

Planning Applications Committee: 31 March 2011

Late additions to reports for consideration.

The Joint Core Strategy for Norwich, Broadland and South Norfolk was adopted on 24 March 2011. Therefore in the case of all reports references to the emerging Joint Core Strategy should be replaced with the adopted Joint Core Strategy 2011. The Joint Core Strategy now forms part of the development plan for the area and full weight can be given to its policies.

Application No: 10/02162/F - Item 5(1) Page 21
Garages Adjacent To 73 Peckover Road, Norwich

Further representations:

Two further representations have been received from local residents who had previously made representations to the application.

The representations raise the following points:

- The only change is to the position of the entrance and placement of parking for the shop. More thought has been given to free parking for the shop and future residents rather than existing tenants.
- Surprised that so many garages are empty when believed that people have applied and been refused a garage.
- The streets surrounding the site are already congested and will become more so.
- It would be better to redevelop the higher site and move the tenants there into vacant garages on the lower Peckover Road site with 3 spaces for the shop and spaces for those who prefer to park off the road at less inconvenience.

Response

The position of the access has been changed to ease any impact on trees along the street frontage and to avoid design difficulties in realigning the highway footpath surface. The access is as existing and is in a reasonable and safe position on site. No free spaces are provided for the shop within the site.

Concerns relating to car parking and loss of garaging are covered by the report at paragraphs 12, 13 and 14.

The redevelopment of the other nearby garage site has been assessed and discussed with the applicant. This site was removed from the HCA sites going forward for application following concerns being raised by officers about access; density and amenity issues. This is not considered to be a suitable alternative site for redevelopment.

Updates to Report

Clarification has been provided that there is no intention to move the existing fence between numbers 25 and 27 Horning Close. The resident concerned has been advised of this in writing as requested.

Further representations:

Cllr Mackoff has also commented on the scheme, expressing concerns about the location of the proposed bin store and the potential for fly-tipping to result in anti-social behaviour and has asked that consideration be given to relocating the store.

Response

Although it is acknowledged that other sites do experience problems of this kind, it is considered that the detailed design of this scheme should reduce the likelihood of this occurring. The bin store would be fully enclosed with gates which open into the parking area, so access to the store would only be available from inside the application site. The store would be able to be overlooked by future residents of the scheme and existing neighbours and, as the site is located at the end of a cul-de-sac, there would not be many people passing the site.

In addition, for collection purposes and to ensure that it is easily accessible to future residents, the bin store should be located within 5 metres of the adopted highway. Although it was originally located further into the site, the design was amended for these reasons. It would be difficult to relocate the store slightly further back, due to the consequent impact on the parking area. It is also considered unlikely to cause a problem in its currently proposed location, for the reasons outlined above. So although the developers have been made aware of Cllr Makoff's concerns, we are not recommending that the scheme be further amended in this instance.

Cllr Makoff has further responded by indicating that the enclosure of the bin store with secure access from within the site may help mitigate her concerns, but she would prefer to see the bin store covered.

Consideration has been given to this but, in this instance, covering the bin store would make it more visually intrusive and the remaining risks identified, following the imposition of conditions as recommended, are not considered sufficient to outweigh increasing the visual impact of this functional element of the proposal.

Further representations:

Two further representations have been received from local residents who had previously made representations to the application.

1.

The first was copied to all members of the planning committee.

The representation raises concerns that the car park is consistently used by parents bring their children to the school on Heigham Road, making the morning and afternoon school run periods of peak usage. It also raises concern that safety would be an issue if access to the car park was removed. The representation includes details of a survey of the car parks usage during school run and other times. This is reproduced below:

Date	Time	Total Number of Cars in Belvoir Street Car Park
Saturday 12/03/11	14.20-15.00	15
Wednesday 16/03/11	08.40-08.50 (just after peak school run time)	5
Thursday 17/03/11	10.45 – 10.50	7
Thursday 17/03/11	15.25 – 15.30	14
Wednesday 23/03/11	08.40 – 08.50	8

The representation also includes images of on street parking full at various times.

The representation notes that there are 422 zone N permits (233 resident and 189 visitor).

Concern is also raised over the decision to dispose of the land, the manor in which this was carried out and the amount of money it is being disposed for.

2.

The second e-mail was copied to some members and included four photographs showing usage of the car park. Two photos had 9 cars in the car park, one had 8 and one had 7. The e-mail commented that the space provided by the car park is vital for the local community to avoid congestion on the narrow streets and the loss of the facility would have a detrimental effect on the locality.

Response

Concerns relating to the car parks use and the use by the school are covered by the report at paragraphs 23-25 and 35-39.

In relation to the decision of the Council as land owner to dispose of the site, this decision has been made by Executive on 28 July 2010. It is clearly not within the remit of planning committee to amend or overturn that decision. It is however relevant for the committee to consider the proposals against planning policy and other material considerations and such an assessment is given within the planning committee report.

Application No: 11/00308/F - Item 5(5) Page 77
Garages adjacent to 63-79 Berners Street, Norwich

Updates to Report

Transport have requested an additional informative note to advise the applicants that the parking spaces will need crossovers and dropped kerbs to be created which need to be provided at the applicants cost.

Application No: 11/00071/U - Item 5(6) Page 87
Queen Charlotte, 286 Dereham Road, Norwich

Updates to Report

On page 91 of the agenda, the response to the representation about the Equalities Act makes reference to certain provisions in the Act which do not come into force until 5 April. However, the Committees duties in respect of Equalities are set out on page 19 of the agenda and consideration of the proposal in respect of equality and diversity issues is contained within paragraphs 32-36 of the report (page 97).

Further representations:

A late representation has been received raising a number of points on the following matters: reiterating the concerns expressed by CAMRA about the loss of the pub; comments about sharia banking; centre likely to be used in excess of 50 people and could be used for prayer; the likely promotion of Norwich City Football Team is likely to lead to more home matches on a Friday night which could exacerbate problems associated with traffic impact; and reference is made to the Air Quality Act and Environment Act 1995 Part 4.

Response:

The concerns of CAMRA are summarised within the report in paragraph 11. The merits or otherwise of sharia banking are not considered relevant to the planning merits of the application. It is recommended that conditions be

imposed to control the use of the premises if permission is granted. The possible promotion of the football team is not a consideration which, it is recommended, should be afforded a significant amount of weight in assessing the likely traffic impacts of the current proposal. The site is not within an Air Quality Management Area.

Application No: 10/02177/F - Item 5(7) Page 101
Ferry Boat Inn, 191 King Street, Norwich

Updates to Report

A condition has been missed out of the recommendation on page 126. There are also a couple of typing errors in the recommendation.

The recommendation should include a condition on page 127, number 23. hours of use of the function room to be restricted to between 08:00 to 23:00. This was detailed in paragraph 99 but missed off the recommendation.

Condition 4 on page 126 should read – The following details to be submitted prior to ‘commencement’, as opposed to ‘determination’.

The word ‘although’ in condition 21 on page 127 should read ‘along’.

Further Representations:

Support from the applicant:

An e-mail has been received and was sent to all members of the planning committee from the applicant in support of their proposals. The e-mail does not provide any additional information that was not already available with the planning application and therefore raises no further issues.

Objection:

A further letter has been forwarded to all members of the committee via e-mail from a neighbouring resident who could not make it to the meeting due to work commitments. This makes the following comments in relation to the committee report:

Para 3 – A TPO has been provisionally placed. There have been 12 objections. It is difficult to understand why anyone would object to preserving these lovely trees unless they have an ulterior motive.

Para 16 – 99 signatory petition – against.

Para 17 – Cannon Wharf Residents’ Association Members – against.

Para 18 – 25 letters of support but only 4 from nearby residents/businesses.

Para 18 – The proposal is clearly NOT in scale with Cannon Wharf. No other development has been allowed to be built so close to the Nova Sad Friendship Bridge.

Para 21 – It is ‘regrettable’ that the trees are to be cut down? They don’t have to be.

Para 24 – ‘I believe all these concerns can or have been addressed’ –
incorrect statement – simply not true they haven’t been addressed.
Para 24 – ‘Turning down the Backpackers.. with the prospect of noisier and
less social activities’. If this refers to any future development then
what is built is under your control.
Para 37 – Tree Planning Officer – I still do not agree with the loss of all the
trees’

The representation comments that the proposals go against objectives for tree
planting in King Street and that the cutting down of trees on the site
contradicts the suggested provision of an eco friendly building. It also
comments that tree planting in mitigation would not replace the riverside
amenity for 15-20 years.

Response

The majority of the comments relating to the report highlight or comment on
consultation responses. In relation to trees the impact is assessed at
paragraphs 90-95 and at paragraphs 109-111 of the committee report.

Application No: 10/01737/F - Item 5(8) Page 139
Thorpe House, 79 Thorpe Road, Norwich, NR1 1 UA.

Updates to Report - Points of Clarification:

Parking

Para 1 – The car parking area at the front of the site is not within the
application but is within the applicant’s ownership and control and
therefore can be subject to conditions if necessary and appropriate.

Para 8 (final box in table), and Para 39 – The area is not currently within a
Controlled Parking Zone (permit parking) although this was proposed to
residents fairly recently. The Transportation Planner advises there are no
plans to advance this at present, and parking remains available on-street
until such controls are introduced. If the scheme is built before any
Controlled Parking Zone is introduced, surplus parking could be
accommodated on-street. This could apply to either residents without
allocated spaces on-site, or visitors, or employees, but the scheme would
nevertheless be expected to conform with parking standards on-site. A
new development built after a Controlled Parking Zone was introduced
would not qualify for permits and would be expected to provide for parking
on-site. Informative Note 5 should be revised accordingly.

Para 20 – The level of residential parking is consistent with policy only if it
is revised in accordance with the suggested conditions.

Section 106 Planning Obligations

Para 18 – The final sentence suggests a scheme with more housing on the same site would be difficult to resist. Unfortunately (due to editing errors) this is supposed to mean that a scheme with more housing would be difficult to accept (on design, transport and amenity grounds predominantly) and more intensive proposals here would likely be resisted.

Para 53 – In revising the design to improve the scheme over earlier iterations, the proposal now provides only 9 child bed-spaces. This means financial contributions as planning obligations can not be required by a Section 106 Agreement, as the threshold under Local Plan policy SR7 is 10 child bedspaces. Thus, Recommendation (1) should be revised accordingly, by removing the childrens play provision from the legal agreement, revising condition 18 and the reason for approval, and omitting reference to policy SR7 where necessary. Recommendation (2) should also be revised to remove this particular aspect from any necessary reason for refusal.

Further representations:

None.

Graham Nelson
Head of Planning Services
31 March 2011