



Planning Applications Committee

09:30 – 11:05

13 June 2024

Present: Councillors Driver (chair), Sands (M) (vice chair following election), Caine, Calvert, Davis, Harper, Haynes, Lubbock, Sands (S) and Young

Apologies: Councillors Prinsley and Smith

1. Election of Vice Chair

RESOLVED to elect Councillor Sands (M) as chair for the Civic Year 2023/2024.

2. Declarations of interests

Councillor Sands (M) explained that he had called in in item 4 (below), Application no 23/01551/U to committee for determination on behalf of residents as ward councillor for Bowthorpe Ward. He explained that he did not have a predetermined view on this application and would approach it with an open mind.

3. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 11 April 2024, subject to the following correction under Item 2, Minutes, correcting the date of the minutes approved to 21 March 2024.

4. Application no 23/01551/U – 3 The Hedgerows

(Councillor Haynes arrived during consideration of this item and did not participate in the debate or determination of the application.)

Proposal: Change of use from dwellinghouse (Class C3) to residential institution for children with special educational needs and disabilities, learning difficulties or emotional and behavioural difficulties (Class C2).

The Development Management Team Leader presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

Two residents of neighbouring properties addressed the committee and outlined their objections. These included concern that the proposal did not comply with Policy 5 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) and DM15 because there was no evidence that the county council supported this change of use and therefore the strategic need

for children's residential homes could not be a material planning consideration; that the proposed condition to restrict the number of residents to three could not be enforced; that the fourth bedroom was too small to be an office and bedroom for staff and therefore there should only be two residents; that there was harm to residential amenity as the proposal would exacerbate parking and access issues on the cul-de-sac. The residents also had concerns about the management of the residential home and would like contact details to report concerns. This worked with landlords of HMOs in the area. It was also suggested that a former care home, Lambert House, would be a more suitable residential home for several vulnerable young people rather than converting a family home.

The Development Management Team Leader confirmed that the conditions attached to the recommendation for approval met the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and were enforceable. Members were required to consider the application that was before them and not an alternative premises. A potential condition via a management plan could include actions to alleviate residents' concerns, including the provision of contact details. The Senior Planner explained that the residential home would be regulated and monitored by Ofsted. The county council did not give specific support because it did not want to be drawn into each individual case, but it had indicated that there was a strategic need for children's residential accommodation.

Discussion ensued in which the Development Management Team Leader and Senior Planner referred to the report and presentation and answered members' questions. This included discussion about the parking management plan and the impact of staff changing shifts and other visitors to the proposed residential home. Members were advised that cycle storage had not been requested because there was adequate space for cycles in the area between the garage and the house, and in the garden. The provision was for four car parking spaces which exceeded the policy provision for C3 and C2 uses by one. The proposal was that each shift had one side of the garage and drive to park their cars, restricting the necessity to move cars to let the other staff member out. Parking would not be much different than that of the existing C3 residential use as a family home. Members noted the policy provision was for two cycle storage spaces for 10 bed C2 residential use. Members also considered that the applicant should demonstrate an active travel plan to include the use of public transport and cycling. It was also noted that the residents would be educated within the residential home.

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

During discussion members considered that specific residential accommodation for children was important and that the council was obliged to provide housing suitable for specific needs for looked after children. A member pointed out that such facilities were generally underoccupied to ensure safeguarding and the needs of its residents were met. Members considered that the parking management plan could work well, and there was an opportunity to control the parking arrangements unlike with C3 or C4 uses, that included HMOs and families with several cars. Ofsted would ensure that the management adhered to legislative requirements. The open event (paragraph 40 of the report) and further outreach would provide an opportunity for the neighbours to get to know the managers. Members were sympathetic to the

concerns of the residents but appreciated that that they had demonstrated that they were good neighbours by liaising with the landlords of the HMOs.

Councillor Sands (M), said that he could not support this application as he was concerned that the cul-de-sac was narrower than most roads, and that the additional traffic movements arising from four members of staff changing shifts every 12 hours and other visitors to the home, was not sustainable in this location.

Members considered that the following conditions should be added to the planning consent: details of the management plan, an active travel plan, and cycle storage. The chair moved the recommendations as set out in the report together with the additional conditions, jointly seconded by Councillors Davis and Lubbock, and it was:

RESOLVED, with 7 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Calvert, Caine, Davis, Harper, Lubbock and Young) and 2 members voting against (Councillors Sands (S) and Sands (M)) to approve application 23/01551/U 3 The Hedgerows, Norwich, and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit.
2. In accordance with plans.
3. Compliance with parking management plan.
4. Maximum of three residents.
5. Management Plan.
6. Active travel plan.
7. Cycle storage.

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

5. Application No 24/00253/F – Heath House, Gertrude Road

Proposal: Change of use of existing public house and ancillary flat to 1 no. dwelling

The Planner (case officer) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

During discussion, the Planner, together with the Development Management Team Leader, referred to the report and presentation and answered members' questions. This included clarification on the proposal to secure access to the designated open space, bowling green. Alternative access from Mulberry Court was not existing or achievable because of differing levels, protected trees. It was noted that there was an error on the plans in relation to the bin storage and that 1,100 litre bins were not required for a property of this size and could be addressed by an informative. Members were concerned about the proposed seven bathrooms and that the applicant intended the property to become a large HMO, but were advised that further planning consent for this would be required for a Sui Generis larger HMO of seven or more occupants. There was no Article 4 direction in place to prevent change of use to small HMOs by permitted development. Members were also advised that as the former public house was not a Statutory Listed Building and not in a conservation area, therefore a historic building survey could not be requested by condition as internal changes could be made at any time without the need to apply for planning consent. An informal request could be made to the applicant, though this

would need to be from their good will as they would be under no obligation to agree to this. It was conceivable that the property could convert back to a public house with the necessary licensing and planning permissions. Members noted that an informative relating to protected species was being recommended. In response to a member's request, the Development Management Team Leader confirmed that it would be appropriate to include biodiversity enhancements within the landscaping condition to protect wildlife.

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

The chair commented on the loss of the public house but that provided the exterior character of the building was retained, the conversion would work well.

Councillor Haynes moved and Councillor Davis seconded that condition 8 be amended to incorporate biodiversity enhancements and with all members concurring was incorporated into the recommendations.

RESOLVED, with 8 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Sands (M), Calvert, Harper, Haynes, Sands (S), Lubbock and Young) and 2 members voting against (Councillors Caine and Davis) to approve application 24/00253/F Heath House, 99 Gertrude Road, Norwich NR3 4SG and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit.
2. In accordance with plans.
3. Retention of access to adjacent open space.
4. Materials to be used in external alterations to pub to match existing.
5. Details of insulated roof system replacement of existing conservatory roof to be agreed.
6. Provision of parking and servicing prior to first occupation.
7. Detailed scheme for the parking of cycles to be submitted and approved and fully implemented prior to first occupation.
8. Detailed scheme for landscaping to be submitted and approved and fully implemented prior to first occupation, to include consideration for biodiversity enhancements.

Informative notes:

1. Protected species.
2. The applicant is advised that the bin size noted on the approved plans (1,100l x 2) is unlikely to be necessary for a property of this size. The applicant should apply for bins via Norwich City Council's online form:

[Instructions | Request a bin - New build property \(norwich.gov.uk\)](#).

CHAIR