NORWICH City Council

MINUTES

Planning applications committee

10:00 to 14:20 **6 November 2014**

Present: Councillors Gayton (chair), Sands (M), Ackroyd, Blunt, Bradford, Button, Grahame, Herries, Jackson, Little (substitute for Councillor Boswell), Neale and Woollard

Apologies: Councillor Boswell

1. Declaration of interests

Councillor Herries declared an other interest in item 3 (below) Application no 14/01134/F 1 The Moorings, Norwich, NR3 3AX as she was currently a resident of Indigo Yard.

Councillor Little said that he had a pre-determined view in respect of item 4 (below) Application no 14/01234/F 41A Ipswich Road, Norwich, NR2 2LN and that he would speak on the item and then leave the room.

Councillor Blunt declared that he had spoken to residents about item 7, Application no 14/00618/F Vikings Venture Scout Hut adjacent to 420 Dereham Road, Norwich, NR5 8QQ, in his capacity as a local member for Wensum Ward, and confirmed that he was approaching the application with an open mind.

2. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 2 October 2014.

3. Application no 14/01134/F 1 The Moorings, Norwich, NR3 3AX

(The following members of the committee attended the site visit to 1 The Moorings at 9:00: Councillors Gayton, Sands, Ackroyd, Blunt, Button, Herries, Jackson, Neale and Woollard. Councillor Bradford had visited the site independently.)

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

The planner (development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. He referred to plan on page 42 of the agenda papers, which was additional to the plans attached to the report to the previous meeting, and showed the extent of the footprint of the proposed extension and its proximity to the boundary fence of no 19 Indigo Yard. The comments of the conservation and design officer had been attached to the report. The planner also referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports which was circulated at the meeting and contained a summary of three additional representations, including a list compiled by residents of Indigo Yard

objecting to the proposal and an additional note from the applicant, together with the officer response. The report also included updates to the report submitted to the committee's meeting on 2 October 2014, which included an additional letter of representation and additional information from applicant and the officer response. Members were also advised of an amendment to paragraph 10 of the report which was to amend the reference to the Northern city centre area action plan (March 2010) as set out in the supplementary report.

The immediate neighbour to the site (no 19 Indigo Yard) addressed the committee and outlined the objections to the scheme that she and her husband had made which included: concern that the proposal was not sympathetic to the Northern Riverside Character Area of the Norwich City Centre conservation area as expressed in the view of the council's conservation and design office; that the proposal would result in loss of light and harm the outlook of residents of Indigo Yard and therefore was detrimental to the amenity of Indigo Yard, which was used as a social recreation area by residents; and, that the design of the building was contrary to National planning policy framework statements and local planning policies which required the design to be of a high standard and to respect local distinctiveness and sympathetic to the conservation area. The neighbour also said that the proposed extension would be the equivalent of a two storey building as it would come right up to the boundary fence and that she was concerned about overlooking and that it would its dominance would affect the quality of their lives.

Three other residents of Indigo Yard addressed the committee and outlined their objections to the scheme which included: the need to preserve the gap between 1 The Moorings and 19 Indigo Yard as it distinguished the developments at The Moorings and Indigo Yard and provided an open vista from the riverside walk and the south west of Indigo Yard, and that the proposed extension to 1 The Moorings was inappropriate use of this space; that some households in Indigo Yard had not been included in the planning consultation; that Indigo Yard was a public space and that the loss of outlook was not that of a "private view"; that the design of the proposed extension did not add "interest and appeal" but was large and dominated Indigo Yard and diminished its outlook; that the proposal contradicted the rigorous spatial planning when the developments at Indigo Yard and the Moorings were constructed and could set a precedent.

The applicant explained that the residents misunderstood the relationship between the buildings and the space and that if the extension was built it would not receive a second glance. He considered that 1 The Moorings could be classified as "New Commercial" and that whilst it had three bedrooms and three shower rooms the space in the living room would only accommodate a three piece suite and a television because space was taken up on that floor by the stairwell. He had purchased the end terrace as his residence and with a view to extend the living room. The impact of the proposed extension would not impact on 19 Indigo Yard. He pointed out that there would still be a gap between the buildings.

The planner then referred to the report and responded to the issues raised by the speakers. The committee was advised that the proposal site was unique and that the proposal was for an atypical extension which would not set a precedent. In reply to members' questions, the planner referred to the report on the design of the gates, which would be locked using a key code and would be made of iron

railings and pointing out that the response to the issues raised by the conservation and design officer were set out in paragraph 3 of the report.

During discussion members commented on the design of the housing units at The Moorings and Indigo Yard and that the proposed extension would obscure the gap between the developments. A member said that he had sympathy with the applicant for wanting to take the opportunity to make the most of his property but he considered that the scheme was incongruous with the rest of the scheme and did not add to its overall coherence and therefore was unacceptable. Another member said that he considered that the application should be refused not because of loss of amenity to the residents but on the issue of design. He considered that the extension would remove the atypical characteristic of the building line and the view from the riverside walk of the break between the buildings, which was a characteristic of the Northern riverside character area of the Norwich city centre conservation area.

Discussion ensued in which the planner explained that less weight had been added to the design and the conservation officer's comments given the lack of identified harm that the proposed extension would cause to the heritage asset (the character of the conservation area). He pointed out that the buildings were modern and although not themselves heritage assets, they did contribute positively to the conservation area. Another member referred to viewing the proposal from the perspective that historic development of the city had always included extensions which have contributed to its rich fabric.

Councillor Blunt then moved and Councillor Herries seconded that the application should be refused because the design, scale and mass of the extension was harmful to the character of the conservation area by the removal of the wedge shaped gap between the two distinct developments of The Moorings and Indigo Yard. This would detract from the pleasant view from the riverside walk and did not respect local distinctiveness. It would also detract from the attractively designed terrace.

RESOLVED, with 10 members voting in favour of refusal (Councillors Gayton, Ackroyd, Blunt, Button, Grahame, Herries, Jackson, Neale, Woollard, and Bradford) and two members voting against (Councillors Sands and Little) to refuse application no application no 14/01134/F 1 The Moorings, Norwich, NR3 3AX, on the grounds that the design, scale and mass of the extension was harmful to the form and character of the conservation area and the proposal did not respect local distinctiveness by filling a gap between the two distinct developments of The Moorings and Indigo Yard, 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 proposed first floor extension would partially fill the wedge-shaped gap between the host dwelling and 19 Indigo Yard, and this would detract from one of the positive elements of the adjacent Riverside Walk and conservation area. A key element of the attractiveness of this section of the Riverside Walk is the spatial relationship between the public walkway and the residential development blocks fronting it, with gaps between buildings adding to the variety and interest of the street scape. As a result of its scale and massing the addition sits incongruously at the end of the attractively designed terrace,

and in this specific location partially infilling the gap in the river frontage, it fails to respect or respond to the character and local distinctiveness of the area and accordingly the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character of the City Centre conservation area, contrary to the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2014), saved policies HBE8 and HBE12 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (2004) and emerging Norwich Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 policies DM3 and DM9.

Article 31(1)(cc) 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. Whilst a scheme has been given a recommendation for approval by officers, elected members considered for the reasons outlined above that on balance and in light of the above policies that the application was not acceptable. The applicant is advised that no further planning fee would be payable for any resubmission for development of the same character or description on the same site and by the same applicant within 12 months of the date of this refusal. The applicant is also advised of the council's pre-application service, further details of which can be found at the following web link: http://www.norwich.gov.uk/Planning/pages/Planning-Pre-ApplicationAdviceService.aspx

4. Application no 14/01234/F 41A Ipswich Road, Norwich, NR2 2LN

(Councillor Little had declared a pre-determined view in this application.)

The planner (development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides, including aerial views of the site. He referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports which was circulated at the meeting and contained a summary of a letter of objection from a resident and chairperson of the Harford Manor Houseowners' Association, which had been omitted from the committee report and the website in error and a letter from Councillor Little, local member for Town Close ward.

The immediate neighbour to the site addressed the committee and outlined her objections which included: concern about the operators removing the hedge at the boundary of her property which had obscured the view; the proximity of the site to her house and the impact of noise and diesel fumes; that the use of the site had intensified from five containers to 20 at its peak and now 15; that the industrial use of the site was contrary to the National planning policy framework and EP22 and not compatible with the residential area and school; concern about vehicles using the same entrance to the grounds as the students of the Hewett School and that the operation should be relocated to another site. The chairperson of the Harford Manor Houseowners' Association said that noise from the site affected other residents but only two households had been consulted. He also said that there should have been restrictions on the site years' ago. Councillor Little said that he welcomed an attempt to regularise the operation of the site but considered that no activities should take place before 8am and suggested measures to mitigate against noise disturbance to residents from the commercial activity.

The agent from NPS spoke in support of the applicant and said that his client had agreed a number of steps to alleviate the residents' concerns. He pointed out that the applicant could submit a certificate of lawful use for the site but had chosen to submit a planning application to regularise the use of the site.

(Councillor Little left the meeting at this point.)

The planner referred to the reports and responded to the issues raised by the speakers. He pointed out that the matter of the hedge was a civil matter between the two parties.

Discussion ensued in which the planner, together with the planning development manager, referred to the reports and answered members' questions. Members were advised that it was council property to consult the occupiers of properties no more than 10m from the application site. Members also sought assurance that the conditions attached to the planning permission were enforceable. The neighbour to the site advised the committee that the school did share the egress/access with the operators of the site. Members noted that part of the grounds maintenance was gritting of car parks and school entrances and that in bad weather an early start was important. The early start of the operation meant that the peak times for the school run were avoided.

During discussion members considered that the proposal was an improvement on the site being used without regularisation. A member suggested that the operators could put permanent buildings on the site and avoid the problems of noise that the containers presented. The committee considered that landscaping would mitigate some of the concerns about neighbourhood amenity but were advised that this would have little impact on noise disturbance. Members agreed by consensus that a condition should be added to the recommendations to include details of landscaping along the northern boundary to be agreed.

RESOLVED with 7 members voting in favour (Councillors Gayton, Sands, Ackroyd, Blunt, Button, Grahame and Jackson) and 4 members abstaining (Councillors Herries, Neale, Woollard and Bradford) to approve 14/01234/F 41A Ipswich Road and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:-

1. In accordance with the approved plans.
2. No employees on site before 07:15 or after 20:00 except in the case of an emergency (which itself shall be defined in the site operations management plan to be agreed through condition 8).
3. No operational use (including the opening of containers) of the premises which form the subject of this permission and outlined in red on the approved location plan ref.01-01-15-2-1035 (01) shall take place other than between the hours of 07:30 and 19:00 on any day except in the case of an emergency (which itself shall be defined in the site operations management plan to be agreed through condition 8).
4. No plant or machinery shall be operated on the premises outside the following hours:
    - before 07:30 hours and after 19:00 hours Mondays – Fridays;
    - before 07:30 hours and after 13:30 hours on Saturdays; and
    - not at all on Sundays or Public Holidays.

- This shall apply except in the case of an emergency (which itself shall be defined in the site operations management plan to be agreed through condition 8).

5. No trade deliveries or collections (including the delivery or collection of green waste or general waste skips) shall take place before 9:00 hours and after 17:00 hours Monday to Friday.
6. The layout of the site shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan ref.01-01-15-2-1035 (03) and retained as such unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
7. Within 3 months of the date of this decision the position of the old container shall be reconfigured in accordance with the details agreed in paragraph 4.1 of the approved Noise Impact Assessment [ref. 10980/1] and retained in this position unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA.
8. Within 3 months of the date of this decision, details of site operations management plan to be agreed Operations on site shall be carried out in accordance with this plan unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA.
9. Within 3 months of the date of this decision details of the siting of the 2 metre high close boarded fence along the northern and western boundaries of the site are to be submitted and agreed by the LPA and maintained and retained in the approved position unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA.
10. Within 3 months of the date of this decision details of lighting (including specification, height, direction, cowling etc) to be agreed.
11. Within 3 months of the date of this decision the noise dampening measures as detailed in paragraph 4.6 of the approved Noise Impact Assessment [ref. 10980/1] shall be installed on all the containers within the site and maintained and retained in the approved form unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA.
12. In accordance with the approved AIA.
13. Details of landscaping along the northern boundary to be agreed..

Article 31(1)(cc) 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.

5. Application no 14/01108/U Rouen House, Rouen Road, Norwich, NR1 1RB

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

At the chair's discretion, a member of the public addressed the committee and expressed his concern about pedestrian access from the Cattle Market Street junction; that there was no assisted pedestrian crossing on Rouen Road; that people attending the medical centre would be dropped off or people would park on double yellow lines and exacerbate existing parking problems in a controlled parking zone.

The applicant said that the medical centre would comply with any conditions that were required. The practice considered that Rouen House was more accessible than the proposed relocation to another unit within Castle Mall.

Discussion ensued in which the planner and the planning development manager referred to the report and answered members' questions. In response to a question from a member the applicant confirmed that Castle Mall had sought planning permission to relocate the medical centre within the mall and was contributing to the relocation of the medical centre to Rouen House. The committee considered the traffic implications and noted that ambulances could stop on yellow lines in an emergency. It was also noted the Norwich Society had raised concerns about access, dropping off and servicing of the proposal. The committee concurred with the suggestion of the planning development manager said that a condition regarding level access for disabled people could be added.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no 14/01108/U for the lower ground and ground floors of Rouen House, Rouen Road and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement within three years.
2. In accordance with approved plans and details.
3. The health centre, comprising a doctors surgery and walk-in centre, shall not be open to the public between the hours of 9pm and 7am hours on any day;
4. No development until measures to improve the pedestrian safety of visitors to the health centre, comprising a hand rail and improved pedestrian plaza to the Normans Buildings entrance;
5. Submission of a Travel Information Plan;
6. A scheme for the provision of pedestrian and vehicle signage;
7. Provision of on street disabled parking bays including dropped kerbs and associated amendments to extant restrictions;
8. Scheme for the provision of cycle storage facilities;
9. The premises shall be used as a health centre and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class D1).
10. Details of access for disabled people to be agreed.

Article 31(1)(cc) 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.

Informative notes:
1. This use would not be eligible for on street parking permits;
2. Major changes to the junction and traffic management in the Golden Ball Street and Cattlemarket Street/Farmers Avenue area is planned for 2015/17; this will deliver improved pedestrian crossing facilities to the Rouen Road area of the city centre;
3. Compliance with condition 7 will involve a traffic regulation order the costs of which will need to be met by the applicant.

6. Application no 14/01228/F 220 Unthank Road, Norwich, NR2 2AH

The planner (development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. He explained that the proposal was not for a separate dwelling but for an annex for an

elderly parent. He also referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports, which was circulated at the meeting, and contained an amendment to paragraph 44 of the main report by correcting the distance from the extension to the boundary 8.5m and clarifying the changes included in the revised plans and the officer response.

A local resident addressed the committee and suggested that at the proposal site was on higher ground than the neighbouring property, the pitched roof should be replaced by a flat roof to lessen the impact on 222A Unthank Road. She also expressed concern that the proposal would result in increased traffic in Beech Drive especially during construction, would increase the risk of flooding and that green areas of the city were being lost by stealth. The resident of 222A Unthank Road to the site addressed the committee and outlined her objections to the proposal which she considered affected her house and would result in loss of privacy; and proposing that the proposed extension should be moved to the other side of the main dwelling house, and querying the need for two driveways to the house. Another resident of Unthank Road addressed the committee and expressed concern about the impact that the proposal would have on the residential amenity of 222A Unthank Road and enjoyment of the garden.

The applicant spoke in support of the application. He considered that a pitched roof was preferable to a flat one and that the height had been reduced. There would be minimal impact on traffic in the lane and that he intended to replant the shrub. He explained that he had purchased the land to the garage two years' ago and that he would be reluctant to discard it. He did not propose to alter the house too much.

Discussion ensued in which the planner (development) explained that further landscaping to soften the new extension and there was a condition regarding planting along the boundary fences.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no 14/01228/F at 220A Unthank Road, and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with the approved plans
3. The annexe hereby permitted shall only be occupied by a family member and incidental to the enjoyment of the main dwelling. The single storey one bedroom annex shall not be converted independently other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of 220a Unthank Road. At no time shall the single storey one bedroom annex be leased or occupied independently from the main dwelling.
4. Details of the new entrance gate to be approved
5. Submission of an arboricultural implications assessment, method statement and tree protection plan
6. Details of supplementary planting or screening to the NW, NW and SE boundaries
7. Any hedge or shrub clearance needed to implement the permission should be undertaken outside the bird nesting season.

8. Details of surface treatment for the extended driveway to maximise the use of soft landscaping and permeable surfacing.

Informatives:

1. The removal of the Magnolia (T6) will require a s211 notice to be submitted.
2. Site clearance and wildlife.

Article 31(1)(cc) 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 the application has been approved subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined above.

7. Application no 14/00618/F Vikings Venture Scout Hut adjacent to 420 Dereham Road, Norwich, NR5 8QQ

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

Two residents of Dell Crescent addressed the committee and outlined their objections to the committee which included: concern about subsidence and land stability; concern about the stability of the retaining wall; the effect that extra traffic would have on the stability of the filled chalk working tunnels and exacerbated problems with car parking. Councillor Galvin, local member for Wensum ward, spoke on behalf of residents and said that the concern was the access to the proposed development and that it should be from Dereham Road. The former scout hut had been accessed from Dereham Road. Dell Crescent was a narrow cul-de-sac and was not wide enough to provide access/egress to the site and there was already parking on the pavement which caused problems to pedestrian access. The area was riddled with tunnels and there were real concerns about the stability of the site.

The senior planner referred to the report and responded to the issues raised by the speakers and answered members' questions in relation to the access to the site and the planning permission granted for the site in 2009; land stability and The Party Wall Act, confirming that the parking provision for the development was within planning policy guidelines and that statistically 80% of residents of flats of this type would be expected to have a car.

During discussion a member suggested that the access to the site should be from a slip road but were advised that this had not been considered because the land was not in single ownership and there were valuable street trees. Members also queried the safety of additional vehicles using Dell Crescent for access to the site and the design of the building which was described as "banal and crude" by the Norwich Society. Members were advised that the three storey building was an identical scheme to the one approved in 2009 and was similar to other apartment buildings in the area. The planning development manager advised members that the current proposal was unchanged to the scheme approved in 2009 and that he considered that there were no justifiable grounds to refuse the application. He also explained that

Discussion ensued in which members who were minded to refuse the application expressed concern about the access to the site and proposing that the applicant considered the feasibility of considering an alternative access from a service road onto Dereham Road. Members also expressed concern about the ongoing issues of ground stability and the impact of the development on the stability of the area and Dell Crescent. Local residents information on the ground conditions and history of the site, the retaining walls and evidence of wells, chalk workings and past problems affecting houses close by raised significant concerns about whether development of the site for housing was appropriate. Officers advised that if they were minded to refuse consent then, in the absence of an appropriately worded planning obligation to deal with affordable housing then that should also constitute an additional reason.

Councillor Sands moved and Councillor Bradford seconded that the application was refused on the grounds of the unsuitability of the access/egress to the site; the ongoing issues about ground stability in the area and that there was no affordable housing on the site.

RESOLVED with 7 members voting in favour of refusal (Councillors Sands, Ackroyd, Blunt, Button, Grahame, Woollard and Bradford) and 5 members voting against refusal (Councillors Gayton, Herries, Jackson. Little and Neale) to refuse application no 14?00618?F Vikings Venture Scout Hut adjacent to 420 Dereham Road, Norwich, NR5 8QQ on the grounds of the unsuitability of the access/egress from Dell Crescent; the concerns about the land stability and that the planning obligations for affordable housing had not been finalised and to ask the head of planning services to provide the reasons for refusal in planning terms:

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

1. Evidence from local residents gives reason to believe, together with the reported location of a well and presence of supporting/retaining walls at the point of the proposed vehicle access onto Dell Crescent, that the site and area due to its poor quality of land stability are not suitable for redevelopment for the scheme proposed. The application is also not supported by viability information which indicates that mitigation measures could be provided to satisfactorily address development risks and enable a viable development to proceed. The development would therefore be contrary to policy DM11 of the emerging Norwich Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 and paragraphs 001 and 005 of the National Planning Practice Guidance as at 6th November 2014.
2. Creation of a new vehicle access onto Dell Crescent and increase in motor vehicles accessing the site and using Dell Crescent for passage and for parking will lead to further vehicle and pedestrian conflicts in the area and hinder emergency vehicles attending the area and would not provide a safe and suitable access to the site for all people to the detriment of local residents and pedestrian and highway safety. The development would therefore be contrary to paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework March 2012.
3. Policy 4 of the Adopted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (March 2011) seeks the target provision of 20% affordable housing on sites of 5 to 9 dwellings in line with the most up to date housing market assessment. No affordable housing provision has been provided for within the

scheme, nor has it been demonstrated that the provision of affordable housing would render the scheme unviable and therefore in the absence of a legal agreement relating to the provision of affordable housing the proposal is considered to be contrary to policy DM33 of the emerging Norwich Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014, policies 4 and 20 of the Adopted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (March 2011) and would undermine the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework to deliver housing need in affordable housing in sustainable locations.

Article 31(1)(cc) 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. Whilst a scheme has been given a recommendation for approval by officers elected members considered for the reasons outlined above that on balance and in light of the above policies that the application was not acceptable.

(The committee then adjourned for lunch at 14:00 and reconvened at 14:20 with the following ten members present: Councillors Gayton, Sands, Ackroyd, Blunt, Button, Grahame, Herries, Jackson, Little and Woollard)

8. Application no 12/00143/ET Depository Building Part Lion House and Part Seymour House, Muspole Street, Norwich

(Councillor Neale was admitted to the meeting during this item.)

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

A member commented that on site provision of affordable was preferable if it could be achieved.

RESOLVED with 10 members voting in favour (Councillors Gayton, Sands, Ackroyd, Blunt, , Button, Grahame, Herries, Jackson, Little, and Woollard) with (Councillor Neale abstaining due to not being present for the entire item) to approve changes to the S106 agreement relating to consent no 11/02236/F Land adjacent to Novi Sad Bridge, Wherry Road, Norwich comprising the following:

1. Reduced affordable housing on site to either 2 social rented dwellings or 4 intermediate tenure dwellings;
2. Where it has been demonstrated that it has not been possible to identify a registered provider to take on the on-site units a commuted sum of £150k would be payable;
3. A review mechanism which reverts back to the original obligations where no part of the development has been completed within three years of the date of the agreement and to parts of the development which have not been substantially commenced.

9. Tree preservation order no 467 – confirmation

RESOLVED, unanimously, having considered the report of the head of planning services, to confirm Tree Preservation Order [TPO], 2014. City of Norwich Number 467; The Bungalow, Eaton Chase, Norwich, NR4 7QW

10. Application no 14/01235/VC Three Score Site, Land South of Clover Hill Rd, Bowthorpe

(Councillor Bradford was admitted to the meeting during the item.)

The planning team leader (development) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides, and answered members' questions. In response to members' suggestions the planning team leader (development) said that consideration could be given to adding an informative to the planning permission about ensuring that the bunds did not prevent easy access to Twenty Acre Wood; that there were access points from the residential home to the public footpath and that the soil removed from the site was used to provide raised beds in communal gardens.

RESOLVED to approve application no 14/01235/VC Three Score site land south of Clover Hill Road Norwich and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

1. Landscaping in accordance with the plans submitted and further landscaping details to be agreed including:
   levels, kerbs, measures to prevent vehicles entering open/green space, boundary treatment elevations, lighting details of private areas (public areas covered by condition 19 of the outline consent), hard surfacing materials.
2. Details of materials including:
   Bricks, render, tiles, columns to entrance, eves detail of entrance canopy, windows, rainwater goods, external walls of lower ground supporting structures, bargeboard, curtain walling, substation/bin/sprinkler store details.
3. Cycle parking stand specification, numbers and location;
4. Construction access to be closed off before occupation and details of access, temporary boundary treatment to either side of temporary foot/cycle path, realignment of pavement on Clover Hill Road and restrictive access barriers;
5. Details of the cycle/foot path access to the west of the site onto Clover Hill Road including the link to the existing pavement, further AIA and AMS for the access and restrictive access barriers;
6. Tree protection in accordance with the AIA:
7. Method for removal, storage and re-use of topsoil in full accordance with supplementary ecology statement;
8. Method statement for the protection of the grassland areas indicated to be protected during development to be submitted and agreed, including details for restoration should the areas be impacted during construction activity.
9. Conservation (ecology) management plan for the site.
10. Development in accordance with approved plans.

11. Performance of the development management service; and progress on appeals against planning decisions and planning enforcement action for quarter 2 2014-15 (1 July to 30 September 2014)

The planning development manager introduced the report and answered questions. The council's request for enforcement action to remove the conservatory on the

riverside at 64-66 Westwick Street would be considered at Norwich Magistrates' Court on 26 November 2014. Enforcement action regarding the moorings at King Street could not be commenced because there was an appeal in progress.

RESOLVED to note the report.

CHAIR