wall fronting St Peter Parmentergate Church to include re-use of salvaged materials from existing wall;
- 5 Scheme for the provision of heritage interpretation;
- 6 Construction method statement;
- 7 Details of tether for bikes;
- 8 Details of roller shutter to car park;
- 9 External lighting;
- 10 Method statement for bats and nesting birds.
- 11 Bird nesting season;
- 12 Landscaping including details of tree planting, living screens (to be maintained to height of 1.8m);
- 13 Details of ecological enhancement works;
- 14 Any damage to Pigg Lane to be made good;
- 15 No extraction/ventilation unless in accordance with scheme to be approved.
- 16 Water efficiency;
- 17 Provision of car parking and bin store;
- 18 Archaeological written scheme of investigation;
- 19 Stop work if unidentified features revealed;
- 20 Retail premises not to open before 07:00 or after 22:00 on any day.
- 21 No trade deliveries or collections before 07:00 or after 19:00 Monday to Saturday. No trade deliveries on Sunday or Bank Holidays.
- 22 Slab levels of new building.

Informatives:

- 1) Businesses and residential properties not entitled to on-street parking permits
- 2) Street naming
- 3) To be aware of traffic management proposals for Cattle Market Street.

Article 35(2) 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.

- (2) application no. 17/00201/L - 24 Cattle Market Street Norwich NR1 3DY and grant listed building consent subject to the following conditions:
1. Standard time limit;
 2. In accordance with plans;
 3. Details of:
 - (i) All new internal and external plant, services & service routes and risers to the principal listed building (drainage, ventilation, heating, cooling, hot and cold water, mechanical & electrical, fire protection, thermal and acoustic insulation, lighting scheme).
 - (j) Schedule of internal finishes to walls, ceilings and floors;
 - (k) All new secondary glazing system within the principal listed building
 - (l) Position, material and appearance of all new partition work and doors
 - (m) Any new fixed blinds to the window openings in the principal listed building
 - (n) Any new rainwater goods to the principal listed building
 - (o) Repairs and cleaning schedule for the external windows, brickwork and render of the principal listed building
 - (p) Cleaning/decoration methodology to external details of external decoration to render, joinery and metalwork;
 4. Listed building – making good;
 5. Preservation and protection of features including:
 - (a) Existing windows to the front and flank elevations
 - (b) Internal floorboards;
 - (c) Internal fireplace;
 - (d) Internal winch.

Informatives:

1. Listed Building reminder on enforcement
2. Retain original fabric of building

Reason for approval:

The proposed conversion of the upper floor of Crystal House to residential and the construction of a new five storey building to the rear will result in some impact to the special architectural and historic interest of the building and the character and appearance of the conservation area. However the principle of this form of development has already been established under the previous planning permission and listed building consent. There are a number of differences between this proposal and the previous extant consents, but with the exception of the removal of the eastern wall, the changes are considered to be an improvement and will result in a

more sympathetic conversion of the principle listed building and an extension to the building which will be slightly less bulky and have less of an impact upon the views of St Peter Parmentergate Church. With regards to the eastern wall, subject to the flint, ashlar and bricks being salvaged and re-used in the new flint wall construction, this is considered acceptable. Overall therefore the level of harm to this heritage asset and its setting is considered to be less than substantial.

In accordance with paragraph 134 of the NPPF, this harm must be weighed against the potential 'public benefits' of the proposals. In this case it is considered that the provision of family housing within this central sustainable location will outweigh any harm. The proposed works are therefore considered to not lead to any significant harm to the heritage asset in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, policies 1 and 2 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (March 2011) and policies DM1, DM3 and DM9 of the Norwich Development Management Policies Local Plan (December 2014).

(Councillor Bradford left the meeting at this point.)

13. Application no 17/01832/F - 40 Bluebell Road, Norwich, NR4 7LG

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

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

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 17/01832/F - 40 Bluebell Road Norwich NR4 7LG and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

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

14. Application no 18/00060/F - 77 Brian Avenue, Norwich, NR1 2PD

The planner presented the report with plans and slides.

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

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 18/00060/F - 77 Brian Avenue, Norwich, NR1 2PD and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Materials to match the existing dwelling.

15. Enforcement Case – 159 Drayton Road, Norwich

The planner presented the report with plans and slides.

During discussion the planner together with the area development manager (outer) referred to the report and slides and answered questions about enforcement.

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

RESOLVED, unanimously, to authorise enforcement action up to and including prosecution in order to secure:

1. Removal of the outbuilding;
2. Removal of the hard surfacing;
3. Removal of the retaining wall;
4. Regrading of the front garden area and laying of turf; and
5. Installation of a boundary fence of no more than 1.2m in height.

16. Enforcement Case – 2 Mornington Road, Norwich

The planner presented the report with plans and slides.

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

RESOLVED, unanimously, to authorise enforcement action up to and including prosecution in order to:

1. Secure the removal of the outbuilding;
2. Secure the removal of the fencing;
3. Making good of the highway;
4. Removal of all demolished materials from site; and
5. Provision of a replacement 1.2m high fence.

CHAIR