



Planning applications committee

10:30 to 15:50

13 October 2016

Present: Councillors Herries (chair), Driver (vice chair), Ackroyd (substitute for Councillor Lubbock), Button, Carlo, Jackson, Malik, Peek, Sands (M) and Woollard

Apologies: Councillors Bradford, Lubbock and Henderson

1. Declarations of interest

Councillor Herries declared an other interest in item 3 (below), Application no 16/00606/F - 297 Aylsham Road, Norwich, NR2 3RY, because she was a member of the East of England Co-operative Society which had submitted an objection to the planning application.

Councillor Peek said that as ward councillor for Wensum Ward residents had asked him about the proposals for items 9 (below), Applications no 16/01106/F - Land used for car parking adjacent to 69 Armes Street, Norwich and item 10 (below) Application no 16/01109/F - Land used for car parking adjacent to 99 Armes Street, Norwich, and confirmed that he did not have a predetermined view.

2. Minutes

RESOLVED to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meetings held on 8 September 2016 and 22 September 2016.

3. Application no 16/00606/F - 297 Aylsham Road, Norwich, NR2 3RY

(Councillor Herries had declared an other interest in this item.)

The planning team leader (development) (outer area) presented the report with aid of plans and slides. He referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports which was circulated at the meeting and contained a summary of a letter of support for this application.

During discussion, the planning team leader referred to the report and answered members' questions. Although the number of car parking spaces was more than the local plan requirement it was considered to be acceptable. He explained that the requirement for the applicant to incorporate a green roof into its proposed store on the corner of Kett's Hill had been site specific and was not justified at this site. Members also noted that planning consent was subject to a condition that required

the applicant to identify all contaminants on the site and provide a statement of remediation. Members also sought clarification on access points, confirmation that there were no significant noise issues from a store operating on the site and on the use of sustainable sources of energy.

Councillor Jackson commented on the application which he considered to be “disappointing” and explained his reasons for objecting to this scheme which included concern that the application had not taken on board site specific policies and that the proposed store would have a greater proportion of comparison goods for sale; that there had been no steps to mitigate noise impact; and, that he endorsed Historic England’s response.

Another member said that she welcomed the development of this vacant site which was an “eyesore”. She pointed out that the store operators were closing another of its stores in the vicinity and that this store would not impact on other retail operators.

RESOLVED, with 9 members voting in favour (Councillors Herries, Driver, Ackroyd, Button, Carlo, Malik, Peek, Sands and Woollard) and 1 member voting against (Councillor Jackson) to approve application no. 16/00606/F - 297 Aylsham Road, Norwich, NR2 3RY and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Details – materials and joinery;
4. Comprehensive landscaping scheme (soft and hard) – to include boundary treatments, high quality landscaping to frontage, biodiversity enhancements, replacement tree planting including trees to be planted in the car park, seating, trolley parking;
5. Compliance with the AIA and TPP;
6. The development shall provide a maximum of 1,690sq.m. net retail floorspace, of which no more than 338sq.m. / 20% floorspace shall be used for comparison goods sales, whichever is the greater;
7. There shall be no future subdivision of the retail store into smaller units;
8. There shall be no mezzanine floorspace added to the store, even though the usual permitted development allowance of 200sq.m;
9. There shall be no use of the comparison goods floorspace separately from that of the main retailer or as a separate unit / via a separate entrance;
10. Restriction on store opening hours – 07:00-22:00 (Mon-Sat), 10:00-17:00 (Sun);
11. Restriction on delivery hours – No trade deliveries or collections, including trade waste or clinical waste shall take place before 07:00 hours and after 23:00 hours (Mon-Sat) and not before 10:00 hours and after 18:00 hours (Sundays and Bank Holidays);
12. Plant compound and acoustic fencing- full details and provision;
13. Delivery management plan;
14. Cycle parking and servicing details;
15. No occupation shall take place on the site until the changes to waiting restrictions facilitated by a Traffic Regulation Order have been secured by the Highway Authority. No occupation of the development hereby approved shall take place unless and until the provisions required within the Traffic Regulation Order have been put in place;

16. Gradient of the vehicle access shall not exceed 1:12 for the first 10 metres into the site;
17. Prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted the proposed access / on-site car and cycle parking / servicing / loading, unloading / turning / waiting area shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter available for that specific use;
18. Development shall not commence until a scheme detailing provision for on site parking for construction workers for the duration of the construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented throughout the construction period;
19. (a) No works shall commence on site until the details of wheel cleaning facilities for construction vehicles have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority;
(b) For the duration of the construction period all traffic associated with the construction of the development permitted will use the approved wheel cleaning facilities provided referred to in part (a);
20. (a) Notwithstanding the details indicated on the submitted drawings no works shall commence on site unless otherwise agreed in writing until a detailed scheme for the off-site highway improvement works as indicated on drawing number SCP/16013/SK02 Rev A (as included within the Transport Statement) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority;
(b) Prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted the off-site highway improvement works referred to in Part (a) of this condition shall be completed to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.
21. Details of plant and machinery
22. Details of ventilation & fume extraction
23. Upon first use of the store, the Travel Plan to be implemented and carried forward;
24. Unknown contamination;
25. Surface water drainage strategy. No systems to be installed until details have been agreed. Details must address issues raised by the EA and demonstrate no resultant unacceptable risk to controlled waters.
26. Energy scheme;
27. Water efficiency details and provision;
28. Compliance with mitigation measures in ecology report;
29. Provision of charging point for vehicles (minimum of three).

Informatives:

1. An application to discharge trade effluent must be made to Anglian Water and must have been obtained before any discharge of trade effluent can be made to the public sewer. Anglian Water recommends that petrol / oil interceptors be fitted in all car parking/washing/repair facilities. Failure to enforce the effective use of such facilities could result in pollution of the local watercourse and may constitute an offence. Anglian Water also recommends the installation of a properly maintained fat traps on all catering establishments. Failure to do so may result in this and other properties suffering blocked drains, sewage flooding

and consequential environmental and amenity impact and may also constitute an offence under section 111 of the Water Industry Act 1991.”

2. Environment Agency – Advice for local planning authority (first sentence);
3. Detailed landscaping plan indicative only and needs to make provision for adequate tree replanting and trees in car park.
4. Advertising – needs to form part of a separate application.
5. In addition to the need to explore biodiversity enhancements and adequate replacement tree planting, the final landscaping scheme should provide a strong front boundary line with the introduction of low level hedging or similar.
6. The applicant is advised to refer to BS8545:2015 ‘Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape’, with respect to ensuring that the tree planting to be detailed on the final landscape plan is of a high quality.
7. The applicant is advised that once the building adjacent to Palmer Road has been demolished, any machinery used to break up the remaining hardstanding shall work back from the boundary with Palmer Road. This will ensure that the area adjacent to the garden will not be compacted which could otherwise result in harm to these trees.
8. Works to highway.

Article 35(2) statement: The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 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.

4. Application no 16/00456/F - BT Telephone Exchange, Westwick House, 70 Westwick Street, Norwich, NR2 4SY

The senior planner (development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. He referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports, which contained further representations and the officer response and a letter from the agents explaining the commercial sensitivity which prevented them from publishing a redacted version of the viability assessment. These documents were circulated at the meeting.

A member of the public addressed the committee and outlined his objections to the scheme which included that it was contrary to policy; would block views of *citywide and*¹ local landmarks; and, concerns regarding the viability assessment.

The agent addressed the committee and said that Westwick House had been vacant a long time; was no longer viable or suitable for any other use; and, had been identified as a negative feature of the conservation area. The scheme would provide new housing. The development would impact on the view of the Roman Catholic Cathedral but not on other views. He pointed out that the statutory consultees had not objected to the scheme and referred to the comments of the Norwich Society.

¹ On 10 November 2016, planning applications committee approved these minutes subject to the amendment to insert “citywide and” before “local landmarks”.

During discussion the senior planner referred to the report and answered members' questions. This included clarification that there were specific landscape conditions to protect the river habitat from invasive species. The senior planner and the team leader (development) explained the calculation used to assess the provision of the affordable housing contribution and the application of the vacant building credit, as set out in the supplementary report of updates to reports.

Discussion ensued in which members commented on the application.

Councillor Sands said that it was regrettable that affordable housing was not provided on site. This led to developments of segregated private dwellings on riverside sites which was unacceptable.

Other members considered that the proposal was generally good and that negotiations with the applicant would ensure as much affordable housing was provided as possible. Members also noted the comments of the statutory consultees and in particular the Norwich Society.

RESOLVED, with 9 members voting in favour (Councillors Herries, Driver, Ackroyd, Button, Carlo, Jackson, Malik, Peek and Woollard) and 1 member voting against (Councillor Sands) to approve application no. 16/00456/F - BT Telephone Exchange Westwick House, 70 Westwick Street, Norwich, NR2 4SY and grant planning permission subject to the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement to include provision of affordable housing contribution and review of viability should works not commence or dwellings be occupied and subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement of development within 3 years from the date of approval;
2. Development to be in accord with drawings and details;
3. Details of facing and roofing materials; brick bond and mortar; joinery; verges; vent systems; external lighting; heritage interpretation; and photographic record of existing building;
4. Side windows to upper floor communal access spaces, hallways, bath/shower rooms, kitchens to be obscure glazed and fixed openings;
5. Details of any remaining archaeological work and written scheme of investigation
6. Details of vehicle charging points; cycle storage; site management for parking/access; and bin stores provision;
7. Details of highways works;
8. Construction management plan; parking; wheel washing;
9. Details of landscaping including: planting; tree pits; biodiversity enhancements, bird and bat boxes; site treatment works; boundary treatments, including any proposals to guard the edge of the river, separation of private amenity areas, gates, walls and fences; edge treatment to roof terraces and gardens; landscape features such as planters, seats, raised walls etc. complete with heights or levels to indicate the overall appearance; parking, access road and path link surfaces; and landscape management and implementation programme and maintenance;
10. Water framework directive compliance;
11. Details of necessary arboricultural method statement for additional site works, ground regrading, protection of existing trees;

12. Compliance with arboricultural implications assessment, arboricultural method statement and additional information at condition 11 and Tree Protection Scheme implemented prior to commencement;
13. Retention of tree protection;
14. Details of provision and maintenance of low zero carbon technologies / renewable energy sources;
15. Details of water efficiency measures;
16. Details of the surface water drainage system and future maintenance of;
17. Details of emergency flood warning and evacuation plan and implementation of surface water flood strategy;
18. Site contamination investigation and assessment (excluding parts 1 and 2 in terms of our standard condition as already complied with);
19. Details of contamination verification plan;
20. Cessation of works if unknown contaminants found and submit details of remediation;
21. Details of testing and/or suitable compliance of all imported material prior to occupation;
22. Compliance with the recommendations of submitted noise report.

Article 35 (2) statement: The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 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 at the pre-application and application stage the application has been approved subject to suitable land management, adoption, appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined within the committee report for the application.

Informatives:

1. Considerate constructors.
2. Impact on wildlife.
3. Highways contacts, street naming and numbering, design note, works within the highway etc.
4. Properties at this development will not be entitled to on street parking permits;
5. Environment Agency guidance;
6. Anglian Water guidance.

5. Application no 16/00759/F - 137 Unthank Road Norwich NR2 2PE

The planning assistant (development) presented the report with the plans and slides. She referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports which was circulated at the meeting which contained a further consultation response from the Norwich Society and the officer response, a factual correction to the summary on the title page of the report by amending the number of objections to 14 as one had been counted twice and revising and replacing paragraph 27 of the main report. A further factual correction was made to measurements on page 3 of the report to read: "Approximately 9.70m to 15.10 m' instead of 'Approximately 4.50m x 7.70m'.

During discussion the planning assistant, together with the planning team leader (development), referred to the report and answered members' questions. In response to a members' concern the construction works could be hazardous to pedestrians, members were advised that there was a large forecourt which could

accommodate skips during the demolition/construction. The principal planner (transport) assured members that the developers would need to have traffic management arrangements in place and provide alternative covered provision if the footway was temporarily unavailable due to construction works. The planning assistant explained that it was not possible to retain the shop front as the proposal was to alter the premises to two units. Members requested that materials from the shop front were salvaged and reused; and agreed to the planning team leader's suggestion that an informative be added to the planning consent.

The planning assistant also advised the committee that the conversion of the outbuilding into a hot food takeaway had been considered to be over intensification of the site and was not part of this application. The committee also discussed the potential landscaping at the site.

Councillor Carlo, ward councillor for Nelson Ward, said that she regretted that previous owners had allowed the building to fall into a poor state of repair and stand empty. She welcomed the potential use of the building for retail and that the shop frontage would be replicated in wood.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 16/00759/F - 137 Unthank Road Norwich NR2 2PE and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Details of all materials including specifically the shop front and front façade
4. Details of soft and hard landscaping including rear amenity area, front forecourt, boundary treatments, bollards etc.
5. Details of bin and cycle storage and parking;
6. Prior to any occupation as an A3/A5 use details of extract equipment / silencers/anti-vibration mounting/insulation that can demonstrate operation at acceptable noise levels must be submitted.
7. The A3/A5 unit shall not be open between the hours of 23:00 and 08:00hrs on any day.
8. No trade deliveries or waste collections to take place between the hours of 19:00 and 07:00hrs on any day and no deliveries or waste collection to take place on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
9. To be built to energy efficiency/water efficiency standards.
10. Permitted development rights for fencing removed in order to protect the open nature of the forecourt area.
11. All windows within the side elevations shall be obscure-glazed and non-opening unless the parts of the windows which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the windows are installed.

Informatives:

1. It should be noted that separate advertisement consent should be applied for prior to erection of advertisements at the site.
2. If the residential dwelling is occupied at any time by more than six unrelated residents then a separate application should be submitted for a change of use to a house of multiple-occupation (HMO).
3. The applicant/agent should undertake negotiations with the Highways department of Norwich City Council regarding a S38 agreement for the adoption of part of the land outlined in this application for highway purposes.

4. Salvage and reuse of material is encouraged.

Article 35(2) statement:

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 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.

6. Application no 16/01117/F – Land west of 3 Beaumont Place

The senior planner (development) 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, and contained summaries of two further letters of objection and the officer response.

The owner of the adjacent house addressed the committee, illustrated with slides he had provided, and expressed his concern that the development would be too close to his dwelling and would block sunlight. He, together with another resident, highlighted the objections to the scheme which included: loss of parking and concern about traffic safety due to the loss of a turning area; disruption during construction, that the proposal was for two dwellings only and that there were more suitable sites available.

The agent replied on behalf of the applicant advised the committee of the outcome of the car park usage survey and said that there was sufficient on-street parking in the vicinity to accommodate the loss of the car park. There would be construction management arrangements in place. Provision had been made to ensure that there was sufficient space between no 3 and the new development to prove maintenance.

During discussion the senior planner responded to the issues raised by the speakers, and together with the principal planner (transport) and the planning team leader, referred to the report and answered members' questions. This included an explanation that the proposed development was in the best position because it would cause more impact on the flats it was moved further away from no 3 and that the sunlight analysis showed no material to no 3.

Councillor Sands expressed concern about the proximity of the dwellings to no 3 Beaumont Place.

RESOLVED, with 9 members voting in favour (Councillors Herries, Driver, Ackroyd, Button, Carlo, Jackson, Malik, Peek and Woollard) and 1 member voting against (Councillor Sands) to approve application no 16/01117/F and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Details of facing and roofing materials; windows; joinery; boundary treatments, walls and fences; external lighting;
4. Details of hard and soft landscaping and planting;
5. Water efficiency;
6. Contamination risk assessment and report to be submitted;
7. Unknown contamination to be addressed;
8. Control on imported materials;
9. Tree protection measures to be implemented.

Article 35(2)

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 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.

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

7. Application no 16/01121/F- Garages adjacent to 110 Quebec Road

The senior planner (development) 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, and contained information about an amended site plan which included a communal bin store to serve adjacent flats and an amendment to the summary information table contained in the committee report to delete references to Armes Street and replace with Quebec Road. During the presentation the senior planner also recommended an additional condition to control the levels of dwellings on the site to ensure that the impact on the neighbouring occupiers was acceptable.

One of the tenants who rented a garage expressed his objections to the scheme which included concern about the loss of garages and the impact that this would have on residents; and suggesting whether the council had considered selling the garage site to residents.

The agent replied on behalf of the applicant and advised the committee of the outcome of the car park usage survey and confirmed that there was sufficient on-street parking in the vicinity to offset the loss of the car park. Development of the site was constrained because of a gas main running through the site but there was sufficient room for gardens to the rear of the new dwellings and there would be soft landscaping to soften the scheme. He also commented that there would be no significant loss of sunlight to existing and proposed properties given the level of separation between the proposed dwellings and existing properties.

The senior planner referred to the report and refuted the claim that there was no alternative garage provision in the area or sufficient space to park cars in the surrounding roads.

During discussion the senior planner, together with the planning team leader, referred to the report and answered members' question. In response to a members' concern that the proposed dwellings did not meet current space standards the senior planner said that whilst this was regrettable, it was not considered sufficient to warrant refusal of the application given that it was well-designed and would lead to the delivery of affordable housing in a sustainable location. The planning team leader explained about the details of the project and that its financial viability was based on the minimum national space standards at the time but not policy DM3. Unlike a social landlord a private developer would market the properties for fewer bed spaces therefore complying with the current national minimum space standards. Members were advised that the dwellings therefore did not comply with current guidance but this was outweighed by the benefits of providing affordable housing in a sustainable location with outside amenity space.

Councillor Sands said that although there was a housing shortage, he considered that the city council should have ensured that it achieved the best possible housing for its tenants and that the dwellings should meet the current national minimum space standards.

RESOLVED, with 9 members voting in favour (Councillors Herries, Driver, Ackroyd, Button, Carlo, Jackson, Malik, Peek and Woollard) and 1 member voting against (Councillor Sands) to approve application 16/01121/F - Garages adjacent to 110 Quebec Road and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Details of facing and roofing materials; windows; joinery; boundary treatments, walls and fences; external lighting;
4. Details of hard and soft landscaping and planting
5. Water efficiency
6. Contamination risk assessment and report to be submitted
7. Unknown contamination to be addressed
8. Control on imported materials
9. Tree protection measures to be implemented and replacement tree planting to be agreed.
10. Slab levels to be agreed prior to construction.

Article 35(2)

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 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.

8. Application no 16/01115/F- Garages opposite 46 Goldwell Road

The senior planner (development) 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, and contained a summary of a representation from the Norwich Society calling for parking needs to be taken into account and four further representations from residents concerned about increased parking pressure in the surrounding area including Hollis Lane, Ashby Street and Kings Lane, and the officer response.

Two residents addressed the committee and outlined their objections to the scheme. (One couple had intended to speak but due to the length of the meeting had to leave before the item could be considered.) Their concerns included loss of car parking spaces for Blue Badge holders and other local residents; and that the council by removing the garages was breaking its contract with its tenants.

The agent referred to the car park survey and said that the six car parking spaces, including two parking bays for disabled people, on the site would be given to the city council's housing services to manage. He also referred to the national minimum space standard for dwellings and explained how each proposal had been assessed and discussed with housing services and development control.

The senior planner referred to the comments from the city council's housing services (paragraph 10 of the report) and confirmed that it was proposed that the scheme was car free with six car parking spaces on the site, including two Blue Badge spaces, being made available to local residents. There were also garages available in the vicinity. The principal planner (transport) confirmed that it would be possible to achieve this and designate parking bays to either specified users or Blue Badge holders by a traffic regulation order and also explained that residents of properties built before 2004 could apply for parking permits. The senior planner suggested that it be conditioned that the applicant submits a management plan for the car parking bays on the site.

Councillor Sands said that he objected to the proposals which he considered to be detrimental to residents' amenity and that the proposed dwellings did not meet current minimum space standards.

RESOLVED with 8 members voting in favour (Councillors Herries, Driver, Ackroyd, Button, Carlo, Malik, Peek and Woollard) and 2 members voting against (Councillors Sands and Jackson) to approve application 16/011115/F garages opposite 46 Goldwell Road and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Details of facing and roofing materials; windows; joinery; boundary treatments, walls and fences; external lighting;
4. Details of hard and soft landscaping and planting
5. Window serving stairwell on southern elevation to be obscure glazed and non-opening
6. Water efficiency
7. Contamination risk assessment and report to be submitted
8. Unknown contamination to be addressed
9. Control on imported materials.
10. Details of management plan for allocation of car parking bays on the site.

Article 35(2)

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 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.

(The committee adjourned for lunch at 13:40 and reconvened at 14:10 with all members present as listed above.)

9. Application no 16/01106/F - Land used for car parking adjacent to 69 Armes Street, Norwich

The senior planner (development) 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, and noted that one further letter of objection had been received with concerns about loss of parking and increased parking pressure.

Councillor Bogelein, ward councillor for Wensum ward, addressed the committee on behalf of local residents and summarised their concerns in relation to this application and the following application no 16/01109/F - Land used for car parking adjacent to 99 Armes Street, Norwich. She suggested that the committee rejected the proposals and retained the car park adjacent to 69 Armes Street because it was well used and would alleviate pressure when the other two sites in the area were developed and said that as there were yellow lines on many streets there was not capacity on the streets for more car parking.

The agent referred to the car parking surveys and said that this car park was the most heavily used in the area but there was on street parking available. The four one bedroom flats with associated parking would not add additional pressure on car parking in the area and would add to the variety of housing available.

The senior planner referred to the report and together with the planning team leader (development) answered members' questions. He said that the allocation of a parking space to the tenants of each unit was compliant with parking standards as this site was out of the city. Members noted that residents in the area had previously opposed proposals to introduce a controlled parking zone. Members also sought further information about the application of social rents and shared ownership and the condition requiring a proper investigation to identify and make safe any unexploded bombs from WWII.

Councillor Sands said that he objected to the scheme because of the minimum space standard and removal of a facility for residential car parking.

Councillor Jackson said that he was concerned about the design of the buildings which came forward of the building line and did not replicate the line of the sash windows of the surrounding Victorian terraces. Councillor Ackroyd said that she considered that the car park should be retained as it was well used at all times.

Councillor Carlo said that as the road was heavily trafficked, she considered that this site should remain as an off road parking facility and be considered for housing in the future when other options for extending the car club in this area and a controlled parking zone had been explored.

RESOLVED, with 5 members voting in favour (Councillors Herries, Driver, Button, Malik and Woollard), 4 members voting against (Councillors Ackroyd, Carlo, Jackson and Sands) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Peek) to approve application 16/01109/F and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Details of facing and roofing materials; windows; joinery; boundary treatments, walls and fences; external lighting;
4. Details of hard and soft landscaping and planting;
5. Water efficiency;
6. Contamination risk assessment and report to be submitted;
7. Unknown contamination to be addressed;
8. Control on imported materials.

Article 35(2)

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 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.

10. Application no 16/01109/F - Land used for car parking adjacent to 99 Armes Street, Norwich

The senior planner (development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. He referred to the issues raised in objection as set out in the report. During discussion members commented on the application.

Councillor Peek commented that this car park was not as well used as the other one in Armes Street. Councillor Jackson referred to the committee's decision to approve development on the site at 69 Armes Road and expressed concern about the cumulative effect of the loss of off street car parking in the area. Councillor Sands said that he considered that there would be further displacement of parking in the area if this car park no longer available.

RESOLVED, with 8 members voting in favour (Councillors Herries, Driver, Ackroyd, Button, Carlo, Malik, Peek and Woollard) and 2 members voting against (Councillors Jackson and Sands) to approve application 16/01109/F and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Details of facing and roofing materials; windows; joinery; boundary treatments, walls and fences; external lighting;
4. Details of hard and soft landscaping and planting
5. Water efficiency
6. Contamination risk assessment and report to be submitted
7. Unknown contamination to be addressed
8. Control on imported materials
9. Tree protection measures to be implemented

Article 35(2)

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 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.

11. Application no 16/01098/F - Garages adjacent 56 Sotherton Road, Norwich

The senior planner (development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

Councillor Sands said that there was plenty of space for off street parking in this area but that he would abstain from voting on the proposal because the dwellings did not meet the current minimum space standard.

RESOLVED with 9 members voting in favour (Councillors Herries, Driver, Ackroyd, Button, Carlo, Jackson, Malik, Peek and Woollard) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Sands) to approve application 16/01118/F and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Bathroom window on first floor south-eastern elevation to be obscure glazed and non-opening.
4. Details of facing and roofing materials; windows; joinery; boundary treatments, walls and fences; external lighting;
5. Details of hard and soft landscaping and planting
6. Water efficiency
7. Contamination risk assessment and report to be submitted
8. Unknown contamination to be addressed
9. Control on imported materials
10. Tree protection measures to be implemented

Article 35(2) statement

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 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.

12. Application no 16/01156/F - 70 Grove Walk, Norwich, NR1 2QH

The planning assistant (development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

The adjacent neighbour addressed the committee and outlined his objections to the proposal which included: that it was too close to his property and would result in loss of day light and overlooking; there was concern that the house would be used as a house in multiple occupation and result in more vehicle movements; that the extension would fill the gap between the properties and result in a terracing effect which could set a precedent for other houses in the street and was therefore unacceptable.

During discussion a member commented that the space between the proposed extension and the neighbouring property was very narrow. Other members expressed concern about the potential terracing effect which would damage the character of a street comprising large detached houses. A member suggested that there was scope to extend the dwelling at the rear. Discussion ensued in which the planning team leader answered members' questions. Members commented on the purpose of the extension and it was noted that the additional bathrooms and downstairs cloakroom would modernise the house as a family home and that planning permission would be required for a change of use to a house in multiple occupation.

The chair put the recommendations to approve application no. 16/01156/F - 70 Grove Walk Norwich NR1 2QH and grant planning permission, subject to conditions, to the vote and with members voting unanimously against approval the motion was lost.

Councillor Sands moved and Councillor Jackson seconded that the application be refused on the grounds that the size and mass of the extension would impinge on the space between no 70 and the neighbouring house so there was no separate space and would create a terracing effect which was detrimental to the amenity and character of the street. On being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED, unanimously, to refuse planning consent for application no. 16/01156/F - 70 Grove Walk Norwich NR1 2QH, on the grounds listed above and ask the head of planning services to provide reasons for refusal in planning policy terms.

(Reasons for refusal as subsequently provided by the head of planning services:

“The surrounding streetscene is characterised by detached dwellings with space between each dwelling, affording views towards trees and rear gardens beyond. The proposed side extension would infill this space and result in a discordant, cramping and terracing impact upon the street scene. The proposals would therefore detract from the appearance and local distinctiveness of the surrounding area, contrary to policy DM3 of the Norwich Development Management Policies Local Plan (adopted 2014) and paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework”.

13. Application no 16/00563/F - Kingdom Hall of Jehovah’s Witnesses, Clarke Road, Norwich, NR3 1JL

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

During discussion the planner and the planning team leader referred to the report and answered members’ questions. The proposed development was stepped back from the street and reflected the character of the surrounding terraced houses and each unit had private garden space. The landscaping condition would ensure that the development complied with local planning policy and permeable surfaces would be used.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 16/00563/F - Kingdom Hall of Jehovah’s Witnesses, Clarke Road, Norwich, NR3 1JL and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Landscaping details;
4. External materials;
5. Removal of permitted development rights;
6. Water efficiency;
7. Submission cycle/ bin storage details.

Article 35(2) statement

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations and has approved the application subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

14. Application no 16/00761/F - 17 And 19 Neville Street, Norwich, NR2 2PR

The senior planning technical officer presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

During discussion the senior planning technical officer referred to the report and answered members' questions. He explained that whilst replacement with exact wooden replicas of the original windows would be ideal the applicant's proposed plastic window replacements were an improvement on the existing windows.

Councillor Carlo expressed concern that this property was protected by an Article 4 Directive in a conservation area and said that she considered that landlords in this area should replace windows with wooden windows and by not doing so undermined the character of the area.

RESOLVED, with 9 members voting in favour (Councillors Herries, Driver, Ackroyd, Button, Jackson, Malik, Peek, Sands and Woollard) and 1 member voting against (Councillor Carlo) to approve application no. 16/00761/F - 17 and 19 Neville Street Norwich NR2 2PR and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. All proposed windows on the front elevation of the property will be white and feature run-through sash horns, chamfered external bars, be sliding sash opening only and have the outward opening function disabled.

Article 35(2) Statement - The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations and has approved the application subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

CHAIR