



Planning applications committee

10:15 to 12:50

8 December 2016

Present: Councillors Herries (chair), Driver (vice chair), Bradford, Button, Carlo, Henderson, Jackson, Lubbock, Malik, Sands (M) and Woollard

Apologies: Councillor Peek

1. Declarations of interest

Councillor Lubbock declared that she had a predetermined view on item 4 (below), Application no 16/01182/F - Garden land adjacent to 82 Eaton Road, Norwich and would reserve the right to speak as a member of the public and then leave the meeting during the deliberation of the item.

The following members as ward councillors stated that they did not have predetermined views in applications within their wards, as follows:

Councillor Jackson said that as Mancroft ward councillor he had been involved in discussions with residents about item 7, Application no 16/01399/F – Land adjacent to Wensum Chapel, Cowgate, but did not have a pre-determined view.

Councillors Carlo and Malik said that as Nelson ward councillors they had been involved in discussions with residents about item 3 (below), Application no 16/00970/F - Whitehall Lodge 56 - 112 Whitehall Road, Norwich, NR2 3EW, but did not have a pre-determined view.

2. Minutes

RESOLVED to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meetings held on 10 November 2016, subject to noting that the meeting ended at 13:20.

3. Application no 16/00970/F - Whitehall Lodge, 56 - 112 Whitehall Road, Norwich, NR2 3EW

The senior planning technical officer presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

The adjacent neighbour addressed the committee and outlined her objections to the proposal which included: loss of sunlight and outlook and was too overbearing; and, that she considered that the proposed extension would have a harmful impact on her small garden, making it feel “hemmed in”. She pointed out that the residents of number 50 shared her concerns.

The agent addressed the committee and explained that the applicant’s intention was not to increase the number of residents and therefore there would be no increase of staff numbers, waste collections and deliveries. The purpose of the extension was to reduce the number of shared bedrooms and improve bathroom and toilet facilities. The senior planning technical officer responded to the issues raised by referring to the report and plans showing the proposed floor plan and the extent of the current ground floor section.

Councillor Tim Jones, Nelson ward councillor (who had arrived at the meeting at this point) addressed the committee and said that the lodge had been developed in a piece meal way; the extension would reduce the garden amenity space for the care home’s residents; would be detrimental to the amenity space of the neighbouring properties; and, that there had been no daylight assessment. Neighbours had complained that clinical waste was left out and collected in the early hours of the morning.

The senior planning technical officer and the planning team leader (outer area) referred to the report and presentation and responded to the issues raised by Councillor Jones and answered members’ questions. The committee was advised that there were conditions requesting details of landscaping to be provided and to ensure that the bin storage was secure and covered.

During discussion, Councillor Malik expressed concern that there was potential for the care home owners to increase the number of residents in the future. He suggested that some residents might prefer to share a room. Members were advised that an additional condition could be added to limit the number of residents in the care home in line with its Care Quality Commission licence (29 residents) and would require the applicants to make a further planning application if they wanted to increase the number of residents in their care.

Councillor Sands explained that he would be voting against the application because of the impact that it would have on the neighbours’ garden. Councillors Carlo and Lubbock also considered that the application was not acceptable because of its detrimental impact on the amenity of the neighbouring garden which included: loss of sunlight and creating a “cramped outlook”.

Other members considered that there was a need for a care home in an urban environment and that the proposed internal room layout and extension would benefit the residents and officers.

The chair moved the recommendations with the additional condition limiting the number of residents in line with the Care Quality Commission licence.

RESOLVED, with 6 members voting in favour (Councillors Herries, Driver, Button, Jackson, Woollard and Bradford), 4 members voting against (Councillors Carlo, Lubbock, Malik and Sands) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Henderson), to approve application no. 16/00970/F - Whitehall Lodge 56 - 112 Whitehall Road Norwich NR2 3EW and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Materials to match;
4. Landscaping;
5. Bin storage.
6. No of residents to not exceed the limit established in the Care Quality Commission licence.

(The committee adjourned for a short break at this point, and reconvened with all members listed above as present.)

4. Application no 16/01182/F - Garden land adjacent to 82 Eaton Road, Norwich

(Councillor Lubbock having declared a pre-determined view left the meeting before the committee discussed the item and did not take part in the determination of this application.)

The senior planning technical officer presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

The agent on behalf of the immediate neighbours and one of the immediate neighbours addressed the committee and outlined their objections to the proposed dwelling, which included concerns: about the size and mass of the new dwelling; that it exceeded the building line to the front and rear; was out of character with other dwellings, would directly overlook no 86, would create a tunnelling effect in the house and garden and prevent sunlight reaching the lounge of no 86. They did not object to the principle of development on the site but suggested that a two bedroomed bungalow would be more appropriate.

Councillor Lubbock, Eaton Ward councillor, outlined her objections to the scheme which included: overdevelopment of the site; lack of information about the ownership of the site; and inconsistent reporting of comments from the Norwich Society.

(Councillor Lubbock left the meeting at this point.)

The agent explained that the application was from a family member related to the owners of number 82. A lot of the issues raised in the planning consultation had been resolved by the revised plans. The design reflected the 1950's architectural style.

During discussion the senior planning technical officer referred to the report and replied to the issues raised by the speakers and members' questions. This included a clarification of the revised plan and the steps to mitigate harm to the amenity of the neighbours. Officers had attempted to show this in the block plans.

The committee commented on the issue of the ownership of the land and was advised that it was not a material planning consideration. A member commented that it might be difficult to move bins into the rear garden. Another member said that there was a variety of different houses on Eaton Road, including smaller ones, and that a bungalow would look out of character.

Councillor Sands said that he did not support the application because he considered that it was overdevelopment of a garden site.

RESOLVED, with 7 members voting in favour (Councillor Herries, Driver, Button, Carlo, Woollard, Henderson and Bradford), 2 members voting against (Councillors Malik and Sands) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Jackson) to approve application no. 16/01182/F - Garden Land Adjacent to 82 Eaton Road Norwich and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Details of materials
4. Details of hard and soft landscaping and planting
5. Cycle and bin storage.
6. Water efficiency.

Article 35(2) Statement

The local planning authority in making its recommendation has had due regard to paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations, following negotiations with the applicant and subsequent amendments the application is recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

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

5. Application no 16/01516/F – Garages rear of 48-54, Rye Avenue, Norwich

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

During discussion members commented on the scheme and considered that the scheme was well designed and good use of this underused garage site.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application 16/01516/F and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Details of facing and roofing materials; windows; joinery; boundary treatments, walls and fences; external lighting;
4. Details of hard and soft landscaping and planting
5. Water efficiency
6. Contamination risk assessment and report to be submitted
7. Unknown contamination to be addressed

8. Control on imported materials
9. Updated Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan to be approved and implemented in accordance with approved documents.
10. Ecology measures to be agreed and implemented.

Article 35(2) Statement

The local planning authority in making its recommendation has had due regard to paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations, following negotiations with the applicant and subsequent amendments the application is recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

6. Application no 16/01371/F– Car Park adjacent to no. 125 West Pottergate, Norwich

The senior planner (development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. Members were advised that there had been one objection from the neighbouring property concerned about the loss of parking space for a disabled relative who visited regularly. There was no identified need for a space specifically for use by disabled residents.

During discussion the senior planner referred to the report and in reply to a member's question explained that the conservation area was to the south of the site, that there were no listed buildings in the vicinity and that there was a mixture of development including the adjacent modern flats.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application 16/01371/F – Car park adjacent to no 125 Pottergate, Norwich, and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. First floor window on west elevation to be obscure glazed and fixed shut.
4. PD rights for first floor windows on rear elevation removed.
5. Details of facing and roofing materials; windows; joinery; boundary treatments, walls and fences.
6. Details of hard and soft landscaping and planting.
7. Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement to be approved and implemented.
8. Water efficiency.
9. Contamination risk assessment and report to be submitted.
10. Unknown contamination to be addressed.
11. Control on imported materials.

Article 35(2) Statement

The local planning authority in making its recommendation has had due regard to paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations, following negotiations with the applicant and subsequent amendments the

application is recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

7. Application no 16/01399/F – Land Adjacent to Wensum Chapel, Cowgate

The senior planner (development) 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 confirmed that there had been no objections to this proposal.

Councillor Jackson, Mancroft ward councillor, said that he was surprised that there had been no objections to the proposal as residents had been opposed to the scheme before the roofline had been reduced. The senior planner confirmed the arrangements for the planning consultations, including a site notice. The smaller scale building with two rather than three storeys did not have a harmful impact on the neighbouring properties. Councillor Jackson commented that he was concerned that a resident had not known about the application until he had told him about it. Councillor Jackson then said that he could not support the application because of he considered that the design was inappropriate for the location and that the mono-pitched roof and blank wall did not fit into the character of the area.

Other members considered that the design was a good use of the site and that it was in an area where residents could be car free.

RESOLVED, with 10 members voting in favour (Councillors Herries, Driver, Button, Carlo, Lubbock, Malik, Sands, Woollard, Henderson and Bradford) and 1 member voting against (Councillor Jackson) to approve application 16/01399/F- land to Wensum Chapel, Cowgate and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Details and samples of facing and roofing materials; windows; joinery; boundary treatments, walls and fences;
4. Details of hard and soft landscaping and planting;
5. Water efficiency;
6. Contamination risk assessment and report to be submitted;
7. Unknown contamination to be addressed;
8. Control on imported materials;
9. Updated Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan to be approved and implemented in accordance with approved documents.
10. Archaeology Written Scheme of Investigation.

Article 35(2) Statement

The local planning authority in making its recommendation has had due regard to paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations, following negotiations with the applicant and subsequent amendments the application is recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

8. Application no 16/00988/F – 27 Spelman Road, Norwich, NR2 3NJ

The planning assistant (development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

During discussion the planning assistant explained that there had been five objectors to the original scheme which had been revised to accommodate their concerns. The revised plans had been sent out for consultation and none of the objectors had withdrawn their original objections.

In reply to a question the planning assistant said that she was not aware that work had commenced on site. She did not think it was appropriate to condition landscaping as there was already established planting and the neighbouring gardens were approximately 15m in length.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve Application no 16/00988/F – 27 Spelman Road, Norwich, NR2 3NJ, subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit.
2. In accordance with plans.
3. Details of materials of timber cladding, window and doors.

Article 35(2) Statement

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations, following negotiations with the applicant and subsequent amendments the application has been recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

9. Application no 16/01628/NF3 - Hardy Road, Norwich

The senior planner (development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. She referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports which was circulated at the meeting and contained a summary of the response from the Environment Agency, and recommending a further condition to the planning permission. The Broads Authority had considered the application and asked that the height of the riverbank be increased by 30cm. The plans would be amended accordingly.

In reply to a members' question, the senior planner said that the timber piling would be replaced like for like. It was proposed that the riverbank would be given a softer treatment. Consideration had been given to using the small brick building as a bat house but it was not suitable and in poor condition. Members were advised that the comments of the council's natural areas officer would be taken into consideration. The works would be completed when the Broadland Housing scheme was developed which it was hoped would come forward in the next couple of years.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 16/01628/NF3 - Hardy Road, Norwich and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Public access for pedestrians and cyclist into perpetuity
4. Tree removal - outside nesting season
5. Tree protection plan and method statement
6. Standard unknown contamination
7. Detailed landscaping, including maintenance and management plan
8. Structure shall be fully recorded prior to demolition
9. Structure shall not be demolished without the scheme for re-development proceeding.
10. Implementation of ecological mitigation – including eradication of Giant Knotweed;
11. Implementation of heritage interpretation scheme.

Article 35(2) Statement

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations and has approved the application subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

10. Application nos 13/02087/VC and 13/02088/VC - Norwich City Football Club Carrow Road, Norwich, NR1 1JE

The senior planner (development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. She referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports which was circulated at the meeting and containing comments on the revised landscape proposals that were submitted after the finalisation of the committee report.

During discussion members considered the proposal and noted the constraints of the area around the stadium and the timescale for the landscaping works to be carried out.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve:

- (1) Application No 13/02087/VC at Norwich City Football Club, Geoffrey Watling Way and Carrow Road, Norwich, NR1 1JE, and grant planning permission, subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106A Deed of Variation legal agreement to include obligations of the original consents with the necessary amendments to the definition of development, and amended planning conditions as summarised below:
 1. New time conditions – provision of
 - By 1 September 2017, the hard and soft landscaping and street trees either side of the east-west Geoffrey Watling Way
 - By 1 September 2018, the landscaping around the South Stand and the provision of street trees adjoining the adopted highway on the southern boundary of the existing surface 'triangle' car park

By 1 September 2018, works to the riverbank shall be provided in accordance with the specification detailed on drawings ref 161006 SL-01 P2 and 161006 SL-02 P1 received. The works, associated safety features and signage shall thereafter be permanently retained in a condition and manner which facilitates use as de-masting and short stay visitor moorings.

2. The development hereby approved shall take place substantially in accordance with the layout shown on Masterplan drawing number 1011/NO/P02 dated 16 April 2007
3. Prior to first use of hard landscaped area – submission and agreement of Parking Management Plan – operation thereafter in accordance with agreed plan
4. Condition requiring full detailed specification of landscape scheme
5. Previous condition - arrangements for drop-off and collection of fans on match days
6. Previous condition – control of installation of any plant and machinery on any non-residential premises
7. Previous condition – control of installation of any extract ventilation or fume extraction system within the non-residential premises
8. Previous condition – control - Foul drainage
9. Previous condition – control of discharge into any watercourse, surface water, sewer or soakaway system
10. Previous condition - Litter bins
11. Previous condition - All exterior
12. Previous condition - pedestrian areas outside the buildings available for public access shall be kept free of all obstructions, unless first agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
13. Previous condition – control amplified sound
14. Previous condition - non-residential servicing arrangements
15. Previous condition - Parking controls within the residential developments
16. Previous condition – PD restrictions
17. Previous condition – Replacement of any trees or plants - failure within 5 year
18. Previous condition - Tree protection.
19. Previous condition – Restrictions on deliveries
20. Previous condition - Community use of facilities.
21. Previous condition CCTV

(2) Application No 13/02088/VC at Norwich City Football Club, Geoffrey Watling Way and Carrow Road, Norwich, NR1 1JE, and grant planning permission, subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106A Deed of Variation legal agreement to include obligations of the original consents with the necessary amendments to the definition of development, and amended planning conditions as summarised below:

1. New time conditions – provision of
By 1 September 2017, the hard and soft landscaping and street trees either side of the east-west Geoffrey Watling Way

By 1 September 2018, the landscaping around the South Stand and the provision of street trees adjoining the adopted highway on the southern boundary of the existing surface 'triangle' car park

By 1 September 2017, works to the riverbank shall be provided in accordance with the specification detailed on drawings ref 161006 SL-01 P2 and 161006 SL-02 P1. The works, associated safety features and signage shall thereafter be permanently retained in a condition and manner which facilitates use as de-masting and short stay visitor moorings .

2. The development hereby approved shall take place substantially in accordance with the layout shown on Masterplan drawing number 1011/NO/P02 dated 16th April 2007
3. Prior to first use of hard landscaped area – submission and agreement of Parking Management Plan – operation thereafter in accordance with agreed plan
4. Condition requiring full detailed specification of landscape scheme
5. Previous condition - arrangements for drop-off and collection of fans on match days
6. Previous condition – control of installation of any plant and machinery on any non-residential premises
7. Previous condition – control of installation of any extract ventilation or fume extraction system within the non-residential premises
8. Previous condition – control - Foul drainage
9. Previous condition – control of discharge into any watercourse, surface water, sewer or soakaway system
10. Previous condition - Litter bins
11. Previous condition - All exterior
12. Previous condition - pedestrian areas outside the buildings available for public access shall be kept free of all obstructions, unless first agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
13. Previous condition – control amplified sound
14. Previous condition - non-residential servicing arrangements
15. Previous condition - Parking controls within the residential developments
16. Previous condition – PD restrictions
17. Previous condition – Replacement of any trees or plants - failure within 5 year
18. Previous condition - Tree protection.
19. Previous condition – Restrictions on deliveries
20. Previous condition - Community use of facilities.
21. Previous condition CCTV

Article 35(2) Statement

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations and has approved the application subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

(At the conclusion of the meeting the chair and members of the committee expressed their gratitude to two officers, who were leaving the council: Ian Whittaker, planning development manager, and Steve Fraser-Lim, planning team leader (outer area) for their contribution to the work of the council and support to members of the committee.)

CHAIR