



PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

10.00 a.m. – 12.10 p.m.

4 February 2010

Present: Councillor Bradford (Chair), Councillor Llewellyn (Vice-Chair), Banham, George, Jago (from end of item 2), Lay, Little (S) (from item 8), Lubbock, Stephenson (substitute for Councillor Read), and Wiltshire

Apologies: Councillor Read (Councillor Stephenson substituting)

1. MINUTES

Application No 09/01465/F – Romany Beer House, 131 Colman Road, Norwich, NR4 7HA

In response to a question, the Senior Planner (Development) confirmed that planning officers had held discussions with the applicants for the site at 131 Colman Road following the refusal of the above application at the last meeting. It was likely that a revised proposal would come before the committee in the future. He explained that permission was not required to demolish the single storey toilet block on the site and it was certainly not the case that the former Romany Beer House was to be demolished.

RESOLVED to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2010.

2. **APPLICATION NOS 09/01367/F AND 09/01368/L – YMCA, 46-48 ST GILES STREET, NORWICH, NR2 1LP**

The Senior Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans. A number of representations and consultation responses had been received since the publication of the report and these had been reproduced in a supplementary report 'Consultation Updates' which was presented to members and circulated at the meeting. It was noted that members of the committee had each received a copy of the letter from the Greenhouse Trust. He then gave the following response to the issues raised in the supplementary report as follows:-

'Response to the first representation (owner of Rigby's Court):-

- The courtyard referred to is to be largely retained and the new development will be roughly along the line of the existing gymnasium.
- It is not considered there would be any impact by virtue of overlooking due to the juxtaposition of the two buildings. Any increase in overshadowing would be limited or non-existent when compared to the existing gymnasium in this location.
- In relation to parking the development is car free, which is considered appropriate in this location. Given that the number of units on the site is decreasing it is not considered that there would be any significant impact to on street parking.
- Issues of design are discussed at paragraphs 26-30 of the report.

Response to issues raised by the Greenhouse Trust:-

- As detailed at paragraphs 38 and 39 of the report the application meets current policy standards for energy efficiency

Response to the issues raised by English Heritage:-

- It is considered that the suggestion to introduce mullions to the windows and sill or lintel detailing to the brick work would result in more of a 'pastiche', which goes against the intention of the design which incorporates more contemporary details including aluminium windows with flush brick openings. The finer details will be important, therefore larger window and section details are recommended as conditions;
- In relation to the roof, had the comments of English Heritage been received earlier it may have been possible to seek an amendment to this, although it is a minor point which is not considered to render the application unacceptable;
- In relation to the tree, it is not considered that this would be out of place but would in fact provide some screening to the adjacent car park and single storey extension to 60 Bethel Street;
- Finally, the signage would require separate advertisement consent if illuminated.'

RESOLVED to approve:-

- (1) Application No (09/01367/F, YMCA 46 - 48 St Giles Street Norwich NR2 1LP) and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard time limit;
2. Development to be carried out in full accordance with the approved plans;
3. Details of mortar mix to be submitted and agreed;
4. Large scale elevations and sections of the windows and window openings (minimum scale 1:20);
5. A scheme for archaeological evaluation to be submitted;
6. Cycle stores and bin stores to be provided prior to first occupation;
7. Full details of the renewable energy system/s to be submitted and to be provided and in use prior to first occupation;
8. Full compliance with the Arboricultural Implications Assessment;
9. Details of hard and soft landscaping to be submitted.

(Reasons for approval: The decision has been made with particular regard to policies ENG1, ENV6, ENV7 and WM6 of the adopted East of England Plan, saved policies HOU4, HOU5, HOU6, HOU18, HOU19, HBE3, HBE8, HBE9, HBE12, HBE19, NE9, EP18, EP22, SR4, TRA3, TRA5, TRA7, TRA8 and TRA9 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, PPS1, PPS3, PPS9, PPG13, PPG15, PPG16, PPG24 and other material considerations.

The use of the site for YMCA accommodation is well established and it is considered that the proposals represent an enhancement to the character of this part of the conservation area and to the setting of the two grade II* listed buildings on the site. In terms of neighbour amenity given the decrease in the number of units on the site and improved on site facilities, it is considered that any impact would be reduced when compared to the existing situation. A number of conditions are proposed which deal with the provision of cycle and bin provision, provision of renewable energy systems, archaeology and landscaping, subject to these the proposals are considered to be acceptable and in line with development plan policy.)

(2) Application No (09/01368/L, YMCA 46 - 48 St Giles Street Norwich NR2 1LP enter application number and address) and grant listed building consent, subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. Submission of a schedule of repairs to the listed building following the demolition of those buildings and structures to be removed. The schedule shall provide full details of all repairs and blocking of openings indicated on the approved plans and details of any further repairs which become apparent following the demolition of the buildings.

(Reasons for approval: The decision has been made with particular regard to policy ENV6 of the adopted East of England Plan, saved policies HBE8 and HBE9 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan and PPG15.

It is considered that the demolition of the existing buildings along the Bethel Street frontage and the reinstatement of the rear of the listed buildings will have a positive impact on the character of this part of the conservation area and on the setting of the two grade II* listed buildings on the site. Conditions relating to the methodology and materials to be used for repairs are imposed to ensure that repairs are carried out in an appropriate fashion with acceptable materials in order to protect the fabric and character of the listed buildings. Subject to these conditions the proposals are considered to be acceptable and in line with development plan policy.)

(Councillor Jago was admitted to the meeting at this point.)

3. APPLICATION NO 09/01451/F- 6 ASH GROVE, NORWICH, NR3 4BE

The Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans. An additional comment had been received from the Norwich Society objecting to the extension as it would be detrimental to the 'pair of cottages'. She pointed out that there were similar extensions to the one proposed on other houses and that the design was acceptable. In response to a question, the Planner confirmed that the windows in the extension would be timber sash and that this was a condition of the application.

RESOLVED to approve Application No 09/01451/F at 6 Ash Grove, Norwich and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with the drawings submitted;
3. Details of the new windows and bricks to be submitted prior to the commencement of the development;
4. Roof tiles to match the existing.

(Reasons for approval: The principle of the proposed extension to the existing dwelling is considered acceptable. It is considered that the design details of the scheme meet the criteria of saved policy HBE12 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted Version November 2004). Furthermore, the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact in terms of loss of amenity, light or privacy to the neighbouring properties and as such can be considered to meet the criteria of saved policy EP22 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted Version November 2004). Therefore, the proposals are considered to be in accordance with the objectives of PPS1, policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan (May 2008) and saved policies HBE12 and EP22 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted Version November 2004) and other material considerations.)

4. APPLICATION NO 09/01003/F – OAK LODGE, 19 BRANKSOME ROAD, NORWICH, NR4 6SN

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

A local resident objecting to the proposal addressed the committee and said that there were 5 residents in Waverley Road who also objected to it. She outlined the objections to the application as follows: there was already sufficient parking; the development was out of character for the area and too large; that the garage would be used for business use and that there was no need for it; the need to protect the hedge; concerned about the visual amenity from her property and loss of privacy; and that a previous application had been turned down.

In response the Planning Development Manager said that a condition of the application being approved was that the garage would be for domestic use only and that the application was for a garage and not parking spaces (which did not need permission).

Discussion ensued in which the Planning Development Manager responded to members questions. Members were advised that the garage was designed to match the house with a similar tiled roof. Members noted that permission was not needed

to create an access to the proposed garage in the back garden and that the number of parking spaces was greater than that permitted for new developments. There was also concern that the condition relating to domestic use of the garage must be enforced.

RESOLVED, with 8 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Lubbock, Banham, Lay, Llewellyn, Wiltshire, George and Driver) and 2 members voting against (Councillors Stephenson and Jago) to approve Application No 09/01003/F Oak Lodge, Branksome Road Norwich and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. In accordance with the submitted plans and details
3. Details of materials (bricks and tiles)
4. No window to be inserted into the roof of the garage
5. Replacement mitigation planting details to be submitted and approved scheme implemented
6. Arboricultural Method Statement to be submitted and approved scheme implemented
7. The garage should be used for ancillary domestic use only

(Reasons for approval: The decision to grant planning permission has been taken having regard to PPS1, East of England Plan policy ENV7 and Saved Local Plan Policies HBE12, NE8, NE9, TRA5, TRA6 and EP22 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan Adopted Version 2004 and to all material planning considerations. The principle of this development and the creation of an additional access point to the site are considered acceptable. It is considered that the design details of the scheme meet the criteria of HBE12 and the creation of the additional point of access is acceptable in relation to TRA5. Furthermore, the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact in terms of loss of amenity to neighbouring properties and as such can be considered to meet the criteria of saved policy EP22. It is considered that the loss of trees on site can be effectively mitigated by replacement planting in accordance with saved policy NE9.)

5. APPLICATION NO 09/01396/F - 8 DENMEAD CLOSE, NORWICH, NR4 6NB

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

RESOLVED to approve Application No 09/01396/F 8 Denmead Close and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with submitted plans and details;
3. Materials to match the existing building.

(Reason for approval: The decision to grant planning permission has been taken having regard to PPS1, East of England Plan policy ENV7 and Saved Local Plan policies HBE12 and EP22 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan Adopted Version 2004 and to all material planning considerations. The principle of the proposed extensions to the existing dwelling is considered acceptable. It is considered that the design details of the scheme meet the criteria of HBE12. Furthermore, the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact in terms of loss of

amenity to neighbouring properties and as such can be considered to meet the criteria of saved policy EP22.)

6. PERFORMANCE OF THE DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT SERVICE, OCTOBER – DECEMBER 2009 (QUARTER 3 – 2009/2010)

The Head of Planning Services and the Planning Development Manager presented the report and answered questions. The dip in performance in September was attributed to the introduction of back office software in September and personnel changes in administrative support to allow for retraining.

Councillor Driver congratulated Planning Services for bringing the number of outstanding applications down but asked how this improvement would be affected when the economy picked up. The Head of Planning Services said that there had been an improvement over the last 3 years. In previous years there had been insufficient resources to cope with the number of applications received and a backlog had accumulated. The service had now reduced the number of 'on-hand' applications and would be monitored to ensure that it was sufficiently resourced to meet an increase in planning applications in the future.

In response to a question on whether the increased delegations to officers had resulted in more applications meeting targets, the Head of Planning Services said that applications that did not need to be determined by the committee could be met within target more easily and did not to allow for the time of the lead in of writing reports and the committee cycle before a decision could be made. He reminded members that members could call-in an application if they wanted it to come before the committee. The Planning Development Manager said that the committee had agreed to review the delegated powers to officers, 6 months from its implementation in September 2009, and a report would be brought to the March meeting.

Councillor Wiltshire said that the figures were positive but that the real test would be when the economy picked up.

RESOLVED to note the report.

7. PERFORMANCE OF THE DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT SERVICE APPEALS: 1 OCTOBER 2009 TO 31 DECEMBER 2009 (QUARTER 3)

The Planning Development Manager presented the report and together with the Head of Planning Services answered questions.

In response to a question the Head of Planning Services confirmed that planning history was a material planning consideration and gave an indication of what could go on the site.

In response to a suggestion that the costs of appeals should be reported to the committee, the Head of Planning Services said that consideration was being given to introduce a time recording system for officer time but pointed out that if legal advice was sought the financial implications were greater. However members needed to be aware that an applicant being well resourced was not a material planning consideration.

Councillor Lubbock welcomed the good record of planning appeals.

RESOLVED to note the report.

8. REVIEW OF THE PLANNING SERVICES CODE OF CONDUCT

(Councillor Little was admitted to the meeting at this point.)

The Solicitor (Planning) presented the report, and together with the Head of Planning Services, answered questions.

Councillor Lubbock referred to the section on Pre-Application discussions and mentioned her concerns with the current wording, noting that councillors could have discussions with applicants but should declare a predetermined view when it came to committee and take no part in the decision making. Other members considered that there was a lack of clarity in the code as to the role of members of the committee and other councillors relating to pre-application discussions.

The Head of Planning Services suggested that the bullet point be reworded as follows:-

‘Councillors who are involved in making decisions about a particular planning application must not have had previous discussions with owners, applicants or agents in connection with that matter. A private discussion could cause others to doubt the councillor’s impartiality’

During discussion members noted that in line with the Council's constitution concerns about the conduct of councillors should be addressed to the Monitoring Officer in the first instance.

Discussion also ensued on the recommended good practice for members of regulatory committees to be present for an entire item in order to determine an application. It was suggested that if a member needed to leave the room during an item the meeting should break until the member returns.

RESOLVED to ask the Solicitor (Planning) to review the Code of Conduct and bring back a revised report to a future meeting of the committee.

CHAIR