



**Planning Applications Committee**

**09:30 – 11:15**

**11 April 2024**

**Present:** Councillors Driver (chair), Sands (M) (vice chair), Fox (substitute for Councillor Calvert), Haynes (to part way through item 4 below), Hoechner, Oliver, Peek, Prinsley, Sands (S), Stutely (substitute for Councillor Oliver), Thomas (Va) and Young

**Apologies:** Councillors Calvert, Lubbock and Oliver

**1. Declarations of interests**

In reply to a question from Councillor Peek, the committee officer explained that a member of the public had not met the criteria to speak on item 3 (below), Application no 23/01598/F, 15 St Margarets Street, Norwich, NR2 4TU because they had not commented on the current application but on an earlier one.

(Councillor Driver later in the meeting declared an other interest in item 4 (below) Application no 24/00176/F Eaton Hand Car Wash, Ipswich Road, Norwich, NR4 6QS because he used the car wash services there.)

**2. Minutes**

**RESOLVED** to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 21 March 2024, subject to item 6. Application no 23/01620/F 25 Hill House Road, Norwich, paragraph that commences “The owner of the property (applicant), to correct the measurement of the insulation that building control required to be relocated to 50mm from 50cm, so that the sentence reads:

“Following building control’s requirement to relocate 50mm of insulation above the ridgeline, they had managed to remove 28mm in height from the construction process.”

**3. Application no 23/01598/F, 15 St Margarets Street, Norwich, NR2 4TU**

**Proposal:** Replacement of existing workshop to create pottery studio, first floor workspace and associated outbuilding/landscape works.

The Planner (case officer) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. She referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports (which had been circulated at the meeting and was available on the council’s website with the agenda papers for the meeting) and contained a correction to the measurements set out in

paragraph 70 of the report and an additional representation from an existing objector requesting a deferment and the officer response. The legal right to light was a separate legal matter to the planning process.

A resident who lived adjacent to the proposed development addressed the committee with his concerns about loss of light and suggesting that as a compromise the whole building should be single storey but still allowing plenty of studio space for the pottery.

The applicant addressed the committee in support of the application to replace the existing pottery workshop with a building that was more accessible, sustainable, and sympathetic to the surrounding heritage buildings, and promoted arts in the city. The applicants had reduced the operating hours out of consideration for neighbours.

The Planner referred to the relevant planning history of the site and said that the current proposal was a compromise of an earlier application for a two-storey building which had been withdrawn. The applicants had taken pre-application advice from the planners. The planning application submitted in 2016 for the demolition of the light industrial building and construction of 3 dwellings was a material planning consideration. Members concurred with the Planner's proposal for an additional condition to ensure that the workshop/studio spaces would be used for light industrial use only.

Discussion ensued in which the Planner and the Development Management Team Leader referred to the report and the presentation and answered members' questions. Members were advised that the toilet on the ground floor would need to comply with building regulations for disabled users. Members sought clarification on the height of the proposed building in relation to the neighbouring flats and houses. It was noted that aluminium windows had been approved as part of the 2016 application, although wooden windows would be acceptable. The council's officers were satisfied with the use of either slate or pantiles in this area. The Planner said that the kiln was electric and made no noise or specific fumes. The use of an extractor fan was to provide ventilation. The building would need to comply with fire regulations. Members also sought confirmation that the application was supported by a comprehensive construction management plan. The applicants had also provided a certificate to demonstrate that they had received consent to remove asbestos from the existing building.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations as set out in the report, and with the additional condition to ensure that the building was used for light industrial use only.

During discussion a member commented on his sympathy for the neighbours' concerns about loss of light but that the assessment for this proposal was that the impact was not unacceptable under policy DM2. Another member commented that permission had been granted previously for flats to be built on this site. This proposal would tidy up the site and that the changes made during the planning process demonstrated that the applicant was willing to get on well with the neighbours.

**RESOLVED**, with 10 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Sands (M), Haynes, Hoechner, Fox, Peek, Prinsley, Young, Thomas and Stutely) and 1 member

abstaining from voting (Councillor Sands (S)), to approve application 23/01598/F 15 St Margarets Street Norwich NR2 4TU and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Archaeological investigation;
4. No development (other than demolition) may commence until a stopping up order has been granted;
5. Compliance with construction management plan;
6. Tree protection;
7. Arboricultural monitoring;
8. Surface water drainage to be agreed;
9. Materials and design details to be agreed;
10. Landscape scheme including external lighting details and biodiversity enhancements to be agreed;
11. Cycle store design to be agreed;
12. Unknown contamination;
13. Parking, EV charging and bin storage provided prior to first occupation;
14. Air source heat pumps to operate in accordance with submitted specifications;
15. No use of air source heat pump on eastern boundary 11pm to 7am;
16. No new external plant without agreement;
17. Open to the public 9am to 9pm only;
18. Private use 7am to 11pm only;
19. No encroachment on public highway;
20. High speed broadband connection.
21. The building to be used for light industrial use only.

Informatives:

1. Event licences may be required.
2. Protected species.
3. Highway Authority response does not infer they will support stopping up order.

(The committee had a short break at this point and reconvened with all members present as listed above.)

#### **4. Application no 24/00176/F Eaton Hand Car Wash, Ipswich Road, Norwich, NR4 6QS**

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

(Councillor Haynes left the meeting during this item and did not take part in its determination.)

**Proposal:** Erection of vehicle rental premises

The Planner (case officer) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides, and referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports (which was circulated at the meeting and available on the council's website) regarding a revised site plan, that had been updated to correct the red line plan and remove part of the public footpath that had been included erroneously.

The Development Management Team Leader read out a statement on behalf of a resident who lived opposite to this site, which outlined his objections to the scheme. (This statement is available on the council's website with the agenda papers for this meeting.)

The agent addressed the committee on behalf of the applicant. The purpose of the application was to provide a single storey building for a car rental business on this site, which was previously a petrol station. The car wash facility would continue. He also commented on the use of low-level lighting and use of landscaping to enhance the site.

The Development Management Team Leader responded to issues raised by the speakers. With regard to the planning history of the site and the refusal of a previous application, officers at the time considered that the proposal amounted to a public off-street car park, which was contrary to policy. The proposal that was refused also failed to include landscaping sufficient to mitigate the impact of the car park on the surrounding area. The application before committee was different both in terms of the proposed use and the amount of landscaping proposed. The landscaping proposed for this site would improve its appearance. There was currently a food truck on the site which was a separate enforcement issue and not part of this application. There were no concerns relating to the proposals for biodiversity enhancements on this site.

Discussion ensued in which the Planner and Development Management Team Leader referred to the report and presentation, and answered members' questions. This include clarification on the gradients on the site; confirmation that there was a condition to cease construction if contamination was found; that the details of lighting would be negotiated with the applicant to ensure that it was appropriate for residents and bats. Members also sought confirmation on the location of the electric vehicle (EV) charging points shown on the plans. There were no policy requirements to control or require sustainable energy use. The use air conditioning unit was considered acceptable as it would have negligible impact.

Members were also advised that the overall impact on biodiversity was positive. Discussion ensued where a member suggested that the proximity to Danby Woods and Park and links with the chalk pits, River Wensum and golf course provided a green network for wildlife, such as grass snakes, to move through. Members were advised that the council's Tree Protection Officer, as part of the discharge of the condition relating to tree replacements, would be able to influence the selection of tree species that was most suitable for this site.

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

A member commented that the application was finely balanced, but he could not support this application for car rental use on land that was currently grassland. Another member pointed out that part of the site was described as scrubland and could be cleared by its owner without planning permission.

**RESOLVED**, with 5 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Sands (M), Prinsley, Sands (S) and Thomas), 1 member voting against (Councillor Fox) and 4 members abstaining from voting (Councillors Hoechner, Peek, Young and Stutely) to

approve application 24/00176/F Eaton Hand Car Wash, Ipswich Road, Norwich NR4 6QS and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Details of external lighting;
4. Opening hours;
5. Unknown contamination;
6. Provision of access details:
7. Restriction on obstructions to access:
8. Site layout:
9. Works on site in accordance with AIA, AMS AND TPP;
10. Tree replacements and hedging to be installed and maintained as per plans;
11. Bird nesting season;
12. Ecological enhancements in accordance with Preliminary Ecological Appraisal;
13. Permeable surface to be used.

Informatives:

1. Works within Public Highway
2. Advertisement consent

CHAIR