



Planning applications committee

9:30 to 13:30

8 September 2022

Present: Councillors Driver (chair), Sands (M) (vice chair), Bogelein, Champion, Davis, Grahame, Lubbock, Peek, Sands (S), Stutely and Young

Apologies: Councillors Thomas (Va) and Thomas (Vi)

1. Declarations of interests

Councillor Sands declared an other interest in item 3 (below), Application no 22/00610/F Land at Mousehold Lane, Norwich, NR7 8HA, as Chair of Mousehold Heath Conservators.

Councillor Bogelein declared an other interest in item 4 (below), Application no 22/00728/F, Angel Road Infant School, Angel Road - Siting of two modular classroom buildings and creation of seating area, because a close relative attended a school run by the same Trust.

Councillor Lubbock declared a pre-determined view in items 5 (below), Application no 22/00506/F, 301 Unthank Road, Norwich, NR4 7QA and 6 (below), Application no 22/00801/F - 406 Unthank Road, Norwich, NR4 7QH, as she had objected to the applications. In accordance with the procedures, Councillor Lubbock would speak on the items and then leave the room and not take part in the committee's determination of the applications.

Councillor Young declared a pecuniary interest in item 7 (below), Proposal for Extraordinary Meeting of committee and site visit - Application nos 22/00570/F & 22/00571/L - University of East Anglia because the university is her employer.

2. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 11 August 2022.

3. Application no 22/00610/F Land at Mousehold Lane, Norwich, NR7 8HA

(Councillor Sands had declared an interest in this item.)

The planner (case officer) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

During discussion, the planner together with the area development manager and the planning team leader, referred to the report and answered members' questions. This included an explanation of the sequential tests that the applicant had submitted and public health concerns (as set out in Main Issue 1 of the report). The operator had two city centre restaurants and was seeking to expand in the northwest of the city, on the outer ring road. The drive-thru restaurant was an integral part of the sequential test and, in accordance with case law, was a material consideration that could not be disaggregated from consideration of the application. Members sought confirmation of the location of all schools in the vicinity and were referred to paragraph 79 of the report. There was no policy to support objection to the proposal on public health grounds. Public health had been consulted but had not responded. A member commented that this did not signify agreement.

A member sought confirmation of the landscaping elements that the applicant had not agreed which included decluttering the site of ancillary development and more robust planting on the boundary of the site. Members also considered that the lighting should be sensitive to nocturnal wildlife, particularly bats.

A member expressed concern that the play area was adjacent to the cars in line for the drive-thru and considered that children would be subject to particulates from vehicle fumes. The committee was advised that the capacity of the restaurant was for 76 covers and that the number of children using the play area would be proportionate.

Members were advised that highways had raised no objections to this proposal. A member argued that the application was not fully compliant with planning policy DM1 as a drive-thru promoted the use of a private vehicle. The planner explained that DM1 was an overarching policy for all developments with an objective to reduce travel by private car. The application of DM18 directs main town centre uses to defined centres. The location and the application of the sequential test must be considered. The proposal would at its busiest (Saturday lunchtime) was estimated to create 49 additional trips to those already on the road network. Members were also reminded that the drive-thru element of the application could not be disaggregated from the application.

A member pointed out that there was no assessment of air quality in the report and expressed concern for children using the play area and people living in the residential properties in the area. Members were advised that there was a condition to manage anti-social behaviour. Customers could be encouraged to turn off engines when idling through signage and enforced by staff in accordance with the management plan. Boundary treatments would also address this. Members were advised that policy DM11 only required air quality assessments for areas included in an air management plan and therefore an assessment was not required for this application.

In reply to a member's question, the area development manager referred to the section of the report under Main Issue 3 – Amenity which addressed the issue of concerns that the proposal would have a cumulative impact on residential amenity. In reply to a question, the planner explained that a detailed litter management plan would be required as a planning condition to protect Mousehold Heath and a wider

area than it was company policy. The area development manager suggested that it could also include the car parks on Gurney Road. A breach of the litter management plan would be subject to planning enforcement.

The area development manager confirmed that the assessment by environmental protection officers on the impact of this proposal in terms of litter, noise and lighting was across the wider area and the city council's boundary. Sprowston Town Council and Broadland District Council had been included in the consultation. A member referred to the comments of Sprowston Town Council objecting to the 24/7 opening hours and suggested that in mitigation to residents' concerns about noise that the opening hours were restricted to close between 22:30 and 06:00. Members were advised that the assessment considered background noise, as set out in paragraph 118 of the report, and that there were no unacceptable impacts from this proposal. Members could however consider a condition to restrict opening hours.

In reply to a question, the planner said the officers were satisfied with the landscaping plan but it would be possible to enhance the plan. Members were advised that the play area was included in the description of the application and was therefore required.

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

Discussion ensued in which members reiterated their concerns raised during questions in relation to the need for amber lighting for wildlife and that the application was not fully compliant with DM1 in relation to the promotion of car use. A member said that the cumulative impact of this proposal on air quality, noise, light pollution created an unacceptable harm. Another member said that mitigation by reducing open hours would make it more acceptable for residents. However, she considered that there was a proliferation of fast-food takeaways on the ring road already.

During discussion on opening hours, members considered that the ring road was less busy at night. Members considered that 22:30 was too early and compromised by suggesting the closure of the restaurant between 23:00 to 06:00, which was standard. It was noted that under policy DM23 the definition of late-night use was midnight. Councillor Lubbock moved and Councillor Bogelein seconded the amendment to restrict the hours of operation to between 06:00 and 23:00 and with 8 members voting in favour (Councillors Lubbock, Bogelein, Sands (M), Champion, Davis, Young, Grahame and Sands (S)), 1 member voting against (Councillor Peek) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Stutely, as chair of licensing, so as not to predetermine any future licensing application), it was approved.

The area development manager advised members that condition 28 could be amended to ensure that external lighting was suitable for all wildlife. Councillor Sands (M) moved, and Councillor Peek seconded the proposal to ensure that LED lighting was amber or the most suitable for wildlife, and on being put to the vote was approved unanimously.

Discussion then ensued on the landscaping condition. The area development manager advised the committee that it was flexible and subject to negotiation. The application description referenced the play frame and so it would need to be included in whatever form the landscaping took. It might be possible to swap the cycle store,

which was to the north and the play area around. A member pointed out that the play area needed to be visual from the restaurant so that people could see their children and therefore this was unacceptable. Councillor Bogelein moved, and Councillor Grahame seconded that the landscaping plan be enhanced and the layout amended. During discussion members noted that there would be an antisocial management plan which would include encouraging customers to turn off their engines. Members considered that ecological mitigation to permit small mammals to cross the site safely should be included in condition 4. A member said he considered that the design was essentially flawed with the vehicles at the drive-thru next to the seating and play area. Members also considered that the cycle store was unsafe as young adults would cut across the car park. Members were advised that there were defined pedestrian routes across the site and that the speed of traffic in the car park would be low. The committee moved to the vote and with 10 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Bogelein, Champion, Lubbock, Stutely, Davis, Peek, Young, Grahame, and Sands (S)) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Sands (M)), the amended conditions were relating to landscaping and ecology were approved.

In response to a question from Councillor Stutely, the area development manager suggested that rather than be proscriptive on areas to be litter picked, officers would consult with local members to ensure that specific areas were not omitted. The committee concurred with this suggestion, unanimously.

The chair put the recommendations as moved previously, and with the amendments and conditions as approved above, and on being put to the vote by 5 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Sands (M), Lubbock, Peek, and Sands (S)) and 6 members voting against (Councillors Bogelein, Champion, Davis, Stutely, Young and Grahame) the motion was lost, and the planning application not determined.

Members then discussed the reasons for refusal. Councillor Bogelein reiterated her concerns about the application not being fully compliant with DM1, in that it promoted the use of private car travel, rather than non-car use; that there was a density of fast food outlets which was detrimental to public health and wellbeing, and in proximity to schools where students were not required to stay on site. Members also considered that there was an issue with the design of the site as the play area and seating area were in the wrong location adjacent to the lane to the drive-thru and there were no alternative acceptable locations on the site to relocate the play area that was not dangerous for children. Councillor Bogelein then moved that the application be refused on these grounds, seconded by Councillor Champion. Councillor Stutely who added that the application was not in accordance with NPPF8 for the protection of health and safety in relation to the play area, and asked officers to provide the exact wording. On the advice of the area development manager that movers and seconders of motions would be consulted if the applicant appealed, it was agreed that Councillor Stutely would second the motion. On being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED, with 6 members voting in favour (Councillors Bogelein, Stutely, Champion, Davis, Young and Grahame) and 5 members voting against (Councillors Driver, Sands (M), Lubbock, Peek, and Sands (S)) to refuse Application no 22/00610/F Land at Mousehold Lane, Norwich, NR7 8HA, on the grounds minuted above relating to compliance with policy DM1 in relation to promotion of private car use rather than non-car use and not promoting public health

and wellbeing, and on design grounds, and ask the head of planning and regulatory services to provide the reasons for refusal in planning terms.

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

1. The proposed development, by virtue of the drive-thru facility, car park in excess of maximum standards and provision of fast food, does not minimise the overall need to travel or reduce dependency on the private car and would fail to maximise opportunities for improved health and well-being. This is contrary to the sustainability objectives of Policy DM1 of the adopted Development Management Policies Local Plan (2014) and paragraph 92(c) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).
2. The location of the playframe proposed within the development would be exposed to the emissions of vehicles moving through or stationary and idling within the adjacent drive-thru lane. This fails to create a healthy and safe space and support healthy lifestyles, contrary to Policy DM1 of the adopted Development Management Policies Local Plan (2014) and paragraph 92(c) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021.)

4. Application no 22/00728/F, Angel Road Infant School, Angel Road - Siting of two modular classroom buildings and creation of seating area

(Councillor Bogelein declared an interest in this item.)

The planner (case officer) referred members to the supplementary report of updates to report which was circulated at the meeting (and available on the council's website). This report detailed amendments to conditions 6 and 1 as set out in the main report. Members were advised that Councillor Brociek-Coulton, councillor for Sewell ward, had advised officers that her objections had now been addressed. The committee was also advised of a new application for temporary permission for a unit which had previously been granted temporary consent which had lapsed in 2017.

The planner then presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. The closure of the junior school was not an issue as the applicant was seeking temporary, retrospective planning consent for two modular classroom buildings and not a permanent solution.

During discussion, the planner together with the area development manager and the planning team leader, referred to the report and answered members' questions. This included questions on the proposal for temporary consent and the planning status of the other modular buildings on the site. Members were advised that the applicant had originally applied for 10 years temporary permission. Officers had suggested 5 years. A further planning application would be needed to extend this, the proposal would not lead to permanent change of use, and any breaches were subject to enforcement. In reply to concerns that the vehicular entrance to the site would be congested, members were advised that there were other accesses on the site. Members commented on how the modular classrooms could be evacuated in a fire, noting that this was an issue for building control. A member sought reassurance that the expansion of the school on this site would not result in increased traffic. The planner advised members that this had not been raised as an issue by Highways and referred members to paragraph 59 of the main report, which stated that two

travel plans had been submitted by the applicant and further details of cycle storage would be conditioned. Members were also informed that officers had advised 5 years for the temporary consent to enable the applicants to obtain funding for a permanent solution. Regarding pupil numbers, it was also noted that St Clements Hill Primary Academy had taken some of the pupils from the closed Angel Road Junior School.

The chair and the vice chair moved the recommendations as set out in the report and as amended in the supplementary report.

Discussion ensued in which members commented on the closure of the junior school due to its condition. The use of modular classrooms and loss of part of the playing field was not ideal but provided a temporary solution. Another member referred to the lack of planning that had led to the Trust to resort to modular classrooms and said that she hoped that it would find a long-term solution.

Councillor Champion, councillor for Sewell Ward, spoke in support of the application and commended the school staff for seeking a permanent solution.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application 22/00728/F at Angel Road Infant School and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Temporary permission for 5 years.
2. In accordance with plans;
3. SUDS details; - Can you give me this in full for the minutes please-
4. Arboricultural supervision;
5. Submission parking/ cycle/ bin storage details;
6. Provision of fire hydrant, within 12 months of the consent being issued.

5. Application no 22/00506/F, 301 Unthank Road, Norwich, NR4 7QA

(Councillor Lubbock had declared a predetermined view and did not take part in the determination of this item.)

The planner (case officer) presented the report with plans and slides. She also referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports which was circulated at the meeting and available on the council's website. The report contained a correction to the numbering of the headings of the main issues and summarised three letters of objection to the revised plans, including one from a consultant acting on behalf of the neighbours, and the officer response. The area development manager presented the section of the supplementary report which responded to the representation, made on behalf of the adjacent neighbours. He confirmed that the normal practice of reporting comments received during the consultation period after the agenda papers had been published had been adhered to and that there had been sufficient time to assess the revised application against these comments.

A resident of Unthank Road, living adjacent to the application site, addressed the committee. He read out a statement on behalf of his wife setting out their concerns that the consultation on the revised plans had concluded on 28 August 2022, that representations had not been published on the council's website and calling on members to defer consideration of the application to a future meeting to allow sufficient assessment of comments. The resident also summarised their objections

to the proposal, which included their concerns that it would have a detrimental impact on their residential amenity and the conservation area, as set out in the main report and supplementary report. There was a two-storey extension at no 297 Unthank Road, but this was approved 15 years ago and under different planning policies, and therefore should not set a precedent. The extension would overlook their main living area, and, in mitigation, it was asked that obscure glazing was used.

Councillor Lubbock, Eaton ward councillor, addressed the committee on behalf of the residents of 303 Unthank Road, who would be most affected by the proposed extension. The house at 301 Unthank Road was locally listed and in a conservation area. She acknowledged that the plans had been revised to remove the second storey from the side return. However, the window from the rear extension would overlook the neighbours' garden and the windows in the side extension overlooked the living room, kitchen and breakfast room and should be obscure glazing. The area of the building to be rendered had been reduced but it was out of keeping with the locally listed building and character of the conservation area. Red brick was preferable. She also commented on the deadline for comments on the revised scheme and said that the council had a duty of care to ensure that an assessment of all comments was made to take recommendations forward to committee.

The applicant addressed the committee in support of the application. He explained that the proposed extension was for family use and to accommodate the needs of a visually impaired resident. The proposal had been scaled back and at the ground floor was like extensions adjacent to the house. He commented on the 60 ft garden which had been neglected and confirmed that the proposals would not be detrimental to the ecology, with no trees being removed and saplings planted. The applicants had worked with the case officer and modified the application.

(Councillor Lubbock left the room at this point.)

The area development manager explained that personal details were removed from representations when published and apologised that this had not been made clear to interested parties when submitting comments. He explained that applications were considered individually on a case-by-case basis and that the two-storey extension at 297 did not set a precedent.

The planner, area development manager and planning team leader, referred to the report and answered members' questions. This included questions on the windows to the extension. Members were advised that the two-storey extension to the rear was acceptable in the conservation area as it could not be viewed from the highway. The committee had noted that although there was planning consent for an extension at no 299, the assessment for this application had been made on the current situation. It was also noted that officers considered that the application was acceptable on its merits and that the disability of one of the residents did not need specific consideration.

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

Discussion ensued in which members commented that this application was finely balanced but considered that overall, it was acceptable. Members were concerned that the neighbours would be overlooked. It was noted that the window on the upper

storey would look out over the garden. Members considered that the upper part of the windows on the side extension should be obscure glazed to protect the neighbours' privacy, noting that the view from the windows was obscured by the boundary treatment to a height of 1.7m. Members were advised that the kitchen in the proposed extension would have bifold doors and therefore daylight would be adequate with the use of obscure glazing at the top of the side windows. Councillor Stutely moved, and Councillor Driver seconded that an additional condition be attached to the planning permission to require the side windows, above 1.7m from ground level, to be obscure glazed, with clear glaze at the bottom of each window, and on being put to the vote was approved unanimously.

The chair moved the committee to the vote on the recommendations as amended.

RESOLVED, with 9 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Sands (M), Bogelein, Champion, Stutely, Peek, Young, Grahame and Sands (S)) and 1 member abstaining from voting (Councillor Davis), to approve application 22/00506/F 301 Unthank Road, Norwich NR4 7QA and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Works in accordance with AIA;
4. Details of surface water drainage.
5. Side extension windows to be obscure glazed, 1.7m above ground level, and clear glaze at the bottom.

Informatives:

1. IN9 Site Clearance and Wildlife
2. IN27 Protected Species

(Councillor Lubbock was readmitted to the committee at this point.)

6. Application no 22/00801/F - 406 Unthank Road, Norwich, NR4 7QH

(Councillor Lubbock had declared a predetermined view and did not take part in the determination of this item.)

The planner (case officer) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. He referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports which was circulated at the meeting and available on the council's website, which contained a correction to the report to confirm that one letter of representation and one from the ward councillor had been received.

Councillor Lubbock, Eaton ward councillor, addressed the committee to explain that her reason for calling in the application was that a sizeable development in a garden should be brought to members' attention and determination by the committee.

(Councillor Lubbock left the meeting at this point.)

Discussion ensued in which the planner and area development manager referred to the report and answered members' questions. Members were advised that the

proposed outbuilding was for ancillary use to the residential property and that this use could include Airbnb. Members also noted that access for construction materials would be via Judges Walk, but there was also access by the side of the house from Unthank Road.

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

During discussion, a member welcomed the removal of the “unsightly garage” which would improve the appearance on Judges Walk. Members took into consideration the mitigation that the applicant had agreed in response to objections from neighbouring residents. This included the use of a green roof which would address and limit the impact of the proposed building on the outlook from the house in Judges Walk that backed on to the site.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 22/00801/F - 406 Unthank Road Norwich Norfolk NR4 7QH and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Details of green roof.
4. Ancillary accommodation;
5. In accordance with AIA;
6. Arboricultural supervision
7. Windows to be fixed shut and retained thereafter.

Informatives:

1. Site clearance and wildlife;
2. Protected species.

(Councillor Lubbock was readmitted to the meeting at this point.)

**7. Proposal for Extraordinary Meeting of committee and site visit -
Application nos 22/00570/F & 22/00571/L - University of East Anglia**

(Councillor Young, having declared an interest in this item, left the meeting.)

RESOLVED to hold an extraordinary meeting of the committee on Thursday, 29 September 2022 at 11:00 am to determine application nos 22/00570/F & 22/00571/L for refurbishment and repair of building 3, Teaching Wall, Norfolk Road, University of East Anglia; and a site visit at 9:30 am prior to the committee meeting.

CHAIR

Planning applications committee

11:20 to 13:10

29 September 2022

Present: Councillors Driver (chair), Sands (M) (vice chair), Champion, Grahame, Lubbock, Peek, Sands (S), Stutely, Thomas (Va) and Thomas (Vi)

Apologies: Councillors Bogelein, Davis and Young

1. Declarations of interests

There were no declarations of interest.

2. Application nos 22/00570/F and 22/00571/L – (Lasdun) Teaching Wall Building 3, Norfolk Road, University of East Anglia, Norwich

(The following members of the committee had undertaken a site visit in relation to item 2 (below): Councillors Driver, Sands (M), Champion, Grahame, Lubbock, Sands (S), Thomas (Va) and Thomas (Vi).)

The area development manager provided a brief summary of the site visit to the University of East Anglia (UEA) for the benefit of members of the committee who had not attended and any members of the public viewing the live stream. The committee had visited the exterior of the Lasdun Teaching Wall and viewed where the proposed extension would be located, the location of trees to be removed as part of the development and viewed the multi-storeyed teaching building internally and externally, with regard to layout and issues relating to the condition of the building, including structural issues and asbestos.

The senior planner (case officer) gave a detailed presentation of the report with the aid of plans and slides. In conclusion the senior planner explained that the planning permission and listed building consent were recommended for approval, subject to conditions, as set out in the report, and in some instances that conditions might be subject to further discussion and negotiation before permission could be granted. Members were referred to Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Listed Buildings Act) which states that “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a Listed Building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.” There were no photos of the

interior of the teaching wall in the presentation, but it was noted that members had the opportunity to see inside the building 3 on the site visit. It was noted that the interior fabric of the building was important, some of which could be retained or redesigned to maintain a uniformity with the design across the entirety of the Lasdun Wall. There had been some unfortunate additions which would hopefully be removed or rectified as a full phased refit came forward in its place. Members were advised that great weight has been given to the conservation of heritage assets and, in line with Historic England, considered the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the listed building and other assets within this area and such harm was outweighed by the public benefit, which included reducing the cost of maintenance for safety, retaining its useability as a teaching and research facility and enhancing education facilities, preventing reputational damage to the university, de-risking the building and avoiding the consequences of the building failing. Also, in line with the NPPF the proposals represent sustainable development.

At the chair's discretion, Stephen Wells, Director of Estates and Facilities at the UEA addressed the committee in support of the application. He referred to: the unique building and its facilities for students, staff and the wider community; its critical condition that should it fail would disable 48 per cent of the university estate; that £8 million had been used to provide spandrel panels for temporary support to the façade; that Lasdun had proposed that the building would be adaptable for future needs; provide an accessible entrance; increase the building's thermal performance in accordance with the university's commitment to net zero carbon; contribute to the university's green infrastructure with additional planting as part of this scheme and address structural issues and asbestos in the building by stripping right back to its framework. The proposal offered a sustainable, viable and deliverable solution and there was no other viable solution. Therefore, the benefit to the public outweighed the less than substantial harm to the listed building.

During discussion, the senior planner, together with the area development manager referred to the report and answered members' questions. In response to a member's question, it was acknowledged that the south side of the building overheated due to the glazing, with film currently being used as a filter, and that the proposal sought to address this. Although the council had requested natural ventilation, mechanical ventilation would be used throughout the building because of the need for a hermetically sealed environment for scientific and research purposes. There would be some inherent heat loss due to the design of the windows, even with triple or double glazing. The fabric first approach, by improving insulation, would prevent the most heat loss from the building, as set out in paragraphs 186 and 187 of the report. A member also asked about the relocation of the telephone masts from the teaching building and was advised that there would be further discussion with the university about relocating these and the also potentially ones on the library roof to another location on the campus to enhance the original rooflines of these buildings.

Discussion ensued on the representations received from the Twentieth Century Society and Historic England and the weight given to these representations by the local planning authority in assessing the planning and listed building applications. The Twentieth Century Society whilst they no longer objected to the replacement windows had maintained its assessment that the proposal would cause substantial harm to the listed building. Historic England considered that the revised scheme would cause less than substantial harm to the listed building. Members were referred to paragraph 92 (page 33 of the agenda papers) where the five fundamental

pillars of the university's justification for the refurbishment strategy, which was integral to the proposed development, and that these had been taken into consideration as part of the officer's assessment of planning balance and as appropriate afforded suitable weight to lead to the recommendations of approval.

Members also sought further information about biodiversity net gain and tree replacement. The senior planner referred to the Main Issue 5: Trees and Main Issue 6: Biodiversity sections of the report. The nine trees lost resulting from this development would be replaced with 9 new trees either within the site, such as within the Swale, but also along Cow Drive. This formed part of the biodiversity net gain calculation as explained within the report. A tree replacement calculation had also been undertaken which indicated 52 trees were required to replace these nine trees in accordance with local policy DM7. Members were referred to paragraph 118 and advised that an audit of the number and species of trees across the campus was required to provide a benchmark for a wider green infrastructure strategy, this strategy being aimed at enhancing and preserving the environment and beauty of the campus setting in a historic park. The additional planting such as the Swale and adjacent landscape areas would provide 1 per cent biodiversity net gain within the red line area and other increase would be within the wider campus. The Swale would also act as part of the surface water mitigation on site. The university's green infrastructure strategy would cover the entire campus and potentially link into the council's own strategies, including Earlham Park. The green infrastructure strategy could be pursued through this application.

A member asked whether the increased floor space would result in increased student capacity out of concern that this would lead to problems of parking in adjacent residential areas. The senior planner referred to the report. Policy for the controlled growth of the university had been revised in 2019 as part of the evidence base supporting university proposals within the emerging Greater Norwich Development Plan. He confirmed that this application did not increase student numbers but there was potential to increase numbers in the future. Members were also referred to the arrangements to the phased refurbishment and reoccupation of the Lasdun Teaching Wall as set out in the report. It was not appropriate, at this stage, to ask for S106 payments to contribute to controlled parking zones or other wider cycle access improvements because the increased floorspace did not result in increased student numbers.

In reply to a member's question, the senior planner said that the space on the roof was constrained by plant and machinery, PV panels and air source heat pumps etc., and, therefore, there was no space for a green or brown roof. There was betterment of biodiversity gain within the redline area and further opportunities around the wider campus and Broad. Members were referred to paragraphs 182 and 183 of the report. Whilst grey water recycling and rainwater harvesting had been discounted now, except for the water capture within the sustainable drainage basin in the Swale, and as part of hard surface areas, it could be investigated and potentially included in future upgrades. Options for the location of the basins or tanks would be discussed with Anglian Water. Members were also referred to the section of the report which addressed nutrient neutrality. The mound, that was part of the original golf course could contain pollutants and issues of nutrient neutrality and site contamination had been assessed within the report, with each having slightly different triggers for assessment. It was considered that the proposal was not constrained by the Natural

England advice in relation to nutrients, but issues of existing site contamination would be dealt with by appropriate conditions.

The senior planner assured members that the university had been asked to share sensitive information about the funding of the scheme and its growth plans with the council. The maintenance of the building was costly. Such financial information had been assessed as part of the planning balance exercise but was commercially sensitive in some regards and it was not appropriate for it to be explicitly discussed in public. The area development manager said that without the investment the building would be unsafe and not used as an active space. Referring to the report, he said that he did not believe as the Twentieth Century Society did that the proposal would result in substantial harm to the listed building. The Lasdun Teaching Wall was a Grade II listed building because it was unique. The Twentieth Century Society and Historic England did not include the planning balance in their assessments as this was for the planning authority to undertake as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The report and points raised in the meeting demonstrates the public benefits that outweigh the harm from this proposal.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations in the report.

Discussion ensued. A member expressed her regret that no natural ventilation was proposed in the building and suggested that there might be areas where it could have been considered and that the roof space was not being used more sustainably. Other members said that they fully supported the proposal to enable the university to maintain the building and meet the needs of twenty first century students. Members also welcomed that: the retention of concrete reduced emissions from embedded carbon by 60 per cent, that the scheme contributed to the university's net zero strategy by reducing heat loss in the building and improved thermal capacity in the extension, and increased biodiversity net gain. Another member endorsed the comments of the previous speakers and said that this was an exciting new phase for the university whilst retaining the historic fabric of the building. Members considered that on balance the less than substantial harm to the listed building was outweighed. It would benefit students and many of whom stayed in the city after graduation and contributed to the local economy.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to:

- (1) approve application no. 22/00570/F - Teaching Wall Norfolk Road University of East Anglia Norwich and grant planning permission subject to conditions such as those listed below (with delegated authority to the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services to agree the final number and form of conditions):
 1. Standard time limit;
 2. In accordance with plans;
 3. Details of external facing materials including final cladding detailing of joints, corners and pattern or tessellation of boards; windows/doors/curtain walling and glazing; joinery; plant enclosure material(s), railing, finish and fixings; rainwater goods; cctv; soffits/cappings; external louvers; manifestations, steel frame finish for covered service access and refuse enclosure; glass roof fixings etc.;
 4. Details of phasing programme for occupation of the building and decant of phases of the Lasdun Wall;

5. Timing of and details of replacement cycle provision for on-site shortfall as required on re-occupation of buildings;
6. Construction Management Statement / Plan and site set up for temporary material stores; safe entrance and delivery points; main office management facilities; site management and noise reduction; safe bus, cycle and pedestrian access; wheel washing facilities etc.;
7. Compliance with the 'Construction Traffic Access Route' within any Construction Management Statement / Plan;
8. Details of cycle parking, EV charge points, car parking, bins and servicing areas;
9. Details of final layout of cycle access via University Drive;
10. Link to UEA travel plan;
11. Details of progress update for movement strategy report and findings;
12. Details landscaping scheme (including tree specification, surface water capture for landscape area irrigation, ecology enhancements on/off-site e.g. nesting boxes, soft and hard landscaping, furniture, handrails means of enclosure and retaining walls, Cow Drive edge works, treatment of felled tree materials etc.) implementation programme; written specifications; landscape management plan;
13. Details of mitigation Programme as Green Infrastructure Strategy including scope of activities / works, planting, tree replacements (and quota), management and implementation programme;
14. Clearance outside of Bird Nesting Season unless supervised;
15. Details of external lighting;
16. Arboricultural meeting and site monitoring;
17. In accord with Arboricultural Impact Assessment etc.;
18. Details of additional Arboricultural Method Statement – tree removal; pruning; no dig construction and hard surface design; root pruning; site set up and compound; design and operation of temporary setback areas;
19. Details of location of services and methodology for installation if within RPA's;
20. Restriction of activities within root protection areas;
21. Details of low zero carbon technologies photovoltaic panels (PV's) array and air source heat pumps (ASHP)
22. Details of new building connections to campus CHP / DHM;
23. Details of water conservation measures;
24. Details of on-site foul water drainage strategy for works, connection point and discharge rate
25. Details of surface water strategy / scheme including maintenance and management;
26. No hard surfaces shall be laid out unless in accordance with surface water strategy;
27. Stop works and details of remediation if unknown contamination is found;
28. Removal of telecoms equipment prior to extension occupation and details of timeline suitable alternative on-site provision being provided.
29. Details of plant and machinery;
30. Details of fume and flue extraction.

Article 35 (2) statement

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 38 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 in the officer report.

Informative Notes

1. Unexploded ordnance;
 2. Comments of Anglian Water in relation to notice under the Water Industry Act 1991 to connect to a drain, protection of existing AW assets (public drain), statutory easement width of 3 metres from the pipeline, sewer adoption agreement and that an application to discharge trade effluent must be made to AW.
 3. Comments of Norfolk Constabulary;
 4. Comments of LLFA;
 5. Environmental protection/mitigation measures
 6. Site clearance and consideration of wildlife;
 7. Protected species;
 8. Considerate constructor;
 9. Removal of asbestos;
 10. Notification of timing of works to avoid impacts on highway network.
- (2) approve application no. 22/00571/L - Teaching Wall Norfolk Road University of East Anglia Norwich and grant listed building consent subject to conditions such as those listed below (with delegated authority to the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services to agree the final number and form of conditions):
1. Standard time limit;
 2. In accordance with plans;
 3. Details external materials including final cladding detailing of joints, corners and pattern or tessellation of boards; windows/doors/curtain walling and glazing; joinery; internal joinery for doors/frames/openings; final sill detail, mullion detail and glazing; plant enclosure material(s), railing, finish and fixings; rainwater goods; cctv; soffits/cappings; external louvers; manifestations; supply and extract cowls, internal plant and machinery equipment (including vents and pipes position, size and finish), internal and external lighting, building signage; cctv; method, timing and extent of ceiling/soffit paint removal; design for wall or ceiling junctions; insulation including around the window openings; final design(s) of rear fixing of spandrel panel; intumescent paint; steel frame finish for covered service access and refuse enclosure; glass roof fixings etc.
 4. For the avoidance of doubt removal of external fixings previously agreed
 5. Details of document for a longer-term strategy for internal layout and finishes based on draft submitted with application;
 6. Related details of internal fixtures and fittings specification of fixed interior elements;

7. Details of strategy for materials recycling for furniture, blocks and doors / fittings.
8. Listed building – making good.

Reason for Approval

The proposed alterations, subject to conditions, on balance will relate satisfactorily to the former arts areas and will respect the specific architectural character of these parts of the listed Teaching Wall. Subject to agreement of final details as outlined the works overall result in an appropriate form of alteration in the context of the internal and external design and layout of the building and will help to secure the optimum site operation through providing improved Campus facilities. The scheme provides an appropriate simple form of development. The continued functional use of spaces is of heritage benefit and some impact on the key elevations and internal spaces as a result of that, in the heritage led form of design interventions that should respond to the design and materiality of the listed building, is considered acceptable.

Whilst there is some impact this is considered to result in less than substantial harm to heritage assets or setting. The public benefit of the new academic spaces and potential this allows for the phased refurbishment of the listed Lasdun Wall buildings, improvements to the safety of the building for public use and de-risking of specialist and other teaching infrastructure along with betterment of lab design to align with modern needs thereby maintaining a teaching use within the Lasdun Teaching Wall which arise from the proposal is weighed against the harm to the significance of the building(s) and setting as required in paragraph 202 of the NPPF, given the nature of this application and the nature of the works and mitigation for the extent of changes it may be considered that the limited harm created is acceptable. As such the works to the listed building, subject to conditions, are considered to be appropriate and in accordance with the objectives of the NPPF, policies 1 and 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2011) and policies DM3 and DM9 of the adopted Development Management Policies Plan (December 2014).

Informative Notes

1. This consent relates only to the works specifically shown and described on the approved drawings. All other works, the need for which becomes apparent as alterations and repairs proceed, are not covered by this consent and may require a further specific consent. Details of any other works, submitted as part of a further application for listed building consent if required, should be submitted to the local planning authority and approved before work continues.

CHAIR