



## MINUTES

### PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

**10.00 a.m. – 12.50 p.m.**

**8 January 2009**

**Present:** Councillors Bradford (Chair), Llewellyn (Vice-Chair), Banham, Bearman, Driver, George, Lay, Little (S), Lubbock and Stephenson

**Apologies:** Councillor Collishaw

#### **1. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2008.

#### **2. APPLICATION NO 08/01063/F – 216 NEWMARKET ROAD**

**RESOLVED** to note that Application No 08/01063/F – 216 Newmarket Road had been withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

#### **3. APPLICATION NO 08/01202/F – 156 ST CLEMENTS HILL**

**RESOLVED**, having considered the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration Services, to approve Application No 08/01202/F – 156 St Clements Hill and grant planning permission subject to the following condition:

1. The development must begin within three years of the date of this permission.

(Reason for Approval: The decision is made with regard to policy HBE12 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan Adopted Version November 2004 and all material considerations. The enlargement of the window into the landing will have minimal impact on neighbouring properties as there is already a window in the side elevation in this position.)

#### **4. APPLICATION NO 08/00830/F – LAND ADJACENT TO AND SOUTH EAST OF SILKFIELDS**

The Planning Team Leader (Development) (Inner) presented the report with the aid of slides, plans and an aerial photograph and circulated a letter from the architect responding to the issues raised during the consultation and notes on energy efficiency. The Planning Team Leader and the Planning Development Manager answered members' questions. Members were advised that the issues relating to

the loss of the so called 'green space' and the lack of nearby facilities had been discussed in relation to the previous refused application and that it was agreed that a refusal on these grounds could not be substantiated. As a result the application had been refused on the basis that the scheme failed the sequential test. This objection by the Environment Agency had now been removed in relation to this new scheme.

Two residents of Silkfields then addressed the Committee outlining their objections to the development which included concerns loss of amenity; about possible flooding and that it would exacerbate existing problems with surface drainage and waterlogging; lack of turning space for emergency vehicles; storage of construction materials and turning space for emergency vehicles. Councillor Holmes, Ward Councillor for Mancroft Ward, then addressed the Committee and said that the site was not suitable for development because it was green space; there were no nearby facilities such as shops and the only change to this and the previous application was the application of the sequential test following a change in the rules of how this was applied.

The architect then responded on behalf of the applicants and pointed out that the land was designated in the Local Plan for development for housing: the problem of drainage in Silkfields could be dealt with but that this development would not contribute to the problem and would use rain water harvesting; would be of higher energy efficiency standards.

Discussion ensued in which members were advised that the density of the site was similar to that of the adjacent Hopkins Homes development. Members also considered the loss of amenity value to the residents and it was noted that there was seating around the Silkfields complex and in the centre but not on the site to be developed. Members were also advised that the issue of drainage on the site would not be compromised by the development which would implement rain water harvesting and have to comply with Building Regulations.

**RESOLVED** with 3 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Lubbock and Driver), 2 members voting against (Councillors Stephenson and George) and 5 members abstaining (Councillors Banham, Lay, Bearman, Llewellyn and Little) to approve Application No 08/00830/F – land adjacent to and south east of Silkfields and approve planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement within 3 years;
2. Samples of materials;
3. Boundary walls and fences;
4. Prior details to include
  - a) Windows, roof windows, doors, eaves;
  - b) Water drainage goods; dormers;
  - c) Cupola,
  - d) Rainwater harvesting apparatus.
5. Archaeology
6. Minimum finished floor levels;
7. Flood plan
8. Landscaping
9. Tree root protection;
10. Cycle and refuse storage.

(Reasons for Approval: The proposals are consistent with policies SS1 and ENV7 of the adopted East of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy, 'saved' policies HOU5, HOU12 A25, HBE3, HBE8, EP13, TRA9 and EP22 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (adopted November 2004), PPS1 and 25 and all material considerations.)

## **5. APPLICATION NO 08/00812/F – 6A ALBION WAY**

The Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. Members were advised that additional comments had been received from the County Council relating to the need for a travel plan and the reasons for refusal had been amended. The Senior Transport Planner was in attendance to respond to questions.

The agent then addressed the Committee and suggested that there could be further discussion with officers relating to the transport plan and that the proposal would put the retail unit, which was currently vacant, back into use. The Planning Development Manager explained that it was necessary to determine the application at this meeting in order to fulfil performance targets. Refusal of this application would allow more time for discussions with the applicants and there would be no fee for a second application.

During discussion the majority of members acknowledged the current problems with traffic and parking in this area and the need for a coherent approach to car parking at the Riverside Retail Centre. Members were advised that the proposal was for an increase in retail floor space that was greater than the size of the supermarket at Eaton and that this would have an impact on the parking in the area. It was considered not unreasonable to take the opportunity to address these issues with the applicant.

**RESOLVED**, with 8 members voting in favour (Councillors Lubbock, Banham, Lay, Stephenson, Bearman, Llewellyn, Little and George), 1 member voting against (Councillor Driver) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Bradford) to refuse planning permission for no 08/00812/F – 6A Albion Way for the following reasons:

1. The Travel Plan fails to meet the objectives of PPG13 as it does not adequately reduce the amount of free parking provision, promote sustainable methods of transport or address the mitigation measures required in order to alleviate the detrimental transport impact this proposal would have on the site and strategic highway. The proposals are therefore considered to be contrary to saved policies TRA10, TRA11, TRA12 and TRA21 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted Version November 2004) and policies T2 and T14 of the East of England Plan (May 2008) and the objectives of PPG13.
2. In the absence of a transport contribution the proposal submitted is not considered to be in accordance with saved policy TRA10 and TRA11 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted Version November 2004) which state that contributions should be paid for transport improvements required directly as a consequence of proposals both on site and in the wider area. The proposals are therefore considered to be contrary to saved policies TRA10 and TRA11 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (Adopted Version November 2004) and the objectives of PPG13.

## **6. APPLICATION NO 08/01216/U – THE SUNLIGHT SERVICE GROUP LTD**

The Senior Planner (Development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. A further letter from the applicant in support of the application, which explained the background to the company and the rationale of their car parks, had been received. The letter included the following points: lack of available parking in the city centre and that this discouraged consumers from being able to readily access the city centre at their convenience; the need for compromises in the current economic climate; that particularly over the Christmas periods high profile car parks had been under pressure; that operators should be able to provide parking at tariffs appropriate and sustainable for the location; and that the aim of the company was to provide additional sites to complement existing sites. In response the Senior Planner said that the background of the applicant was not relevant to the determination of the application and that the other comments had been addressed in the report. Members were advised that for the avoidance of doubt the second recommendation for both this application and the one for land adjacent to the Novi Sad bridge should be amended by the addition of 'and authorise the taking of legal proceedings including prosecution if necessary'.

The applicant then addressed the Committee in support of this application and the one for the land adjacent to the Novi Sad bridge, in which he considered that there was a demand for additional parking in the city and that retailers were under pressure in the current economic climate. He pointed out that the proposal was for temporary consent.

Discussion ensued in which Councillor Lubbock pointed out that there was sufficient car parking in the city and that this application undermined the County Council's park and ride scheme. Councillor Llewellyn said that consent should have been sought before the car parks had been set up.

### **RESOLVED to:-**

- (1) refuse planning permission for Application No 08/01216/U – The Sunlight Service Group Ltd for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed temporary car park would undermine the transportation strategy for Norwich to promote a shift of modal choice from the car to walking, cycling and public transport and as such would be contrary to saved policies TRA3, TRA21, TRA22 and TRA24 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan and the objectives of PPS1, PPG13 and the Norwich Area Transport Strategy.
2. The proposed temporary car park would have a negative impact on the character of the surrounding City Centre Conservation Area contrary to saved policy HBE8 of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, policy ENV7 of the adopted East of England Plan and the objectives of PPG15.

- (2) authorise enforcement action under S172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure the cessation of the unauthorised use and authorise the taking of legal proceedings including prosecution if necessary.

## **7. APPLICATION NO 08/01226/F – LAND ADJACENT TO NOVI SAD BRIDGE, WHERRY ROAD**

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

**RESOLVED to:-**

- (1) refuse planning permission for Application No 08/01216/F – Land adjacent to Novi Sad Bridge, Wherry Road for the following reasons:-
  1. The proposed temporary car park would undermine the transportation strategy for Norwich to promote a shift of modal choice from the car to walking, cycling and public transport and as such would be contrary to saved policies TRA3, TRA21, TRA22 and TRA24 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan and the objectives of PPS1, PPG13 and the Norwich Area Transport Strategy.
- (2) authorise enforcement action under S172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure the cessation of the unauthorised use and authorise the taking of legal proceedings including prosecution if necessary.

**8. APPLICATION NO 08/00907/F – HALDIN HOUSE, OLD BANK OF ENGLAND COURT**

The Planner presented the report with the aid of slides and together with the Planning Development Manager answered members' questions.

**RESOLVED**, with 9 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Lubbock, Banham, Lay, Stephenson, Bearman, Llewellyn, Little and George), 0 members voting against and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Driver) to approve Application No 08/00907/F – Haldin House, Old Bank of England Court and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Precise details of material, colour and finish of door frame to be submitted.

(Reasons for Approval: By virtue of the location of the proposed doorway to the north of the covered alleyway in a less visible location and visually detached from the adjacent listed building, the proposed doorway is not considered to have an adverse impact on the character of setting of the Conservation Area. The proposed development is therefore considered to be in accordance with saved policies HBE8, HBE9 and HBE12 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, Adopted Version (November 2004) and Planning Policy Guidance 15.)

**9. APPLICATION NO 08/0095/L – ANGLIA RAILWAYS LTD, NORWICH RAILWAY STATION**

The Planner presented the report with the aid of plans, slides and a computer generated of the proposals for the ticket barrier if implemented. A further letter of representation had been received concerned about the impact on the building; the function of the barriers and the installation of software; and that the works were not justified. The proposal was for listed building consent and full planning permission was not required. The Senior Planner and the Planning Development Manager

answered questions. Members were advised that the station building had changed a lot during its history and referred to the shopping kiosks and developments at other main line stations, such as Liverpool Street and Paddington. The proposal was a modern interpretation of ticket barriers and two-thirds of the concourse would remain accessible to the general public. The proposals were the result of long discussions with the applicants.

Discussion ensued in which some members expressed concern that the barrier would be visually intrusive and detrimental to the fabric of the building. Councillor Bearman suggested that the barrier would be less intrusive if barriers were provided to each platform but it was suggested that this would hinder passengers who had inadvertently gone on to the wrong one. The barrier would make it difficult to see vulnerable people and larger items such as bicycles onto trains. Those members who supported the proposals considered that the barrier was important for the functioning of a modern city railway station and would improve security, crowd control and ticket collection. It was pointed out that a guard would be available at the barrier to assist passengers. There was some concern about the left side angle of the barrier and that the toilets would only be available to passengers.

Councillor Bearman moved and Councillor Little seconded that the application should be refused as the proposals for the barrier in relation to its location were contrary to the design and character of the building.

**RESOLVED**, with 3 members voting in favour (Councillors Stephenson, Bearman and Little), 6 members voting against (Councillors Bradford, Lubbock, Lay, Llewellyn, George and Driver) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Banham) the amendment to refuse the application was lost.

The officers' recommendations were then moved and it was:-

**RESOLVED**, with 6 members voting in favour (Councillors Bradford, Lubbock, Lay, Llewellyn, George and Driver) 3 members voting against (Councillors Stephenson, Bearman and Little) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Banham) to approve Application No 08/0095/L – Anglia Railways Ltd, Norwich Railway Station listed building consent, subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit.
2. CCTV equipment to be removed if no longer required for use.

(Reasons for Approval: The proposed ticket barriers, vehicle gate, metal gate, fencing and CCTV are considered to be required for the safe and efficient operation of the use of the building. The proposed works are also considered to have a minimal impact on the historic fabric, character and setting of the Grade II listed building, by virtue of the proposed designs, uses of materials and siting of the works. The proposed works are therefore considered to be in accordance with saved policy HBE9 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan, Adopted Version (November 2004), policy ENV6 of the East of England Plan (May 2008) and Planning Policy Guidance 15.)

CHAIR