



**Planning applications committee**

**11:15 to 13:15 and 13:50 to 16:55**

**13 June 2019**

Present: Councillors Driver (chair), Maxwell (vice chair following appointment), Bogelein, Button, Huntley, Peek, Neale, Sarmezey, Stutely, Utton and Wright

Apologies: Councillors Ryan and Sands (M)

(Agendas for the meeting were published in two parts for the sessions at 10:45 and 13:15.)

(All members listed as present above had attended the site visit to Eaton Chase/Ryrie Court at 9:30 that morning. The chair apologised to members of the public for the delay in the start of the meeting because of the site visit.)

**1. Appointment of Vice Chair**

**RESOLVED** to appoint Councillor Maxwell, as vice chair for the ensuing civic year.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Stutely declared an other interest in items 4 and 5 (below), Application no 18/01190/O - The Bungalow, Eaton Chase, Norwich, NR4 7QW and Tree Preservation Order, 2014, because he resided in the area.

Councillor Utton declared a predetermined view in item 15 (below), Applications 19/00381/L - Norwich School Refectory, The Close, Norwich, NR1 4DD and 19/00403/F - Norwich School Refectory, The Close, Norwich, NR1 4DD, because he had objected to the planning application.

**3. Minutes**

**RESOLVED** to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meetings held on 9 May 2019, subject to the following amendments in relation to item 4, Application no 18/01190/O – The Bungalow, Eaton Chase, Norwich, NR4 7QW, third paragraph, second sentence, deleting “Ryrie Court” and replacing with “the new development”; and last sentence of the paragraph, deleting “traffic management statement” and replacing with “transport for assessment”.

**4. Application no 18/01190/O – The Bungalow, Eaton Chase, Norwich, NR4 7QW**

(Councillor Stutely had declared an interest in this item.)

The area development manager (outer) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. He also referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports, which was circulated at the meeting, containing summaries of an additional representation from a local resident in support of the scheme and additional information from the applicant, and the officer response. It was proposed to amend condition 9 to seek to require details and provision of signage to explain that parking would be controlled within Ryrie Court, surface detail for the access and any upgrade to surfacing along the access route which might be required to ensure its suitability for use.

Five local residents addressed the committee with their objections to the proposed scheme. Their concerns include: that variations to the tree preservation order should have been agreed before consideration of the redevelopment of the site; that residents had collected data on the number of vehicle movements to Ryrie Court on a daily basis and were concerned that the new houses would generate more vehicle movements from residents, their visitors and service vehicles; that the development did not provide housing across the population spectrum and contained no social housing; that it was outline planning permission and that various conditions could be considered to “further reduce any possible amenity impacts”; concern about the layout and scale of the development on the site and proximity to neighbouring residents would result in overlooking of neighbouring properties; that the development of five houses did not merit the loss of the existing woodland and the increased traffic through Ryrie Court; concern that it would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the residents of Ryrie Court sheltered housing scheme, many of whom were disabled or vulnerable; that the applicant did not have a historic right of way and that the access through Ryrie Court was under dispute; Concern about noise and congestion in Ryrie Court from construction traffic and **if access from Pettus Road to Ryrie Court closed**<sup>1</sup>, many residents would not be able to access the nearest bus stop; that members visited Blakeney Close which was west of the application site; concern about loss of natural habitat of species worthy of protection and pointing out that the site had been designated as woodland; that the site was greenfield not brownfield and that there were other sites for housing which were more suitable. Councillor Lubbock, Eaton ward councillor, then commented that she considered that the access through Ryrie Court was inappropriate because it was on a 90 degree angle to Pettus Road, which already had yellow lines, and was only 3 metres wide; that the residents of the 36 units at Ryrie Court shared the parking bays in the car park and that these were used by doctors, deliveries and visitors; that there was no room for refuse vehicles servicing the new houses to turn around in Ryrie Court; that Ryrie Court was not adopted and unsuitable for heavy through traffic; that the city council as landlord had not responded on behalf of the residents of Ryrie Court and that it was willing to allow access through the car park without considering the loss of amenity to its tenants.

The agent replied on behalf of the applicant. The current application was the result of positive feedback from the planners and a sensitive response to the issues raised by local residents, in relation to the tree preservation order, ecology and access. The applicant had acquired the right of way through Ryrie Court. Parking provision for the four houses was higher than would be expected for that part of the city with 2 spaces for each house and 2 additional visitor parking spaces. The existing arrangements on Ryrie Court car park would be unaffected. There had been

---

<sup>1</sup> Minutes approved by committee on 11 July 2019 subject to insertion of “if access from Pettus Road to Ryrie Court Closed” and correction of road name to Blakeney Close.

discussions with the council's arboricultural officer regarding the protection of the specific trees.

The area development manager (outer) referred to the report and responded to the issues raised by the speakers. In planning terms the historic right of way to the former bungalow through Ryrie Court was irrelevant in considering this application. The area development manager (outer) in reply to a member's question said that for consistency all comments received from the public were summarised in the report and this explained why, despite not being material to the planning application, the comments on the legal right of way through Ryrie Court had been included in the reports.

The lead arboricultural officer answered member's questions and said that there had been a lack of tree management on the site. The discharge of the condition to replace trees following removal work in 2017 had not taken place and was required. The proposal to revoke the existing tree protection order would ensure the protection of individual trees on the site, including a veteran Oak tree whose roots were compromised by its proximity to the existing bungalow. She explained the trees that would be retained under the proposal and that residents in Pettus Road had indicated that they supported the removal of 2 Sycamore trees backing on to their gardens. She confirmed that there was a lot of scope on the site for 25 replacement trees. She also said that a woodland tree preservation order did not adequately protect individual trees or ensure proper maintenance and that the order should list each tree individual tree on the site.

(The lead arboricultural officer left the meeting at this point.)

The area development officer (outer) and the planner then referred to the report and answered members' questions regarding access to the site through Ryrie Court and the concerns expressed from residents of the sheltered housing scheme about construction traffic and that the vehicle movements to the four houses would not adversely affect the current situation. He said that it would be possible to condition that construction traffic only entered the site through the Eaton Chase access. The planner answered questions about the ecology of the site and measures to protect wildlife on the site and explained that there would be further details at the reserved matters stage. The area development officer (outer) said that the proximity of the scheme to neighbouring properties was not unusual for this part of the city. The layout of the site and details, such as the design of the buildings and positioning of windows, would be determined at the reserved matters stage.

(The committee adjourned for a short break at this point. The committee reconvened with all members as listed above as present.)

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations as set out in the report and as amended in relation to condition 9.

Discussion ensued in which members commented on the planning application. A member said that he considered that the scheme was acceptable provided that construction vehicles accessed the site through Eaton Chase to protect the amenity of the residents of Ryrie Court.

A member said that he considered that the interests of the residents of the sheltered housing scheme were protected under the legislation and that he was concerned about the council's transferral of rights of access to the applicant and the amenity loss to residents in granting permanent access to the development site.

A member spoke against the proposal to revoke the woodland tree protection order for the site, citing development management policies to protect the trees, and her concern about the impact on its ecology and wildlife. Other members said that they were satisfied on this point as individual trees would be protected and the landscaping and ecology on the site would be improved.

Discussion ensued on arrangements for construction traffic. Members were advised of the options for construction access to the site and that it would be reasonable to condition that construction traffic entered the development site via Eaton Chase and Unthank Road. The dwellings on Eaton Chase were further back from the road and construction traffic would not have as great an impact as on the tenants of the sheltered housing scheme, whose dwellings backed onto Ryrie Court. Members were reassured that considerate construction management would be in place and could be enforced by environmental protection or as a breach of a planning condition notice. Members were keen to ensure that there was no ambiguity and that all construction traffic went through Eaton Chase but appreciated that for practical reasons there could be an eventuality where Ryrie Court would need to be used. The area development manager (outer) confirmed that the developers would need to agree a construction management plan prior to the commencement and that if necessary a variation in condition could be applied for. Councillor Stutely moved and Councillor Button seconded that condition 10 should be amended to ensure that construction traffic could only access the site via Eaton Chase, Unthank Road, and with 8 members voting in favour (Councillors Maxwell, Button, Huntley, Neale, Bogelein, Sarmezey, Stutely and Utton), 1 member voting against (Councillor Peek) and 2 members abstaining from voting (Councillors Driver and Wright) the amendment was carried.

The chair moved the recommendations as amended, seconded by the vice chair.

Councillor Wright, Eaton ward councillor, stated that he would be voting against the application because of his concerns about the loss of residential amenity due to the access arrangements and environment.

A member said that he considered that this was a finely balanced application and that he would be voting in favour.

**RESOLVED** with 8 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Maxwell, Button, Neale, Peek, Sarmezey, Stutely and Utton) and 3 members voting against (Councillors Wright, Huntley and Bogelein) to approve application no. 18/01190/O - The Bungalow Eaton Chase Norwich NR4 7QW and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit for outline consents;
2. Reserved matters to relate to appearance and landscaping;
3. In accordance with plans;
4. Details of sustainable urban drainage scheme;
5. Protection of birds during nesting season;

6. Details of updated ecological survey and proposed enhancement
7. Details of external lighting;
8. Details of car parking, electric vehicle charging points, cycle storage, bin stores, access / mews road surface;
9. Details of parking control, alterations and management scheme for Ryrrie Court, to include details of signage, surface detail for the access and any upgrade to the surfacing along the access route;
10. Details of Construction Management Scheme, including road condition survey; and to ensure that construction vehicles only enter the site via Eaton Chase, Unthank Road;
11. Tree officer site meeting;
12. Detail of arboricultural information;
13. Compliance with Arboricultural Implications Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statements etc. and Tree Protection Scheme implemented prior to commencement;
14. Siting of services within protected areas;
15. Retention of tree protection - no changes etc. in ground levels within root protection areas / construction exclusion zones
16. Removal of PD rights for extensions, alterations and roof alterations;
17. Garages to be retained for parking purposes only and not converted;
18. Water efficiency measures to comply with latest standards;
19. Cessation of works if unknown contaminants found and submit details of remediation;
20. Details of testing and/or suitable compliance of all imported material prior to occupation.

#### Informatives

1. Considerate constructors;
2. Dealing with asbestos;
3. Impact on wildlife – protected species;
4. Note of TPO;
5. Land ownership;
6. Highways contacts, street naming and numbering, design note, works within the highway etc.;
7. Street Works Network officer comments.

#### Article 35 (2) statement

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations, following negotiations with the applicant and subsequent amendments the application has been approved subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

#### **5. Tree Preservation Order (TPO), 2014, City of Norwich No 467: The Bungalow, Eaton Chase, NR4 7QW**

The area development manager (outer) presented the report.

A member said that he welcomed the proposal to remove the Sycamore trees, replanting with more appropriate species, and to improve the environment and biodiversity of the site.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to revoke woodland Tree Preservation Order (TPO), 2014, City of Norwich No 467: The Bungalow, Eaton Chase, NR4 7QW and immediately reserve individual and groups of trees listed on this site.

(The committee adjourned for lunch at this point and reconvened at 13:50 with all members listed above as present.)

## **6. Application no 18/01766/O - 174 Newmarket Road, Norwich, NR4 6AR**

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

Two local residents addressed the committee with their objections to the scheme including concern about the use of the driveway and the detrimental impact of vehicular noise and traffic fumes on the amenity of their gardens. They also considered that the proposal did affect the conservation area despite not being visible from the public realm. Councillor Ackroyd, Eaton ward councillor, addressed the committee and said that the proposal would impact on the neighbouring house and the houses in Wentworth Green, where the rear gardens back on to this site, because of its proximity (22 metres from the first house in Wentworth Green); that the proposal would set a precedent this side of Newmarket Road; was harmful to the natural wildlife and would result in the loss of a green area within the conservation area.

(For clarification, the planner referred to the report and explained that the driveway was accessible to emergency vehicles and that vegetation and an acoustic fence would provide a buffer to help to reduce noise and car lights at the neighbouring properties. At its nearest point, the access road was approximately 5 metres from the Western boundary fence. In reply to a member's question, the planner outlined that the site had recently been sold and the local planning authority had not received instruction to withdraw the application and therefore it must still be determined.)

The agent addressed the committee and said that this was an outline planning application and that the plans showing the location of the house were indicative. He confirmed that the site had been sold and that the intention was to implement planning consent in due course.

Discussion ensued in which the planner and the area development manager (outer) referred to the report and answered members' questions regarding the planning history of the site; boundary treatments and impact on biodiversity from the removal of trees on the site and that replacement planting would be required. The committee was advised that replacement tree planting would be secured via a separate process with the tree officers in order that the replacement tree planting was secured in the event that the planning permission was not implemented. The committee was also advised that 7 to 8 vehicle movements to the new dwelling were not unreasonable. Some members were concerned about the loss of amenity to 174 Newmarket Road and were advised that the previous application had been submitted by its owner and there was sufficient garden space remaining at that property. The committee was also advised of the differences between the previously submitted application and the current application.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations as set out in the report.

Discussion ensued in which some members commented that this site was a distance from the neighbouring properties and a good use of space and land. Other members commented that development of brownfield sites was preferable to the division of a garden but with no specific policy it was not a material planning consideration for refusal.

Councillor Wright, Eaton Ward councillor, said that he disagreed that the subdivision of this garden in a conservation area was not grounds for refusal. He considered that the proposal was detrimental to residential amenity and that it contravened local planning policy DM2.

**RESOLVED**, with 8 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Maxwell, Neale, Peek, Bogelein, Sarmezey, Stutely and Utton), 2 members voting against (Councillors Wright and Huntley) and 1 member abstaining from voting (Councillor Button) to approve application no. 18/01766/O - 174 Newmarket Road, Norwich, NR4 6AR and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Outline time limit and submission of reserved matters;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Reserved matters application to include an updated arboricultural impact assessment, method statement and tree protection plan, notwithstanding the information submitted.
4. No dig construction of access;
5. Pre-development site meeting with the council's arborist;
6. Surface water drainage proposals to be provided at reserved matters stage;
7. Bin/bike stores details and provision;
8. Acoustic fencing details and provision;
9. Water efficiency;
10. Vehicular access to be made available prior to first occupation.

**7. Application no 19/00373/F - Elaine Herbert House, The Great Hospital Bishopgate, Norwich, NR1 4EJ**

The senior planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. She referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports, which was circulated at the meeting, and proposed to amend condition 1 to increase the standard time limit to 5 years for the applicant to raise the necessary funding to implement the proposal.

The senior planner referred to the report and answered members' questions. The materials would be subject to condition. Members also sought clarification about Historic England's concern about the size of the entrance and the officer's view that the entrance needed to be prominent and that on balance it was far enough away from the stonework of the historic buildings.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations as set out in the report.

During discussion members welcomed this application and considered that the replacement building would be an improvement on the 1960's building and would be more in keeping with the listed buildings that comprise The Great Hospital.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to approve application no. 19/00373/F - Elaine Herbert House, The Great Hospital, Bishopgate, Norwich, NR1 4EJ and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Time limit of 5 years;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Details to be agreed: bricks, brick bond and mortar, stonework to entrance, flintwork, decorative brick finishes, roof coverings, glazed lantern and chimneys, rainwater goods, balconies, external doors and windows (including surrounds), new masonry details, oak cladding, columns to the colonnade
4. No works until Archaeological written scheme of investigation
5. Unidentified archaeological features
6. No works until Drainage strategy to be agreed
7. Minimum Finished floor level 2.7m AOD
8. Flood proofing
9. Flood warning and evacuation plan
10. Scheme for generating a minimum of 10% of the predicted energy requirement from decentralised renewable and/or low carbon sources has been agreed.
11. The development shall be designed to meet 110 litres/person/day water efficiency.
12. Details of covered cycle parking, bin store and collection arrangements
13. Landscaping scheme has been approved (including external lighting, replacement planting and ecological enhancements).
14. Bird nesting season
15. Structural engineers statement for the demolition of Elaine Herbert House
16. Scheme to deal with the protection of the existing historic flint wall and gateway into the site from Bishopgate and the historic wall to the south of the bin store
17. Details of plant and machinery
18. Construction method statement
19. Provision of street bench for bus stop on Cotman Fields
20. Reuse of plaque
21. In accordance with AIA, AMS and TPP
22. Provision of site monitoring for trees
23. Arboricultural supervision

**Informatives:**

1. Any damage to the highway and footways to be made good
2. Development not entitled to on street permits
3. Anglian Water assets
4. Construction working hours
5. Refuse bins and collection arrangement to be arranged prior to first occupation
6. Tree protection barriers
7. Archaeological brief
8. Street naming and numbering

#### Article 35(2) Statement

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018) as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations, following negotiations with the applicant and subsequent amendments the application has been approved subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

### **8. Application no 19/00119/F - 7 Crummock Road, Norwich, NR5 8LL**

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. (The presentation included a detailed explanation of the plans which had not been included with the committee papers.)

During questions from members, the planner referred to the report. He confirmed that there was sufficient off street parking at site for a small HMO and that it was in the West Earham controlled parking permit zone. Members were also advised that a condition was being recommended to prevent the property becoming a larger HMO. Development control usually was notified of breaches by members of the public, which could be enforced as a breach of planning conditions.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations as set out in the report.

During discussion members commented on their dissatisfaction that this dwelling was a former council house and would make a good home for a large family and that in policy terms, it was difficult to resist the application. Some members said that they would vote against because they considered that the extension was too overbearing and was detrimental to the amenity of the neighbouring property. Another member said that there were other two storey extensions in the area.

Councillor Bogelein said that she would abstain from voting because she considered that the proposal was overbearing and would result in significant loss of light to the adjacent property.

**RESOLVED**, on the chair's casting vote, with 4 members voting in favour (Councillors Maxwell, Button, Peek and Utton), 4 members voting against (Councillors Huntley, Neale, Sarmezey and Stutely) and 3 members abstaining from voting (Councillors Driver, Wright and Bogelein) to approve no. 19/00119/F - 7 Crummock Road Norwich NR5 8LL and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans
3. Section 73 compliance / use as C3 or C4 dwelling only.

### **9. Application no 19/00262/U - 3 Brereton Close, Norwich, NR5 8LX**

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. (The presentation included a detailed explanation of the plans which had not been included with the committee papers.)

During discussion a member commented that this application was acceptable in that the extension was in proportion to the garden space.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations as set out in the report.

**RESOLVED**, with 10 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Maxwell, Wright, Button, Huntley, Neale, Peek, Bogelein, Sarmezey and Utton) and 1 member abstaining from voting (Councillor Stutely) to approve application no. 19/00262/U - 3 Brereton Close, Norwich, NR5 8LX and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Use as a C3 dwelling house or C4 small scale HMO only.

#### **10. Application no 18/01823/VC - 128 Dereham Road, Norwich, NR2 3AF**

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. (The presentation included a detailed explanation of the plans which had not been included with the committee papers.)

The planner referred to the report, and together with the area development manager (outer), answered members' questions. He explained that the assessment in relation to noise had taken into account that the site was adjacent to a busy road. Members were advised that to avoid ambiguity and to protect residential amenity, live music within the outside space could be restricted. In relation to reducing the hours of use members were advised that the application had previously been a café and had been granted a late licence to provide food for the Muslim community. The committee noted that environmental protection would act on justified complaints regarding noise nuisance or anti-social behaviour which could result in the premises licence being reviewed.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations as set out in the report and as amended.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to approve application no. 18/01823/VC - 128 Dereham Road, Norwich, NR2 3AF and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Restrict hours of use to 08:00 and 23:00 on any day
4. Restrict the use of amplified or live music within the outside space after 2200.

(The committee adjourned for a short break at this point. The committee then reconvened with all members listed above as present.)

## 11. Enforcement Case 18/00003/ENF – Land at Holt Road, Norwich

The senior planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. He explained the history of the site and that enforcement action was being recommended allowing the occupants 12 months to seek alternative accommodation.

An inspector of Norfolk Constabulary addressed the committee and said that there had been reports of animals obstructing traffic on the A140 and smoke from burning rubbish on the site which was hazardous to air traffic, which endangered lives. East Anglia Air Ambulance Service and local residents had raised concerns about this and supported calls for enforcement action. The managing director of Norwich Airport International Ltd said that the operation of the airport was at serious risk from the storage of waste and livestock on this site, which was considered inappropriate on this site.

The occupant of the site then addressed the committee. He said that the waste material on the site had been “fly-tipped” and that he had cleared a lot of it away. The animals had been taken off the site. The volume of complaints from residents was due to stigma and prejudice against Gypsies. In response to the unsuitability of the site near the airport and busy road, he pointed out that the traveller site at Swanton Road was infested by rats as it was next to a waste recycling centre and the Roundwell site was adjacent to a busy road.

The senior planner and the area development manager (outer) referred to the reports and answered members’ questions. The senior planner said that he did not consider that the waste materials that had been on the site were the result of fly-tipping and coincided with the occupancy of the site. In reply to a member’s question, the planner said that the site was considered inappropriate for residential use for either building consent for a dwelling or a traveller site because there was no pedestrian path to the site and the land was designated as employment land, and also due to highway safety concerns regarding the increased use of the vehicle access. Members noted that it was usual for travellers to have both a static and touring caravan. There was now a better prospect of the 13 additional pitches at Swanton Road coming forward than there had been in October. The area development manager (outer) explained that the family’s personal circumstances had to be balanced with the harm that the continued use of the site would have in planning terms. He said that the site was a paddock and that it would be difficult to argue that livestock could not be kept on the site provided there was adequate fencing. The planner said that he had visited the site several times and was always welcomed on to the site. He confirmed that the animals had been moved off the site and the vast majority of the waste material and 2 additional caravans had been moved off the site, following complaints from residents. In order to explain the layout of the site, members were shown an aerial photograph of the site and the positioning of the fence and that the boundary of the site was undefined. The senior planner advised the committee that the breaches and subsequent legal advice on under enforcement was sufficient reasons to bring the case back to the committee. In reply to a member’s question the committee was advised that in planning terms there was a lack of available traveller pitches in Norfolk, but this site was not suitable for a traveller site. The owner would be put in touch with the relevant agencies to help find an alternative site.

The chair and vice chair moved the recommendations as set out in the report.

Discussion ensued in which members commented on the enforcement issue. A member said that she had been disappointed that the occupant was back before the committee and that there had been breaches in the under-enforcement of the site.

In reply to a member's question, the senior planner and the area development manager (outer) explained that the advice was for full enforcement but that the other options were for the occupant to make a planning application or to decide that enforcement action was not expedient..

Councillor Stutely said that he could not vote in favour of enforcement because of the lack of spaces for travellers on sites in the county.

**RESOLVED**, with 10 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Maxwell, Wright, Button, Huntley, Neale, Peek, Bogelein, Sarmezey and Utton) and 1 member voting against (Councillor Stutely) to:

- (1) authorise full enforcement action to cease the use of the land for the siting of residential caravans, including the removal of all structures and materials related to the residential occupation, with the exception of the front boundary fence and gates;
- (2) impose a compliance period of 12 months to allow the occupants to have a reasonable period of time to arrange an alternative place to live and time to clear the site;
- (3) ask officers to liaise with the traveller sites and tenancy manager at Norfolk County Council to assist the occupants in applying for an alternative caravan pitch, should they wish to pursue this option.

(The area development manager (outer) assured members that officers would ensure that the occupant was aware of his rights to appeal if he wanted to challenge the committee's decision.)

## **12. Application no 18/01706/F - 53 Dereham Road, Norwich NR2 4HZ**

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations as set out in the report.

**RESOLVED**, with 10 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Maxwell, Wright, Button, Huntley, Neale, Peek, Sarmezey, Stutely and Utton) and 1 member abstaining from voting (Councillor Bogelein, because she considered there had not been sufficient time given at committee to discuss the application) to approve application no. 18/01706/F – 53 Dereham Road, Norwich NR2 4HZ and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Noise impact assessment and implementation of noise mitigation measures;

4. Landscaping and boundary treatments to rear;
5. Refuse and cycle storage;
6. Water efficiency;
7. Surface water drainage details.

### **13. Application no 19/00624/F- 5 Primula Drive, Norwich, NR4 7LZ**

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. He referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports, which was circulated at the meeting, and contained further comments from the agent in response to points raised by objectors.

The planner referred to the reports and answered members' questions. He explained that the addition of the new lounge was not a requirement of licensing regulations.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations as set out in the report.

During discussion members welcomed the application to improve an HMO which would provide accommodation for key workers and students. Members pointed out that it was important that the housing market provided accommodation for individuals on low wages.

**RESOLVED**, unanimous, to approve application no. 19/00624/F – 5 Primula Drive, Norwich NR4 7LZ and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Use to be C3 dwelling or C4 small HMO only.

### **14. Application no 18/01831/F – 25 Pennyroyal, Norwich, NR6 6JQ.**

The area development manager (outer) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. He referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports and said that the description of the proposal on the front of the report and should read "erection of single storey rear extension". He also pointed out that the site was in Catton Grove ward.

During discussion the area development manager (outer) referred to the report and answered member's questions on this retrospective planning application. He explained that this was not in a conservation area and that the extension was too large to be covered by permitted development rights.

Councillors Neale and Utton said that the appearance of the extension took too much of the garden space and was unattractive and spoiled the view of the area.

**RESOLVED**, with 9 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Maxwell, Wright, Bogelein, Huntley, Peek, Bogelein, Sarmezey and Stutely) and 2 members voting against (Councillors Neale and Utton), to approve application (18/01831/F – 25 Pennyroyal, Norwich, NR6 6JQ) and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;

**15. Applications 19/00381/L - Norwich School Refectory, The Close, Norwich, NR1 4DD and 19/00403/F - Norwich School Refectory, The Close, Norwich, NR1 4DD**

(Councillor Utton declared a predetermined view and left the room during the consideration of this item.)

The area development manager (inner) presented the report.

**RESOLVED** unanimously to undertake a site visit at 9:00 on 11 July 2019 in anticipation of the application Applications 19/00381/L - Norwich School Refectory, The Close, Norwich, NR1 4DD and 19/00403/F - Norwich School Refectory, The Close, Norwich, NR1 4DD being determined at the planning applications committee being held on the same date.

(Councillor Utton was readmitted to the meeting.)

CHAIR