NORWICH City Council

MINUTES

**Planning Applications Committee**

**10:00 to 13:15** **Thursday, 09 October 2025**

Present: Councillors Sands (M) (Vice-Chair in the Chair), Caine, Hampton, Harper, Haynes, Knight, Lawes, Lubbock, Oliver and Stutely (substitute for Fox).

Apologies: Councillors Driver, Fox and Smith

**20. Declarations of Interest**

20.1 Councillor Knight declared a pre-determined view in application 25/00765/F – 71 Silver Street, Norwich, NR3 4TU, she would speak on the item and then leave the room. Councillor Caine declared an other registerable interest as he knew and worked with one of the objectors for application 24/00826/F 4 Wall Road, Norwich, NR3 4HW, he would take part in the discussion and vote on the item as he was not pre-determined, and the objector had not sought advice from him.

**21. Minutes**

21.1 This minutes of the previous meetings would be taken to the next meeting of the Committee.

**22. 25/00750/U Victoria House, Queens Road**

22.1 The Committee considered an application for the change of use of the car park previously associated with Victoria House to temporary car park.

22.2 The Committee had before it a report in which all information was laid out.

22.3 Tracy Armitage, Senior Planner, presented the application to the Committee and assisted them in their deliberations. The application was for the temporary use of the land on the Victoria House site for public car parking. The site had been vacated some time ago by the previous occupant Marsh and the former office building had been demolished. The temporary car park largely corresponded to the former staff car park. The access to the car park was from St Stephens Road. There was a ban on right turns onto the site from St Stephens Road with signage on either side of the road. It had been used as a public car park since May 2025. Within the site there were internal arrangements that cars entered from St Stephens Road, followed a one-way system and exited onto Brazen Gate. The relevant policy was DM29 which sought to provide for but limit the total amount of public parking in the

city centre. Proposals for temporary car parking were supported by the policy for sites that were awaiting development provided that the temporary car park would not impact the long term development of the site and there was no unacceptable traffic impact. DM29 also placed a cap on the number of public car parking spaces in the city centre of 10,000, monitoring suggested that there were currently around 8800 spaces. The 266 proposed by the application would therefore not exceed the cap. There had been reports that cars had been entering and exiting the site from St Stephens Road in contravention to the highway signs and internal arrangements; measures were being proposed by the applicant to address this including increased signage and one-way restrictor plates. The Committee noted the updates report that following consultation with Norfolk Constabulary a car park management plan had been submitted which set out operational arrangements for the site; this detailed that the site would be closed to the public between 23:00 and 06:00 with security patrols prior to the site opening and closing; temporary lighting would also be installed to be operated during the hours of darkness when the car park was open. Norfolk Constabulary had confirmed that the arrangements would offer an appropriate level of crime prevention for the temporary use of the car park. A lighting plan had been submitted which confirmed that the temporary lighting would be battery or solar powered and would be sited in such a way that the light would be orientated away from the boundary to residential properties to limit the impact on neighbours. The lighting would be within the amber spectrum to limit the impact on wildlife. A condition was proposed to introduce a minimum tariff level for parking on site, which would increase the cost of parking on the site. An additional condition had been included in the updates report to limit the hours of operation to being open 06:00 to 23:00. As the application was retrospective the conditions within the report included an implementation timescale for new measures. The proposal was recommended for approval with the conditions detailed in the report and the tabled papers.

22.4 Councillor Davis addressed the Committee, speaking in objection to the application, pursuant to the provisions of Planning Applications Committee Procedure Rule 9. She was objecting on behalf of Town Close residents as the proposal conflicted with the adopted development plan and emerging policies, which included DM28, DM29, DM31 and GNLP4 and GNLP7.1. These policies promoted restraint on city centre parking and prioritised walking, cycling and public transport. There were several underused car parks and the proposal would add an additional 266 car park spaces. This would further the dependency on car use for a location that was highly accessible through other means of transport. There was no evidence of parking need as several park and ride services stopped at the bus station which was located opposite to the site. Temporary permissions still had to comply with the development management plan unless material considerations outweigh it. The 10,000 public car parking spaces in DM29 should not be considered as a quota that had to be met. The proposal did not meet the tests within policy, as it would cause unacceptable impact and would delay and prejudice redevelopment of the site. The harm caused by the site were that it would undermine the Council's restraint policy, cause environmental harm through the avoidable trips in cars which would increase emissions, cause amenity harm and disturbance to neighbours and would cause anti-social behaviour. The draft Supplementary Planning Document for

Policy 2 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan strengthened the requirement for low carbon design and EV infrastructure. She urged members to refuse the application as the scheme contradicted the development plan as there was no proven need, would undermine sustainable transport and risked delaying regeneration.

22.5 Jason Tucker addressed the Committee as representative for the applicant pursuant to Planning Applications Committee Procedure Rule 9. The Committee heard that the scheme supported the regeneration of the site and ensured that the condition of the site did not deteriorate further. The conditions proposed would support the management of the car park and the demand for the site showed there was need for car parking in the city centre. The redevelopment of the site would bring active use back to the land. The applicant and operator had worked with officers to make amendments to the scheme to ensure that it complied with policy. Through the installation of signage and further control measures this would prevent cars entering and exiting the site inappropriately. The Committee heard that the proposal struck the right balance between providing a necessary service while ensuring impacts were mitigated.

22.6 In response to questions from the Committee the Senior Planner confirmed that she was expecting an application to be submitted for the redevelopment of the site within the next four weeks. DM29 made it clear that temporary uses of a site could not delay the regeneration of the site and the Committee heard that the Council had refused temporary permission in the past where it was felt that the temporary use would delay regeneration. The Committee heard that if permission was granted and an extension was sought for the use as a public car park then a further planning application was required.

22.7 Members asked about the quality of the surface of the car park. The Senior Planner confirmed that the surface of the car park was not as would be expected for a permanent car park, however in officers' view the surface was suitable for use as a temporary car park and the car park management plan confirmed that regular inspections and work to remedy any issues would take place. The lighting on the site was deemed necessary to ensure safety while it was open and operating in hours of darkness.

22.8 The Development Manager responded to Members' questions and confirmed that officers did not have evidence to suggest that other car parking facilities were underutilised. The temporary nature of the car park was a material consideration. Members could determine what weight should be given to each part of DM29. In officers' view the temporary nature of the car park that would support the future desirable redevelopment of the site was mitigation for the quality of the site. The conditions proposed would also support a greater level of control over the management of the car park.

22.9 In response to Members' questions the Democratic Services Manager confirmed that pre-determination was if a Member had made a statement that would be deemed by a well-informed person that they would not consider any further evidence.

22.10 The Development Manager confirmed in response to questions that retrospective planning applications were permissible under the legislation and an applicant should not be penalised for submitting an application to regularise a situation. The current operation of the car park was not satisfactory, and this could have been addressed earlier through the application process. The application should be determined in the same manner as any other application.

22.11 Members queried whether the concerns from Norfolk Constabulary had been addressed and whether the lighting plan as indicated sufficiently reduced dark spots. In response the Senior Planner confirmed that the Police had been consulted on the car park management plan, which included the lighting scheme, and had confirmed that they were satisfied. The Development Manager confirmed that the plan submitted was indicative and as part of the conditions proposed the detail of the lighting would be agreed to maximise coverage without impact on the residential properties on Victoria Road.

22.12 Members sought clarification on the definition of “temporary”. The Development Manager stated that any planning permission that was granted which was time limited was deemed to be “temporary”. The 18 month period had been negotiated between officers and the landowners as it was felt this was sufficient time for the application for the redevelopment of the site to be submitted and determined.

22.13 In response to questions the Senior Planner confirmed that the site would be gated and made secure while it was not open to the public. Periodic security patrols would take place whilst the car park was open and it would be patrolled in the evenings before it shut and, in the mornings, before it opened. The site itself had gates at the entrance and there was a barrier at the Brazen Gate exit.

22.14 Members asked questions on the 10,000 public car parking spaces cap within DM29. In response officers confirmed that the cap applied to the city centre and had been in place for several years. The number of car parking spaces available in the city centre was at the lowest level it had been for several years. The proposal therefore would not exceed the cap. As part of the review of the Greater Norwich Local Plan and the Development Management policies it could be explored whether the cap was still justified. DM29 provided for parking in the city centre with appropriate controls in place.

22.15 In response to further questions the Senior Planner confirmed that during the operation of the office building there had been occasions where the staff car park had been made available to Christmas shoppers.

22.16 The Development Manager confirmed in response to questions that if the Committee rejected the application the use of the site as a car park would not have planning permission. To control the use of the site the Council would use its enforcement powers to serve notice requiring the use of the site to cease.

22.17 Members asked for clarification on the current traffic orders in place that prevented turning onto the bus gate on Brazen Gate during peak hours in the morning and how this was compatible with the egress of the site. In response the Development Manager said that the County Council had been consulted on the application as Highways authority. As part of this the operation of the car park would have been considered alongside the adjacent road network. It was unlikely that many cars would be exiting the car park during the peak morning hours.

22.18 Members discussed the merits of the application. Some members felt that the meanwhile use of the site would aid the redevelopment of the brownfield site, the meanwhile use of the site would also support the prevention of Anti-Social Behaviour on site. The car park management plan submitted had addressed concerns raised by Norfolk Constabulary. The site was considered to comply with the Council's Development Management policies. Members noted that the County Council had not raised an objection to the site.

22.19 Some members considered that as the full planning application for the redevelopment of the site was due to be considered shortly there was no need for the site to be used as a temporary car park. The quality of the car park was raised as a concern, especially the accessibility for wheelchair users. The cap within DM29 should not be considered a target for the number of car parking spaces and there were several car parks in close proximity to the application site. It was considered that providing additional car parking spaces would encourage car journeys into the city centre. There were concerns around safety of users of the car park. Members expressed concerns that the site would not be accessible for wheelchair users.

22.20 It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved as detailed in the officer recommendation with the additional condition as follows:

That disabled parking spaces be identified on suitable surface areas with routes identified for access and egress for wheelchair users on the site close to the St Stephens Road access.

22.21 **RESOLVED,** with six voting in favour, three against and one abstention, that application 25/00750/U was approved as detailed in the officer recommendation and as amended subject to the following conditions:

1) Temporary permission – 18 months;

2) In accordance with plans;

3) Minimum tariff charges – implemented within 14 days

4) Operation in accordance with Car Park Management Plan - measures in place within 1 calendar month of the date of decision.

5) Installation of lighting scheme within 6 weeks of the date of decision

6) Restricting hours of operation to 6am – 11pm

7) Disabled parking spaces to be identified on better surface areas close to the St Stephens Road access point.

22.22 Councillor Harper left the meeting at this point.

**23. 24/00826/F 4 Wall Road, Norwich, NR3 4HW**

23.1 The Committee considered an application for the subdivision of the plot and erection of one self-build dwelling.

23.2 The Committee had before it a report in which all information was laid out.

23.3 Samuel Walker, Planner, presented the report the application to the Committee and assisted them in their deliberations. The Committee heard that Wall Road was a residential area in the north of the city close to the junction to Sprowston Road. The application site included a semi-detached three bedroom house likely built in the 1930s. There was an existing rear conservatory and a garage in the garden and the property had a large side garden. The proposal was for the subdivision of the plot and the erection of one self-build dwelling, as part of this the existing garage would be demolished. The existing conservatory would be demolished to facilitate bin and bike storage. Off-street parking for each property would be provided with electrical charging points. The proposed dwelling would be a two-bedroom dwelling which provided sufficient space for three persons. The existing and proposed property would have private gardens with bin storage. Objections had been received from neighbours which related to overlooking, overshadowing and outlook and the development being out of character for the area. The Committee noted that the property was in a critical drainage catchment area and the proposal includes less hard standing surface area in the private garden and proposals for the driveway to overcome surface water drainage issues. As the property was self-build the application was exempt from Biodiversity Net Gain. A condition was proposed for a period of three years to require the builder to maintain residency, if the property was sold in this period, then it would be subject to Biodiversity Net Gain. As the application increased the amount of overnight use of the site Nutrient Neutrality credits were required. The applicant had confirmed that appropriate credits had been secured and would be purchased once the planning consent had been issued. The Council was not able to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply which tilted the planning balance. The application was recommended for approval.

23.4 The Planner referred members to the tabled papers which highlighted that the trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) were located to the north of 312B Sprowston Road and were separated from the application site by three buildings which would not be impacted by the building. The trees on the border between 4 Wall Road and 312 Sprowston Road that would require root pruning were not subject to a TPO.

23.5 Stevie Savage addressed the Committee as an objector pursuant to Planning Applications Committee Procedure Rule 9. The objector was resident at 6 Wall Road and raised concerns around the overbearing impact

on their property from the proposed development. The way the property was oriented meant that the side aspect that faced the proposed development was the main entrance. The only window to the second bedroom would face directly onto the side wall of the proposed development and would block both light and restrict their view of Mousehold Heath. The room was used daily as a home office. There were two downstairs windows and a glazed door that looked out into a courtyard garden which brought natural light into living areas. The objector considered that a one-storey development would be more appropriate. The plot was a modest size and therefore would not be large enough to accommodate a property of the proposed size. The development would be out of character with the area. Previous pre-application advice for the site had suggested that a proposal would be recommended for refusal.

23.6 James Garnham addressed the Committee as the agent pursuant to Planning Applications Committee Procedure Rule 9. The Committee heard that the proposal had been designed to respect the established character of Wall Road which featured a variety of homes in both scale and size. The proposed development reflected the proportions and roof heights of neighbouring properties. The proposed materials integrated with the surrounding streetscape. The applicant had worked closely with planning officers to ensure that the scheme aligned with planning policy. The highways authority had been satisfied with the amended layout which provided one parking space per dwelling with EV charging and secure storage for bins and cycles. The agent referred to the objections on sunlight assessments, these tests were applied to principal windows of habitable rooms such as living rooms and were not applied to secondary windows. The proposed dwelling and 4 Wall Road did not require assessment as the windows were not principal windows.

23.7 At the request of the Chair the Development Management Team Leader responded to points made by the speakers. The Committee heard that the pre-application advice had been for a different proposal on the site and the pre-application response provided did not prejudice any decision made by the Committee. In terms of the sunlight assessment any specific questions would be answered.

23.8 In response to questions from the Committee the Planner confirmed that while the report did not include the measurement between the proposed property and the boundary, the distance between the proposed property and 6 Wall Road was 4.5 metres at the rear of the plot which was the closest distance, at the front of the property due to the step-in the distance was 6.9 metres. The distance between the proposed property and 4 Wall Road was 2 metres.

23.9 Members queried the sunlight assessment and where the assessment had considered overshadowing. The Planner responded that the assessment considered the amount of sunlight and diffuse light that was to the window and whether it achieved a good level of daylight. The amount of sunlight to the first floor bedroom of 6 Wall Road was considered acceptable, the windows on the ground floor were not primary windows and the rooms had other windows serving these rooms. In response to further questions the Planner confirmed that while the bedroom was taken into account as it was

the only window serving the room and was assessed in line with the guidelines so was not considered a secondary room. The windows in the proposed development and 4 Wall Road served non-habitable rooms such as a cupboard and a stairwell. Officers confirmed that the rooms on the ground floor of 6 Wall Road had other windows that provided light to these rooms.

23.10 Members queried the previous pre-application advice, in response the Development Management Team Leader confirmed that the advice was confidential and were not publicly available from Norwich City Council but had been provided by the initial recipients with their neighbours. The advice did not form a decision of the Council and the advice was caveated that it represented the opinions of officers and could not prejudice any future decision of the Council. Material planning considerations were previous planning decisions on the site and these would be considered as part of the assessment of the application.

23.11 The Planner clarified in response to questions that reference to “sky light” in paragraph 57 of the report was in reference to light from the sky. In response to questions the Planner confirmed that no trees were proposed to be felled as part of the application.

23.12 Members asked whether the unique layout of 6 Wall Road had been considered. In response the Planner confirmed that the road had a number of different types of properties including bungalows that adjacent to two storey buildings. The Development Management Team Leader confirmed that the assessment had considered that the primary living rooms on the ground floor that would be impacted by the development had other windows that would not be impacted by the proposed development. The assessment had been conducted on the first floor window as this was the only window to the bedroom and the assessment highlighted that the impact was considered acceptable within the guidelines. In response to further questions the Development Management Team Leader confirmed that a private view was not a material planning consideration, outlook was a material consideration. As the Council could not demonstrate a five year housing land supply which titled the balance and that the Council should seek to approve applications unless there were clear reasons to refuse the application.

23.13 Members sought assurances of the consultation period. The Planner confirmed that the Council had sent out the neighbour letters as standard at the start of the application period. The system recorded who letters had been sent to, as the Council did not deliver the letters itself so did not know whether the letters had been received. Neighbours notified the Council that letters had not been received, as two properties confirmed in writing that they had not received letters the Council chose to run the consultation process again to all who would originally have been consulted and made contact with neighbours to ensure letters had been received.

23.14 Members discussed the merits of the application. Some members considered that the proposed property would significantly impact the outlook of neighbouring properties. The assessment of the sunlight was considered and acknowledged that it was deemed acceptable but this was advisory. The impact of the proposed property would be significant on cloudy days.

23.15 Some members felt that the application was finely balanced and the lack of a five-year housing land supply tipped the balance in favour of approval, it was acknowledged that the proposed development would cause significant change for neighbouring properties and would have an impact.

23.16 It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved as detailed in the officer's recommendation.

23.17 **RESOLVED**, with four members voting in favour, four against and one abstention, and the Chair using his casting vote, that application 24/00826/F was approved as detailed in the officer recommendation subject to securing nutrient neutrality mitigation and subject to the following conditions:

1) Standard time limit

2) In accordance with plans

3) Landscape scheme

4) Biodiversity Enhancements including small mammal access

5) Sustainable Drainage (SuDS)

6) Car parking to be area to be provided before first occupation of new development

7) Bin and Bicycle storage provided before first occupation

8) Works on site in accordance with Tree Protection requirements: AIA/AMS/TPP

9) In accordance with materials specified

10) Maintenance of air source heat pump

11)Water efficiency 110 litres per person, per day

12) Biodiversity exemption to be reviewed if self-build exemption falls away

Informatives:

- Building Regulations Approval Required
- Construction working hours
- Biodiversity Net Gain – exemption

**24. 25/00765/F 71 Silver Street, Norwich, NR3 4TU**

24.1 The Committee considered an application for a single-storey rear extension and entrance porch.

24.2 The Committee had before it a report in which all information was laid out.

24.3 Adam McGregor, Planner, presented the report on the application to the Committee and assisted them in their deliberations. The Committee heard that the property at 71 Silver Street fronted Silver Street and the rear backed onto Nightingale Lane. There were a range of differing types of rear extensions present on the road with differing forms and heights and were not uniform in appearance. The property had an existing front porch which was proposed to be demolished and a new porch to be constructed. The proposal had been subject to amendments and officers considered that the revisions to the heights and distance to the boundary to the neighbouring property and the stepping in would reduce the level of impact on outlook and overshadowing on neighbouring properties.

24.4 Matthew Ames addressed the Committee at the discretion of the Chair. The Committee heard that the concerns raised by objectors were on the larger terrace developments in the NR3 area. The report quoted that the height of the existing flat roof extension at 71 Silver Street was 2.8 metres however the measurement was closer to 2.4metres high, which suggested that the change would be less than would be case. The architect's drawing did not show neighbouring properties and therefore did not show how the proposal would be relation to neighbouring properties. The objector referred to the Council's guidance on extensions which highlighted that a reasonable gap should be retained between properties to ensure adequate levels of light and to avoid a tunnelling effect. The proposal would create a tunnelling effect as it would run the entire width and ran the entire length of the passageway.

24.5 A statement was read on behalf of the Applicant. The Committee heard that the applicant had considered the design following seeing other properties in the NR3 and NR2 area with similar extensions on streets with similar architectural styles. The applicant considered that the proposal was in keeping with the character of the area. Following discussion with planning officers the proposal had been amended to reduce the height.

24.6 Councillor Knight addressed the Committee pursuant to Planning Applications Committee Procedure Rule 9. The Committee heard that concerns that the drawings did not show neighbouring properties to give a better indication of the relation of properties. The tunnelling effect of the proposal would have an impact on neighbouring properties and the proposal would be very close to the boundary and that this would set a precedent for similar proposals.

24.7 Councillor Knight left the meeting at this point.

24.8 At the request of the Chair the Planner, the Development Management Team Leader and Development Manager responded to points made by the speakers. The Committee heard that for planning applications the documents were required to show the proposal which the submitted document had. For some applications the Council required the submission of documents related to the street scene which could show other properties, this had not been considered necessary for the application as there was no change in land level

between the two sites. In terms of the tunnelling effect this was considered to be the effect of being enclosed by two tall walls either side. There was some existing tunnelling as a result of the narrow gap between two tall walls. There would be a loss of outlook which was a different matter for the side windows. This had been addressed in the report.

24.9 In response to questions from the Committee the Planner confirmed that the impacts on 69 Silver Street would be overshadowing to three windows and the second was loss of outlook. The eaves of the extension had been reduced to 2.3 metres which was considered acceptable, this had been 2.8 metres in the original proposal. The Development Management Team Leader confirmed that a boundary treatment of 2 metres could be installed at any point without requiring planning permission, with the height of 2.3 metres this would only be a 30 centimetre increase in height compared to what could be installed. In response to further questions the Planner confirmed that the application would have been considered under prior approval.

24.10 Members discussed the merits of the application. Some members considered that the application would have an impact on neighbouring property however they felt that there were no grounds to vote against the application. Some members considered that there was a mixture of differing styles of extensions within the area and was typical of the type of terraced housing where properties were in close proximity to one another.

24.11 It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved as detailed in the officer's recommendation.

24.12 **RESOLVED,** with five members voting in favour and three members abstaining from voting, that application 24/00765/F was approved as detailed in the officer recommendation subject to the following conditions:

1) Standard time limit

2) In accordance with plans.

Informatives:

- Biodiversity Net Gain not required.

CHAIR