

Planning Applications Committee: 8 September 2022

Updates to reports

Application: 22/00728/F

Address: Angel Road Infant School, Angel Road

Item: 4b

Further correspondence with Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service who have agreed to allow the school up until next year to install the fire hydrant. They had previously requested installation prior to development but given that the modular units are already in place this cannot happen now. Condition 6 would therefore be worded to require the hydrant to be installed within 12 months of approval.

Further correspondence with Cllr Julie Brociek-Coulton who has informed us that she supports the planning permission.

A new application has now been submitted, reference is 22/01113/F. This is for a further temporary permission for the unit which was approved under reference Y/4/2012/40. The previous application granted temporary consent, which lapsed on 3 July 2017. The new application has not yet been assessed.

A typographical error on the proposed conditions sets the standard time condition as condition 1. This should instead be a temporary permission, for 5 years.

Application: 22/00801/F

Address: 406 Unthank Road, Norwich NR4 7QH

Item: 4c

Paragraph 11 of the officer's report erroneously refers to 'four letters of representation, one of which was undersigned by eight persons'. The paragraph should read:

Advertised on site and in the press. Adjacent and neighbouring properties have been notified in writing. One letter of representation has been received from a neighbour and one from a local councillor, citing the issues as summarised in the table below. All representations are available to view in full at <http://planning.norwich.gov.uk/online-applications/> by entering the application number.

Application: 22/00506/F

Address: 301 Unthank Road, Norwich NR4 7QA

Item: 4d

It is noted that there is a discrepancy in the numbering of the Main Issues within the report however the subject header and associated content is correct.

For clarity, the headings in the body of the report should read as follows:-

Main issue 2: Heritage (page 98, paras. 27-31)

Main issue 3: Amenity (page 99, paras. 32-35)

Main issue 4: Trees (page 99, paras. 36-38).

A further three letters of objection to the revised plans have been received during the consultation period, from or on behalf of existing contributors. These objections raise the following issues:

Issues raised	Response
The scale and height of the revised scheme as a two-storey rear extension and dormer window is not in character with its neighbouring properties.	See Main Issue: Design
The proposed materials – off white rendered blockwork is inferior both in quality and appearance of the original building and surrounding properties.	See Main Issue: Design
The revised two-storey element would have a detrimental impact on the residents of no. 303's enjoyment of their property due to loss of privacy into their living room, kitchen and garden.	See Main Issue: Amenity
The two-storey extension is out of keeping with the Conservation Area.	See Main Issue: Heritage
If approved, the revised scheme would set an unwanted/dangerous precedent in this part of the conservation area.	Each planning application received is assessed based on its own merit. The approval of one scheme would not guarantee the outcome of another.
The second-storey aspect of the proposal and third-storey dormer are incongruous and not in keeping with the character, scale and massing of these locally listed buildings within the Unthank and Christchurch Conservation Area.	See Main Issues Design and Heritage
The modern palette of materials will increase the visual impact and massing of the extension.	See Main Issue: Design
The proposal does not appropriately preserve or enhance the local character and appearance of the locally listed building or the Conservation Area and may harm designated heritage assets and their setting.	See Main Issue: Heritage

Issues raised	Response
The use of render, second-storey extension and dormer do not adequately harmonise with the architectural character or appearance of No. 301 itself nor the wider area and are not appropriately scaled and massed for the site and its immediate environs.	See Main Issues Design and Heritage
The second storey will cause harm to the amenity of no. 303 by loss of outlook, which is further amplified by the use of render creating an enclosed and oppressive outlook.	See Main Issue: Amenity
The ground floor side windows will provide a view into the kitchen/breakfast room and rear living room of no. 303 and cause a significant erosion of privacy.	See Main Issue: Amenity
The second storey rear window will overlook the gardens of several neighbouring properties leading to a clear loss of privacy and overlooking.	See Main Issue: Amenity

One of the representations comes from a consultant acting on behalf of objectors. The representation asks that the application is withdrawn from consideration at committee and is subject to a 'a proper appraisal of the implications of this application by the Conservation Team'. The consultant suggests that failure to do so will result in an application for a judicial review by the objectors. The representation also suggests other objections by the consultant's clients have not been addressed and should not be dealt with via an up-date to the agenda.

Your officers disagree that there is any issue with the timescales in this case. The re-consultation ran until 29th August and the committee report was finalised on 25th August. As such, comments received from 26-29 August are summarised in this document, as is normal practice for this council. The committee will need to consider whether or not the response is adequate and if the application can be determined.

Notwithstanding that the proposals have not been reviewed by a Conservation Officer, the comment from the Design and Conservation Team is careful to point out that this is not an indication that the scheme is acceptable or otherwise and that it should be determined in accordance with the development, NPPF where relevant and the duty upon the council to either preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area. This duty is specifically set out at paragraph 28 of the officer report and the assessment of the schemes impact is set out in the subsequent paragraphs at 29 to 31. The conclusion on this point is that the proposal will not cause harm to the conservation area. Officers therefore consider that the duty set out in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 has been discharged and that there is no reason to defer consideration of the application on this point.

In addition, the sections of the report dealing with 'Design' and 'Heritage' deal with the impact of the proposals upon the house, which is locally listed (see paragraph 29).

The same letter of representation also called into question the relevancy of the applicant's disability in relation to the assessment of the application. The council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on equality and diversity as noted within the report, however, the disability status of the applicant has not, in this case, had a bearing on the assessment of the proposal. The disability has not been afforded any weight when concluding that the proposals are acceptable and can be recommended for approval.

In response to the planning statement, which references an existing two-storey extension at 297 Unthank Road, the consultant on behalf of the neighbour states that the two-storey extension at 297 Unthank Road did not gain planning permission. It is noted that this statement is incorrect as planning permission for a two-storey extension at 297 Unthank Road was granted under application reference 4/1998/0660/F.