

Planning Applications Committee: 12 May 2016

Updates to reports

Application 15/01646/F Bartram Mowers Bluebell Road Item 4(a) Page 20

Additional representations:

Two further objections received – Proposals have not been designed sensitively in relation to the Yare Valley and would despoil views, they are unduly large and dense and similar to university halls of residence. The development should be designed to use the existing access and will harm wildlife.

Officer response:

See main issues 1-4 within the report.

Application 16/00426/VC 286 Dereham Road Item 4(b) Page 47

Additional representation:

- One further objection received – Committee report is incorrect in the following areas: Merton Road is an access point used by the premises as this completes the loop around which numerous cars circulate endlessly looking for parking places, in contravention of 'no access road signs;
- Planning notification was limited to houses within 10 metres of the property. The area affected by activities at these premises is much more extensive and many residents remain unaware of this application.
- Norwich City Council is well aware of breaches of planning permissions reported to them during Ramadan 2015 which they continue to ignore. These breaches remained totally uncontrolled and unenforced.
- Worship is taking place therefore it is a place of worship contrary to the planning permissions. A gentleman when asked why he had parked outside our house said he was going to the mosque. It is advertised on the internet as a mosque.
- As a public house there were very few authorised license extensions beyond 23.00 hours which is why the business folded. This was also specifically limited to 1 night's entertainment only not 30 consecutive nights as proposed.
- It is misleading to compare the previous use against the current when comparing noise impacts.
- Car parking pressure after 23:00 will result in a 'curfew' for residents.
- The planning condition requiring submission of a management plan within 3 months, will be insufficient to have this agreed prior to Ramadan 2016.

Officer Response:

See main issues 1 and 2 within the report. With regard to the final comment above, it is proposed to change the wording of this condition to require that the management plan is submitted within 1 month.

Modifications to conditions:

Following further considerations on the detailed wording of the hours condition, it is proposed that its wording is amended to require that the premises shall close at 23:00 except during Ramadan period when it shall close 3 hours after sundown and not after 23:00 (if the three hour period elapses prior to 23:00) and not after 01:00 if the three hour period elapses after 23:00).

Clarification:

Paragraph 28 notes that there are no significant considerations in relation to the equality and diversity act. It should be clarified that the Equalities and Diversities Act 2010 places a duty on the Council to promote good relations between different parts of the community. It is noted that the proposals are in relation to a community centre serving the Muslim community and would assist significantly in serving the needs of this community. As such the benefits of the proposal in meeting this need are a material planning consideration in this case (see para 32 of the report). However officers consider that this consideration is one amongst others (previous use of the site, existing permissions, mitigation measures, etc) and not an overriding factor in this instance.

Application 15/00756/F Land adjacent to 37 Bishop Bridge Road Item 4 (C) Page 53

Additional representations:

Four letters of support received – commenting that new food store serving the Heathgate /Bishopgate/Cotman Fields areas would be welcomed.

One letter of comment received – commenting there must be yellow cross hatching put into the roundabout at the bottom of Ketts Hill (preferably with a camera). A large amount of congestion is due to traffic blocking the access/egress onto the roundabout, particularly on match days.

It should be noted that a letter of comment received in response to the second consultation was submitted by Cllr Price. This comment raised a number of comments that are referred to in the Issues raised summary table on pages 58-60, including: will provide local community with local facility and employment; departure from local plan since the site is allocated for housing; comments in relation to access/egress/traffic modelling/pedestrian and cyclist facilities; antisocial behaviour associated with the availability of cheap alcohol; poor air quality.

Additional information submitted by the applicant:

The applicant has submitted a Supplementary Note focuses on the impact of the development on Sprowston Road Local Centre. Extract below:

Sprowston Road is a small centre. The Aldi foodstore forms its principal convenience offer. Other convenience floorspace in the centre comprises 'Norwich Express Store' and 'Sprowston Express Store', albeit both of these are very small units which are intended to cater only for passing, 'top-up' shopping needs rather than serving any bulk shopping requirements. There is also a CTN (confectionary, tobacco and news) unit in the centre.... The analysis at Appendix VII of our Planning and Retail Statement (PRS), which

accompanies the application, confirms that the Aldi store at Sprowston Road is significantly over-trading, and is projected to continue doing so in 2018. In our letter of 29 April 2016, we observed that that would continue to be the case even if a higher benchmark turnover were applied to the proposed Lidl store in accordance with up-to-date available information on sales densities and growth rates. That being so, we went on to conclude in our PRS (and re-iterated this in our letter of 29 April) that, while there will be some diversion of trade to Lidl from the Aldi store at Sprowston Road, that store would continue to trade above benchmark, and so the impacts on that store would be neither significant nor adverse.

As a result, we expect the Aldi store to continue to trade above benchmark and remain a popular convenience retail destination, post-Lidl. On this basis, any 'linked trips' between Aldi and the two small convenience stores, which currently exist, ought to remain following the proposed development, such that there is, in our view, negligible potential for harm to the centre as a whole through the loss of linkage with Aldi. Moreover, we have noted above that the convenience floorspace in the centre is formed of two small units, which are intended to serve only top-up shopping requirements (in comparison to the proposed Lidl, which is intended to cater predominantly for bulk shopping needs), and also a CTN unit. Because those small convenience units are intended to serve a different shopping need to the proposed Lidl, and therefore the limited overlap in the business models of those stores (as explained in Section 2 of our PRS), it follows that, applying the well-established principle of 'like competes with like', the potential for competition between Lidl and those small convenience units is negligible. We would therefore expect that floorspace to continue to trade with a turnover consistent with our pre-development forecasts. In summary, we have demonstrated in our submissions to-date that there will be no adverse impacts on the Aldi store as a result of this proposal and so it will continue to trade above benchmark post-development. By extension, any links between that store and the rest of the centre will, logically, be preserved so that there is negligible potential for harm to the centre as a result of a loss of linked trips.

Officers have considered this response and accept that there is insufficient evidence to suggest that the proposed development would a significant adverse impact on this designated centre.

Consultation response

The Highway Authority has reviewed the letter submitted by Exigo on behalf of Aldi and confirm that the contents do not alter their formal position.

Retail Impact update

It should be noted that an application has recently been received in connection with 5 Neatmarket, Norwich (16/00621/F)

The application relates to the alteration and extension of an existing retail unit (Former B&Q floorspace plus vacant units – retail use unrestricted) to create three separate retail units. The submitted plans indicate Lidl as a future occupier of one of the new units (2412sqm). This would result in additional convenience floorspace within the city. This additional food offer has been considered but given the location of the unit in the south of the city, the cumulative impact on the 15/00756/F retail study area is unlikely to be significant.

**Application 15/01927/O Barrack Street Development Site, Barrack Street,
Norwich
Item 4 (D) Page 103**

Erratum:

The table of representations on page 103 should be updated to include 1 comment, in addition to the 4 representations of objection.

**Application 16/00408/U 134 Unthank Road
Item 4(e) Page 129**

Additional representation:

One further objection received - Unthank Road needs more diversity and not another estate agent or financial business. We need to encourage more localised retail units along Unthank Road who in turn support the local community.

Officer response:

See Main issue 1 (paragraphs 12 – 19) within the report.

**Application: 15/01867/F 145 & 147 Earlham Road
Item 4(i) Page 177**

Additional representation:

Three additional letters of representation have been received objecting against the proposal. The representations do not raise any additional issues that have not already been discussed in the report to committee.

**Application 16/00283/F 1 Hanover Court
Item 4(n) Page 239**

The Tree Protection Officer has reviewed the revised proposal and considers it acceptable in principle – subject to a condition requiring a revised Arboricultural Method Statement being submitted.

“This is OK please do condition the revised AMS as suggested.”
