



PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

11.00 a.m. – 3.15 p.m.

11 June 2009

Present: Councillors Bradford (Chair), Llewellyn (Vice-Chair following election), Driver, Jago, Little and Stephenson

Apologies: Councillors Banham, George, Lay, Lubbock and Wiltshire

1. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIR

RESOLVED to appoint Councillor Llewellyn as Vice-Chair for the ensuing civic year.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Little declared a personal interest in item 5 below - Application No 09/00249/F - Norwich Family Life Church, Heartsease Lane, because he represented the Council on the Mousehold Heath Conservators and item 8 below - Application No 09/00243/F – Land At Brazen Gate, Southwell Road, because he served on the management committee for Lakenham Way.

Councillor Bradford declared a personal interest in item 5 below - Application No 09/00249/F - Norwich Family Life Church, Heartsease Lane, as representative of the Council and Chair of the Mousehold Heath Conservators.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 14 May 2009.

4. APPLICATION NO 09/00182/O – THE TALK AND 114 OAK STREET

The Senior Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans and said that he was confident that the section 106 agreement would be satisfactorily completed by 24 July 2009. He referred to a letter sent to all members of the Committee by the management of The Talk which expressed concern about the loss of The Talk as a facility to the community and said that there were no policy reasons to retain the current use on that site. The site was designated for redevelopment in the emerging Northern City Centre Action Plan.

During discussion members noted that one cycle parking space would be provided per unit and that there would be potential space for cycles in the gardens at the rear of the properties.

RESOLVED, with 4 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Llewellyn, Stephenson and Driver) and one member abstaining (Councillor Jago), to approve Application No 09/00182/O – The Talk and 114 Oak Street and to:-

(1) grant planning permission subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 Agreement to include affordable housing, provision of contributions to child play space, open space, transportation contributions, education, on street parking controls and subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard reserved matters time limit;
2. Reserved matters to relate to landscaping;
3. Removal of residential permitted development rights;
4. Submission of the following details:
 - (a) Samples of all external materials;
 - (b) Colour and finish of renders;
 - (c) Material, finish and colour of rainwater goods;
 - (d) Sections through external joinery, including windows, doors and bin store doors;
 - (e) Details of external bike stores.
5. Details of secure gates to be provided at the entrances to the pathway to the rear of plots 9 – 18;
6. Details of new surfacing and lighting to Jenkins Lane to be provided and implemented;
7. Foul and surface water conditions as required by Anglian Water;
8. Bin and cycle stores to be provided prior to first occupation and not to be used for any other purpose;
9. Archaeological investigation, evaluation and mitigation;
10. Full details for the provision of 10% of the sites energy from renewable or low carbon sources;
11. Further land contamination details in the form of a preliminary risk assessment and site investigation scheme;
12. Details on monitoring, maintenance and any contingency action to be carried out on site for site contamination;
13. If further contamination found details to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and remediation methods to be agreed.

(Reasons for approval:- The recommendation has been made with regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application including policies ENV6, ENV7, ENG1 and WM6 of the adopted East of England Plan, saved policy T2 of the adopted Norfolk Structure Plan, saved policies NE9, HBE3, HBE8, HBE9, HBE12, HBE19, EP1, EP16, EP18, EP20, EP22, HOU4, HOU5, HOU6, HOU7, HOU13, HOU18, SR4, SR7, TRA5, TRA6, TRA7, TRA8, TRA9 and TRA14 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, PPS1, Supplement to PPS1, PPS3, PPG13, PPG15, PPG16 and other material planning considerations. The proposal is for the redevelopment of a brownfield site with residential development in a central sustainable location. The proposal accords with the development plan for

the area and with Central Government Guidance. Subject to the conditions listed the proposals are considered to be acceptable.)

- (2) if a satisfactory Section 106 Agreement is not completed prior to 24 July 2009 to delegate authority to the Head of Planning and Regeneration Services to refuse planning permission for the following reason:

In the absence of a legal agreement or undertaking relating to the provision of affordable housing, children's play provision, public open space, transportation contributions, on street parking controls and education contributions the proposal is contrary to saved policies HOU4, SR7, SR4, TRA11 and HOU6 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan.

5. APPLICATION NO 09/00249/F - NORWICH FAMILY LIFE CHURCH, HEARTSEASE LANE

(Councillors Bradford and Little had declared a personal interest in this item.)

The Senior Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans, and together with the Planning Development Manager answered questions.

Two members of the congregation addressed the Committee detailing the Church's ministry in the Heartsease Estate area which benefited particularly older and young people. Councillor Waters, Ward Councillor for Crome Ward, said that the application was driven by two considerations: the need for the Church to reintroduce a more convenient way to offer community facilities and suggested that consideration be given to a phased development of the site so that the Church could return to Heartsease Lane.

The architect then addressed the Committee and said that the temporary building could be constructed by the time the Church had to vacate its temporary location in 4 months time. The temporary building would then be dismantled in 5 years time to coincide with the opening of a new permanent church building on the site.

Discussion ensued in which members were advised that officers had spoken to the architect about phased development but the concerns about the temporary building as outlined in the report had not been overcome. There was a risk that if temporary planning permission was granted and this was renewed the temporary building would not be dismantled. Members recognised and appreciated the work of the Church but considered that the proposed building was inappropriate in planning terms. The Chair concurred and pointed out that the Crome Ward Councillors, including the County Divisional councillor for the Ward, acknowledged the benefits that the Church brought to the local community.

RESOLVED to refuse planning permission for Application No 09/00249/F - Norwich Family Life Church, Heartsease Lane for the following reasons:

1. It is considered that the proposed development does not demonstrate that the building will not be required to be retained on site long term or provide sufficient information to assess impacts on the potential for future

redevelopment of the site. The development would add to the number and site coverage of temporary buildings on site and in its inception, design and construction will not provide for a sustainable development of the site and would therefore result in a piecemeal development of the site out of character with the area to the detriment of the amenities and safety of the area. The development would therefore be contrary to PPS1, East of England Plan policy SS1 and City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan 2004 saved policies EP20, NE7.

2. It is considered that the siting, scale and design of the building in relation to the character of the site, street frontage and surrounding area; the industrial form of the development; and the use of unsympathetic materials are unacceptable and that the development as proposed would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area and the setting of the adjoining Mousehold Heath. The design of the proposed building would not integrate successfully or harmonise within this environment and consequently the proposal would be out of keeping with its surroundings. The development would therefore be contrary to PPS1, East of England Plan policy ENV7 and City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan 2004 saved policies HBE12, NE1.
3. It is considered that the proposal does not include an acceptable form of landscaping for the development and that the landscaping proposed as part of the scheme would not enhance the appearance and character of the built and natural environment of the site and its surroundings contrary to PPS1, PPS9 and the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan saved policies NE1, NE7, NE9.
4. It is considered that the development as proposed would result in the loss of further designated green space on this site and within this part of the City and the development does not provide an appropriate assessment of the rationalisation or replacement of green space on site or in the surrounding area. Therefore the development as proposed is considered to represent an unacceptable form of development on this restricted site which would be detrimental to the amenities and general character of the area contrary to PPS1, PPS9 and the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan 2004 saved policy SR3.
5. The proposal does not provide a travel plan for future operation of the site or demonstrate that adequate cycle stores and refuse stores or future facilities for car parking can be provided on-site and that the operation of the site would not therefore create problems within the adjacent part of Norwich highway network and is therefore contrary to PPG13 and the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan 2004 saved policies TRA7, TRA8 and TRA12.
6. The site is located within an area identified as having Archaeological Interest by Norfolk Landscape archaeology. The proposal does not include an appropriate assessment of the archaeological significance of the site and is therefore contrary to PPG16 and the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan 2004 saved policy HBE4.

6. APPLICATIONS NOS 09/00146/F AND 09/00148/L – 100 POTTERGATE

The Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans. Copies of photographs were circulated to members at the meeting.

A resident then addressed the Committee outlining his objections to the proposal and expressing concern about that the site notices had been removed. Eighteen people had signed a petition opposing the proposals. He pointed out that the roof line seen from aerial photographs demonstrated the symmetry of this 'unique' roof line.

In response the Planner pointed out that the building was no longer a single building and that the extension to the rear had altered the symmetry of the building. There had been 6 dormers at one time. The roofline was not 'read' from above and therefore the view from above was not a planning consideration.

Councillor Driver moved and Councillor Jago seconded that a site visit should be conducted before the Committee could determine this application.

RESOLVED to defer consideration of Application Nos 09/00146/F And 09/00148/L – 100 Pottergate to enable the Committee to conduct a site visit before its next meeting (Site visit to be at 9.00 a.m. on Thursday, 2 July 2009).

7. APPLICATION NO 09/00282/F – 81 MONASTERY COURT

The Senior Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans, and together with the Planning Development Manager, answered questions on the report.

A resident and representative of the Central Norwich Citizens' Forum outlined his and the Forum's objections to the proposed scheme, which was considered unacceptable on health and amenity grounds. He pointed out that the original proposal was 1.5m lower than the proposed brick building. A resident of Elm Hill then outlined his objections to the proposed which would be visible from his garden and living rooms. The Chairman of the Friends of Elm Hill then addressed the Committee and outlined the concerns which had been detailed in two letters of objection to the proposed sub-station and proposing that it be relocated.

During discussion members took into account that permission had already been granted for a sub-station, which had not been opposed, could be carried out if this application for a brick enclosed sub-station was refused. Members considered that it might be appropriate to ask the applicants to consider an alternative site for the sub-station and appreciated that aesthetically and environmentally, in terms of noise pollution, the brick enclosed sub-station was preferable to that granted in the earlier application.

RESOLVED to:-

- (1) approve Application No 09/00282/F – 81 Monastery Court and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. A scheme of noise mitigation measures to be submitted;
3. Details of materials, including samples of bricks, mortar mix and colour of the powder coated louvers;
4. A programme of archaeological excavation to be submitted.

- (2) write to the applicant requesting that consideration is given to an alternative location for the sub-station on the site.

(Reasons for approval:- The recommendation has been made with regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application including policies WM6, ENV6 and ENV7 of the adopted East of England Plan (May 2008), saved policies HBE3, HBE8, HBE12 and EP22 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (November 2004), PPS1, Supplement to PPS1, PPG15, PPG16, PPG24 and other material considerations. On balance it is considered that the proposals are acceptable and subject to the conditions listed the proposals would not have any significant detrimental impact on neighbour amenity, the appearance of the conservation area or the setting of any Listed Building.

(The Committee adjourned for lunch at this point and reconvened at 2.00 p.m.)

8. APPLICATION NO 09/00243/F – LAND AT BRAZEN GATE, SOUTHWELL ROAD

(Councillor Little had declared a personal interest in this item.)

The Senior Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans, and together with the Planning Development Manager answered questions. The Planning Development Manager advised that the principal concern was the additional parking being available when there was adequate capacity in either other city centre car parks or Park and Ride sites. Therefore the recommendation was altered to adjust condition 5 to allow parking on any Sunday and Saturdays at the busiest time of the year i.e., from 20 October to 10 January. In addition condition 4 should replace Norwich Union with Aviva.

Discussion ensued on the use of the temporary car park by members of the public and concerns that the Council should be consistent in its approach. Councillor Driver, Ward Councillor for Lakenham Ward, said that the current use of the car park worked well, particularly for people attending football matches, and expressed concern that removing this facility would result in parking 'chaos' on local streets. Members noted that Norwich Union (Aviva) gave away the fees to charity and that parking fees should favour short stay parking over long stay.

Councillor Driver supported wider public use but wished for it to go further by allowing public car parking on any Saturday. The Planning Development Manager advised that on many Saturdays there was space in Park and Ride sites but acknowledged the potential problem of football parking in residential streets and suggested the recommendation could be amended to allow parking on Saturdays when Norwich City first team played at home.

Councillor Driver moved and Councillor Stephenson seconded that, condition 5, restricting use of Aviva Staff members be removed and that the car park should be made available for use by the public on Sundays throughout the year; on Saturdays during the period 20 October to 10 January; on Saturdays when the Norwich City Football Club played at Carrow Road; and that tariffs should favour short stay use.

RESOLVED to approve Application No 09/00243/F Land at Brazen Gate, Southwell Road and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:-

1. Temporary for 3 years;
2. Submission of an ITP Within 3 months;
3. Submission of a full travel plan within 12 months;
4. Personal to Aviva;
5. Allow public use of the facility subject to the following restrictions:-
 - (a) any Sunday throughout the year;
 - (b) on Saturdays in the period 20 October to 10 January of each year;
 - (c) on other Saturdays only when Norwich City Football Club's first team is playing at Carrow Road;
 - (d) subject to agreement of tariffs which favour the use of short stay car parking over long stay car parking.

(Reasons for approval: Linked to the applicant's commitment to provide a Full Travel Plan within 12 months of the date of permission, it is considered that a further temporary permission for a 3 year period restricted to staff parking only would not be contrary to national, regional and saved Local Plan policies TRA3, TRA6, TRA12 and TRA21. This takes into account the unusual circumstances relating to the scale of the undertaking and the complexity of steering through a FTP for such a major large local employer and is based on the applicant's commitment to the pursuit and delivery of alternative and more sustainable modes of transport for their employees.)

9. APPLICATION NO 09/00284/O – 271 HEIGHAM STREET

The Senior Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans and answered questions.

RESOLVED, with 5 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Llewellyn, Stephenson, Little and Driver) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Jago) to approve Application No 09/00284/O – 271 Heigham Street and grant planning permission subject to:-

- (1) the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 Agreement to include provision of child play space and transportation contributions;
- (2) the following conditions:
 1. Standard reserved matters time limit;
 2. Reserved matters to relate to landscaping;
 3. Garages to be used for parking and not to be converted;
 4. Submission of the following details:
 - (a) Samples of bricks and tiles;
 - (b) Colour and finish of renders;

- (c) Colour and finish of timber cladding;
 - (d) Colour and finish of timber doors and windows;
 - (e) Material and colour of front door frames;
 - (f) Material colour and finish of the balcony;
5. Details of the balcony privacy screen to be provided prior to first occupation;
 6. Obscure glazing to the second floor landing window of the townhouses;
 7. Bin stores to be provided prior to first occupation and not to be used for any other purpose;
 8. Details of covered and secure cycle parking to be provided prior to first occupation;
 9. Submission of a scheme for the protection of the trees along the boundaries during the course of the development;
 10. Archaeological investigation, evaluation and mitigation;
 11. Full details for the provision of 10% of the sites energy from renewable or low carbon sources;
 12. Further land contamination details in the form of a preliminary risk assessment and site investigation scheme;

(Reasons for approval:- The recommendation has been made with regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application including policies ENV7, ENG1 and WM6 of the adopted East of England Plan, saved policies NE9, HBE3, HBE12, HBE19, EP16, EP18, EP22, HOU6, HOU13, SR7, TRA5, TRA6, TRA7 and TRA8 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, PPS1, Supplement to PPS1, PPS3, PPG13, PPG16 and other material planning considerations. The proposal is for the redevelopment of a brownfield site with residential development in a central sustainable location. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle and in line with the Development Plan and Central Government Guidance. On balance it is considered that there would not be a significant detrimental impact on the amenities of nearby residents and subject to the S106 requirements and appropriate conditions the proposals are considered to be acceptable.)

- (3) if a satisfactory Section 106 Agreement is not completed prior to 10 July 2009 that delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning and Regeneration Services to refuse planning permission for the following reason:

In the absence of a legal agreement or undertaking relating to the provision of children's play provision and transportation contributions the proposal is contrary to saved policies SR7, TRA11 and HOU6 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan.

10. APPLICATION NO 09/00296/F – 70 – 72 SUSSEX STREET

The Senior Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans. He pointed out that the agent had circulated a copy of the design and access statement to all members of the Committee. A further representation had been received from the Central Norwich Citizens' forum supporting the proposal; complimenting the 'unusual and ingenious' design and the designers; commenting that the development would create its own rich community without compromising security; the three rendered gables work well sculpturally but that the a light coloured

brick might work just as well as the white paint, which might be too 'overdramatic/powerful'; suggesting that the benches on the communal terrace would be better orientated east-west as opposed to north-south where they would face the rear of the new properties and suggesting tables could be introduced into this area. The Environment Agency had also made a representation and did not object to the proposal subject to conditions requiring further details of contamination and mitigation, which had already been included in the recommendations in the report.

Councillor Stephenson welcomed the contemporary approach of the design and noted that the development would have strong environmental benefits.

RESOLVED to approve Application 09/00296/F – 70 – 72 Sussex Street and grant planning permission subject to:-

- (1) the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 Agreement to include provision of contributions to child play space and transportation;
- (2) the following conditions:
 1. Standard 3 year time limit;
 2. Submission of the following details:
 - (a) Full details of the colour and finish of bricks, tiles, render, timber and curtain wall system including samples where required;
 - (b) Material, finish and colour of rainwater goods;
 - (c) Details including colour and sections through external joinery, including windows, doors, shopfront and curtain screening to glazed link element;
 - (d) Material colour and finish of gates to the parking area and bin stores;
 - (e) Details including large scale drawings and colour of canopies and porches;
 - (f) Material scale and finish of boundary treatments including privacy screens;
 3. Landscaping scheme to include hard and soft landscaping, external lighting and all boundary treatments;
 4. Scheme of landscape maintenance;
 5. Full details of cycle stands to be provided prior to first occupation and not to be used for any other purpose;
 6. Bin stores to be provided prior to first occupation and not to be used for any other purpose;
 7. Archaeological investigation, evaluation and mitigation;
 8. Full details for the provision of 10% of the sites energy from renewable or low carbon sources including a scheme for the provision of water, energy and resource efficiency measures to be submitted;
 9. Further land contamination details in the form of a preliminary risk assessment and site investigation scheme;
 10. Details of plant and/or ventilation equipment for the A2/A3 unit to be submitted;
 11. Removal of permitted development rights for the change of use of the A2/A3 unit to a retail A1 use;

(Reason for approval:- The recommendation has been made with regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application including policies ENV6, ENV7, ENG1 and WM6 of the adopted East of England Plan, saved policies NE9, HBE3, HBE8, HBE12, HBE19, EP1, EP16, EP18, EP22, HOU6, HOU13, SR7, TRA5, TRA6, TRA7, TRA8 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, PPS1, Supplement to PPS1, PPS3, PPG13, PPG15, PPG16 and other material planning considerations. The proposal is for the redevelopment of a brownfield site in a central sustainable location. The proposal accords with the development plan for the area and with Central Government Guidance. Subject to the conditions listed the proposals are considered to be acceptable.)

- (3) if a satisfactory Section 106 Agreement is not completed prior to 31 July 2009 that delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning and Regeneration Services to refuse planning permission for the following reason:

In the absence of a legal agreement or undertaking relating to the provision of children's play and transportation contributions the proposal is contrary to saved policies SR7, TRA11 and HOU6 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan.

(Councillor Llewellyn left the meeting at this point.)

11. APPLICATION NO 09/00286/F – 21 GRANGE ROAD

The Planning Team Leader presented the report with the aid of slides and plans. The modern design would have the benefit of greater insulation than traditional construction.

RESOLVED with 3 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Little and Driver) and 2 members voting against (Councillors Stephenson and Jago) to approve Application No 09/00286/F – 21 Grange Road and grant planning permission subject to the following condition:-

1. Commencement of development within three years

(Reasons for approval: The decision to grant planning permission has been taken having regard to Saved Local Plan Policies HBE12 and EP22 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan Adopted Version 2004 and to all material planning considerations. The side and rear extension is of an acceptable design, scale and massing and would not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties.)

12. APPLICATION NO 09/00323/F – 14 EATON ROAD

The Planning Team Leader presented the report with the aid of slides and plans and explained that this was partially a retrospective application. The wall was almost complete and would have coping stones on the posts. It was a similar approach to other walls in the locality and the same height as the hedge at the front of the neighbouring property.

RESOLVED with 4 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Jago, Stephenson and Driver) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Little) to approve Application No 09/00323/F – 14 Eaton Road and grant planning permission (with no conditions).

(Reasons for approval: The decision to grant planning permission has been taken having regard to saved policies TRA5, HBE12 and EP22 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan Adopted Version November 2004 and all material planning considerations. The wall and gates are of an acceptable scale and design and do not have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the surrounding area or on highway safety.)

13. APPLICATION NO 09/00340/F – 79 WHITEHALL ROAD

(Councillor Driver left the room for part of this item.)

The Planning Team Leader presented the report with the aid of slides and plans and answered questions.

RESOLVED, with 3 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Little and Stephenson), 1 member voting against (Councillor Jago) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Driver, having been absent for part of this item), to approve Application No 09/00340/F – 79 Whitehall Road and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:-

1. Commencement of development within 3 years.
2. Facing and roofing materials to match the existing house.

(Reasons for approval: The decision is made with regard to policies EP22 and HBE12 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan Adopted Version November 2004 and all material considerations. Because of its good design and high quality materials the extension will not have an adverse impact on the visual or residential amenities of the area.)

14. APPLICATION NO 09/00343/U – 5 GUARDIAN ROAD, INDUSTRIAL ESTATE

The Senior Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans. He explained that the application had been resubmitted and was before the Committee as a procedural matter and there had been no objections.

RESOLVED to approve Application No 09/00343/U – 5 Guardian Road, Industrial Estate and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

1. Use to commence within 3 years.
2. Restriction on parking spaces.

(Reasons for approval: The use is considered to broadly accord with national and regional policies and saved Local Plan policies EMP2, EMP5 and EMP 13 and, in so

doing, makes good use of a commercial unit within an industrial area, some distance from residential properties in the surrounding area.)

15. APPLICATION NO 09/00316/O – 120 SOUTHWELL ROAD

The Senior Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans and explained that this was an application for outline planning permission.

During discussion Councillor Driver pointed out that the site sloped down and that there should be no on-street parking associated with the proposal. Members noted that landscaping on the frontage of the site would improve the street scene.

RESOLVED with 3 members voting in favour (Councillors Little, Bradford and Driver) and 2 members voting against (Councillors Stephenson and Jago) to approve Application No 09/00316/O – 120 Southwell Road and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard outline time limit.
2. Reserved Matters to refer to appearance and landscaping.
3. Reserved Matters to comply with broad parameters of Design and Access Statement and indicative plans in terms of scale and footprint.
4. Access and parking as per submitted plans.
5. Bin storage details to be agreed.
6. Replacement planting.
7. Cycle storage.
8. Boundary treatment.

(Reasons for approval: It is considered that the principle of residential development of the scale and density proposed which respects its surroundings is acceptable, taking into account national and regional planning policies, together with the following saved policies contained within the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan 2004:HBE12, EP22, HOU13, TRA6, TRA7, and TRA8.)

16. APPLICATION NO 09/00240/U – 76 ST GEORGES STREET

The Planner presented the report with the aid of slides and plans and answered members' questions.

RESOLVED to approve Application No 09/00240/U – 76 St Georges Street and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:-

1. The use hereby permitted must be begun within three years of the date of this permission for Saturday dining only.
2. The courtyard terrace shall only be used by customers of the restaurant who are consuming meals and will be restricted to groups of not more than six people;
3. Setting up of the tables on the terrace will not commence before 11 am and the tables will be cleared by 4 pm. Use of the terrace by customers shall not commence before 12 noon and cease at 4 pm with last orders taken before 2.30pm.

4. The outside dining area and the placement of the tables and chairs will be confined to the area beneath the canopy and will be cordoned off and separated from the remainder of the courtyard.
5. There shall be no live or amplified music played in the courtyard.

(Reasons for approval: The proposed use of the terrace will not have a detrimental impact on residential amenity or the wider conservation area. No instances of noise disturbance have been reported to Environmental Health in the 12 month temporary period granted approval under application 08/00196/U. Therefore the proposals are considered to be in accordance with PPG24, policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan (May 2008) and saved policies HBE8, EP22, AEC1, SHO9 and SHO22 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted Version November 2004).)

17. APPLICATION NO 09/00283/F – ROTARY HOUSE, KING STREET

The Senior Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of slides and plans.

During discussion some members sympathised with the concerns of the Norwich Society that the proposed building would be too near the remains of the City Wall. Councillor Driver pointed out that the proposal was for a much needed facility.

RESOLVED with 2 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford and Driver) and 3 members abstaining (Councillors Jago, Little and Stephenson) to approve Application No 09/00283/F – Rotary House, King Street subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard time limit;
2. Compliance with the Arboricultural Implications Assessment;
3. Details and a timetable for landscaping;
4. Details of external materials including:
 - (a) Samples of bricks and roofing materials;
 - (b) Timber boarding type and colour;
 - (c) Details of colour and material for rainwater goods;
 - (d) Colour finish and sections through joinery;
 - (e) Large scale drawings of chimneys including colours and materials;
5. A programme of archaeology, evaluation, investigation and mitigation.

(Reason for approval: The recommendation has been made with regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application including policies WM6, ENV6 and ENV7 of the adopted East of England Plan (May 2008), saved policies NE9, HBE3, HBE8, HBE12, EP18, EP22, HOU13, TRA6, TRA7, TRA8 and TRA9 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (November 2004), PPS1, Supplement to PPS1, PPS3, PPG13, PPG15 and PPG16 and other material considerations. The proposal are considered to be an appropriate form of development providing 4 sheltered housing flats, subject to conditions it is not considered that the proposals would have an adverse impact on neighbour amenity, the surrounding Conservation Area, City Wall or trees adjacent to the site. The proposals are therefore considered to comply with Development Plan Policy.)

CHAIR