

Planning Applications Committee: 13 October 2016

Updates to reports

Application 16/00606/F Item 4 (a) page 31

Further Representation:

One late representation has been made in support of the application:

- “I wish to support the application for the Lidl supermarket development at 297 Aylsham Road, Norwich. I regularly shop at the present Lidl supermarket further along Aylsham Road but it has become evident that this particular store is now too small. The proposed site already has planning permission for a food store by Morrison's but due to recent trading conditions the company will no longer develop the site.

The proposed site has been in a derelict state for a number of years since G J Goff's vacated it and this is now an excellent opportunity to put the site to good use where it will benefit the local community. I am of the considered opinion that if this development does not get the go ahead then it will remain in a derelict state and an eyesore for many years to come.

I therefore urge the Planning Committee at Norwich City Council to approve this application.”

Application 16/00456/F Item 4 (b) page 61

Further Representation:

- Thank you for spending the time to take me through the councils views in respect of the application of the approved policy requirements of the above application ... the current policy applicable to conservation areas for preserving and enhancing views of citywide and local landmarks is as stated by the Council in its Conservation Area Appraisal - policies and guidelines Section C Views and Landmarks Part 2 Preserving and enhancing views of citywide and local landmarks:
“Redevelopment proposals which will block or detrimentally affect views of the citywide landmarks, i.e. the Castle, the Anglican Cathedral, Roman Catholic Cathedral, St Peter Mancroft, City Hall and St Giles’ Church, will not be approved.”
- The local landmarks are quite different in that they will not be approved unless there are over-riding public benefits arising from the proposed development or compensatory views of the local landmark can be created elsewhere. It appears to me that the City Councils Planning Policy currently requires development proposals which will block or detrimentally affect views of the citywide landmarks to be rejected. In circumstances where both the Applicant and the Council accept that the proposed development will block and

detrimentally affect views of citywide landmarks namely the Roman Catholic Cathedral, and the City Hall I therefore invite you to use your delegated powers to confirm the City Councils Policies as detailed above and to refuse the above application ... and that this matter will no longer expend valuable resources and costs by you presenting a totally unmerited case before the Planning Committee on Thursday

Response:

- The appraisal document should be read in context with other Local Plan policies. Page 32 of the document advises that the significance of each area establishes how each 'policy' in this document is applied to each character area. In areas of higher significance, the emphasis is generally on protecting and enhancing the quality, whilst in areas of lower significance, the emphasis is on positive regeneration, promoting the reconstruction of the areas and using good design to increase the quality of the environment. The northern riverside character area scores 11 and is placed 3rd out of 4 categories of significance within the document.
- In terms of negative landmarks, such as this site, the document suggests development which involves cladding them in more appropriate materials, remodelling them to improve their appearance and silhouette, or ideally, their demolition and appropriate redevelopment will be encouraged.
- The area has undergone significant redevelopment and change in recent years and related changes to views have therefore occurred in promoting development with the current proposal being seen as part of that regeneration. Views of local landmarks are retained and in some instances reframed and the largest impact will be a loss of view of the Cathedral from a small section of the riverside. Further consideration of this issue is set out within main issue 2, 3 and 5 of the report and on balance, and given relevant consultee responses, the proposal is considered to be an appropriate form of development within a highly sustainable location and increases much needed housing availability within the area.

Further Representation:

- I have looked for and not been able to locate on your web site the applicants Viability Assessment. This is a document that you and the policies require submitted and given that you have made a decision on such matters is clearly available but not on the web site could you please forward me a copy without delay ... Your SPD is specific as to what you require and I am happy to receive that information suitably redacted where commercially sensitive. Also the basis of your decision of 10% contribution is this the value of 1 house 4 houses or what is it?

Response:

- A viability assessment has been produced by the applicant and reviewed by officers. The agent has indicated that the information contained is commercially sensitive and asked that the document is not released. They have provided a written explanation for their position and asked that this letter is released to the local resident. A copy of this letter has been placed on public access and also forwarded on to the resident.

- With the initial assessment questions were put to the applicant to ask for a review of affordable housing values providing a sense check with local registered providers (RP) that the assumed level of receipt are realistic; Marketing and sales agent fees in relation to affordable housing dwellings and private dwellings; CIL exemption for affordable housing to be factored in; Cash flow, with interim payments from RP's which would help cash flow and reduce interest rather than the RP will pay on completion; Profit levels with a reduced profit level on affordable housing dwellings and review of market level profit. The DV Typical assumption is likely at 6% profit on GDV for affordable dwellings. An updated viability report has been produced, including revisions to figures, which indicate that if providing for affordable housing the scheme would be unviable at the revised profit levels. The senior housing development officer has confirmed that the assessment is sound.
- Further negotiation has taken place with the applicant on what may be achievable either on site or as a commuted sum within the context of the offsetting allowances within the vacant building credit (VBC) and calculations in line with our Affordable Housing SPD. Calculations are:-

Total GIFA = 3603m²
 Vacant Building Credit = 1585 m²
 Net Floor Space after VBC = 2018 m²

Max affordable housing requirement
 On site
 $2018 / 3603 \times 0.33 = 18.48\%$ requirement
 $42 \text{ units} \times 0.1848 = 7.76 = 8 \text{ units of affordable housing on site}$

Commutated sum
 $3603 \times 0.1848 \times \text{£}1083.66 + \text{£}1000 = \text{£}722,538.11$

- A 10% threshold in line with some other developments that have been approved in the recent past was negotiated. Using the net floor space after VBC a 10% amount was then applied to this to calculate:-

10% (floor space) on site
 $2018 \text{ m}^2 \times 0.1 = 201 \text{ m}^2 = 4 \text{ units of affordable housing on site (4 x 50 m}^2 \text{ 1-bed flats)}$

10% (floor space) commuted sum
 $2018 \times 0.1 \times \text{£}1083.66 + \text{£}1000 = \text{£}219,682.59$

- A further revised viability assessment has been received to show how the provision/contribution would be balanced within the applicant's overall forecasts for the development of the site e.g. accepting a reduced level of % profit and thereby demonstrating that they are comfortable with the level of affordable housing that they can offer, either on site or as a commuted sum.
- The council has no reason to believe that the revised assessments within the report are not accurate and the negotiated off-site contribution together with proposed review mechanisms within a S106 agreement are considered

reasonable and proportionate in providing for affordable housing in line with current policy.

Agent response to information request:

Circulated with late additions document and available on public access

Neighbour response:

"I note that the applicant has replied in respect of his Viability Assessment and is claiming that it is all sensitive and therefore not available for public access. Given that he suggests that such a document has been available since his first application he complains that my request is late. I was not aware that any statement had been submitted as details of it was not posted on your web until your report was available last week. You will be aware that in accordance with your SPD the information required in many instances is not commercially sensitive and the Applicant had the opportunity to submit for public viewing a redacted version of any matters he felt should not be disclosed. Given his now comments he clearly submitted an unqualified version and cannot now retrospectively claim privilege. Please therefore have a copy of the unreacted Assessment for me this morning."

Application 16/00759/F
Item 4 (c) page 95

Further consultation response: The Norwich Society

The same roof height onto Unthank Road should be retained, and we would much prefer that the existing Burrell's building be converted rather than demolished.

Response:

Please see Main Issue 1 (p101) of the report for consideration of these issues.

Erratum:

Page 95 should now state that there are 14 objections, 1 petition and 1 comment. One contributor wrote in twice and both objections were previously counted separately.

Paragraph 27 should now read:

"The proposed residential unit exceeds the national minimum internal space standards and benefits from outdoor external private amenity space. The position of windows has the potential to result in overlooking of what are thought to be habitable rooms on the first floor of No. 135, however a condition has been included requiring side elevation windows to be obscure glazed to reduce this impact. The proposal does have the potential to result in loss of light and outlook to these neighbouring windows as the proposed building is of a greater depth than the existing, however an approximately 3.00-4.00m gap will be maintained between the two buildings."

Application 16/01117/F
Item 4 (d) page 109

Two further letter of objection received raising the following concerns:

- Impact on highways safety due to the displacement of cars onto the street, concern at the cumulative impact with a proposal in Hanover Road, lack of accessibility for delivery drivers, the reduction of parking for the proposed development, lack of provision of a turning circle,

Response:

- As detailed in the report (main issue 3) the proposal does not cause concern on the ground of highways safety. No application has been received to date for the site in Hanover Road, although it is understood that one may be forthcoming in the near future.
- With regard to the cumulative impact of this proposal and other planned developments, members of planning committee must determine which is of greater priority; parking or housing. In planning policy terms it is clear that housing should be the greater priority. In any event, it is believed that there is sufficient capacity in terms of on-street parking in the area to absorb the cars that would be displaced as a result of the proposed development.
- With regard to the reduction in parking spaces for the proposed development, see main issue 3 – the level of parking complies with the Council's parking standards set out in the Local Plan.

Application 16/01109/F
Item 4(f) page 133

One further letter of objection received, concerns about loss of parking and increased parking pressure.

Response: See main issues 3 and 4.

Application 16/01121/F
Item 4(h) page 157

Amended proposed site plan received which now includes communal bin store to serve adjacent flats.

Correction to 'Summary information' table within Committee report: References to Armes Street are in error and should refer to Quebec Road. In addition there is no bin presentation area proposed.

Application 16/01115/F
Item 4(i) page 169

Representation from the Norwich Society:

We suggest that the level of objection for this site and similar others should be considered individually. We are in favour of the development in principle but the parking needs of each area need to be taken into account.

Four further representations received, objecting on the grounds of increased parking pressure on surrounding roads including Hollis Lane, Ashby Street and Kings Lane.

Response:

- The traffic survey submitted with the application indicates that the car park is full to capacity or close to capacity during the night time when it was surveyed on 4 occasions between 23.30 and 00.30. During the daytime the occupancy fell to 50% and 61% at the time of survey.
- The development has been designed to be car-free therefore maximising the number of parking spaces available to existing residents and the information provided by NCC Housing team is that steps have been taken to provide alternative garages for existing tenants. This matter is also dealt with in main issue 4.

Telereal Trillium
140 London Wall London EC2Y 5DN
T +44 (0)20 7796 5500
F +44 (0)20 7769 5501

Info@telerealtrillium.com
www.telerealtrillium.com



Mr Lee Cook
Norwich City Council

By email : leecook@norwich.gov.uk

12 October 2016

Dear Lee

70 Westwick Street: Application Ref:16/00456/F

We refer to your email of 10 October 2016 to our planning agent Lanpro. We note that you have received a request from a member of the public who is a local resident requesting a copy (redacted) of our viability assessment that accompanies the application.

Given that the application has been valid since the 30th March 2016 and as such that viability assessment was required to validate the application we find it curious that such a request for it has now been made 3 days in advance of the Planning Committee. This gives us very little time to go through complex and sensitive documentation to consider what, if any, information can go into the public domain and what should be redacted.

In any event, as you will be aware applicants / developers are not obliged to publish viability information. In respect of this application, the majority of the inputs are commercial in nature and in particular build costs, anticipated sales receipts, profit and cost of finance are all sensitive and bespoke to Telereal Trillium. If these were made public it would negatively impact our ability to deliver the scheme against other competing developments and developers within both Norwich and rest of the U.K. The key objection to releasing this information is that it will negatively impact upon the competitive tender process and provide competing developers and developments within Norwich an advantage knowing our pricing per unit at this stage.

The viability assessment has been prepared by professional property consultants Savills adopting a well-established toolkit viability assessment methodology recognised by the industry including RICS. This viability information has been assessed by Planning and Housing officers of the Council and informed your recommendation to Committee. I would highlight that the viability assessment of this scheme shows that under normal circumstances with a standard developer profit gained, the development would be unable to deliver any affordable housing. However, we recognise the importance of the City being able to achieve the delivery of both public and private sector housing and have taken the positive step to make a financial contribution via S106 equivalent to a 10% affordable housing contribution, through reduced profit levels on the scheme.

We would be grateful if you could pass our letter on to the local resident in question and request that in addition that you confirm to them that the Council are fully satisfied with all of the appraisal inputs,

(cont / 2)

its conclusion and in particular the positive steps made by the applicant to provide 10% affordable housing contribution.

Yours sincerely



James Bradbury
Development and Disposals Manager
Telereal Trillum
james.bradbury@telerealtrillum.com