



Planning applications committee

09:30 to 12:25

14 September 2017

Present: Councillors Driver (chair)(to end of item 3 below), Maxwell (vice chair, in the chair from item 4 below), Button (from end of item 2 below), Bradford, Carlo, Henderson, Jackson, Malik, Peek, and Woollard (until end of item 4) and Wright

Apologies: Councillor Sands (M)

1. Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

2. Minutes

RESOLVED to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 10 August 2017, subject to correcting the job titles of the planners.

3. Application no 17/01022/F - Heath House, 99 Gertrude Road, Norwich, NR3 4SG

The senior planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. Since the publication of the report, the council had received three further objections regarding loss of open space, impact on parking and over-development of the site.

A local resident and Councillor Brociek-Coulton, local member for Sewell Ward, addressed the committee and outlined their objections to the scheme which included loss of a protected open space and that the funding in mitigation was insufficient; concern about access to the site for emergency and refuse vehicles and due to the steep incline to future residents; the loss of parking at the public house would exacerbate the congested parking on Gertrude and Violet Roads; and asking that the former bowling green be designated as an asset of community value.

In response the senior planner said that the access to the site was not unduly steep. Waste collection vehicles would not be required to use this access.

The agent addressed the committee and said that the applicant had worked with the council to overcome the concerns of the original application which had been refused last year. The payment of £15,000 for a recreational facility was in line with the council's policy DM8. The proposal included space for car parking and bin storage, was compliant with SUDs drainage and contributed to the five year land supply.

During discussion, the senior planner and the area planning development manager (inner area) referred to the report and answered members' questions. The proposal had been assessed on its own merits. The loss of protected green space had been

outweighed by the delivery of four houses with mitigation provided by the payment for the refurbishment of the pitch and putt site at Mousehold Heath. The site had not been used as a recreational facility for a couple of years and was in private ownership. It was a windfall site that contributed to the five year land supply. It was unlikely to be used as a bowling green again. Members noted that there was a lack of play provision in this area. The senior planner said that this site was not an asset of community value and explained the process of designation which would activate when the "asset" was put on the market giving the community an opportunity to secure funding to purchase it. Members were advised that the applicant would be required to provide full details of water drainage and flood risk mitigation before development of the site. Each house would have a private garden where there was room to store bins. The details of the passageway between the middle houses could be requested as part of the landscaping condition. The protection of trees was covered by the arboricultural statement and the council had the authority to take enforcement action for the area covered by a tree protection order.

Discussion ensued in which member considered the objections to the scheme. Some members considered that once the site had been developed it would be lost as a green open space. There was a shortage of play provision in the city. Members were advised that highways officers had not objected to the access to the site or the arrangements for parking at the site. Some members considered that the payment of £15,000 towards the improvement of a local recreational facility was too low. Following discussion, Councillor Carlo moved and Councillor Malik seconded that the application should be refused on the grounds that it would result in the loss of protected open space and that other uses as set out in policy DM8 had not been explored sufficiently, and it was:

RESOLVED, with 7 members voting in favour (Councillors Carlo, Malik, Jackson, Henderson, Wright, Woollard and Bradford) and 4 members voting against (Councillors Driver, Maxwell, Button and Peek) to refuse planning application no 17/01022/F - Heath House, 99 Gertrude Road, Norwich, NR3 4SG, on the grounds of loss of protected open space and that other uses as set out in policy DM8 had not been explored sufficiently, and to ask the head of planning services to provide the reasons for refusal in planning policy terms.

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

"The proposal would lead to the complete loss of designated open space, causing harm to visual amenity and recreation provision within the locality, contrary to the requirements of criterion (a) of the second part of policy DM8 of the Norwich Development Management Policies document (2014). In addition the applicant has failed to satisfactorily demonstrate there is no viable or reasonably practicable means of restoring or re-using the site for an alternative form of open space, contrary to the requirements of criterion (c) of policy DM8. The benefits of the scheme, including the proposed off-site mitigation do not outweigh the harm caused by the loss of the open space, and therefore the proposal does not meet criteria (a) and (b) within the first part of policy DM8, and conflicts with guidance in paragraph 74 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012)."

(Councillor Driver left the meeting at this point. Councillor Maxwell, vice chair, was in the chair for the remainder of the meeting.)

4. Application no 17/00986/F - 40 Fishergate, Norwich, NR3 1SE

The planner presented the report with the 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 an additional letter of objection relating to increased traffic issues, including increased pollution and impact on the children's play area; and a letter of support from One Norwich, welcoming the proposed site as key to new model of care provision in Norwich and that it was in a central location with good transport links and close to parking facilities.

A resident of St Edmund's Wharf, whose ground floor apartment abutted Hansard Lane, addressed the committee and highlighted her objections to the proposed surgery. This included concern that there would be "constant traffic" and noise from vehicles using the car park, no clear right of way on Hansard Lane and concern about potential damage to her external walls because of the tight access. She also expressed concern that there was inadequate parking provision for patients, provision to drop off disabled visitors or pavement to the carpark, and traffic issues.

The applicant (a partner of the surgery) spoke in support of the application and explained that the practice had outgrown its current premises in Cowgate and needed to expand to meet demand from developments in Anglia Square and Whitefriars. The proposal had the support of NHS England and Norwich Clinical Commissioning Group. The use of the car park was for staff only. The current surgery did not provide any parking. Patients walked, used buses or parked in existing public car parks. St Saviours car park was the same distance from the current surgery to the new surgery.

The planner explained that there was car parking at the rear of St Edmunds church and that the ownership of Hansard Lane was a civil matter. In reply to members' questions, the planner said that the proposal was for change of use and that there were no changes to the car park or access. The potential to provide cycle storage on the site had been discussed with the applicant but there was public cycle storage at Fye Bridge. There was no designated drop off for disabled people but Blue badge holders could park in permitted parking zones. The area planning development manager (inner area) explained in response to a question that the application would secure a piece of land connecting St Edmunds Wharf and Old Millers Wharf. This application was for change of use and therefore no landscaping conditions had been required. A buddleia bush had been removed.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 17/00986/F - 40 Fishergate Norwich, NR3 1SE and grant planning permission subject to section 106 agreement to secure provision of riverside walk across the south of the site at 40 Fishergate, connecting the riverside walk to adjacent sites at St Edmunds Wharf and Old Millers Wharf and the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. In accordance with submitted Transport Plan;
4. Subject to flood management plan prior to first occupation;

5. Subject to Section 106 to secure riverside walk.

(Councillor Woollard left the meeting at this point.)

5. Application no 17/00980/F – Eastgate House, 122 Thorpe Road, Norwich NR1 1RT

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides, including a shadow analysis. He referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports which summarised revisions to the plans which included re-designation three flats to one-bedroom/one person flats which met the standard designation for this level of occupancy; improved access to bin storage, and soft landscaping to include screening.

During discussion the planner and the area planning development manager (inner area) referred to the report and answered members' questions. Members sought information about the change of use and the extent of the prior approval under permitted development rights. There would be parking for the flats on site, with some of the car park reserved for the coroners' court. The committee concurred that there should be a landscaping condition to secure the location of the bin store and open amenity space.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 17/00980/F - 122 Thorpe Road, Norwich, NR1 1RT and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. External materials – roof covering, fascia details, window details, balustrade including fittings.
4. No occupation until provision of refuse and cycle storage has been implemented.
5. Water efficiency 110L per person per day.
6. Landscaping plans to be agreed.

6. Application no 17/01130/VC - 174 Aylsham Road, Norwich, NR3 2HJ

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

During discussion the planner referred to the report and answered members' questions. Extending the operating hours did not create a significant risk to residents from fumes from the petrol sales. The shop would not be open all night but sales could be made through a hatch. The sale of alcohol was regulated through licensing legislation.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 17/01130/VC - 174 Aylsham Road, Norwich, NR3 2HJ and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Temporary consent for 12 months unless extension is agreed with council;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Noise monitoring procedure to be agreed and followed;

4. Certain activities not to be carried out during the hours 11pm-7am;
5. Bicycle storage and car parking in accordance with the details approved under 4/1992/0549;
6. Landscaping in accordance with the details approved under 4/1993/0004;
7. Installation of plant and machinery to be agreed.

7. Application no 17/00836/F - 20 Catton Grove Road, Norwich, NR3 3NH

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

During discussion the planner referred to the report and answered questions. Members discussed the principle of the development in a residential garden. It was noted that the reference to “brownfield” in paragraph 24 of the report was incorrect as it was a rear garden and therefore “greenfield”. The plots were varied sizes and the proposal was not considered to be detrimental to the character of the area.

Councillor Jackson said that he could not support this application because the subdivision of the garden was detrimental to the character of the area. Councillor Carlo said that the development would set a precedent and that it was close to Mousehold Heath. She hoped that the council would adopt a policy on subdivision of garden space for residential use. The chair pointed out that there was already a bungalow on the other side of the road in a smaller subdivided garden plot.

RESOLVED with 7 members voting in favour (Councillors Maxwell, Button, Henderson, Malik, Wright, Peek and Bradford) and 2 members voting against (Councillors Carlo and Jackson) to approve application no. 17/00836/F - 20 Catton Grove Road, Norwich, NR3 3NH and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Materials to be agreed;
4. Cycle and refuse details to be submitted;
5. Scheme to deal with surface water drainage;
6. All boundary treatments to have hedgehog gaps;
7. In accordance with tree protection plan;
8. Site clearance only outside of bird nesting season;
9. Water efficiency.

Informatives:

1. Property naming & numbering
2. Works to the highway require highways consent
3. Tree protection barriers to be appropriately constructed

8. Application no 17/00165/F - Mill House, Hellesdon Mill Lane, Norwich, NR6 5AY

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. He referred to the supplementary report of updates to the reports and pointed out that the reason for the application to be referred to committee was because of “objection” only.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 17/00165/F - Mill House Hellesdon Mill Lane Norwich NR6 5AY and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Ecological assessment.

9. Application no 17/01028/F 194 Thorpe Road, Norwich, NR1 1TJ

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

During discussion the planner referred to the report and answered members' questions. The new shed/garden room would be on the site of the former garage and would overhang the slope, and had windows to the front only. There were similar sheds and outbuildings in the neighbouring properties. Members welcomed the use of a green roof on the extension and shed.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 17/01028/F 194 Thorpe Road, Norwich, NR1 1TJ and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Works in accordance with Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement.

10. Application no 17/01063/F 79 Church Lane, Norwich, NR4 6NY

The planner presented the report with plans and slides.

During discussion the planner together with the area planning team manager (inner area) referred to the report and answered members' questions. The conditions would require a darker brown wood stain. A member pointed out that the two bay cart lodge would be a garage if roller doors were added. Members were advised that the extra dimension was to provide storage.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no 17/01063/F 79 Church Lane, Norwich, NR4 6NY and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Details of stain colour to be secured.

CHAIR