

Planning Applications Committee: 8 January 2015

Updates to reports

Application no 14/01521/F – Fishmarket and 69-75 Mountergate Item 4A, pages 19-50

Further letters of representation

A further letter of representation has been received in support of the application from the adjacent land owner adjoining and immediately to the west of the application site (Trustees of the Great Hospital). The letter notes that one of the reasons for the application is to kick start the regeneration of the Mountergate area and that the owner is keen to support the proposed new car park which will help that process for the benefit of the area.

Amendment to report

At paragraph 58 on page 33 the word east should read west to read... "the land immediately to the west and south is under two separate ownerships".

Application no: 14/01094/F – 117-127 Trinity Street Item 4B, pages 51-86

- 1) Anglian Water (see Main Issue 5 (para 89-92)) confirm there is adequate capacity for waste and foul waters, but confirm a preference for a sustainable drainage system to be used on site and therefore object to the current proposals unless a condition is used to include SUDs where possible.

Response: condition 3 would secure this.

- With the exception of demolition, there shall be no commencement of development until a surface water drainage scheme has been agreed, to be informed by a ground conditions survey and to include proposals for management and maintenance. No occupation until the drainage is provided.

- 2) Demolition of the apartments should not be allowed until a contract for the site's redevelopment has first been agreed, to ensure minimal detrimental impact on the setting of the conservation area and to minimise disruption to neighbours and to minimise the period when a loss of housing stock occurs.

Response: An additional condition (No.21) is recommended.

- There shall be no demolition of the existing apartments until such time as a contract for the site's redevelopment and construction of the flats

has first been made and evidence of this contract provided to and approved in writing by the LPA prior to demolition of the existing flats.

- 3) It is considered prudent to include a new condition to prevent future creation of new windows anywhere in the scheme without permission, to prevent loss of amenity, privacy or overlooking albeit that permitted development rights for flats would not allow this at present.

Response: An additional condition (no. 22) is recommended. - There shall be no creation of new windows without first gaining the consent of the LPA.

- 4) Re Condition 16 balcony screens and window planters: The condition should be revised to ensure precise design details are agreed, and the applicant has proposed that these are also inspected on site in situ prior to approval, prior to occupation, to ensure their effectiveness of screening.

Response: The condition 16 will be revised as such. – No occupation until details agreed and site visit of installation confirms adequate functionality.

- 5) Minor errors in report: Para 61 – 1.56m should read 1.55m. Para 70 – 1.6m should read 1.7m.

- 6) The applicant has amended the proposed elevations on plan PL03 from version C to version D (revised 07.01.15). The only change has been the position of the boundary wall between 1 Essex Street and the rear block of the new development, due to an original drafting error. The distance of the closest part of the development from the boundary wall remains 1.55m as shown on the layout plan, and the overall separation distance between the two rear walls of house and flats remains 8.7m at this point.

**Application no: 14/01450/O - 16 &17 The Hedgerows
Item 4C, pages 87-102**

Clarification

The applicant has confirmed that the bungalow is for family use (C3).

**Application no: 14/01382/F - 170 St. Clements Hill
Item 4E, pages 115-124**

Error

The location plan on page 116 is incorrect and is a duplicate of the preceding item. The correct plan will be shown to members during the presentation.

**Application no: 14/01660/F – 114 Cambridge Street
Item 4F, pages 125-130**

A further letter of representation has been received objecting to the scheme for the following reasons:

- Unsightly extension
- Unsafe construction
- Roof height too high
- Roof is flat and not sloped
- The external materials are wood rather than tiles

The design issues are addressed within the committee report. The safety of the construction is a matter for Building Control to assess and it is understood that building control have already signed off the construction.