

**Planning Applications Committee: 11 July 2019**  
**Updates to reports**

---

**Application:** 19/00381/L & 19/00403/F  
**Address:** Norwich School, The Close  
**Item no:** 4(a)  
**Pages:** 23-66

**Additional representations:**

Five additional letters of support have been received raising the following points:

- Within the medium-term the proposed compensatory planting of 700 trees would become more beneficial to Norwich than the trees which are to be felled;
- The replanting of trees off-site is the only option;
- The scheme's design is outstanding; and
- The Norwich School's community outreach programme is extremely beneficial.
- The Dean and Chapter of Norwich Cathedral have stated that they will work closely with the school to explore whether there might be further tree planting within the Close, to help towards the loss of the trees through this project.

This brings the total number of representations received during the second consultation to 9 in support and 0 in objection.

**Correction:**

Within the table below paragraph 24 at the top of page 31, the row 'Letters of Objection (14)' has been incorrectly repeated. For clarity, all of the rows below 'Letters of support (26)' relate to points raised within letters of support.

**Revised tree planting scheme and additional consultation response:**

The applicant has submitted a revised tree planting scheme which makes some technical corrections and provides planting plans. The council's Landscape Architect has provided a written response to the revised compensatory tree planting scheme.

The Landscape Architect's comments note that the proposals result in an overall comparable level of oven dry biomass tonnage to the current situation but also note a loss of an estimated 24.058 oven dry tonnes of biomass from the city centre. The comments conclude as follows:

*Whilst the applicant has now made considerable effort to make provision for compensatory planting, the compensatory package can only be considered as an off-setting measure. Given the remoteness of the majority of the planting from the city centre and the limited environmental public benefit to the city and the street scene, it is not considered to directly account for the loss of an important tree and group within the city centre, and does not mitigate effects on public realm.*

*Landscape proposals within the site are limited due to site constraints, do not mitigate effects on public realm and fail to address the lack of maturity to the interior landscape resulting from the removal of tree group. Green wall and roof features offer some ecological criterion to the scheme however there are doubts as to whether these could be considered as providing an overall ecological enhancement.*

*The landscape objection is therefore sustained.*

*Should this application be resolved to be approved by the committee, the proposed compensatory planting scheme and management and maintenance plan will require some revisions and additions to ensure its deliverability.*

---

**Application 18/01681/F & 18/01682/L**

**Address: 58 Bracondale, Norwich, NR1 2AP**

**Item no: 4 (b)**

**Pages: 67-85**

**Correction:**

Paragraph 12, page 71 – The first sentence states that “The tower would largely be subject to repair and replacement”. This should read “The tower would largely be subject to repair and refurbishment”.

---

**Application 19/00440/MA**

**Address: St. Anne’s Wharf, King Street, Norwich.**

**Item no: 4 (c)**

**Pages: 91-24**

**Further representation received from Norwich Society:**

“We had a very useful visit to the site yesterday with a presentation from John Dixon of IW and Max from Orbit Homes, and we understand the constraints that the revisions are being developed within:

- The pdf of the elevations was too small scale to show the 'burglar bond' brickwork, and we had incorrectly assumed this was recessed cladding; we think this feature will work well as a visual contrast to the brickwork
- we agree with the omission of the monopitch roofs which would be out of scale and inappropriate for King Street
- the vertical differentiation, with plain brickwork elevations and parapets, give a simplicity to the facade and helps to reduce its scale to be more appropriate with the street scene
- the corner windows work well to lighten the visual effect of the block edge

Although we would have preferred a more sympathetic approach, we understand that the design team is heavily constrained by the existing consent, and accept that the changes are probably the best that can be achieved. We therefore withdraw our objection.”

**Additional conditions recommended:**

- 26. Landscaping and layout details of courtyard D to be agreed.
- 27. Specification of windows facing King Street to be agreed to ensure adequate soundproofing.

---

**Application 18/01058/F**

**Address: Land Rear of 50 To 54 Gertrude Road**

**Item no: 4 (d)**

**Pages: 125-142**

**Additional representations:**

Additional comments have been received. These comments raise the following points:

- Accurate drawings of the neighbouring house have not been provided
- Drawings do not clarify where the transition between one and two storey is on the neighbouring property
- Concerned that the existing property will look odd at the end of the proposed terrace. A Western elevation drawing would highlight this better
- Request for a similar roof pitch to the neighbouring dwelling to be in keeping with surrounding properties.

**Officer comment:**

The measurements provided in the representation are broadly in line with those shown on the submitted plans. Although the transition between the two storey and single storey elements of the neighbouring dwelling are not shown on the drawings, the officer has measured this on the plans and it has been taken into consideration when forming a recommendation for the scheme. It is acknowledged that the proposed dwellings will be of a different design to the existing property, however the scheme is considered to provide a positive contribution to the streetscene. There are a mixture of property types in the surrounding area and therefore the proposed roof pitch is not considered to be incongruous to the prevailing character of the area.

---

**Application: 19/00651/F**

**Address: 120 Earlham Green Lane, Norwich NR5 8HF**

**Item no: 4(e)**

**Pages: 143-152**

**Materials confirmed for dormers:**

The dormer cheeks/walls will be rendered. The roof will be GRP.

---

**Application: 19/00291/F**

**Address:** Fieldgate, Town Close Road, Norwich, NR2 2NB  
**Item no:** 4(f)  
**Pages:** 153-170

**Additional representations:**

Two additional letters of representation have been received raising the following points:

- The development is described as extensions but is actually more akin to a two storey rebuilding on the existing footprint. A two storey building would be out of proportion and out of place.
- The property would be excessive in proportion to the surrounding properties, especially to the east and opposite to the site.
- The proposed design is out of character to the Georgian style of building typical of the estate. The proposed building would not compliment the surrounding buildings.
- A modern single-storey alternative to the bungalow could be achieved without adversely impacting upon the street-scene.

One further representation has been received from a previous objector highlighting the following issues.

- The approach to this proposal is inconsistent with the approach taken to the development of the only other 'new-build' on Town Close Road, number 1A, which was granted consent for single storey extensions in 2016. Initial two-storey plans for this development were withdrawn on the grounds that the development would have a negative impact on the character of the conservation area.
- The Council's report does not apply sufficient weight to the size of the development. The proposed build is three times larger than the neighbouring 13 Town Close Road and represents a 250% increase over the existing build.

A letter and a heritage statement have also been received from consultants acting on behalf of the above neighbour. The letter raises two main points:-

- The application should have included a Heritage Statement as required by paragraph 189 of the National Policy Planning Framework and the Norwich City Local Plan Policy DM9. The report does not mention the statutory duties imposed on the Local Planning Authority by sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and therefore does not properly address the impact on the nearby buildings and conservation area.
- The report has not applied sufficient weight to the impact of the development upon the setting of the conservation area or the surrounding listed buildings. This has been emphasised by the submission of a substantial heritage report by one of these consultants.

The Heritage Statement, which runs to 28 pages, deals at length with the impact of the proposed development upon the conservation area and upon the setting of various listed buildings along Town Close Road. It concludes by saying that "Taking into account all of the above issues [contained in the report], there is considerable

evidence to demonstrate that this is an inappropriate development which will have a harmful impact on surrounding listed buildings and the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and the application should therefore be refused”.

**Officer comment:**

The correspondence from the consultants on behalf of one of the objectors’ raises issues that need to be addressed. However, because of the level of detail, particularly in the heritage statement, it is not appropriate to do so in this up-date paper.

Consequently, the officer recommendation is that:

The application should be **DEFERRED** for consideration at a later committee to allow a detailed and comprehensive response to be provided in a revised officer report.

---