



Planning applications committee

14:00 to 15:10

19 December 2019

Present: Councillors Driver (chair), Bogelein, Button, Lubbock, Neale, Oliver (substitute for Councillor Maxwell), Peek, Ryan, Sands (M), Sarmezey, Stutely and Utton

Apologies: Councillors Maxwell (vice chair) and Huntley

1. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Bogelein declared a pre-determined view in item 5, Application no 19/01475/F – 213 Dereham Road, Norwich, NR2 3TE.

2. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 14 November 2019.

3. Application no 19/01280/F - Land Rear of 32 and 33 Cattle Market Street (accessed Via Three Tuns Court), Norwich

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

An adjacent neighbour to the site addressed the committee. He said that the two previous applications had been rejected and thanked the applicant and case officer for reducing the proposed building to a single storey office reducing the impact of overlooking of his and the adjacent properties. The plot and its proximity to neighbouring buildings was not suitable for residential use and he asked that the committee considered no occupation in the building from 22:00 to 06:00.

The applicant explained that he had purchased the freehold of the court yard and accepted that the previous applications were too large. The proposal was for a ground floor studio/office which he intended to use as his own office. He did not object to the condition to restrict the use of the building for office use but would like to be able to work in it after 22:00.

The planner explained that there was a condition proposed to prevent the use of permitted development rights to convert the office to residential use as the site was not suitable for residential use. It had not been thought necessary to restrict the hours of office use. The planner then referred to the report and presentation and answered members' questions. The current use of 32/33 Cattlemarket Street was unknown. The proposed flat roof to the single storey office and step back from the ground floor window of 32/33 Cattle Market Street would mitigate concerns about the

development blocking light to this building. The planner also confirmed that the applicant intended to use the proposed building as an office and that B1 use also included light industrial use which was suitable for residential areas.

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

During discussion two members expressed concern that rather than considering the current use of the site as a waste of space it could be landscaped and used as a green space, which would enhance Connesford House and 32/33 Cattle Market Street. The locally listed property at 32/33 Cattle Market Street should be encouraged back into use. There was potential for the office space to change to residential use and the constrained site was not suitable for this. Other members considered that the proposed development was good use of space and replicated medieval development in this part of the city.

Discussion ensued in which members considered whether to restrict the hours of use of the proposed office, with some members suggesting that it would be up to the applicant to be respectful of the neighbours. Some members considered that the light industrial element use should be removed from the permission to protect the amenity of Connesford House and 32/33 Cattle Market Street. Councillor Neale moved and Councillor Bogelein seconded that light industrial be removed from the land use. It was noted that the applicant could apply in the future if the use of the building for light industrial was required. On being put to the vote, with 7 members voting in favour (Councillors Button, Bogelein, Lubbock, Neale, Sarmezey, Stutely and Oliver) and 5 members voting against (Councillors Driver, Peek, Ryan, Sands and Utton) the amendment to remove light industrial/research and development use from the B1 permitted use was accepted.

The chair then moved the committee to the vote and it was:

RESOLVED with 10 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Button, Neale, Peek, Ryan, Sands, Sarmezey, Stutely, Utton and Oliver) and 2 members voting against (Councillors Lubbock and Bogelein) to approve application no. 19/01280/F - Land Rear of 32 and 33 Cattle Market Street (accessed Via Three Tuns Court) Norwich and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Submission cycle and bin storage details;
4. Specified B1 office use only (removing light industrial/research and development use and permitted development rights to change to dwelling);
5. Materials;
6. Construction Management Plan;
7. Landscape.

4. Application no 19/01511/F - Garages adjacent to 83 Belvoir Street, Norwich

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

The planner then referred to the report and answered members' questions. Members sought confirmation that there would be protective measures in place to ensure that the trees would be protected during the development. Members also sought details of the proposed biodiversity measures and boundary treatments as set out in condition 10. The measures were in accordance with the ecology report. In reply to a question, the planner confirmed that the land was owned by the city council but that the applicant was Orwell Housing Association. Floor space and room sizes were in accordance with the council's policy and national standards.

During discussion on the boundary treatments, members expressed a preference for hedging because it created greater biodiversity than panelled fencing and should have been proposed as part of the application. The council was working in partnership with the registered social landlord and should promote hedging. Members noted that the association's housing on the other side of the road had railings and hedging at the front. Two members expressed concern that hedging would make a difference for biodiversity and should be encouraged and that the city council had missed an opportunity to require it. The area development manager (outer) discouraged members from requiring a condition to be added to the planning consent and pointed out that whilst hedges were already proposed to the front, it would be more difficult to plant hedges on the southern boundary because of the limited width available. The planner said that the landscaping condition was subject to discussion with the applicants and members' preference for hedging would be part of the negotiations. (Following further discussion it was suggested that an informative be added to the planning consent to advise the applicant of the committee's preference for hedging.)

Discussion ensued on the merits of the scheme, members commented that it was an underused garage site, with an asphalt surface. The development would provide two affordable family homes with gardens, which would open up the biodiversity of the site. The boundary treatment could emulate that of the houses operated by the same housing association over the road.

Before going to the vote, the planner answered two questions from members. She confirmed that the games court was enclosed with a gate, but she could not confirm whether it was locked at certain times. The development of two houses was below the policy threshold to require the installation of solar panels.

RESOLVED, with 11 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Button, Bogelein, Neale¹, Peek, Ryan. Sands. Sarmezey, Ryan, Oliver and Utton) and 1 members voting against (Councillors Lubbock) to approve application no. 19/01511/F - Garages Adjacent 83 Belvoir Street, Norwich and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Contamination site investigation;
4. Previously unidentified contamination;
5. Compliance with AIA;

¹ The minutes of the meeting were approved at the meeting held on 9 January 2020 subject to recording that 11 members voted in favour of this item and correcting Councillor Neale's vote as in favour of the application.

6. Arboricultural supervision;
7. Materials;
8. Landscaping;
9. Imported material;
10. Small mammal access in boundary treatments;
11. Biodiversity enhancement;
12. Drainage scheme;
13. Flood resilience/resistance measures;
14. Flood warning notices;
15. Water efficiency

(Following further discussion it was suggested that an informative be added to the planning consent to advise the applicant of the committee's preference for hedging.)

Informative

The committee requests the planner to advise the applicant of the committee's preference for the use of hedgerows as boundary treatments to be considered during the negotiation on the landscaping conditions.

5. Application no 19/01475/F; 213 Dereham Road, Norwich, NR2 3TE

(Councillor Bogelein having declared a pre-determined view left the meeting during the consideration of this application.)

The planner presented the report with the plans and slides. He confirmed that the application was for the extension of a family home. A Juliette balcony had been in the initial plans but had been removed in mitigation of overlooking of neighbouring gardens.

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

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 19/01475/F – 213 Dereham Road, Norwich, NR2 3TE and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

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

(Councillor Bogelein was readmitted to the meeting at this point.)

6. Application no 19/01474/F; 337A Dereham Road, Norwich, NR2 3UT

The planner presented the report with the plans and slides. He explained that the description on the front of the report was incorrect and should be amended to "demolition of car port and extension to garden". The proposal was a variation of the original landscaping scheme. It was a councillor's application and there were no objections to the proposal.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 19/01474/F – 337A Dereham Road, Norwich NR2 3UT and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

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

CHAIR