



**Planning applications committee**

**09:30 to 10:45**

**13 April 2017**

Present: Councillors Herries (chair), Bradford, Button, Carlo (from middle of item 3 (below) onwards), Driver, Henderson, Jackson, Lubbock, Malik, Peek and Woollard

Apologies: Councillor Sands (M)

**1. Declarations of interest**

Councillor Lubbock declared a predetermined view in item 6 (below), Application nos 16/01951/F and 16/01952/L - 2 Church Lane and 18 Eaton Street, Norwich, NR4 6NZ, because she had spoken to residents who objected to the scheme and wanted to support them in her capacity as Eaton Ward councillor.

**2. Minutes**

**RESOLVED** to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 9 March 2017.

**3. Application no 16/01584/F – Land at rear of 67 St Augustines Street, Norwich**

(Councillor Carlo entered the meeting during this item and therefore could not participate in the committee's determination of the application.)

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

In reply to a member's question, the planning assistant referred to the report and explained that the council owned the alley to the side of the city wall which provided access for maintenance.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously (with all members eligible to vote voting in favour, Councillor Carlo having been absent for part of the presentation) to approve application no 16/01584/F - Land Rear of 67 St Augustines Street, Norwich, and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Water efficiency;
4. Archaeology;
5. Storage of materials;
6. Boundary treatment;
7. Permeable paving retained;

8. Soakaway – archaeological implications;
9. Provision of cycle and vehicle parking and refuse storage prior to first occupation;
10. Maintenance of landscaping access for recording: The developer shall afford reasonable access to allow for a full photographic survey of the scheduled Ancient Monument to be carried out before and during the course of works hereby approved. No works shall take place until details of the type and manner of access to be provided have been agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
11. Making good: Any damage caused to the Scheduled Ancient Monument by the works hereby approved shall be made good in accordance with a scheme first submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority and the making good in accordance with the scheme as agreed shall take place within 3 months of the approval of the scheme.
12. Stop work if unidentified features revealed;
13. Preservation and Protection of Features: No works shall take place on the site in pursuance of this consent until a detailed scheme of work outlining the proposed measures of protection for the following features, which shall enable them to remain undisturbed in their existing position and fully protected during the course of the work on the site, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority: Historic City Walls (Scheduled Ancient Monument).

Informative:

1. It may be necessary to apply for Scheduled Ancient Monument consent; it is the responsibility to establish the requirement for this with Historic England.
2. Other works: This consent relates only to the works specifically shown and described on the approved drawings. All other works, the need for which becomes apparent as alterations and repairs proceed, are not covered by this consent and may require a further specific consent. Details of any other works, submitted as part of a further application if required, should be submitted to the local planning authority and approved before work continues.

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 17/00220/MA - Land at Goldsmith Street Greyhound Opening and Haslips Close, Norwich**

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

During discussion the senior planner referred to the report and answered members' questions. He confirmed that there would be a hedge around the play area which would provide a safe and contained area for children to play. The principle of loss of parking on the site for local residents had been established when the application for this site had been approved. Members, however, were updated and advised that the

council was exploring the implementation of a controlled parking zone which had been conditioned as part of the permission providing parking for local residents and that the specific needs for a Dereham Road resident had not been progressed due to a change in that individual's circumstances. The senior planner confirmed that the dwellings would be accessible and that 10 per cent were policy compliant and suitable for modifications for disabled people.

Discussion ensued in which members welcomed the new dormer windows and considered them more aesthetically pleasing. Members also considered that the consolidation of the three play areas into one space would be practical for parents with more than one child as children would all play in the same area. Members commented that the revisions were beneficial but that this development had been subject to long delays. They looked forward to its first occupation next year.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to approve application no. 17/00220/MA - Land at Goldsmith Street, Greyhound Opening and Haslips Close, Norwich and grant planning permission subject to the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement to include provision of affordable housing and subject to the following conditions:

1. Development to be in accord with drawings and details;
2. Details of facing and roofing materials; external lighting to be in accord with applications 16/00794/D and 16/01919/D; and details to be agreed within 4 months of the date of permission for brick bond; joinery; window shutters; verges; vent systems; external lighting (Private residences); and heritage interpretation;
3. Windows facing south Block L first floor flats to be obscure glazed and fixed openings;
4. Details of vehicle charging point; car club vehicle parking point; cycle storage; and bin stores provision to be in accord with application 16/01930/D; and details to be agreed within 4 months of the date of permission for car club vehicle;
5. Details to be agreed within 4 months of the date of permission of highways works;
6. Details to be agreed prior to first occupation of travel plan;
7. Provision to be made prior to first occupation of extension to Controlled Parking Zone;
8. Construction management; parking; wheel washing etc. to be in accord with application 16/01827/D;
9. Details of landscaping Midland Street area; private gardens; and street trees (planting; tree pits; biodiversity enhancements; south play spaces; site treatment works; boundary treatments, gates, walls and fences; access road and path link surfaces; and landscape provision and maintenance) to be in accord with application 16/00794/D and 16/01565/D; and details to be agreed for landscaping for communal areas and north-east play area;
10. Pre-construction site meeting, details of arboricultural monitoring; and where necessary Arboricultural Method Statement for additional site works, protection of existing trees and planting to be in accord with application 16/01691/D;
11. Compliance with Arboricultural Implications Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement and additional information at condition 10 and Tree Protection Scheme implemented prior to commencement;
12. Retention of tree protection;

13. Details of Passivhaus measures to be to be in accord with application 16/01546/D; and details to be agreed prior to first occupation for provision and maintenance of LZC technologies and renewable energy sources should development not achieve Passivhaus accreditation;
14. Water efficiency measures set at 110 litres/person/day;
15. Implementation of surface water flood strategy;
16. Details of modelling of the surface water pipe network to be in accord with application 16/00729/D;
17. Details of maintenance of the surface water drainage system to be in accord with application 16/00729/D;
18. No hard-standings to be constructed prior to surface water works having been carried out;
19. Details of site contamination investigation, assessment and remediation to be in accord with application 16/01829/D;
20. Details of contamination verification plan to be agreed prior to first occupation;
21. Cessation of works if unknown contaminants found;
22. Details of all imported material prior to occupation to be agreed prior to first occupation;
23. Details of plant and machinery;

#### Informatives

1. Considerate constructors.
2. Unrecorded Unexploded Ordnance.
3. Impact on wildlife.
4. Highways contacts, permits, design note, works within the highway etc.
5. Environment Agency guidance.
6. Anglian Water guidance.

#### 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 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.

#### **5. Application no 17/00298/F - 82 Christchurch Road, Norwich, NR2 3NG**

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

During discussion, the planning assistant referred to the report and answered members' questions on the design and materials proposed for the extension. She explained that the use of modern materials would provide a contemporary style and was not out of keeping with other houses in Christchurch Road which have also been updated. Members considered the concerns raised by the immediate neighbours but considered that it would not have a detrimental impact on them or the immediate area.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to approve application no. 17/00298/F - 82 Christchurch Road Norwich NR2 3NG and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

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

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 and has approved the application subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

**6. Application nos 16/01951/F and 16/01952/L - 2 Church Lane and 18 Eaton Street, Norwich, NR4 6NZ**

(Councillor Lubbock, having declared a predetermined view in this application, addressed the committee and then left the meeting during the committee's determination of the applications.)

The senior planner (development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. He advised members that paragraph 10 of the report should be amended as the list referred to "2 x 1-bed flats" which should be amended to "2 x 2-bed flats" as the proposal comprised a total of eight dwellings: four one-bed flats; two two-bed flats and two two-bed houses.

Councillor Lubbock addressed the committee on behalf of local residents and outlined their objections which included: concerns about highway safety and congestion because of the need to service the development from Church Lane and that the junction of Church Lane and Eaton Street was an important one and should be kept clear for access; and that the site was overdevelopment and would be too dominant for the listed building on the site. There should be a less dense development on the site and the provision of more amenity space for future residents; improve access to the site and vehicle turning space; and enhance the listed building and conservation area. She also suggested that as this was a complicated site the committee undertook a site visit before determining the applications.

A resident of Tamarind Mews spoke on behalf of 13 residents, who had signed a petition objecting to the proposals, and two other residents addressed the committee and outlined their objections. This included concerns that the proposed development would exacerbate existing parking problems in the area and that four parking spaces on the site would not be sufficient as future residents of the proposed dwellings would have cars and visitors. The residents also questioned the provision of eight cycle spaces and suggested that this was not the mode of transport that most people would use. The proposed two-storey block was considered to overlook the rear of properties in Tamarind Mews, particularly no 7, and the gable end would have an unacceptable impact and should be stepped back by 1.5 metres. Residents were also concerned about traffic chaos, as the access/egress was adjacent to the traffic lights, and the arrangements to service the proposed dwellings from Church Lane rather than on site would increase traffic congestion. They expressed concern about the impact that it would have on the conservation area and that there was an opportunity for an improved less dense development on this site.

The agent addressed the committee on behalf of the applicant. She said that the new development would provide high quality well designed residential dwellings and provide more effective use of the site. The developers had worked closely with planning officers for a scheme which fitted into the conservation area and there had been no objections from the statutory consultees. She referred to the sunlight analysis which demonstrated that there was no significant harm to the properties in Tamarind Mews. The provision of car parking on the site was in accordance with the city council's policy. The development and the principle of housing on the site was in line with local and national policies.

(Councillor Lubbock left the meeting at this point.)

The chair referred to the committee's agreed criteria for site visits and said that the site was an open site and it would have been possible for members to visit it if they desired. The senior planner said that he did not consider it necessary for members to conduct a site visit. The site was visible and the slides showed the site in context with the neighbouring buildings.

The senior planner referred to the report, and together with the planning team leader (outer area) responded to the issues raised by the speakers and answered questions from members. The buildings on the site were vacant. There was no overlooking of the neighbouring properties or gardens because of the use of roof-lights at the rear of the proposed apartment building; and the distance and oblique angle between them.

During discussion members expressed concern about the lack of amenity space for the residents of the flats. Members were advised that the two houses had gardens. Marston Marshes were within walking distance and therefore the lack of amenity space for the flats was considered acceptable and not uncommon for a city development. An ecological assessment had been made and hedge clearance could only take place provided there were no nesting birds.

The planning team leader (outer area) confirmed that the conservation and design officer had been consulted on the proposals and had no objections to the scheme which was of high quality and would have a positive impact on the Eaton district centre and bring vitality into the area.

A member suggested that a door should be provided at the rear of the apartment building for residents to use when putting out their bins.

Councillor Bradford said that he would abstain from voting on this application because of his concerns about the location and traffic implications from this proposal and the development in the context of the listed building.

Councillor Henderson explained that she could not approve this application which provided amenity space for only 25 per cent of the dwellings. Councillor Carlo said that the proposal was overdevelopment and did not complement the listed building. She also objected on the grounds of lack of amenity space for the future residents.

**RESOLVED**, with 7 members voting in favour (Councillors Herries, Driver, Button, Malik, Jackson, Peek and Woollard), 2 members voting against (Councillors Carlo and Henderson) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Bradford) to approve:

- (1) application no 16/01951/F - 2 Church Lane and 18 Eaton Street, Norwich, NR4 6NZ and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:
  1. Standard time limit;
  2. In accordance with plans;
  3. Details to be submitted to include external materials to be used in the construction of the development, details of external joinery, rooflights, external flues, details of proposed eaves and verges, rainwater goods, brick bond and mortar etc;
  4. Landscaping details, soft and hard to include details of permeable paving, external lighting, bin presentation area, cycle parking and all boundary treatments;
  5. Compliance with the mitigation measures set out in section 8 of the protected species survey;
  6. Unknown contamination - in the event that any is discovered, works are to cease and a scheme for remediation agreed with the local authority;
  7. Imported material - Any imported topsoil and subsoil for use on site to be certified;
  8. Restricted construction times;
  9. Removal of permitted development rights for houses for enlargements and extensions;
  10. Compliance with the approved parking strategy;
  11. Water efficiency.
  
- (2) application no. 16/01952/L - 2 Church Lane & 18 Eaton Street Norwich NR4 6NZ, and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:
  1. Standard time limit;
  2. In accordance with plans;
  3. Demolition of single-storey curtilage listed buildings attached to the rear of the listed building – To be carried out by hand or using hand held tools;
  4. All existing fabric to be retained unless notated otherwise on the approved drawings;
  5. Details of repair works to the flank elevation of the rear wing of the two-storey curtilage listed building.

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 stage, the application has been approved subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

CHAIR