

Updates to report

Application no: 15/00225/F – 1 The Moorings
Item 4(A) Page 19

Two additional letters of representation:

- Wish to object for the same reasons as the first proposal as nothing has changed. The extension is incongruous with the surrounding buildings and would have a detrimental impact upon the riverside conservation area as well as being a towering ugly presence over Indigo Yard.
- Despite minor changes we believe they make no difference and object again. The extension infills the gap between The Moorings and Indigo Yard, affecting pathway and numbers 16, 17 and 18 Indigo Yard from being too close. We also share the conservation officer's view that 'the proposed extension is inappropriate'.

Officer response:

- Objections noted.

Additional correspondence from applicant:

- The trees are placed on the drawings from photograph rather than survey and should not be relied upon. It is my point that if there were no trees at all the proposal should be an acceptable design solution – it affects but in no way destroys the 'architectural' break between the terraces.
- The coincidence of the tree application is in no way connected to the proposal, it is just to raise the point to the City Council that their tree requires work whether the extension ever happens or not.

Application no: 14/01615/FT – Telecommunications Mast In Front Of 47 – 69 Newmarket Road
Item 4(A) Page 55

Additional follow-up letter of representation from neighbour:

- We continue to strongly object to this application. The existing pole is high enough and we do not wish for an intrusion of our view from the front of our property.

Officer response

- Design and heritage issues are already covered in the report (main issue 2). The right to a view in this particular circumstance is largely a private interest and not a principal amenity consideration, particularly where there is not considered to be a more mitigating amenity concern such as a development being overbearing in nature.

Application no: 14/01604/F and 14/01605/L – The Cottage, 2 The Crescent
Item 4(C) Page 79

Corrections to report:

Addition of reason for approval on listed building consent:

Although the proposals will lead to less than substantial harm to the listed buildings, the degree of the harm is considered to be relatively low and does not undermine the setting or significance of the heritage assets. This balanced decision is made with some weight being afforded to the benefits of bringing the cottage back into a more usable state and the environmental benefits the PV panels. In this case the benefits are considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm, bearing in mind the considerable importance and weight being given to the impact on listed buildings. The development is in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Development Plan, and it has been concluded that there are no material considerations that indicate it should be determined otherwise.

LBC conditions 3 and 4 to be deleted, and replaced with:

- 3 Landscaping details (including soft and hard screening and a management scheme/maintenance schedule);
- 4 Details of:
 - a. bricks(including samples), bond type and mortar colour;
 - b. tiles (including details of reinstatement for removed rooflights);
 - c. all internal and external joinery;
 - d. rooflights;
 - e. PV panel specification and rack;
 - f. eaves/parapet detail including flashing.

Additional follow-up letter of representation:

- Reduction in one panel does not make this proposal any more acceptable and we continue to object to principle of this gross abuse of listed building. Approval would be a travesty for conservation.
- Perhaps it would be more acceptable to place the panels on the rear roof of the main house to reduce the visual impact although this may be less efficient.

Officer response:

- Design and heritage issues are addressed in main issue 1.
- The rear roof was presumably not opted for due to it being west-facing. This would also have heritage implications that would need assessing, including potential fabric concerns.

Additional follow-up letter of representation:

- The drawings are not accurate: the “south of east elevation” shows the panels coming up to just below the new window yet the “elevation/section south” shows them coming to just below the eaves, if so they would be taller than the screening.
- Report does not take into account the main area to the rear of 2-5 The Crescent is dominated by a set of coach houses which over the years have been adapted for accommodation use. This is a coherent collection of historic buildings and informs the historical setting of the Crescent albeit interspersed with later additions which with their flat roofs, do not detract from the coach houses. Placing an array of solar panels in the middle of them is clearly a significant deterioration to the setting of the heritage buildings.
- Report suggests environment is damaged by modern extension of No.2, lessening the significance. If the planners considered the modern extension to be in harmony with the heritage setting when they granted it permission several years ago, it cannot be used as an argument to now damage that environment.
- Report ignores that the mitigation measures (screening) only softens the view from Coach and Horses Row and does nothing for view from the rear of the listed terrace, which is undermined by the industrial array of unscreened black panels. No effort was made to visit the neighbouring properties to assess this view and the only assessment is from No.2, radically underestimating the other views.
- The planning officer ‘admitted in his telephone conversation with me on 18 March, he had done no substantial research into the panels specified and therefore the Report’s comments on the qualities of the panels are specious and should be disregarded by the Committee’ and stated that ‘there would be no problem for us with reflected light’ with ‘no calculations or had any basis on which to make that statement’. At the very least if the committee agree the array, it should be subject to a technical assessment by a qualified engineer to assess the situation of glare (which is a documented issue) to ensure an unbiased outcome – in addition to the other conditions on the panels themselves.
- It is difficult to follow how the report reaches the conclusion of ‘less than substantive harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets’. With the acknowledgement of the considerable importance and weight afforded to conservation of listed buildings, the report seems to wilfully ignore the implications of the development. The heritage impacts outweigh the small environmental benefits.

Officer response

- **Accuracy of drawings:** the “south of east elevation” is a sketch view/visualisation of the perspective from ground floor level and all measurements appear to be distorted by around a third. It is intended to be indicative and the relationship between the screening and the panels remains the same on the sketch as in the other plans. Members should base their assessment on the “elevation/section south” and the “north of west elevation”. The exact details of the screening are recommended as a condition of any approval.
- **Heritage impact:** The report does take account of the neighbouring listed curtilage buildings (see main issue 1) and makes a judgement of their significance through the various factors which influence their setting. This includes the extension to No.2 and the report is careful not to suggest this is a negative aspect, just that it is a contemporary feature which contributes to the setting here as the built environment has evolved.
- **Less than substantial harm [to a heritage asset]** is a term defined within national planning policy, with the alternatives being no harm and substantial harm. It is clearly neither of these and the less than substantial harm is identified in the report within the context of an assessment of the significance of the heritage assets affected. It is clear from the plans and the report that this takes into account the lack of screening on the host-dwelling side (paragraph 25) and the impact on the neighbouring listed buildings (paragraph 28). Plans and photographs will form part of the committee presentation which should allow a sufficient level of information for members to make their own judgement on whether the less than substantial harm identified can be justified or not. Members will be fully informed of the considerable weight to be afforded to the protection of the heritage assets.
- **Glare:** There has been no evidence to suggest that the specified panel, which the manufacturer describes as ‘microstructured glass and anti-reflective’, would be not be accurate in its description. Details on the manufacturer’s website detail that the module has an anti-reflective coating to increase its efficiency.
- Given the panels are not opposite any habitable windows and given the orientation of the site, it is considered unlikely that the angle of reflection could lead to significant glint (direct reflection from the surface) or glare (continuous source of brightness relative to diffused lighting, i.e. a reflection of the bright sky around the sun) to the degree it would cause a nuisance. However it is accepted that the reflective power of a panel (particularly when coated) is also lower than a number of other materials, including standard glazing. This amenity assessment cannot ignore the potential for glare and glint which is already apparent, such as from the facing windows on curtilage buildings (which would in theory be much greater), rooflights, lead flashing and the windows on the flats at Coach and Horses Row opposite. This non-listed row of flats could also install solar/PV panels along the entire length of the facing roof plane without planning

permission. For the above reasons it is not considered that a detailed technical assessment is necessary or proportionate in this case.

- As mentioned in the report the final detail is subject to condition, including the material and finish for the frame/rack which itself may also contribute to potential annoyance.

Application no: 15/00118/F – 24 Ipswich Road
Item 4(E) Page 105

Additional representation from the Norwich Society:

The porch suggests an art deco style to the house which will be destroyed by the proposed projection and over provision of glazing to the new gable. This will damage the character of the front elevation. We are surprised that the ugly flat roof extension to the left of the front elevation remains. The north facing side window on the single storey rear extension is very close to neighbouring property and the glass should be opaque.

Officer response:

- The design of the front extension is addressed within paragraph 19 of the committee report
Neighbour privacy is considered within paragraph 26 of the committee report. A condition has been recommended to require this window to be obscure glazed and non-opening except at 1.7m+ above floor level

Application no: 14/01841/F – 36 – 50 Drayton Road
Item 4 (G) Page 125

Amendments

- A revised site plan has been submitted indicating a revised junction layout, pedestrian refuge, cycle access provision, pedestrian access to the rear of the site and additional landscaping. This is shown on the Power-point presentation.

Additional representation

- The Aldi on Sprowston Road are not complying with the planning conditions. The same will happen for this site and relate to opening hours, delivery times, delivery protocol including use of refrigeration units, reversing alarms, site security and light pollution

Officer response

- See main issues 1, 4 and 5

Additional / revised information from applicant

1. Opening hours are proposed to be between 8:00am and 10:00pm Mondays to Saturdays and at any time between 10:00am and 6:00pm on Sundays. At the moment there is no condition on opening hours to either units.
2. Delivery hours are proposed to be between 6am -11pm. At the moment there is no condition on delivery hours to either units.
3. The existing service yard use is going to be reduced in terms of it is use by the fact that the majority of vehicles will be loading within a covered loading bay. This will significantly reduce any noise and/or disturbance as the noise would be contained within the retail unit. Furthermore, the noise from deliveries is expected to be significantly less than Topps, this is because at Topps pallets and crates are delivered to the existing non enclosed service yard. A fork lift is then used to pick up these pallets and take them into the storage area. Qualitatively this will cause more noise pollution than the unloading proposed by Aldi which will be in an enclosed loading area, containing all the noise pollution. We do not anticipate a high volume of deliveries at this location, we anticipate on average a max of 3 per day. We accept a condition requiring a Delivery/Servicing Management Plan.
4. Provision of a pedestrian link to Boot Binders Way and into the site from the south. Future safeguarding of route to Clickers Road
5. Provision of pedestrian refuge at the entrance of the site, pedestrian bollards and a cycle ramp to Drayton Road. Level access for wheel chair users is already provided from the pedestrian access. We have provided a wheel ramp alongside the proposed stairs to enable bikes to wheeled up and down.
6. We feel that the package of transport benefits provided at this site at the south and the current vehicle entrance mean that a further pedestrian refuge at the bus stop is not required on Drayton Road.
7. Provision of further compensatory tree planting within the site and along the east boundary. We will provide a full detailed landscaping plan, which will include further locations, under the condition.
8. Erection of a new hard landscaping along the east boundary
9. We can confirm that there will that the only plant to be located externally of the building is that shown on the proposed plans. Other chiller and freezer plant will be located within the building therefore more than adequately screened enclosed to avoid noise impact.
10. The revised site plan indicates that there will still be cycle parking to the north-east corner of the site.

Officer response

1. Given the fall-back position of the unrestricted retail use, the proposed days and hours of operation are reasonable and should be conditioned as such
2. Given the fall-back position of the unrestricted retail use, the delivery times are reasonable and should be conditioned as such
3. This conclusion is accepted. Although, a condition securing further details relating to delivery management for the entire site is still considered necessary

4. Historically, the application site and adjoining site to the east was subject to a section 106 agreement, whereby a riverside walk was to be provided. Such measures are in place on the southern portion of the site. The applicant's willingness to provide pedestrian access to the south of the site and safeguard the path as a riverside walk is welcomed as it is in accordance with the council's objective of providing a walkway along the northern side of the river. Furthermore, the provision of an access gate will aid sustainable access to the site from the Marriott's Way and also from Wensum Park. Opening and closing times of such a gate can be secured by condition.
5. The realignment of the access, provision of the refuge / bollards and a cycle ramp will significantly improve the pedestrian and cyclist environment to the frontage of the site. Indeed, the bollards will also help deter unauthorised parking of heavy goods vehicles along the public footpath. It is acknowledged that paragraph 59 of the report required that the new steps from Drayton Road should come in the form of a ramp to enable easy access for wheel chair users. However, due to the constraints of the site and significant improvements to the main access, such measures are not considered necessary.
6. The provision of a new refuge to enable easy access to the bus stop on the opposite side of the road would be desirable. However, in the context of the other transport enhancements, conditioning such measures is not considered necessary or reasonable in this instance.
7. The provision of further tree planting within the car parking area and eastern boundary is welcomed and will help provide a sympathetic transition from the road to the designated open space to the south and help screen the site from adjoining residential properties. Such matters can be secured by condition.
8. This measure is welcomed and can be secured by condition
9. The comments of the Environmental Protection officer requiring a condition detailing a list of all plant is noted. However, as the applicant has confirmed that the plans submitted indicate all external plant, such a condition is not considered necessary.
10. In light of the Police's comments, it is still recommended that cycle storage be relocated to the front of the store. This matter can be secured by condition.

Application no: 15/00113/F – 20 Grosvenor Road
Item 4 (I) Page 161

Additional representation from Cllr Carlo:

- The proposed kitchen extension would bring the living accommodation very close to the neighbours. The installation of French windows would encourage the occupants to open onto the backyard, giving rise to noise. The proposed development could potentially undermine the quality of life for local residents, especially in relation to noise and loss of privacy.

Officer response:

- Noise and disturbance issues have been addressed in the report.

Cllr Carlo has also raised concern that the property is being occupied by seven independent persons, which would require planning permission to change the lawful use of the property from a C4 HMO to a Sui Generis HMO. This is a separate matter and will be looked at as an enforcement investigation.
