

## Planning Applications Committee: 26 February 2015

### Updates to report

---

#### Application no: 14/01413/F – Emmanuel House, Convent Road Item 4(A) Page 15

Additional letter of representation from Councillor Little

- Supporting residents of 20 Unthank Road in asking for additional measures to mitigate against potential noise disturbance.
- To recap from earlier comments: it's clear that planning policy, while being broadly favourable to developments such as this, also offers protection for neighbouring businesses, people's living and working conditions in adjacent properties, community well-being and places of tranquillity; all of which are relevant here. Policy DM3 gives "significant weight to the uses and activities around [a development site]".
- The measures proposed by the applicant are welcome, particularly 24/7 site supervision. However there is scope in the plans and policy for mitigation measures to go further as suggested by residents of No.20:
  - Soundproofing the wall of the laundry room which is adjacent to the annex
  - Further soundproofing measures for the living quarters
  - A higher boundary wall or fencing

#### Officer response

- Comments are noted.
- On the third point it is worth clarifying the agent's point on site supervision. In part (v) of the site management section the report includes the agent's direct quote. Officer interpretation of this is that there will be site supervision 24 hours a day but it is not clear whether this will be residential, i.e. on-site. This is understood as meaning off-site supervision will be available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week with out of hours cover available on the phone for instance. This detail would be critical within the site management plan to be agreed through condition. As discussed in the previous meeting, thought was given to a condition requiring 24 hour on-site cover but it was decided given the number of tenants it was considered unreasonable.
- On the three additional mitigation measures: these are addressed in response the most recent letter of representation in paragraph 14 and the officer response remains relevant.

#### Agent response

- Without being able to check it with the client, the agent is still fairly confident in being able to commit to dry lining the Party Wall of the laundry room with two layers of plasterboard to help with noise

transmission. The floor above is concrete so will not transfer to the first floor.

- The boundary wall with No.20 can be increased to 2.4m.
- With regards sound proofing the units themselves the agent feels this is going too far considering Environmental Protection raise no objections whatsoever on these grounds.
- The immediate area is mixed in use and is concerned that onerous conditions or amendments may be imposed given the site's location with high ambient noise.

### **Officer response**

- Members may wish to include a condition requiring, on the same timescales as the others, details on soundproofing on the ground floor laundry room Party Wall with 20 Unthank Road or increasing boundary heights. However officer's view is that these are not necessary.

---

### **Application no: 14/01526/A – Prospect House, Rouen Road Item 4(B) Page 37**

The applicant has responded to objections with the points below:

- Archant has listened to the views of others throughout the application process
- The signage changes are necessary to reflect the changing brand
- The signs retain the character of the building
- Sign 1 is vital as it is the only sign easily viewed from Cattle Market Street
- Sign 5 is unobtrusive and is the only sign visible as visitors approach from the ring road up Rouen Road, the postal address of Prospect House

The agent has responded to objections with the points below:

- Throughout the application process we have had a positive response from both Planning and the Conservation Design team; where with the exception of the lighting on sign 3 (which has since been omitted from the application) no other issues or concerns have been raised.
  - Following the comments we have received my client has compromised by removing sign 3 and by restricting the times when the signs will be illuminated.
  - The proposed lighting is by no means anything like a neon sign and the lighting will only provide a "halo" affect around the back of the signage and will not illuminate the whole letter/logo.
-

**Application no: 14/01608/U – 1A Oak Street  
Item 4(D) Page 55**

A further representation from a local resident forwarded by Councillor Stammers raising additional comments as set out below:

- Relevant documents provided by Norwich City Council describe the applicant as Julian Housing Support. This questions the validity of the application.
- Six parking spaces and two disabled spaces would be inadequate for staff and patients.
- Significant building work is being carried out in advance of the planning decision.
- If the Council is minded to grant consent the use should be limited to this specific use and for a limited period.
- Opening hours should be restricted to normal office hours ie. 9am – 5.30pm weekdays only.

**Response**

- The consultation documentation produced describes the location of the site as Julian Housing Support, 1A Oak Street, Norwich. This relates to the address details of the Unique Property Reference Number (UPRN), which incorporates, in this case, the last known occupier. Such information is often included within the UPRN to make it easier for a person to identify what premises is being referred to. The documentation makes it clear that the application is made on behalf of Serco. As such, it is confirmed that the application is valid.
- Since the application has been submitted the amount of off-street parking available to the proposed clinic has changed. The revised number of off-street parking spaces is now seventeen, which is considered to be adequate provision for both staff and visitors in this city centre location.
- The building work is being carried out at the owners and applicants risk. It has no bearing on the assessment of the planning application.
- If members are minded to approve the application a condition is proposed to restrict the use within the D1 use class – see paragraph 35 of the report and condition 3. The Applicant has not applied for a temporary consent and a condition limiting use to a temporary period only where the proposed development complies with the development plan, as in this case, would not pass the test of necessity (NPPF, paragraph 206).
- The existing office use has no restriction in terms of hours of operation and given the proposed restriction of the use within the D1 use class under condition 3, it is considered that the imposition of a condition restricting hours of operation would not pass the test of necessity (NPPF paragraph 206) and would be unreasonable.

**Application no: 14/01850/F – 49 Hunter Road  
Item 4 (E) Page 69**

**Additional information:**

- Petition (51 signatures). Concern that the proposal will result in significant increase in traffic congestion which would have an adverse impact on pedestrian safety

**Response:**

- See main issue 2
- 

**Application no: 14/01798/F – 19 The Avenues  
Item 4 (F) Page 81**

**Additional information**

- Sketch of the new street scene submitted by the applicant
- Letter of support from the owner of the adjoining property to the west (no.21).
  - Reservations about the extension may affect the outlook from the east side of their house, reducing light to their dining room and bedroom, but that they always expected that no.19 would need to be extended in the future to bring it up to standard / capacity
  - Most of the houses on the street have had two-storey extensions having some impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties
  - No.19 is the smallest on the street and is not suitable for a growing family
  - The rear of no.19 is currently set back from its neighbours and the extension would bring it more in line with other houses on the street
  - The extension to the east will also enhance the appearance of the house from the street making it more balanced.
  - The size of the plot lends itself to such an extension utilising the available space to the northern and eastern aspects

**Response**

- It is unclear if the illustration is to scale. However, it is considered to be a reasonably fair depiction of the scale of the proposal relative to neighbouring properties, demonstrating that it will not compromise the visual amenities of the street scene.
  - See main issues 1 and 6
-

**Additional information**

The applicant that the following is brought to the attention of members:

"As well as the extension itself being fully insulated and built to exceed the thermal requirements of the Building Regs, we're combining the extension with a variety of measures to make the house more energy efficient. We're hoping to do all, or most, of the measures recommended on our Energy Performance Certificate which would take our house to, or near, a rating of B/86. These, as mentioned in the Design and Access System, include a new energy efficient boiler, improved insulation (incl under floor), PV panels and possibly solar water heating and greywater harvesting. We're also not planning to lose any green space as the extension is being built where there is currently a concrete patio."

**Response**

Whilst these measures are not a requirement, they are consistent with the thrust of planning policy which is to deliver sustainable development. Furthermore, the retention of existing garden space will also help reduce any surface water run-off.