

Updates to reports

Application no: 13/01964/F 25-27 Quebec Road

Item 4(1) Page 23

Correction to report:

Paragraph 41 states three new dwellings in relation to CIL liability. This should read as two new dwellings.

Additional condition number 10:

A condition 10 is recommended to require further detail of the car port to be submitted to the local planning authority for approval in order to ensure satisfactory design and to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Application no: 13/01636/F Castle Mall entrance, Back of the Inns

Item 4(3) Page 83

Three letters of support:

Three letters of support have been received from the executive director of Norwich BID, the chief executive of the Norfolk Chamber of commerce and the centre manager of Castle Mall. Each supports the plans to improve the Castle Mall entrance at the Back of the Inns, stating that the proposal incorporates an innovative design and improves accessibility and overall would enhance the streetscape.

More generally, the letters welcome the further investment in Castle Mall as it will not only help retain the 870 jobs at the centre, but will attract new retailers (and with them new jobs) to the centre. This proposal should be supported, especially as it aligns with 'town centres' first principles and should help retain Norwich's position as a top 10 UK retail destination.

Response: Noted.

Two letters of representation:

Stating that the design, like the previous designs, does nothing to preserve or enhance a sensitive streetscape. Works to buildings in conservation areas are subject to tighter planning controls in conservation areas and there is no better reason for approving this revised application than the previous one.

One representation states that the suggestions of the Norwich Society and the original architect are good and the owners of Castle Mall should explore these further.

Response:

The officers' assessment of the revised entrance design can be found in the committee report, paragraphs 22 – 28 (page 88).

In addition, it is not the planning authority's role to dictate design styles, but instead to assess whether the proposal sustains and enhances the significance of this part of the St Stephen's special character area within the City Centre Conservation Area.

Norwich Society comments:

There seems little change to the proposal and no apparent attempt to consider more appropriate solutions.

The proposals do not achieve the sensitivity or subtlety needed in this location. The design must respond to this tight, busy streetscape and in our opinion the height, scale and the use of further intrusive new materials do not achieve this.

We still hold the view that the improvements can be achieved by adapting the existing elevation. This would enhance the total length of the façade and bring it back to life.

The proposal before us now will quickly date and not deliver the required results. The design does nothing to unify the total façade and hold it together and the new central folded metal screen clashes visually with the tower on one side and the large brick elevation on the other.

We are unable to support this proposal located in such a prominent location in the heart of the City's retail area.

Response:

The officers' assessment of the revised entrance design can be found in the committee report, paragraphs 22 - 28 (page 88).

It should be noted that the National Planning Policy Framework states that 'planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles.'

In addition, it is not the planning authority's role to dictate design styles, but instead to assess whether the proposal sustains and enhances the

significance of this part of the St Stephen's special character area within the City Centre Conservation Area.

Application no: 13/02031/RM – Three Score, Bowthorpe.

Item 4(4) Page 93

One letter of representation:

A further representation has been received from a member of the public who previously commented on the application. The contents of the further submissions are summarised below:

- The comments in paragraph 55 should be remembered throughout mitigation that the site is important for its dry open flower rich grassland habitats which support open habitat invertebrate assemblages which includes species of conservation concern;
- This site is of national importance based on the expert's opinion and being a site that supports a number of NERC species and therefore this development should not see a negative impact on them. I still believe that developing a given area and only within that area is it mitigated can only be negative on the bee and wasp population. The areas of habitat must be at least matched in area and quality which likely suggest that areas of habitat outside of this development will need to be utilised and managed long term to support the bee and wasp communities appropriately;
- I can appreciate that as part of this application the full area has not been surveyed for bees and wasps, but of course it should have been for the initial application;
- The on-site mitigation of maintaining the excavated topsoil for reuse is welcomed, however post-construction monitoring of this approach is requested, it could then be used for other schemes on this site. The success of this approach must be monitored as it was to be blindly used across the rest of the schemes and didn't work it would be both a waste of money and secondly not be mitigating the bee and wasps, and thus causing detriment to the bee and wasp community in site which includes species of conservation concern. Post-construction surveys should be carried out over a number of seasons including repeat season over a number of years, and I believe that three years would be appropriate. Monitoring the success of the onsite mitigation should be a condition of the approval of this application.
- The recommendation of the Norfolk Wildlife Trust for a conservation management plan is welcomed and this should be a condition.
- Paragraph 62 of the report refers to off-site mitigation and the use of funds for offsite mitigation to seek to enhance the habitat for invertebrates. In theory this sounds good however, I make reference to my first point. The species and habitats of interest (them we wish to mitigate) require dry open flower rich grassland and they are species of open habitat. Bunkers Hill Wood, is a wood although adjacent habitat could be valuable for bee and wasps, however this is to be developed.

Earlham and Bowthorpe Marshes, which is mostly peaty (not suitable substrate for nesting), and in winter mostly flooded, will provide minimal benefit for bee and wasps. I only see real potential within the Bowthorpe Historic Park, although, specific enhancement would need to be made, as I believe at current it does not support the rich diversity the rest of the site has. I only make a point of this as we should not think just because money is being put forward to support and enhance biodiversity in these areas, that it will necessarily support the bee and wasps, which are to my mind the key ecological issue of this site to be developed.

- The above is partly acknowledged in paragraph 64, but I would like to point out I feel that it would provide minimal benefit, rather than as stated not fully mitigating the impacts of the development.
- Paragraph 66 states that this development has outline planning consent, however the full ecological value of this site, and the rest of the area was not fully assessed and thus a true impact of the development could not have been made at that stage. Therefore, outline planning aside, now we are better informed, let's make a decision on what we now know. There is little credit to be gained by saying it already has outline consent. I do not make comment to the commitments of housing as I cannot make any valid contribution to this. As an ecologist I do however feel I can comment on ecological points with merit.
- Paragraph 67: I debate this as no sites have been fully identified to provide off-site mitigation, specifically for bees and wasps, rather than as possible add-ons to areas that were previously earmarked for enhancement as part of outline planning permission, which fall short to supporting a rich aculeate community. This was mentioned in paragraph 62. We currently can only say that we look to provide mitigation on site, in areas that are not going to be developed. The sum of this can obviously only be less, than that of the value of the site as a whole. Thus, it is lacking and off-site mitigation is fundamental in order to adequately mitigate this development. As it stands can it be approved? I make reference to paragraph 65. If significant harm is caused and cannot be adequately mitigated, the proposal must be refused.

Response

Section 55 of the report (page 103) summarises the results of the invertebrate report submitted with the application. It is relevant to note further that of the 13 species of conservation concern, two are section 41 species. Section 41 of The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 1996 (NERC) requires the Secretary of State to publish a list of habitats and species which are of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England. The list is drawn up in consultation with Natural England. The section 41 list must be used to guide decisions including those on the grant of planning permission. Presence of species on this list is a material planning consideration. In addition section 40 of NERC places a duty on every public authority in exercising its functions, to have regard, so far as is consistent with

the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.

With regard to monitoring this is dealt with by condition 61 and one of the primary purposes of conditioning a conservation management plan is to secure monitoring of the success on the on-site mitigation measures.

In terms of off-site mitigation, the representation is correct in that only the area of the Bowthorpe Historic Park has the potential to provide habitat for the invertebrates in question here and indeed this was acknowledged by officers in writing the report albeit in hindsight not explicit in the wording of it. In order to secure mitigation for the specific invertebrates in question the works to and management of this area will need to be informed by ecological advice.

Considering the site as a whole, the approach to on-site mitigation can be extended to other phases, although clearly the development will lead to the loss of large areas of habitat. The historic park can feasibly provide for some further off-site mitigation, although needless to say this is not of a comparable area and therefore the loss of habitat will not be fully mitigated as detailed at paragraph 64 (page 105). Indeed such loss of habitat for section 41 species was recognised when approving the outline planning consent.

Whilst such detailed information was not available at outline consent stage, the decision was made in the knowledge that valuable habitat for invertebrates including section 41 species would be lost as part of the development, albeit it is acknowledged that the full extent of the sites value was not known.

The outline and reserved matters process is a two stage consent process albeit the outline permission is the planning permission and what is to be considered here are the acceptability of matters of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping. What is effectively being sought by the objector here is a planning obligation to secure management of another site to fully off-set the impact of the proposals. Any such planning obligation would need to meet the legal tests of necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly relate to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development and in this regard at reserved matters stage it is considered that making a case that such an obligation is necessary to allow for the approval of the reserved matters in question is fundamental flawed because the matter in question cannot be linked back to an impact of these specific details.

The key sections of the NPPF are summarised at paragraph 65 (page 105) of the committee report. The extent of harm and if this constitutes significant harm to an extent depends on the success of the mitigation which is being secured. The policies in the NPPF are a material consideration in the determination process which needs to be weighed against other policy and material considerations including the need to provide housing. At outline stage the principle of developing the site in the form indicated within the parameters of that consent was on balance approved. Turning to paragraph

67 (page 105) of the report, this is placing the harm in the context of the decision being made here which relates to the detailed matters of layout, scale, landscaping and appearance and there is considered to be no good reason to refuse these details matters. In particular it is considered that the layout and landscaping of the site have gone as far as they reasonably can in mitigating the ecological impacts on the development.

Further Information:

The applicant has submitted a methodology for the protection of the grassland areas indicated to be protected during development which is considered to be acceptable and provides for the areas in question to be fenced off during development and for ecological monitoring during construction works. Therefore it is recommended that condition 8 of the resolution on page 109 of the report be amended to require the method for the protection of the grassland to be implemented in full accordance with the submitted details.

Application no: 14/00028/VC - McDonalds

Item 4(5) Page 115

Amendments to the report:

1. Paragraph 40 should read:
On the basis of the noise impact assessment submitted it is not considered that there would be any significant impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents as a result of normal use of the hot food takeaway. Subject to compliance with the management plan it is **not** considered that the operator has provided adequate mitigation for anti-social behaviour and it is considered that a refusal along these lines would be extremely difficult to uphold. Regard has also been given to odour, air pollution, health considerations, cumulative impacts and access and servicing of the site and the neighbouring petrol station however none of these matters are considered to give rise to significant demonstrable harm as such it is recommended that the application be approved subject to the conditions outline in the recommendation below.

Updates:

It was identified earlier in the week that the red line plan did not extend to the adopted highway, this has therefore been revised to include the access and egress to the site. It is not considered by officers that this requires re-consultation as it is a technical correction and does not alter the proposals in anyway, therefore it is not considered that any parties interests would be prejudiced by the amendment.

Application no: 13/02051/F Former Wellesley First School Wellesley Avenue North Norwich NR1 4NT

Item 4 (7) Page 143

Additional information:

On 25th February the applicant provided an additional statement updating the likely phasing of development and explaining the importance of the temporary facility as follows:

“I am emailing to provide an update on the medical centre and pharmacy that are proposed at Wellesley Avenue North.

I met with the NHS on Monday and the Business Case is going to the NHS England Executive for sign off in 2 weeks time. We hoped this would be sooner but we are confident this will be a formality. We will then immediately progress the medical centre and pharmacy by appointing a main contractor who will deal with the various planning conditions. The pharmacy is a critical part of this Business Case and if we are not able to quickly open the temporary pharmacy then the whole scheme is at risk. I am aware that is not a planning concern but wanted to highlight the importance of this temporary application. If the temp pharmacy is not opened then the pharmacy licence is lost and the whole scheme would have to be rethought.

We are progressing the residential element of the site and Chaplin Farrant are working on this to satisfy the necessary planning conditions.

The temporary pharmacy would be placed on one of the plots which would then be developed as a home when the new medical centre/pharmacy have opened.”

Response:

The comments are noted as being supportive of the report and recommendation to grant temporary permission for this facility.

Application no: 13/01982/F 463 - 503 Sprowston Road, Norwich

Item 4(8) Page 151

Amendment to the report

Recommendation (1) should refer to application No. 13/01982/F

Additional letter from the agent:

I understand this application was originally being dealt with by Jo Hobbs, with whom we have had discussions regarding the appropriateness of the

application and find it a little disappointing that this is now being recommended for refusal without any further correspondence.

I note there are two reasons for recommended reasons for refusal being which as summarised as:

The steps failing to provide a suitably designed emergency escape for wheelchair users:

The requirement for a deed of variation to the Section 106 agreement attached to the previous consent.

We have today discussed the second point and agree that this can easily be overcome by a simple deed of variation and on its own, would not constitute a reason for refusal.

The main reason for refusal is therefore due to the amendment failing to provide a suitable means of emergency escape to the building. I would also clarify that the steps in question would only be used in the event of an emergency escape and are not designed to provide any access to the building.

I note that two consultation responses have been received, from CNC Building Control and the Fire Service.

CNC Building Control have stated in their response that the proposals do not affect the Public Areas and will not affect the means of escape from the Warehouse Area as it is unlikely that a member of staff in a wheelchair would be employed in a Warehouse. They are therefore limiting their own comments to the means of escape of a member of staff in a wheelchair working in the office area.

As you are aware, the building with the steps complies with Building Regulations and we have sought further response from 'PWC Building Control Services' and attach a copy which clearly explains why the installation of the steps is not a contravention of Building Regulations.

The Fire Service have also responded as part of the consultation process and I note they do not object to the proposals and have clearly stated the means of escape is a Building Control matter, which we have clearly complied with. The Management of the means of escape is also a matter for the building users, ALDI, and the presence of the steps from parts of their building is part of that management and their own responsibility. Many of their buildings have steps from the Office Area means of escape and as a point of reference, the store on Plumstead Road which was constructed 3 years ago, also incorporates steps in the same area.

I also note that part of the recommendation for refusal is due to the preference being for the previously approved ramped means of escape. Obviously, this application needs to be considered on its own merits and any reason for refusal has to relate to the information before Officers and Committee Members.

As the reasons for refusal of this amendment are not based on design or appearance, but are based on the detail of the building under Building Regulations and the use of the building under DDA requirements, I would request you reconsider the recommendation for the committee on 6th March 2014.

I am more than happy to discuss this further should you wish to contact me, otherwise I would be grateful if you could confirm if your recommendation will be amended as a late update to the Planning Committee.

Additional letter from the applicants appointed Chartered Surveyor:

Firstly I should start by saying I have discussed the exit steps from the staff entrance in great detail with Jo Hobbs who was the planning officer for the project. She accepted the rational that PWC put forward for the stepped exit and said she would recommend it for approval.

Item 12 in the report dated 6 March 2014 for planning committee is factually incorrect as the steps; are not a contravention of the Building Regulations and it is not impossible for a wheelchair user to egress the building

It should be pointed out that 5.32 in part B of the Building Regulations referred to in item 12 of the planning report is not a Building Regulation requirement it is only one way of achieving compliance.

The second statement is ridiculous in that it infers that all building cannot have steps. The vast majority of commercial buildings have steps internally and lifts cannot be used for evacuation in a fire situation. Wheelchair people are assisted from this type of premises by colleagues in a designed escape fire strategy. The Aldi external steps are no different.

To explain the strategy behind evacuation down the external steps at the Aldi store in a fire situation PWC would comment as follows. The area in question is not a public area, it is for staff use only.

The fire protection in the store is above the minimum guidance indicated within the Building Regulations in that the wall between the sales and back of house is a 60 minute compartment wall. This is an additional provision. Means of early warning and detection in the back of house staff area is above the minimum standard of the Building Regulations as the AFD is category 2 where category 5 is the minimum standard

The corridor in this area is a 30 minute protected corridor, this provision is a further increase in protection than that indicated within the Building Regulations

A refuge has been provided within the staff office area where a person in a wheelchair will go to and escape will be assisted by other members of staff.

This is a standard procedure used throughout the UK for assisting wheelchair people in a fire situation.

Either side of the compartment wall can be used as a place of relative safety in a fire situation without having to evacuate the building.

Also in a fire situation staff will go onto the sales floor to ensure members of the public are being safely evacuated rather than staff exiting the staff exit door and leaving the general public to their own devices.

As previously stated this scenario has already been brought to the attention of Jo Hobbs who understood the strategy and agreed with the principles.

Refusal of this application on the grounds of fire safety and DDA compliance is inappropriate and it is requested you reconsider based upon the above information.

Response:

“Item 12” in the report is related to comments made by consultees to the application. Specific comments made by CNC Building Control are at paragraph 13. The Fire service has previously commented that in discussion it has been noted that ramped access to facilitate improved egress for people with mobility impairment would be considered in the future when planning applications were to be considered by the City Council.

Assessment is included within the report about the technical nature of compliance for the means of escape with other legislation. However; paragraphs 31 and 32 are particularly relevant in relation to ongoing compliance and suitability of the access and in relation to the current opportunity for the applicant and their agent to discuss local concerns made by consultees in response to the application and potential for alternative means of escape being provided.

Application nos: 13/02087/VC and 13/02088/VC Norwich City football Club, Geoffrey Watling Way, Norwich

Item 4(10) Page 181

Amendment to the report

Drafting errors / clarification:

- Para 6 – “delays to their provision” relates to the riverside walk, road, landscaping, and works along the river bank.
- Para 6 – “facilities” should be made available for residents of the area i.e. at Allison Bank and Ashman Bank as well as NR1.
- Para 13 – for the avoidance of doubt, the Broads Authority have confirmed that the recommendation for mooring features to be provided

by 1st May 2015 at the earliest (as at paragraph 35) is acceptable to their schedule for asset review (discussed at para 45). However, it is considered appropriate to allow this to be provided by 1st August 2015.

- Para 27 – a revised condition for the riverside walk specification would include a requirement to provide details for the riverside path to be useable by service vehicles, the specification for which shall be agreed with officers, so the construction specification is clear to landowner and the management group of the adjoining flats. Ultimately, works to the flats that require “heavy duty plant and/or machinery and service vehicles” and which require access via the Council’s own landholding will be subject to gaining a license from the landowner, clauses for repair and finances can be arranged through that non-planning process.
- Para 32 – Members may be aware that some tree works on Council’s land have already started, to help avoid bird nesting season, but the applicant has committed to their replacement in locations to be confirmed by detailed plans.
- Para 34 – “whatever cost” was poorly described, and was actually intended to mean ‘a cost as opposed to the known cost of street tree provision by the LPA’.
- Para 35 – May-August 2017 ‘at the earliest’, should instead read “May-August 2017 at the latest”.
- Para 35 – Following discussions with the applicant and other parties delivering proposed works around the stadium, it has been agreed with the LPA officers that the proposed schedule for timescale of works can be amended, as below (changes are shown underlined). It is worth noting that the Club and Broadland Housing Group have endorsed this timescale and have agreed this is deliverable to their timescales and planned resources.
- May – August 2014: Provide the Riverside Walk outside Ashman Bank, Allison Bank and NR1, and construct all the Geoffrey Watling Way roadway to public adoptable standard.
- May - August 2015: Provide Mooring points and mooring facilities required by planning obligations following the Broads Authority’s 2014 review of navigation assets, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA in the event of a delay to the Broads’ review.
- May – August 2016: Provide hard landscaping and street trees and soft landscaping either side of the Geoffrey Watling Way adopted road alongside the N&P Stand and corner stand, and to the north of Ashman Bank and Allison Bank (this would include landscape and infrastructure works outside the shop, continuing behind the stand (Yellows entrance / Delias entrance etc.) to the start of the ticket office).

- May-August 2017 (at the latest, although could be brought forward to tie in with their works): Provide a landscaping scheme to the area outside the Jarrold Stand and provide trees adjoining the adopted highway next to the triangle car park north of the road outside the NR1 development (the details of which shall be agreed in advance as they may need to be expected to relate to any future development options on the car park).
- Works to Riverbank as necessary will be provided by 2017, subject to agreement with the LPA and likely to be in tandem with the Carrow Quay scheme (albeit no earlier than 2015).
-
- Para 37, 40 – Following the above revisions, the non-highway landscaping outside the N&P Stand, Ashman Bank and Allison Bank are required by August 2016.
- Para 41, 42 – Following a survey of the riverbank in the last fortnight, it is anticipated that works required may be extensive enough to require further detailed consideration to meet the objectives for safe footway protection, navigation, bank security, boom tower protection and appropriate recreation area. It is proposed that conditions or the Section 106 Agreement now require:
 - (i) works to be agreed with the LPA, based on a conditions survey; and,
 - (ii) works to be undertaken to a timetable to be agreed, and no later than 2017, unless first otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA.
- Para 46 – Amendment to the timescale for providing mooring points and facilities – see above.

Recommendations 1 and 2:

- To allow the LPA officers to arrange use of either section 106 Agreements or conditions to affirm the revised timescales discussed above, as an amendment to those of the original committee report paragraph 35.
- To insert the following revisions or new conditions:
 - TIME LIMITS FOR LANDSCAPING & WALK PROVISION
 - RIVERSIDE WALK SPECIFICATION –
 - (a) amended description
 - (b) confirmation of weight capacity and paths' load ability
 - (c) walk design needs to include CCTV & lighting ducting
 - ENGINEERING OF RIVER BANK EDGE
 - MOORINGS PROVISION TIMESCALES

- To allow the existing conditions of permissions 4/2002/1281/O and 06/00012/VC to be varied as agreed by officers in liaison with the applicant, but based on the following proposed amendments:

Retained conditions (i.e. those still relevant to the developments)
(subject to final wording being agreed by officers):

1. Devt to be as per historic Masterplan 1011/NO/P02 of 16th April 2007, unless otherwise first agreed by the LPA.
2. Landscape Masterplan.
3. Off-site coach parking.
4. Plant and machinery – future installation precautions.
5. Foul drainage shall be discharged to the main foul sewer.
6. Surface water from parking and hard landscaping to be passed through oil interceptors, but not roof water.
7. Exterior lighting – details to be agreed - and retained.
8. Materials storage and keeping pedestrian areas free of obstructions unless first agreed by the LPA.
9. No amplified sound to be used without first agreeing the details of maximum noise levels 2m from loudspeakers.
10. Details of servicing arrangements.
11. Parking and cycle spaces to be provided for resi, to at most 1 space per dwelling, to be permanently retained solely for the use of residents and their bona fide guests.
12. Removal of PD Rights – no satellite dishes, no extensions.
13. Ongoing landscaping maintenance requirements.
14. Tree protection during works.
15. Details of precise alignments and dimensions.
16. Details of road surface treatments.
17. Details of road levels.
18. Details of road traffic control measures.
19. No deliveries to the hotel and stadium to take place when the main stadium is in use or for two hours before or after.
20. Illustrative drawings of this permission do not form part of planning permission.

Amended conditions (i.e. those still relevant but in need of updating)
(subject to final wording being agreed by officers):

1. Contamination remediation works.
2. Extract vent & fume systems– if installed shall be retained.
3. Litter bins to be used in all publically accessible areas - in accordance with details to be first agreed – and retained.
4. Riverside Walk provision and defined specification.
5. Hard and soft landscaping before each phase.
6. Trees and Utility Routing precautions during construction.
7. Details of road traffic signal layout.
8. Details of road carriageway markings.
9. Details of road direction signs.
10. Community facilities to be provided within the stadium.
11. Position of CCTV cameras associated with use of the stadium to be agreed.

Removed / deleted conditions (i.e. those complied with / not relevant)
(subject to final wording being agreed by officers):

1. Time limit for RM submission and commence.
2. Development to be as per historic Masterplan 10365-MP 2009.
3. Flood risk assessment.
4. Contamination assessments.
5. Contamination remediation works.
6. Phasing Plan.
7. Archaeological works programme.
8. Development to provide public art (no details needed).
9. Details to be submitted for cycle storage.
10. Details of siting, design and external appearance.
11. Details of walls, fencing and means of enclosure.
12. Details of materials.
13. Details of doors, windows and glazing.
14. Residential windows to have acoustic glazing (no requirement for them to be retained).
15. Development to meet residential density of 40 d/ha.
16. Residential developments to provide play space.
17. Soft planting and site treatment works provision.
18. Management and Tariff scheme for Decked Car Park.
19. Designs of buildings, access ways and car parks shall include appropriate provision for disabled persons.
20. Before hotel is brought into use, the drop-off, access and landscapes area at the hotel to be provided (not retained).
21. Play space relating to those dwellings to be provided.
22. Car parking spaces for the dwellings to be provided.

Informative Notes shall be provided as listed below:

1. Explanation of the absence of a time limit condition.
 - a. The scheme has already been implemented pursuant to the submitted reserved matters. There are no further reserved matters able to be submitted.
2. Removal of decked car park and resi on triangle car park.
 - a. The time period for submission of reserved matters on the triangle car park or other areas has expired and the new permission shall not be able to cover those areas, so are excluded from the proposal description.
3. Previous masterplans are relevant only in relation to the unimplemented areas of live consents, ie. Landscaping, riverside walk and roads.
4. The designs of the landscaping either side of the Geoffrey Watling Way road and along the riverside walk are expected to be along the latest indicative plans of XYZ (Stephen Flynn), but area known as Jarrold Plaza can be related to either the overall scheme or any possible future development of triangle car park, although the latest plans are also supported in principle.
5. Standard construction good practice advice.
6. Remaining planning obligation requirements advice.