

Planning Applications Committee: 12 January 2017

Updates to reports

Application 16/01499/F - Garages Adjacent To 40 Thurling Plain Item 4a page 21-32

Additional representation:

One further representation received, objecting to the proposal due to concerns about security at the rear of no. 42 Thurling Plain, where the boundary is currently formed by one of the garage blocks which is proposed to be removed. Further concerns raised with regard to the impact of construction works.

Officer response:

The boundary treatments would be controlled via condition to ensure that suitable and secure means of enclosure are provided for all properties that adjoin the site where required. There is separate legislation which controls demolition and construction works and the Council also provides guidance to developers with regard to minimising the impacts of construction works.

Application 16/01742/F - Land And Garages Rear Of 2 To 20 Hanover Road Item 4b page 33-46

Correction:

The Development proposal on page 33 of the original committee report is incorrect and should read:

“Demolition of existing garages. Erection of 2 No. two bed houses and 2 No. 1 bed bungalows.”

Consultation response:

Environmental Protection Officer:

I have read the desk study provided for this application and agree with the recommendation that further intrusive works are required. If approval is given, I would suggest that conditions are applied to deal with possible contamination and imported materials and informatives added regarding construction working hours and handling of asbestos. The unexploded ordinance risk should be very low as no reported WWII bomb drops were reported in close proximity to the application site.

Additional representations:

Further representations received from 7 individuals objecting to the proposal on the grounds of:

- loss of parking and highway safety
- impact on the character of the area,
- loss of privacy, and
- concerns regarding access for visitors including health workers.
- concern raised that the proposal would restrict the ability for people to improve their homes.
- concern that the number of parking spaces within the car park is 26, not 29 as stated within the report, and therefore this skews the figures presented to the planning department.

Officer's response:

- With regard to visitors, the proposal does provide for additional parking and during daytime hours, when health visitors and delivery drivers are likely to visit, there is normally less parking pressure compared to night times.
 - The proposal would not restrict the ability of people to improve or maintain their homes.
 - With regard to the existing number of parking spaces, it is confirmed there would appear to be 26 spaces within the car park (the markings are difficult to see). This does not however alter the conclusion within the committee report regarding the issue of loss of parking when balanced against the planning benefits of the proposal.
 - The issues of loss of parking, impact on the character of the area and loss of privacy are addressed within the committee report.
-

Application 16/01554/F - Erection of 13 No. gypsy and traveller pitches with associated amenity blocks for each plot.

Item 4c page 47 - 65

Additional Representation:

Community & Environmental Services
Reduction and Recycling Manager
Norfolk County Council

Swanton Road Recycling Centre is operated on behalf of Norfolk County Council by FCC Environment. The site receives in excess of 250,000 visitors per year. During peak operational times very slow moving traffic can often build up back to the junction on Mile Cross Lane. We would like to propose the following considerations in relation to the planning application referenced above:

1. There is the potential for difficulty of access for new site residents around the queuing traffic to the Recycling Centre, particularly at peak times/busy

weekends. Improvements could be made for site access in the form of an additional 'through lane' to the traveller site entrance (currently left hand layby). Assistance could also be offered to support the traffic movement in terms of clear signage, clear road markings and clear instructions for drivers on the use of the road from the business property of Ace Waste up to the junction of the site entrance close to the Recycling Centre.

2. Impact on Recycling Centre operations from the additional burden placed by an increase in residential traffic movements at the end of Swanton Road. We are making improvements to our own site layout for encouraging quick throughput of customers, but the site has major restrictions already and any assistance with traffic flow on Swanton Road, as indicated above, would be considered essential and very much welcomed.
3. The construction phase may be problematic for the Recycling Centre service operations with heavy goods vehicles coming and going during development. Consideration of the times of any vehicle movements in relation to the busy periods at the Recycling Centre would be beneficial.

Officer Response:

Points 1 and 2 – see main issue 2. Additional information has been submitted with the application and agreed by transport officers to show that highways impacts of the development will be minimal and will only result in a small increase in traffic flow in the area. Further detail would be sought by condition to secure suitable design of access and routing of vehicles around the existing and proposed gypsy and traveller sites. Additional highway works as suggested would be disproportionate with the nature and likely highways impacts of the scheme.

Point 3 – see main issue 2 in terms of traffic flows and highway impact. A condition could be sought asking for details of the management of construction vehicles accessing the site if the degree of impact was considered to adversely affect operations and road safety in the area. Given the nature of development, types of commercial vehicles accessing the area as existing and the limited build period the highway and business impact these would not appear to justify such a condition in this instance.

**Applications 16/00752/F & 16/00753/L – External and internal alterations and conversion of outbuilding to 1 no. dwelling at 42 St. Giles Street.
Item 4(g) page 111**

Additional representation

One further representation has been received from a household within St. Giles Terrace objecting to the building of a new, self-contained dwelling within the garden of the property on the following grounds:

1. Development - Fail to see the need or justification for another small unit – one on-line property marketing site states there are currently 70 one and two bedroom flats in NR2 alone and the area has seen a significant amount of housing development over the past ten years.
2. Heritage – The plan proposes a new porch entrance from St.Giles Terrace. We question the owner’s right to build this and the design is inappropriate particularly as it would involve destroying the original, gated wall. Also the access via St.Giles Terrace path would mean there is no way of safeguarding the seclusion of this secluded terrace and would irrevocably alter the terraces sense of place and space.
3. Design – the proposed plan for a one –bedroom, modern dwelling does not conform to policy DM3.
4. Access, health and safety – The distance between the proposed dwelling and the street is 35 – 40 metres and the accessibility is complicated and difficult. We are concerned about access for emergency services/ tradesmen and the logistics of the build and future occupation may require future significant works.

Officer response

Point 1 – See main issue 1.

Point 2 – It is acknowledged that the existing and proposed plans indicate a structure extending beyond the boundary wall. This appears to show the original rear door and entranceway, at a lower level, where the current ground level sits on top. It is confirmed that the proposal does not include a new porch or changes to the rear boundary wall or gate.

Point 3 – See main issue 2.

Point 4 – See main issue 3. A condition could be attached requiring the submission of a construction management plan, if members felt this was appropriate.

Application 16/01215/MA – 115 Newmarket Road Norwich NR22HT Item 4f page 95-110

Correction

Paragraph 7 should now read: “This application is an amendment to a previous consent. Application 15/01782/F and 15/01784/L was submitted for a new garage within the curtilage of the property which was granted consent.”

Addition

Paragraph 11 should now include the following:

“d) Change in door number and design”

Addition

Section 23 Main issue 1: Design and Heritage should also include the following:

“The previous consent included two smaller garage doors with a personnel door to one side. The garage has been built with one large garage door. The door is roller shutter with wood panelled effect. The conservation officer has stated that the doors of the previous scheme would be more in keeping with the character of the conservation area. However, when viewed from the road at an oblique angle, the door does not appear disproportionately large to the structure.”