

## Planning applications committee

**Date: Thursday, 09 September 2021**

**Time: 10:00**

**Venue: Council Chamber, City Hall**

Members of the public, agents and applicants, ward councillors and other interested parties must notify the committee officer if they wish to attend this meeting by 10:00 on the day before the committee meeting, please. Numbers are restricted due to social distancing arrangements. The meeting will be live streamed on the council's YouTube channel.

### Committee members:

#### Councillors:

Driver (chair)  
Button (vice chair)  
Bogelein  
Champion  
Everett  
Giles  
Grahame  
Lubbock  
Maxwell  
Peek  
Sands (M)  
Stutely  
Thomas (Va)

### For further information please contact:

Committee officer: Jackie Rodger  
t: (01603) 989547  
e: [jackierodger@norwich.gov.uk](mailto:jackierodger@norwich.gov.uk)

Democratic services  
City Hall  
Norwich  
NR2 1NH

[www.norwich.gov.uk](http://www.norwich.gov.uk)

### Information for members of the public

Members of the public and the media have the right to attend meetings of full council, the cabinet and committees except where confidential information or exempt information is likely to be disclosed, and the meeting is therefore held in private.

For information about attending or speaking at meetings, please contact the committee officer above or refer to the council's website

## Agenda

Page nos

### 1 Apologies

To receive apologies for absence

### 2 Declarations of interest

(Please note that it is the responsibility of individual members to declare an interest prior to the item if they arrive late for the meeting)

### 3 Minutes

5 - 6

To approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 12 August 2021

### 4 Planning applications

Please note that members of the public, who have responded to the planning consultations, and applicants and agents wishing to speak at the meeting for item 4 above are required to notify the committee officer by 10:00 on the day before the meeting.

Further information on planning applications can be obtained from the council's website:

<http://planning.norwich.gov.uk/online-applications/>

Please note:

- The formal business of the committee will commence at 10:00;
- The committee may have a comfort break after two hours of the meeting commencing.
- Please note that refreshments will not be provided. Water is available

- The committee will adjourn for lunch at a convenient point between 13:00 and 14:00 if there is any remaining business.

## Summary of applications for consideration at committee 7 - 8

**Standing duties** **9 - 10**

**4(a) Application no 21/00182/F - 20 Cowgate, Norwich, NR3 1SY 11 - 40**

<b>4(b)</b>	<b>Application no 21/00737/F - 24 - 28 Prince of Wales Road, Norwich, NR1 1LG</b>	<b>41 - 52</b>
-------------	---	----------------

Date of publication: **Wednesday, 01 September 2021**





**Planning applications committee**

**10:00 to 10:25**

**12 August 2021**

Present: Councillors Driver (chair), Button (vice chair), Carlo (substitute for Councillor Grahame), Champion, Giles, Lubbock, Maxwell, Peek, Sands (M) and Stutely

Apologies: Councillors Bogelein, Everett, Grahame, Thomas (Va)

**1. Declarations of interests**

Councillor Peek declared an other interest in item 3 (below), Application no 21/00679/U at 457 - 465 Dereham Road, Norwich, in that he was a regular user of the car wash.

**2. Minutes**

**RESOLVED** to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 8 July 2021.

**3. Application no 21/00679/U at 457 - 465 Dereham Road, Norwich**

The planner (case officer) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. The assessment of this planning application had taken into consideration the revised National Planning Policy Framework (issued on 20 July 2021). A supplementary report of updates to reports had been circulated to members before the meeting and comprised a summary of three further representations from residents and confirmation that the car wash staff would have access to facilities inside the building.

The planner, together with the area development manager and the planning team leader, referred to the report and answered members' questions. Environmental health officers had not objected to the opening hours proposed by the applicant despite the proximity to residential properties. Members were advised that there were existing commercial activities on the site without any restriction on hours and therefore these activities were not possible to control through the planning process. The hours of operation were considered appropriate for this location. Members

noted that a late night refreshment licence would be required for the take away to serve food after 23:00. The applicant's intention was that the car wash would close at 17:00 when the take away restaurant would open. There was no planning control to require the car wash to close and potentially there could be an overlap in the operation of the two businesses.

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

During discussion a member said that it was likely to be only two to three customers between 23:00 and midnight. There would be two separate businesses on the site which had previously been a busy service station. The success of these businesses could attract other commercial activities to this underdeveloped site. Members took into consideration that an application for late night refreshments would be subject to administration under the Licensing Act and that it was not possible to implement environmental enhancements or limit the hours of use of other activities on the site outside the "red line" delineating this planning application.

Councillor Lubbock opposed the grant of planning permission for this application because of the impact on residential amenity; that it was contrary to policy DM24 and that the hours of operation should be restricted to 23:00 given its proximity to residential properties.

**RESOLVED** with 9 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Button, Peek, Sands, Chamberlain, Maxwell, Giles, Stutely, Carlo) and 1 member voting against (Councillor Lubbock) to approve application 21/00679/U at 457 - 465 Dereham Road and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Restrict opening hours for the public (no access between 24:00 and 17:00)
4. Specified fume extraction scheme to be installed (details to be submitted)
5. Provision of cycle parking and bin storage

#### Informatives

1. Contamination

#### CHAIR

**Summary of planning applications for consideration****ITEM 4****09 September 2021**

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application no</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Case officer</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Reason for consideration at committee</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
4(a)	21/00182/F	20 Cowgate	Sarah Hinchcliffe	Demolition of existing building and construction of 3.5 storey building to provide 15No. one and two bedroom flats with associated works.	Objections	Approve
4(b)	21/00737/F	24 – 28 Prince of Wales Road	Jacob Revell	Removal of part flat roof area over Second Floor to create external terraced area with bar hidden below existing 2nd floor perimeter walls.	Objections	Approve





## **STANDING DUTIES**

**In assessing the merits of the proposals and reaching the recommendation made for each application, due regard has been given to the following duties and in determining the applications the members of the committee will also have due regard to these duties.**

### **Equality Act 2010**

It is unlawful to discriminate against, harass or victimise a person when providing a service or when exercising a public function. Prohibited conduct includes direct discrimination, indirect discrimination, harassment and victimisation and discrimination arising from a disability (treating a person unfavourably as a result of their disability, not because of the disability itself).

Direct discrimination occurs where the reason for a person being treated less favourably than another is because of a protected characteristic.

The act notes the protected characteristics of: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

The introduction of the general equality duties under this Act in April 2011 requires that the council must in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by this Act.
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not.
- Foster good relations between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not.

The relevant protected characteristics are: age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation.

The council must in the exercise of its functions have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination against someone due to their marriage or civil partnership status but the other aims of advancing equality and fostering good relations do not apply.

### **Crime and Disorder Act, 1998 (S17)**

- (1) Without prejudice to any other obligation imposed on it, it shall be the duty of each authority to which this section applies to exercise its

various functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area.

- (2) This section applies to a local authority, a joint authority, a police authority, a National Park authority and the Broads Authority.

### **Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act 2006 (S40)**

- (1) Every public authority must, on exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.

### **Planning Act 2008 (S183)**

- (1) Every Planning Authority should have regard to the desirability of achieving good design

### **Human Rights Act 1998 – this incorporates the rights of the European Convention on Human Rights into UK Law**

#### ***Article 8 – Right to Respect for Private and Family Life***

- (1) Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence.
- (2) There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of his right except such as in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the rights and freedoms of others.
- (3) A local authority is prohibited from acting in a way which is incompatible with any of the human rights described by the European Convention on Human Rights unless legislation makes this unavoidable.
- (4) Article 8 is a qualified right and where interference of the right can be justified there will be no breach of Article 8.

**Report to** Planning applications committee

**Item**

9 September 2021

**Report of** Head of Planning and Regulatory Services

**Subject** Application no 21/00182/F - 20 Cowgate, Norwich, NR3 1SY


**Reason for referral** Objections

4(a)

<b>Ward</b>	Mancroft
<b>Case officer</b>	Sarah Hinchcliffe <a href="mailto:sarahhinchcliffe@norwich.gov.uk">sarahhinchcliffe@norwich.gov.uk</a>
<b>Applicant</b>	Kent Magill Ltd

Development proposal		
Demolition of existing building and construction of 3.5 storey building to provide 15 no. one and two bedroom flats with associated works.		
Representations		
1 <sup>st</sup> round of consultation		
Object	Comment	Support
20	0	0
2 <sup>nd</sup> round of consultation (amended mix, reduced number of units)		
Object	Comment	Comment
7	0	0
Final round of consultation (reduction in height, amended roof design)		
Object	Comment	Comment
2	0	0

Main issues	Key considerations
1. Principle of use	Loss of protected public house, loss of locally listed building, residential use within a Large District Centre and City Centre Leisure Area
2. Heritage and Design	Impact upon the conservation area. Footprint and layout, scale and massing, position of entrances, external appearance
3. Amenity	Impact upon existing residents taking into consideration overlooking and overshadowing. Living conditions for future residents including size of units, light, external space, noise and air quality.
4. Transport	Car free accommodation, provision of bike and bin stores
5. Trees and landscaping	Existing and new provision
6. Drainage	Foul and surface water drainage provision
7. Biodiversity	Ecological mitigation and biodiversity enhancement measures
8. Energy and water	10% energy requirements



© Crown Copyright and database right 2021. Ordnance Survey 100019747.

Planning Application No 21/00182/F  
Site Address 20 Cowgate

Scale 1:500



**NORWICH**  
City Council

PLANNING SERVICES



Page 12 of 52



9. Affordable Housing	Amount and type of affordable housing provision
<b>Expiry date</b>	4 June 2021, extension agreed until 16 September 2021
<b>Recommendation</b>	Approve subject to satisfactory completion of a legal agreement

## The site and surroundings

1. The application site currently includes a two storey detached, neo Georgian style public house with residential accommodation at first floor level. The pub was last known as 'The Blueberry Music House' and once was part of Norwich's live music scene. The building is currently vacant and has been boarded up to prevent trespass.
2. The building is located at the junction of Cowgate and Peacock Street and is set back from both road frontages. Hard surfacing wraps around the building and once provided outside seating areas on the frontage to Cowgate and parking to Peacock Street.
3. Directly adjacent to the south and west is the tall and imposing rear elevations of the Roys department store/supermarket building located on Magdalen Street. This building ranges in height between approx. 13.5 and 17.5 metres tall. As part of the operations of this building a delivery yard is located directly to the west of the application site.
4. To the immediate north and east the area consists of mainly late 19 century residential terraces of two storey form, with the exception of a three storey residential building to the north east at No. 31 Cowgate.

## Constraints

5. The site is subject to the following constraints/local plan designations;
  - Protected public house – Policy DM22
  - Locally listed building – Policy DM9
  - Norwich City Centre Conservation Area, Anglia Square Character Area – Policy DM9
  - Area of main archaeological interest – Policy DM9
  - Regeneration area – Policy DM5
  - Large District Centre and City Centre Leisure Area – Policies DM18, DM20, DM23
  - City centre parking area – Policy DM29

## Relevant planning history

6.

Ref	Proposal	Decision	Date
16/00010/ACV	Nomination as an asset of community value.	APPR	21/10/2015

## The proposal

- The application proposes the demolition of an existing public house and erection of a 3.5 storey building to provide 15 flats. 11 are one bedroom, 2 person flats and 4 are two bedroom, 4 person flats, arranged over 4 floors of accommodation, including the roof space.
- The application has been revised from the initial submission of a 3.5 and 4 storey building to accommodate 23 x one bedroom flats. The design of the building has been amended including measures to reduce the bulk and height of the proposals and amend the roof design.
- The four ground floor flats are accessed directly from the street frontages. The remainder of the flats are accessed via a rear entrance from a small rear communal courtyard. The rear courtyard also accommodates bin and cycle storage.

## Summary information

Proposal	Key facts
<b>Scale</b>	
Total no. of dwellings	15 (11 x 1 bed 2 person units and 4 x 2 bed 4 person units).
No. of affordable dwellings	3
Total floorspace	1 bed flats: 53-64sqm (meets minimum standards) 2 bed flats: 70-78sqm (meets minimum standards)
No. of storeys	Three and a half storeys
Max. dimensions	Approx 11.5 metres to ridge and 8.3 metres to eaves.
<b>Appearance</b>	
Materials	Red bricks, smut clay pantile roof, grey single ply membrane flat roofs, conservation rooflights, dormer windows with lead surround to street elevations and standing seam cladding to rear dormers, recessed timber 'yard' cart openings, painted

	timber doors, timber sash and casement windows to street, metal windows and doors to courtyard.  Sedum planted green roof to bin and cycle store and rear entrance canopy.
Energy and resource efficiency measures	Fabric first approach, with water usage limited to 105 litres per person per day.
<b>Transport matters</b>	
Vehicular access	None
No of car parking spaces	Car free development
No of cycle parking spaces	24 (within covered store in rear courtyard).
Servicing arrangements	Within bin store in rear courtyard.  7 x 360 refuse and 5 x 360 recycling (or possibly 2 x 1100 litre waste, 2 x 1100 litre recycling).

## Representations

10. Advertised on site and in the press. Adjacent and neighbouring properties have been notified in writing. 27 letters of representation have been received citing the issues as summarised in the table below. Changes were made during the course of the application (to reduce the bulk and height of the proposals, amend the roof design and alter the housing mix) and neighbours were re-consulted on two further separate occasions. Two letters of representation were subsequently received as part of the final revisions citing the same issues previously raised.

11.

Issues raised	Response
Object to the demolition of the existing building, which has significantly more heritage and design value than the Heritage Impact Statement, or the Council scoring system, currently allow. It warrants conversion into a smaller development of larger flats, more in keeping with the scale of the surrounding streets, and with a decent and humane provision of outside space.	See main issue 1: Principle of Development
The proposed flats are not in keeping with the existing architecture on Cowgate and the	See main issue 2: Heritage and Design

Issues raised	Response
surrounding roads. It is out of scale with domestic dwellings in Cowgate.	
As the development comes almost to the roadside it will be overshadowing and dominate the cityscape.	See main issues 2 and 3: Heritage and Design; Amenity
The proposed building blocks out more area than the Roys building against which it sits. It will block out views of the cathedral for many residents and is overly large for the plot.	Protection of a private view is not a material planning consideration.
The building will take all light and privacy from our properties, overlooking properties on Cowgate, Peacock Street and Willis Street.	See main issue 3: Amenity
This area already has an issue with parking. We already struggle to park as people use the area to park and visit the shops. With no parking provision for these flats it will exacerbate the problem.	Residents will not be eligible for residential parking permits and therefore the availability of parking within the controlled parking zone will not be effected.
If the existing building must be removed then surely a row of terrace houses, with garden areas and parking spaces would be much more in keeping with the area and much less objectionable to residents.	See main issue 2: Heritage and Design
Cowgate is a small street which is already used as a cut through and is pretty noisy with the traffic, adding extra residential dwellings to this will only increase this issue.	The development is car free and will not create additional car movements.
The drains will not be able to cope.	See main issue 6: Drainage.
Squeezing 23 flats into this small space will not provide good living conditions for the people moving in, including cramped conditions and insufficient lighting and outlook, and will put strain on the surrounding areas. More 2 and 3 bedroomed family homes are needed, not tiny bedsits.	See main issue 3: Amenity. The revised scheme proposes 15 x 1 and 2 bed units which meet with the national space standards rather than 23 x 1 bed units.
Why not renovate the pub and turn it into something that the local community needs.	See main issue 1: Principle of development
The air quality is poor at best, and increasingly is returning to pre-pandemic levels as more people are driving into and from the area. Residents will be exposed to	See main issue 3: Amenity



Issues raised	Response
<p>the emissions from the lorries and vans which deliver to Roys as well as postal vehicles. I would be very concerned about the health consequences for existing residents from the increased pollution of vehicles belonging to/serving the inhabitants of the proposed development - and for those potential residents of the development as they will be exposed to very high levels of pollution whenever they opened their windows or left the building.</p>	
<p>As Pub Protection Officer for the Norwich and District branch of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) we strongly object to the plans to demolish the public house and build flats on the site. The building should be retained for the community as a public house and music venue.</p> <p>We also would suggest that now the effects of the Pandemic are lessening and the economy is beginning to pick-up that the building should be offered for sale again as a public house and music venue at a sensible market price close to what it was bought for.</p>	<p>See main issue 1: Principle of development</p>

12. Councillor Osborn, ward councillor for Mancroft Ward, has objected to the application on the following grounds:

“This development would violate Norwich’s policy DM2 – Amenity. With 23 single bedroom flats in very close proximity in a small space it is hard to see how the development would provide satisfactory amenity, satisfactory living and working conditions, adequate protection from noise and pollution and adequate levels of light and outlook for future occupiers, as required by policy DM2. Furthermore the development will cause overlooking and loss of privacy especially for the historic cottages opposite the site on Cowgate.

The height and massing of the building would be significantly greater than the surrounding terraced properties and historic cottages, violating policy DM3. While the development claims that it will aim to restore the historic streetscape of the area, the greater height and massing is not in character with the surrounding terraces. Furthermore, the massing of the design lacks any variety or mitigation, meaning that it will impose on the street in a way that is detrimental to the residential character of the surrounding area, while providing little in the way of visual interest. In other words, it is a massive and imposing design that will damage the streetscape.

Furthermore, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifies that there is

an overall growth in recent years in the number of families needing housing. Providing exclusively single-bedroom flats does nothing to meet the need for affordable family homes. There has recently been a large increase in the number of single-bedroom properties in the surrounding area (eg: on Edward Street) and there is a need for family homes in the area.”

## **Consultation responses**

13. Consultation responses are summarised below the full responses are available to view at <http://planning.norwich.gov.uk/online-applications/> by entering the application number.

### **Design and conservation**

14. Initial comments - I do not think that there is clear and convincing justification for the loss of this locally listed public house (NDHA) and the associated introduction of a building of such a scale and massing would introduce a dominant and distracting intrusion into the area, negatively altering and eroding the traditional, historic character and appearance of the conservation area, and drawing attention away from the existing nearby heritage assets.
15. In their present form the works will cause harm to the setting of various heritage assets and the wider character and appearance of the conservation area contrary to the requirements of the section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, NPPF Chapter 16 in particular Paragraphs 130, 193, 194, 196 and 197, NPPG Historic Environment Good Practice in Planning 3, Setting of Heritage Assets, Local Plan policies DM1, DM3 and DM9.
16. Final revision plans – although ongoing discussions have taken place with the conservation officer in relation to the design and heritage aspects of the application no further comments were received.

### **Public protection**

17. I have concerns regarding the impact noise, as opposed to the general level of noise, afforded by the immediately adjacent delivery yard. I also appreciate the consultant has added 3dB (doubling of noise levels) to compensate for any present day reduction in noise due to current circumstances resulting from lockdown.
18. I therefore have no objections to the application on the basis of noise provided the recommended glazing conditions presented in the Sound Acoustics Noise Assessment, dated 3rd March 2021, are installed and maintained according to manufacturer's recommendations, that is double glazing of between Rw32 & 35 and trickle ventilation ranging from between Dn.e.w 31 to 40dB with no trickle ventilation to rooms facing the delivery yard.
19. In order to address the potential for impact noise, I would wish to also see an Informant added to the decision notice which states to any prospective buyer that there may be noise associated with activities undertaken at the premises adjacent to the flats and that any complaint of noise nuisance from this particular activity will be investigated by the council with all mitigation in place i.e. windows and trickle vents closed.

## Highways

20. In principle I would have no objection on highway grounds to the proposed development subject to conditions.
21. The site is located in a highly accessible part of the city centre, it is within a controlled parking zone and according to local policy, none of the new dwellings would be entitled to on-street parking permits so consequently it would be considered a 'car free' scheme.
22. Provision of cycle parking appears to be adequate and would be within a secure rear communal yard. As the bin store would open out directly onto Cowgate where there is currently a disabled parking bay, this would need to be removed and the double yellow line lengthened to facilitate refuse collection access via new dropped kerb. An amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order would be required, as part of that process the feasibility of relocating the disabled parking nearby could be considered, or whether disabled parking provision within the Magdalen Street surface car park would suffice.
23. The footprint of the building is proposed to be set back from the back edge of the adopted footway on the Peacock Street and Cowgate elevations. As a consequence it would be essential that all windows do not open outwards, so as to avoid being a hazard to passing pedestrians. The margin between the building and the footway is understood to be paved which will facilitate ease of street cleansing.
24. The footway on Peacock Street has a dropped kerb adjacent to the site, it will be necessary for the footway to be reconstructed to full kerb height.
25. The extant illuminated 'no entry' sign at the Cowgate side of the site would appear to be sited hard up against the site boundary and the new building facade. It is my advice that this illuminated no entry sign is repositioned on a new refuge island; in doing so it will reinforce the no entry restriction and facilitate contraflow cycling. (NB for carriageways less than 5metres in width only one no entry sign is required, therefore the no entry sign on the opposite footway can be removed). These matters can be explored through the Small Highway Works Agreement.
26. During the construction phase there is likely to be a need for a hoarding around the site, and footway diversion set up, access for vehicles and staff parking would need to be managed, for these reasons a Construction Traffic Management Plan is required.

## Housing strategy

27. Final revision plans comments - Norwich has a high need for affordable housing, in particular one-bedroom accommodation. We therefore welcome the proposal for 15 units including 11no 1 Bed flats and 4no 2 Bed flats. The proposed number of dwellings will trigger the threshold for the provision of affordable housing, currently 30% in developments of less than 16 units. If vacant building credit applies, which would need to be confirmed by the Planning Officer, then this would be taken into account in calculating the requirement for affordable housing in accordance with The Affordable Housing SPD (adopted 1 July 2019). In this instance, if vacant building credit applies, it has been calculated that 3 units of affordable housing would be required in order to be policy compliant.

28. There would be preference for the affordable housing to be 1 bedroom units as there is a higher need for this size of accommodation. This should be secured under a S.106 agreement with the units transferred to the ownership of a Registered Provider. It would be preferred if these are let at Social Rent rather than Affordable Rent as this is the overarching housing need in the City.
29. It is welcome that all units will meet Nationally Described Space Standards, and that all 1 Bed flats meet the requirement for 2 person units and that all 2 Bed flats meet the requirement for 4 person units. All units should be of tenure neutral design and the affordable housing integrated into the scheme.

### **Landscape**

30. Final revision plans comments - Overall, the proposal is much improved since initial submission. We have some reservations about the number of trees that could be delivered within the rear courtyard, particularly given overshadowing of the site by existing and proposed buildings, and also the effect the trees may have on light levels within the proposed building. Fastigate or lighter canopied trees that tolerate shade should be considered.
31. We would advise a landscaping condition including details of the green roofs to be provided.
32. It is advised that T1 be retained as is of value to the street scene and as current proposals stand there would not be any scope for compensatory planting of public visual amenity benefit, notwithstanding any capability to mitigate the effects on the streetscape from the revealed Roys building. We will leave detailed commentary on this to the arboricultural officer, however with regard to the street scene we feel that potential impacts on T1 should be avoided, and if this means reducing the building footprint back away from the existing tree, this should be considered. How foundations will be excavated and how the building will be constructed in such close proximity to the tree requires detailed consideration.

### **Norfolk County Council - planning obligations**

33. As the number of dwellings have reduced below the planning obligations team threshold (20 dwellings). We have no comments to make on this site as the number of dwellings has reduced, and our previous comments are no longer applicable.
34. Fire: Norfolk Fire Services have commented that taking into account the location and infrastructure already in place, there is no requirement for a fire hydrant for this development.

### **Norfolk historic environment service**

35. The development proposal affects a site of considerable archaeological potential within the medieval walled city of Norwich. The site also lies inside the defences of Late Anglo-Saxon date, north of the Wensum. The Late Anglo-Saxon defensive ditch, which was about 9m wide and lies approximately 30m to 50 north of the application site. The name Cowgate is of Late Anglo-Saxon origin and the street in effect formed an intramural road running parallel to the north arm of the defences. The site is therefore likely to have been in continuous occupation since the 9th century. Further information on the exact date and nature of the earliest occupation on the site is a key aim of any archaeological work.

36. The Archaeological Desk Based Assessment is on the whole a competent and thorough report, although it arguably underplays the sites potential relating to below-ground archaeological remains of Late Anglo-Saxon/Anglo-Scandinavian date.
37. The overall archaeological potential of the site is high. At some stage archaeological trial trenching will be required and there is a high likelihood that some form of pre-construction archaeological mitigation (excavation) will be also be required.
38. Previously asked for archaeological work prior to determination, but satisfied standard three conditions can be used, allowing demolition to slab level only before investigation.

#### **Norfolk police (architectural liaison)**

39. Secured by Design advice, including specific points relating to restricted/secure access to the site, secure mail delivery, secure cycle storage, bin stores.

#### **Norwich Society**

40. Whereas the height is probably appropriate for this city centre site, the design is unimaginative. The lack of variety of form and articulation makes it look particularly massive. The change from the mansard roof round the corner to the full height block is of poor proportion. There is no local context - why not reference the attractive historic elevations in the DAS with their top floor weavers' windows and variety of fenestration.
41. We consider the development principle is appropriate for the site, however we strongly object to this application in terms of design quality.
42. 2<sup>nd</sup> revision plans comments - We consider that this is certainly an improvement on the previous scheme. However, are unclear why they don't have the ground floor flats accessible directly from the street, rather than entered from the rear. This would make them more in keeping with other properties on these streets and may eliminate the ground floor internal corridor; this would give extra space to the flats and less of a bottleneck in a fire escape situation.
43. In summary we do not oppose the scheme and this represents an improvement, but we still feel there is scope for improvement in design quality.

#### **Tree protection officer**

44. T1 is a prominent tree protected by conservation area status. There is currently no arboricultural justification for its removal. An 'off-site' tree, under separate ownership, its retention/protection is considered to be essential. Its loss would have a negative impact on the street scene, an impact that could not be adequately compensated for by replacement planting within the proposed courtyard. Works to enable the tree to be retained/protected should be carried out in accordance with the recommendations contained within the AIA. Applying conditions TR4 (arb supervision within RPA), TR6 (arb works to facilitate development) and TR7 (works on site in accordance with AIA, AMS, TPP) would be appropriate.

## Anglian Water

45. The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Whitlingham Trowse Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows.
46. In the used water (foul) network the development will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. Anglian Water will need to plan effectively for the proposed development, if permission is granted. We will need to work with the applicant to ensure any infrastructure improvements are delivered in line with the development. A full assessment cannot be made due to lack of information, we therefore request a condition requiring on-site drainage strategy.
47. The surface water strategy/flood risk assessment submitted with the planning application relevant to Anglian Water is unacceptable as no information has been provided relating to the surface water strategy for the site. We request a condition be applied to the decision notice if permission is granted.

## Citywide Services

48. Our guidance is for every 6 flats a minimum of 1 x 1100 litre recycling bin and 1 x 1100 litre refuse bin are provided. So we would expect 3 x 1100 refuse and 3 x 1100 recycling to be provided for the 15 flats.
49. The bins appear to be approx 14 metres away from the public highway, our requirement is no more than 5 metres- is there going to be a managing agent who will present them for collection by 7am on the day of the collection? A dropped kerb to the roadside on Cowgate will also be required.
50. Further to clarification on unit size - Based on the size of the development and what you have stated previously (further to contact with Biffa), I would suggest 7 x 360 refuse and 5 x 360 recycling bins as an alternative are required.

## Assessment of planning considerations

### Relevant development plan policies

51. **Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk adopted March 2011 amendments adopted Jan. 2014 (JCS)**
  - JCS1 Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
  - JCS2 Promoting good design
  - JCS3 Energy and water
  - JCS4 Housing delivery
  - JCS5 The economy
  - JCS6 Access and transportation
  - JCS7 Supporting communities
  - JCS8 Culture, leisure and entertainment
  - JCS11 Norwich city centre
  - JCS19 The hierarchy of centres
  - JCS20 Implementation
52. **Norwich Development Management Policies Local Plan adopted Dec. 2014 (DM Plan)**

- DM1 Achieving and delivering sustainable development
- DM2 Ensuring satisfactory living and working conditions
- DM3 Delivering high quality design
- DM5 Planning effectively for flood resilience
- DM6 Protecting and enhancing the natural environment
- DM7 Trees and development
- DM8 Planning effectively for open space and recreation
- DM9 Safeguarding Norwich's heritage
- DM11 Protecting against environmental hazards
- DM12 Ensuring well-planned housing development
- DM13 Communal development and multiple occupation
- DM16 Supporting the needs of business
- DM17 Supporting small business
- DM20 Protecting and supporting city centre shopping
- DM21 Protecting and supporting district and local centres
- DM22 Planning for and safeguarding community facilities
- DM23 Supporting and managing the evening and late night economy
- DM28 Encouraging sustainable travel
- DM29 Managing parking demand in the city centre
- DM30 Access and highway safety
- DM31 Car parking and servicing
- DM32 Encouraging car free and low car housing
- DM33 Planning obligations and development viability

### **Other material considerations**

#### **53. Relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework July 2021 (NPPF):**

- NPPF2 Achieving sustainable development
- NPPF5 Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- NPPF8 Promoting healthy and safe communities
- NPPF9 Promoting sustainable transport
- NPPF11 Making effective use of land
- NPPF12 Achieving well-designed places
- NPPF14 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- NPPF15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- NPPF16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

#### **54. Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)**

- Affordable housing SPD adopted July 2019
- Trees, development and landscape SPD 2016
- Heritage Interpretation SPD adopted 2016

#### **55. City Centre Conservation Area Appraisal, September 2007**

### **Case Assessment**

56. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Relevant development plan policies are detailed above. Material

considerations include policies in the National Planning Framework (NPPF), the Councils standing duties, other policy documents and guidance detailed above and any other matters referred to specifically in the assessment below. The following paragraphs provide an assessment of the main planning issues in this case against relevant policies and material considerations.

### **Main issue 1: Principle of development**

57. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs – JCS4, JCS7, JCS11, DM1, DM12, DM13, DM20, DM21, DM22, DM23, NPPF sections 5 and 8.

#### **Loss of a protected public house**

58. The Blueberry Public House is identified in the Local Plan as a protected community public house in relation to Policy DM22 and appendix 5. DM22 only permits the loss of such pubs in the following circumstances:
- a) adequate alternative provision exists within 800m of the site; or
  - b) all reasonable efforts have been made to preserve the facility but it has been demonstrated that it would not be economically viable, feasible or practicable to retain the building or site for its existing use; and
  - c) evidence is provided to confirm that the property or site has been marketed for a meaningful period and that there is no realistic interest in its retention for the current use or for an alternative community use.
59. As the pub is listed in Appendix 5 of the Local Plan all three of the above criteria need to be met before its loss can be permitted. If the above criteria can be satisfied, then preference will be given to alternative community uses before other uses are considered.
60. Norwich is fortunate in offering a vibrant and distinctive pub culture appealing to all ages and social groups. There are a number of alternative pubs within 800m of the site, the closest is located within 50 metres (the Plasterers Arms). In addition the Planning Statement identifies four venues (Ribs of Beef, The Leopard, Louis Marchesi and Epic studios) within 5/10 minute walking distance from the site which specifically provide a music offering. Therefore, the requirements of part (a) are met as there exists alternative provision of both public houses and music venues within the required distance.
61. The building is understood to have been purchased by the applicant for £235,000 after being put up for sale for £225,000. The building is said to be in a poor state of repair and a structural survey provided by the applicant suggests that an estimated £150,000 of repairs and renovation will be required to bring it back into its existing use in its current form. Advice sought from relevant colleagues within the council suggest that the amount quoted for repairs and renovation is not excessive. The amount paid for the building is similar to comparable vacant commercial building values in Norwich. Sufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that part (b) of DM22 has been met.
62. The public house was purchased by the applicant in February 2020 and was understood to have been closed for 12 months prior to this. This suggests that the public house has been closed since February 2019. In May 2019 there was



notification of intention to sell the property. The Planning Statement explains that the property was extensively marketed by Fleurets (who specialise in marketing pubs, restaurants and leisure uses) both on the internet and via mailing lists before the applicant purchased the property after receiving details and viewing the property in September 2019. There was limited interest in the property for continued use as a public house, even with the low purchase price.

63. The pub was registered as an asset of community value until it lapsed in late October 2020. No expressions of interest from community groups were raised in the relevant moratorium period, 6 months from May to November 2019. There was reportedly no interest from local community groups wishing to purchase the property during the time that it was for sale. The council does not hold any information which disputes this. Sufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that part (c) of DM22 has been met
64. All three criteria of policy DM22 have been met and the building is no longer listed as an asset of community value. During the time that the property was for sale no interest was generated in purchasing the property for an alternative community use. Therefore, the loss of this community public house has been justified and can be accepted in policy terms

### **Loss of a locally listed building**

65. The proposals involve the demolition of '20 Cowgate' which is a locally listed building within a conservation area. Local policy DM9 states:

"Development resulting in harm to or loss of significance of a locally identified asset will only be acceptable where:

  - a) there are demonstrable and overriding benefits associated with the development; and
  - b) it can be demonstrated that there would be no reasonably practicable or viable means of retaining the asset within a development."
66. Criteria (b) of policy DM9 has some similarities with DM22, but focuses on practicalities and viability of retaining the building as an asset within a development rather than retention of a community use on the site. The information provided by the applicant as summarised in earlier paragraph 60 adequately demonstrates that it would not be economically viable to carry out the works required to bring the building in its current form back into use.
67. The applicant within a supporting statement explains that various options were considered to retain the building on the site and extend around it, however the position of the building and its relationship to surrounding buildings limit development potential. An option to demolish existing single storey additions to the building and replace with 2 or 3 storey extensions, together with a roof extension to provide a third storey to the original building was considered in order to provide 3 to 6 flats (depending on the mix). However, this presented viability issues with development costs exceeding the final value of the development.
68. The applicant's commentary regarding the practicalities of retaining the building within a more extensive redevelopment of the site seems reasonable and again the

price paid for the site is not excessive when considering its redevelopment potential in this respect. Therefore, although the loss of any identified heritage asset is unfortunate it can be accepted in this case. However, any replacement building would need to be of a use and appropriate design in order to provide “demonstrable and overriding benefits” required to demonstrate full compliance with policy DM9.

69. In conclusion, the loss of a community public house and locally listed building has been sufficiently justified in accordance with policies DM22 and DM9. Therefore, the principle of the demolition elements of the proposals can be accepted. To fully satisfy policy DM9 the benefits associated with the proposed new elements of the development need to be assessed and such considerations form part of subsequent sections of this report.

### **Residential use within a Large District Centre and City Centre Leisure Area**

70. Although the site is located within the Anglia Square, Magdalen Street and St Augustine’s Large District Centre it is not currently within retail use (formerly A1 use) or within a ‘defined retail frontage’. Although located on the edge of the ‘city centre leisure area’ the immediate context to the north and east is a dense area of residential development. Wrapping around the site to the south and west are the inactive rear elevations and delivery area of large scale building within retail use.
71. The site is located at the very periphery of both the defined retail and leisure area, on a site adjacent to a residential area and where residential use would not lead to the loss of a retail use or unduly prejudice the operation of other retail or leisure uses within the defined areas. Therefore, on balance the introduction of a residential use to the site will contribute to a vibrant mix of town centre uses and is acceptable.
72. In addition the site was previously covered by the Northern City Centre Area Action Plan (now expired). This plan supported the objectives of JCS 11 of achieving the comprehensive regeneration of the northern city centre for a mix of beneficial uses. The redevelopment of this site for housing would support JCS 11 by making best use of this brownfield site.

### **Main issue 2: Heritage and Design**

73. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs – JCS2, DM3, DM9, DM12, NPPF section 12 & 16, Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
74. The existing building is locally listed and the site is located within the Anglia Square character area of the City Centre Conservation Area. Peacock Street and residential dwellings on Cowgate are found within the Northern City character area adjacent.
75. In terms of design considerations, the Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) identifies this part of the city centre conservation area as being of low significance and of very poor townscape quality. The area was heavily bombed during the Second World War, and then further cleared in the following years with the resulting townscape appearing confused in places with many visual juxtapositions which relate poorly to the remaining historic buildings. Larger buildings of the 1960s and 70s dominate the character area with their assertive ‘modern’ design.

76. In the immediate vicinity of the site, Roys and much of Anglia Square are identified as negative buildings. The view along Cowgate to Magdalen Street with the area of surface car parking on the application site at the junction of Peacock Street and Cowgate and the backdrop of large parts of the bulky Roys building and the multi storey car park at Anglia Square provide a negative vista as a result. The CAA identifies a range of building types within the conservation area which include narrow fronted 2- 3 storey 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century buildings along Magdalen Street, as well as industrial and commercial buildings.
77. There is a sequence of locally listed buildings to the north east and west of the site. The loss of the locally listed building which currently occupies the application site itself has been initially considered within main issue 1 above. There is a difference of opinion between the council's conservation and design officer and the applicant's heritage consultant as to the significance of the existing building which appears to have been built in the years following WW2. The council's conservation and design officer considers the building of architectural/aesthetic, historic and communal/social heritage value and local significance, which sits well in its context and harmonises with the prevailing modest scale and built form in which it resides.
78. Whereas the applicant's heritage consultant considers the level of heritage value that the building retains as low. Also, they consider that the building's detached footprint and recessive position within the site represents a weak presence in the townscape which interrupts the historic pattern of development along Cowgate and Peacock Street and erodes the legibility of the 18th century street network and associated views. It is their view that the building does not contribute positively to views along Cowgate or Peacock Street.
79. It is agreed by all parties that the setting of the existing building is marred by the out of scale development of Roys department store adjacent, which employs poor quality building materials and utilitarian design. The area of surface car parking on the forecourt of the existing building is also uncharacteristic of the area and further degrades the street scene and opens up views of the bulk of the Roys building beyond. Development proposals of an appropriate design, which reinstate a built street frontage and introduce more bulk and prominence to the application site which is located in the foreground of the more bulky development beyond could arguably lead to an improvement of this situation.
80. In any event the harm or loss of significance which would arise through the demolition of the locally listed building on the application site itself can only be accepted where there are demonstrable and overriding benefits associated with the development as required by policy DM9. Demolition of the building allows for the site to be used in a more efficient way and provide a greater quantity of housing, including affordable housing, than conversion of the building or its retention and extension would allow in this highly sustainable location. It also presents an opportunity to recreate the relationship that historic development on the site once had with its surroundings, removing the area of surface car parking on this prominent corner and providing an active frontage to the development to integrate the use of the site into the surrounding residential character in a more positive way while obscuring more of the poor quality backdrop to the site. Also given the more limited contribution that the building makes to the significance of the conservation area and the low significance and poor townscape quality of this part of the city centre conservation area itself, the harm that will result from the loss of the building should be assessed in line with paragraph 207 of the NPPF.

81. The loss of the building is not likely to result in anything greater than 'less than substantial harm' to the special character and appearance of the conservation area as a whole, thus engaging paragraph 202 of the NPPF. The 'less than substantial' harm should be weighed in the balance against the other public benefits of the proposals in accordance with paragraph 202 of the NPPF, as set out in paragraph 80 above.
82. Lengthy discussions have taken place with both the applicant and their representatives and the council's conservation and design officer to determine an appropriate scale and position of proposed new development on the site. The site is located at a transition between domestic scale, purely residential developments which are typically (with a few exceptions) two storey in scale and commercial or mixed developments which are greater than two storeys in height.
83. The applicant's design approach has been to recreate the scale and form of development which would have historically occupied this corner site (before the existing post war building). There is historical evidence that three storey terraces with yards housing residential and factory uses, all located adjacent to the back edge of the footway would have existed along Peacock Street. Together with a corner tavern occupying the site itself. The applicant argues that redevelopment of the site presents the potential for reinstatement of the historic building line lost in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century.
84. The development has been modified through several iterations, further to design suggestions from the council's conservation and design officer. The proposed development presents three full storeys of accommodation within a building of traditional design and materials. The frontages to Peacock Street and Cowgate have a hipped roof with two small dormers and conservation rooflights, which serve accommodation (a 4<sup>th</sup> storey) located within the roof space. The eaves and ridge height of the proposals have been reduced so as to be similar in scale to No.31 Cowgate, which is a three storey locally listed residential building to the north east of the site.
85. To the rear the development has a mixture of gables and large standing seam clad dormers. The internal accommodation has been arranged such that openings to the rear allow active surveillance to the rear access to the building, its courtyard area and cycle storage.
86. The modifications made to the scale and design of the proposals result in a form of development which would not be out of scale with its surroundings. The reduction in emphasis of the accommodation within the roof space from the main street frontages has been successfully achieved through the use of smaller dormers and roof lights and the arrangement of fenestration and rainwater goods gives a sense of the historical narrow plot widths which in turn reduces the apparent bulk of the building. The building now has an active frontage with both Cowgate and Peacock Street due to the creation of entrances to ground floor units direct from the street. The proposals are clearly greater in scale and height than the two storey terraces of Cowgate, Peacock Street and Willis Street. However, the revised proposals now interact more successfully with the street scene and existing community and are no longer considered to overwhelm the existing residential properties but represent an appropriate transition in scale between the existing residential and commercial developments in this area.

87. The revised form of development redefines this prominent corner and reintroduces a building of sufficient scale and design quality to provide a greater presence and stronger frontage with both Peacock Street and Cowgate. The development serves to reinforce the historic character and appearance of this part of the conservation area character area in a way that the existing building in its recessive position, overshadowed by the monolithic overbearing Roys building is not able to.
88. The impact of the development is limited to the setting of heritage assets in its immediate vicinity, specifically the setting of locally listed No.31 Cowgate, the Wensum Chapel, the Plasterers Arms and in design terms the wider townscape character of Cowgate/Peacock Street. The scale and design of the proposed development has been revised such that it should not detract attention from these adjacent heritage assets or negatively impact on the traditional, historic character and appearance of the conservation area.
89. Any impact upon these heritage assets and the character and appearance of the conservation area as a whole is 'less than substantial' in NPPF terms and therefore should be weighed in the balance against the other public benefits of the proposals in accordance with paragraph 202 of the NPPF.
90. On balance the low level of 'less than substantial' harm to the significance of designated heritage assets is considered acceptable given the 'clear and convincing justification' of the public benefits associated with the removal of surface parking from the site and the provision of market and affordable housing. The proposals comply with policies DM3 and DM9 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 and paragraph 202 and 207 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

### **Main issue 3: Amenity**

91. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs – DM2, DM11, DM12, DM13, NPPF section 12, 15.

#### **Amenity of future occupiers**

92. The presence of the large imposing bulk of the Roys department store adjacent to the south and west represents a considerable constraint to the layout of new development on the site. The delivery yard to the store is located adjacent to the west of the application site and presents noise considerations.
93. Revisions to the development from the initial submission have significantly reduced the number of proposed units. In addition all of the units have either a dual aspect to the accommodation or face on to Peacock Street. This ensures that each unit is provided with adequate levels of natural ventilation, daylight and outlook.
94. The public protection officer has considered the information provided within the applicant's Noise Impact Assessment which considers both traffic and delivery noise . In addition information provided at the time of officer site visit regarding delivery frequency, type and timings mainly during store opening hours with no specific machinery confirmed the findings of the noise survey. Public protection has raised no objections to the application on the basis of noise, as sufficient mitigation can be achieved through the use of glazing conditions and a restriction on the use of trickle ventilation to rooms facing the delivery yard.

95. In terms of air quality the site is located within the city centre air quality management area (AQMA). However, the proposal is for a car free development on a local road network which is subject to one way traffic restrictions and does not serve as a main thoroughfare or a bus route. The scale of development proposed in this location within the AQMA does not raise any specific air quality concerns and will not result in unacceptable impacts on the amenity of new residents. Indeed the removal of parking provision which currently exists on the site and replacing this with a car free development may provide a minor benefit to local air quality.
96. Each of the flats provide adequate amounts of floor space to comply with the nationally described space standards. Very limited external amenity space is provided for residents due to the constrained nature of the site. It is difficult to see how significant amounts of quality amenity space could be accommodated on the site due to its limited size and the impact that surrounding development would have on the useability of any such amenity space due to its height and proximity, overshadowing such provision. A small communal courtyard to the rear and two small external terraces form the limited provision. This is not untypical of development in the surrounding area and is acceptable in this sustainable large district centre location with local access to urban parks and open spaces. Therefore, while there is a technical conflict with the aims policy DM2 which seeks to secure external amenity space within residential developments, the living conditions of the occupiers would not be compromised as access to public open spaces are within walking or cycling distance of the site.
97. The applicant has worked with officers and has provided revisions to the proposals which provides a mix of units in a layout which offers an acceptable level of amenity for proposed new occupiers of the development. The development will not give rise to harm to the living conditions of future occupiers. The proposal is in accordance with Policies DM2, DM12 and DM13 of the Local Plan which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that developments provide a high standard of amenity for future occupiers.

#### **Amenity of existing occupiers**

98. The closest residential neighbours to the site are located to the north and east and are separated from the application site by the public highway. To the north properties are located between 15 to 20 metres from the site. The terrace at 21-29 Cowgate is located beyond its front garden areas. Although the proposals represent an increase in height when compared to the existing building and an additional two floors of accommodation, the separation distance involved, the top floor of accommodation being served by rooflights and the presence of the intervening public highway mean that the increase in overlooking and resultant impact on privacy will not result in a situation which differs significantly from the circumstances found generally locally.
99. To the east, the end of terraces to Cowgate and Willis Street are located closer at 8 metres distant. The less formal elevations with limited window openings and small rear yards to these properties will be impacted to a limited extent by increased opportunity for overlooking. Given the relationship of the proposed development with the much taller Roys building directly adjacent it cannot be considered that the proposals themselves will result in additional overshadowing or loss of light to any existing residential developments.

100. Although the relationship of the development to residential neighbours will be closer than existing and of additional height it is not incompatible with the large district centre location where densities are higher and the urban grain finer. Therefore, although the amenity of residents will be affected by the development, the harm is not considered of a level to justify the refusal of planning permission on these grounds. This harm has been weighed against the regeneration benefits of developing an underutilised brownfield site for new housing. The proposal is in accordance with Policies DM2, DM12 and DM13 of the Local Plan which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that developments provide a high standard of amenity for existing occupiers.

#### **Main issue 4: Transport**

101. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs – JCS6, DM13, DM28, DM30, DM31, DM32, NPPF section 9.
102. Located within a large district centre, in a highly accessible location in close proximity (within 150 metres) of extensive public transport provision at Magdalen Street/Anglia Square and the numerous frequent bus services into the city centre and onwards to numerous locations beyond, the principle of accepting the proposal as a car free development is considered to be acceptable, in line with policy DM32.
103. New residents would not be entitled to parking permits and therefore additional pressures on on-street parking will not increase as a result within the controlled parking zone.
104. The development will necessitate the loss of a disabled parking bay located adjacent to the site on Cowgate, to facilitate refuse collection from the site. The disabled parking provision in this location likely facilitated access to Gurney Surgery to the north west of the site which has now relocated away from these premises. However, this provision also facilitates access to shops and services located at the northern end of Magdalen Street. A Traffic Regulation Order will explore the opportunities for re-provision of disabled parking in the near vicinity elsewhere on Cowgate in locations which would not result in a corresponding loss of residents permit parking. Also, in any event disabled parking provision is available within the Magdalen Street car park.
105. A cycle store is provided in the rear south west corner of the site, providing a total of 24 cycle parking spaces for residents and their visitors. This meets the standards as set out under policy DM31 for a development of this scale.
106. A bin storage area is located within the rear courtyard adjacent to the western boundary with the Roys delivery yard. There is sufficient space to accommodate waste and recycling storage provision, which will need to be presented to the edge of the site on collection day within the designated bin collection area. Necessary arrangements for presenting bins for collection will be secured by condition.

#### **Main issue 5: Trees and landscaping**

107. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs – DM3, DM7, DM8, NPPF section 15.
108. An existing street tree is located directly outside of the site on Peacock Street. This is a prominent tree which is identified as an important tree within the conservation area appraisal and protected by the conservation area status.

109. The council's tree protection officer has confirmed that there is no arboricultural justification for the removal of this tree and its loss would have a negative impact on the street scene as also identified by the council's landscape architects. Works to enable the tree to be retained/protected should be carried out in accordance with the recommendations contained within the submitted Arboricultural Assessment.
110. Policy DM7 requires major development proposals with a frontage of greater than 10 metres with a public highway to make provision of street trees except where a clearly building-dominated design approach would prejudice their inclusion. For reasons already set out within the 'Heritage and Design' section above the inclusion of street trees within the development is not historically appropriate in this location.

### **Main issue 6: Drainage**

111. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs – JCS1, DM5, NPPF section 14.
112. To prevent unacceptable risks of flooding downstream Anglian Water have requested that an on-site foul water drainage strategy be agreed through a planning condition to ensure that they can plan effectively and deliver infrastructure improvements to the public sewer network to accommodate the development as necessary.
113. The existing site is entirely covered by the building on the site and hard surfacing. The site due to its size offers limited opportunity to provide traditional soakaways while complying with Building Regulations requirements. Small elements of green roofs (to the cycle and bin stores and rear entrance canopy) will help to provide very small scale attenuation benefits. However, given the existing site baseline the proposal is unlikely to increase the impermeable area nor the risk of flooding on the site or in the surrounding area.
114. A planning condition as requested by Anglian Water will require demonstration that surface water management options have been assessed in accordance with the drainage hierarchy and that where a connection to the system is demonstrated discharge rates are restricted to nearest possible greenfield rates.

### **Main issue 7: Biodiversity**

115. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs – JCS1, DM6, NPPF section 15
116. The applicants ecologist has provided a preliminary bat roost assessment which assesses the potential for use of the building by roosting bats and concludes that the building is vacant but in good external condition. This urban location is absent of any natural habitat likely to support or connect to potential foraging habitat. The conclusion of the report is reasonable considering the location of the building and its condition.
117. The urban location of the site limits the potential for attracting wildlife. However, based on the location and aspect of the site and taking into consideration the proposed design of the new building, habitat enhancement measures in the form of integrated swift nest boxes within the external walls of the building are proposed and are considered appropriate. The provision of these biodiversity enhancement measures can be secured by planning condition.



## **Main issue 8: Energy and water**

118. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs – JCS1, JCS3, DM1, DM3, NPPF section 14.
119. The proposal triggers both energy and water elements of policy 3 of the JCS. The applicant has indicated that it may not be possible for passive solar gain and some 'bolt-on' renewables to provide benefits on the site given its relationship with the bulk of the Roys building adjacent. It is likely that a fabric first approach will be adopted.
120. Any such energy provision or reduction in energy demand will need to be clearly evidenced. Suitably worded conditions could secure details of 10% of the developments energy requirements from renewable or low carbon sources and water efficiency measures as required by JCS3.

## **Main issue 9: Affordable housing**

121. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs – JCS4, DM33, NPPF section 5.
122. JCS4 requires a development of this scale to deliver 30% of the new dwellings as affordable housing. On the basis of 14 net additional dwellings and taking into account a discount for vacant building credit this equates to 3 units.
123. The Housing Development Officer has confirmed a preference for 1 bedroom units, preferably for social rent rather than affordable rent as this is where the greatest need is. All dwellings meet Nationally Described Space Standards. All units should be of tenure neutral design and integrated into the scheme, which is achievable due to the development consisting of a single block.
124. The applicant is content to enter into a section 106 agreement to secure 3 affordable dwellings, which will be formalised by legal representatives of both parties.

## **Compliance with other relevant development plan policies**

125. A number of development plan policies include key targets for matters such as parking provision and energy efficiency. The table below indicates the outcome of the officer assessment in relation to these matters.

<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Relevant policy</b>	<b>Compliance</b>
Cycle storage	DM31	Yes, subject to condition
Car parking provision	DM31	Not applicable
Refuse Storage/servicing	DM31	Yes, subject to condition
Energy efficiency	JCS 1 & 3 DM3	Yes, subject to condition
Water efficiency	JCS 1 & 3	Yes, subject to condition

Sustainable urban drainage	DM3/5	Yes, subject to condition
----------------------------	-------	---------------------------

## Other matters

126. The following matters have been assessed and considered satisfactory and in accordance with relevant development plan policies, subject to appropriate conditions and mitigation: archaeology.

## Equalities and diversity issues

127. The proposals necessitate the removal of disabled parking facilities adjacent to the site. Reprovision in the locality will be explored and secured if possible by planning condition. There however remains disabled parking provision within the Council's Magdalen Street car park and short term parking provision (for Blue Badge holders) is available on the double yellow lines in the area. The proposals should therefore not have a significant impact on the ability of disabled persons being able to access facilities within the large district centre.

## S106 Obligations

128. Affordable housing – 3 units, preferably 1 bed units for social rent.

## Local finance considerations

129. Under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the council is required when determining planning applications to have regard to any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application. Local finance considerations are defined as a government grant or the Community Infrastructure Levy.
130. Whether or not a local finance consideration is material to a particular decision will depend on whether it could help to make the development acceptable in planning terms. It would not be appropriate to make a decision on the potential for the development to raise money for a local authority.
131. In this case local finance considerations are not considered to be material to the case.

## Conclusion

132. The proposed development of housing is on a brownfield site in a highly sustainable location. Although there remains alternative public house provision within 800 metres of the site, redevelopment of the site will result in the loss of a community public house. This has been justified through demonstrating that there was no demand for continued public house or community use of the building when offered for sale and providing information which suggests that retention of the building for its current use is not practical or viable. The proposed new building is of an appropriate design and scale for the location and would have an acceptable impact upon heritage assets and amenity of adjacent neighbours. The amenity of future occupiers of the development is also considered to be acceptable.

133. There would be some impact upon designated heritage assets, most notably the loss of the locally listed building '20 Cowgate' and the resultant impact on the conservation area. However, this less than substantial harm is considered to be outweighed by the benefits of the development, which includes making more efficient use of an underutilised site, the removal of surface parking and providing market and affordable housing.
134. The development is in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Development Plan, and it has been concluded that there are no material considerations that indicate it should be determined otherwise.

## Recommendation


To approve application no. 21/00182/F - 20 Cowgate, Norwich, NR3 1SY and grant planning permission subject to the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement to include provision of affordable housing and subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Materials to be agreed;
4. Landscaping scheme to be agreed;
5. Scheme for on-site foul drainage works to be agreed;
6. Surface water drainage scheme to be agreed;
7. Arboricultural supervision within RPA;
8. Arboricultural works to facilitate development;
9. Works in accordance with submitted tree documents;
10. Archaeological investigations to be agreed;
11. 10% energy requirement measures to be agreed;
12. Water efficiency measures to be agreed;
13. Integrated swift boxes to be installed and made available for use prior to first occupation;
14. Off site highways works (footway reconstruction to Cowgate and Peacock Street, no-entry restriction signage reconfigured, drop crossing for refuse access and reinstatement of parking signage and line as necessary) to be agreed;
15. All highway works to roads and footways to be carried out before final occupation;
16. No overhanging/obstruction of highway land (by gutters/facias/ gates/doors or ground floor windows);
17. Scheme for parking of cycles and storage of bins (including any management arrangements for presenting bins to the edge of the site for collection) to be agreed;
18. Details of on-site construction worker parking to be agreed;
19. Construction traffic management plan (CTMP) including construction traffic access route to be agreed;
20. During construction all traffic to comply with CTMP;
21. Traffic Regulation Order for amending waiting restrictions (to facilitate relocation of disabled parking if feasible) on Cowgate to be promoted;

### Informatives:

- Noise nuisance investigations with mitigation in place.
- Construction working hours
- Works to public highway require agreement with Norfolk County Council.

- New dwellings no on-street parking permit entitlement.
- Extant waiting restrictions and traffic management require further assessment.
- Protected species awareness



PROPOSED ROOF PLAN AND SITE BLOCK PLAN REV B - August 21



THE BLUEBERRY, COWGATE, NORWICH, 1:500 @ A3





#### Proposed Cowgate (North) Elevation

Red facing brick in Flemish bond with cream mortar and flat camber arches  
 Traditional painted timber sash windows with full half-brick reveals  
 Painted timber doors and surrounds  
 Projecting brick cornice with dentil & string course detail  
 Pantiled street frontage  
 4no integrated facing brick swift boxes at eaves level by 'Birdbrickhouses'



#### Proposed Peacock Street (East) Elevation

Red facing brick in Flemish bond with cream mortar and flat camber arches  
 Traditional painted timber sash windows with full half-brick reveals  
 Painted timber doors and surrounds  
 Projecting brick cornice with dentil & string course detailing  
 'Yard' cart openings with segmental brick arches and recessed brick and timber boarding, painted timber flush casements  
 Pantiled street frontage with lead dormers  
 4no integrated facing brick swift boxes at eaves level by 'Birdbrickhouses'






Proposed West Side Elevation



Proposed West Courtyard Elevation

Grey standing seam cladding to rear dormers, lead grey single ply roof finish with PPC trims




Proposed South Side Elevation



Proposed North Courtyard Elevation




Proposed South Courtyard Elevation




COWGATE

PEACOCK STREET




Proposed Ground Floor Plan


PROPOSED FLOORPLANS REV C - August 21  
Accommodation Mix:-  
11no 1 bedroom 2 person flats  
4no 2 bedroom 4 person flats



THE BLUEBERRY, COWGATE, NORWICH, 1:200 @ A3 / 1:100 @ A1



Proposed Third Floor Plans



Proposed First Floor Plans



**Report to** Planning applications committee

**Item**

9 September 2021

**Report of** Head of Planning and Regulatory Services

**Subject** Application no 21/00737/F - 24 - 28 Prince of Wales Road, Norwich, NR1 1LG

**Reason for referral** Objection


4(b)

---

<b>Ward:</b>	Thorpe Hamlet
<b>Case officer</b>	Jacob Revell - 07741 103222 - <a href="mailto:jacobrevell@norwich.gov.uk">jacobrevell@norwich.gov.uk</a>

Development proposal		
Removal of part flat roof area over Second Floor to create external terraced area with bar hidden below existing 2nd floor perimeter walls.		
Representations		
Object	Comment	Support
18	0	1

Main issues	Key considerations
1	Principle of Development
2	Design and Heritage
3	Amenity
<b>Expiry date</b>	16 September 2021
<b>Recommendation</b>	Approve with conditions



© Crown Copyright and database right 2021. Ordnance Survey 100019747.

Planning Application No 21/00737/F  
 Site Address 24-28 Prince of Wales Road

Scale 1:500




**NORWICH**  
 City Council

PLANNING SERVICES



Page 42 of 52



## The site and surroundings

1. The application site is located towards the top end of Prince of Wales Road, approximately 400m from the River Wensum at the base of the street and 80m from the junction to Upper King Street. St Faiths Lane is located to the north of the site.
2. The extant use of the property is as a nightclub. Permission to use the property for B1 Business use was granted in 2017 but never implemented, so the nightclub use remains.
3. The site covers three addresses, including a new building at number 28 which was granted permission in 1997. Numbers 24 – 26 are locally listed. The local list description is as follows:

*C19. 3 storeys, rendered. Parapet. 3 bay composition with pilasters. Large glazed openings with 5-centred arches above flanking bays, semi-circular headed opening in centre. Later right-hand extension. Modern shopfront.*

4. The site is located within the City Centre Conservation Area.
5. The site is located within the Late Night Activity Zone and the City Centre Leisure Area.

## Constraints

6. City Centre Conservation Area

## Relevant planning history

7. The records held by the City Council show the following planning history for the site.

Ref	Proposal	Decision	Date
17/00837/U	Change of use of part of ground floor, all of first floor and second floor from nightclub (Class D2) to Business (Class B1).	APPR	21/07/2017
21/00910/F	Repainting of existing shopfront, replacement doors and flanking panels.	APPR	19.08.2021
21/00911/A	Display of 1) 1no. internally illuminated projecting sign; 2) Free standing illuminated letters; 3) 2no. internally illuminated poster boxes.	APPR	19.08.2021

## The proposal

8. The proposal is for the reconfiguration of the second floor of the property to create an external area to be used in association with the nightclub. The applicant seeks to remove a section of the existing flat roof to create an open-roof area on the second floor of the building.
9. The intention is that club users will be able to use this area of the building for smoking. The applicant intends to provide a bar service and provide seating within this area. Amplified music is proposed on the terrace.
10. There would be an overhang of flat roof over the edges of the terrace, and as such the alterations would not be visible from the street-scene. An internal staircase is proposed, in addition to the complete refurbishment of the property. All external walls of the existing property will be retained – the property will appear the same from external views of the property.
11. The applicant proposes that this space will be usable between 10:00 and 04:30 Monday to Saturday, and between 10:00 and 03:30 on Sunday and bank holidays.

## Representations

12. Advertised on site and in the press. Adjacent and neighbouring properties have been notified in writing.
13. During the first round of consultation, 18 letters of representation were received in opposition to the development. 1 letter of representation was received in support.
14. An additional 2 week re-consultation was carried out following the receipt of the Noise Impact Assessment. At the time of writing, no additional representations have been received as a result of this consultation.
15. The representations received are summarised in the table below.

Issues raised	Response
The noise generated by the proposal will have an unacceptable impact on residents of the Cathedral Close, in addition to residents of Prince of Wales Road, St Faiths Lane, Cathedral Street, Recorder Road and Upper King Street. The existing noise already has a great impact on these residents and this use would exasperate this further.	See main issue 3
Granting this application would set an unwelcome precedent for other nightclubs to do the same within Prince of Wales Road.	See main issue 3

Issues raised	Response
Will lead to additional drug use, public disorder and anti-social behaviour. The proposal contradicts any intention to 'clean up' Prince of Wales Road.	See main issue 3
Night-time venues are increasingly in danger of closing – new venues will support the economy of the city following the pandemic.	See main issue 1

## Consultation responses

16. Consultation responses are summarised below the full responses are available to view at <http://planning.norwich.gov.uk/online-applications/> by entering the application number.

## Design and conservation

17. No comments received.

## Environmental protection

18. The proposal will be acceptable from an Environmental Protection perspective if certain conditions are applied.
19. The acoustic report provided identifies the correct noise indices and uses the best available models. The model relates to beer garden noise (without music) and is therefore not a perfect fit, but no more appropriate model is available.
20. The report identifies LAMax (short term loud events) will be 1db below the WHO guidance for night time sleep disturbance.
21. Environmental Protection would not normally object to this, but due to the uncertainty of the modelling, a degree of uncertainty is introduced.
22. Modifiers or penalties should be applied in these instances. The type of noise in this instance should received a 3 – 6 DB penalty, taking the noise generated beyond the World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines.
23. Some of this noise may be masked by Prince of Wales Road, but this is unlikely to be the case to the rear of the property. There is some noise here generated by Mantras outside smoking area.
24. Midnight would be an appropriate time to stop the use of amplified music and the sale of alcohol on the terrace, as most nightclubs do not become busy before this time and city centre background noise drops off around this time. The WHO guidelines come into effect at 23:00, but there is a reduced likelihood of issues before 24:00.

25. Conditions should be applied ensuring that no alcohol is sold nor amplified music played on the second floor beyond midnight. A noise limited should be installed on the sound system fitted on the second floor.
26. If these conditions are applied, noise will be controlled to an acceptable level.

## **Assessment of planning considerations**

### **Relevant development plan policies**

27. **Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk adopted March 2011 amendments adopted Jan. 2014 (JCS)**
  - JCS2 Promoting good design
  - JCS5 The economy
  - JCS7 Supporting communities
  - JCS8 Culture, leisure and entertainment
28. **Norwich Development Management Policies Local Plan adopted Dec. 2014 (DM Plan)**
  - DM1 Achieving and delivering sustainable development
  - DM2 Ensuring satisfactory living and working conditions
  - DM3 Delivering high quality design
  - DM9 Safeguarding Norwich's heritage
  - DM11 Protecting against environmental hazards
  - DM18 Promoting and supporting centres
  - DM23 Supporting and managing the evening and late night economy

### **Other material considerations**

29. **Relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework March 2021 (NPPF) (as revised):**
  - NPPF7 – Ensuring the vitality of town centres
  - NPPF8 – Promoting healthy and safe communities
  - NPPF12 – Achieving well designed places
  - NPPF16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

### **Case Assessment**

30. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Relevant development plan policies are detailed above. Material considerations include policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Councils standing duties, other policy documents and guidance detailed above and any other matters referred to specifically in the assessment below. The following paragraphs provide an assessment of the main planning issues in this case against relevant policies and material considerations.

### **Main issue 1: Principle of development**

31. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs – JCS5, JCS8, DM1, DM18, DM23, NPPF7, NPPF12.

32. It should first be noted that this application does not result in the creation of a new nightclub use. The lawful use of the property is for late night entertainment, but the site has been vacant for some time. The planning application relates solely to the creation a new terraced area on the second floor in association with the existing use.
33. DM23 outlines the general acceptability and expectations regarding late night uses within the city centre. Proposals for late night uses are typically only permitted within the Late Night Activity Zone. Policy DM23 states that late night uses will only be appropriate where they 'would not give rise to unacceptable amenity and environmental impacts which could not be overcome by the imposition of conditions'.
34. In this instance, the use is already in place, but the impact of this use could be amplified by the proposed alterations to the fabric and use of this part of the building. Alterations to the building are acceptable in principle, but only where they do not result in adverse design or amenity impacts.

## **Main issue 2: Design and Heritage**

35. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs – JCS2, DM3, DM9, NPPF12.
36. The affected part of the property is locally listed. It is necessary to assess the heritage impact on the individual building in addition to impact on the wider conservation area.
37. DM9 states that the significance of locally identified heritage assets should be retained wherever possible. The affected property was constructed in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century and has a relatively strong architectural character, with large arched windows dominating the front elevation of the property. The property is flat roofed, with the roof visually obscured behind a parapet.
38. The property has been significantly altered since its construction. The existing flat roof is of modern design and materials and is not considered to have notable architectural merit. The removal of part of this flat roof is not considered to impact upon the significance of the locally identified heritage asset.
39. Indeed, the renewed use of this part of the building will bring a degree of vibrancy to an otherwise vacant part of the building. It is considered that this will have a positive impact on the overall character of the street scene and the wider conservation area.
40. One letter of representation has cited concern that the noise transmissions from the nightclub use may cause damage to the surrounding listed properties. This planning application relates only to the use of the second floor of the property. The anticipated level of noise of this area is not close the level of noise vibration required to cause damage to surrounding buildings.

## **Main issue 3: Amenity**

41. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs – JCS7, DM2, DM11, NPPF8.
42. Most letters of representation received relate to noise concerns in relation to the creation of an open-roof terraced area. It is evident that residents in surrounding

properties already deal with noise issues relating to the late night uses on Prince of Wales Road.

43. The applicant has produced a Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) detailing projected noise levels from the proposed area. They have made this assessment using SoundPLAN 8.2 acoustic software. The applicant has assessed the impact principally to nearby residential properties on Prince of Wales Road. The applicant makes their assessment against desirable levels of environmental noise outlined by the World Health Organisation.
44. The applicant has assessed noise using the 'speaking, raised voices (beer garden)' as the source of noise, combined with amplified music at a level of 70 db. This is then considered against the external facades of the property and the noise sensitive receptors on Prince of Wales Road. The NIA predicts that noise levels within the terrace will fall within the WHO guidelines. The NIA further identifies that LaMAX events (short term loud events such as shouting) will be 1db under the WHO indices for night time sleep disturbance.
45. As noted in their comments above, Environmental Protection have identified issues with the NIA provided relating to the sound modelling source noise and the lack of modifiers applied to the sound modelling. However, they find that the potential for noise disturbance is heightened not by the principle of the development but by the use of the terrace, as higher levels of noise are likely to be generated by the proposed bar external amplified music. Environmental Protection identify from the base data provided by the applicant that unacceptable noise is most likely to occur after midnight, when club uses typically become busy.
46. Environmental Protection have therefore suggested restricting the time that alcohol can be sold on the second floor, reducing the time in which people are likely to stay in the terraced area beyond midnight. In addition, they recommend that no amplified music should be played beyond midnight, reducing the overall noise levels associated with this part of the building. A noise limiter will be installed to ensure that amplified music cannot be played above a certain level. There will be some noise generated after midnight, but this is anticipated to be substantially reduced and more in line with the noise created in other club smoking areas, such as that at Mantra. It is worth noting that the masonry and glass facades to the property will be effective at reducing noise, particularly at lower levels.
47. Some concern has been raised regarding the level of noise generated by opening doors to and from the terrace, letting out the general noise from the nightclub. It should be noted that the doors lead to a covered stairwell which is entirely internal and unlikely to provide substantial noise concerns. To mitigate against this impact further, a condition will be applied requiring that these doors are kept close except for entry and exit.
48. It is noted that many of the concerns have been raised by residents living on parallel streets, particularly St Faiths Lane. The closest residential property to the proposed roof terrace is approximately 50m away (5 St Faiths Lane). Other residential properties are located substantially further away than this. It is considered that this distance, in addition to the mitigation measures outlined above, will ensure that the noise to these properties does not create an unacceptable noise impact.



49. Some residents have expressed concern regarding increased littering, drug use and anti-social behaviour resulting from this development. These issues are associated with the use of night-clubs generally, but it is worth reiterating that the use is already established. It is not anticipated that the proposed development will increase these issues. The applicant argues that reducing the level of smoking outside the club will reduce the level of anti-social behaviour occurring between club-goers on the street and will be easier to control within the premises.
50. Having taken the concerns of the objectors into account alongside the NIA, it is concluded that the amenity impact of the proposal can be successfully mitigated by conditions restricting the sale of alcohol from the terrace, in addition to the use of amplified noise. Neither shall occur beyond midnight. A noise limited to any proposed soundsystem would also be conditioned to limit the impact of any amplified noise prior to this.

### **Equalities and diversity issues**

51. There are no significant equality or diversity issues.

### **Local finance considerations**

52. Under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the council is required when determining planning applications to have regard to any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application. Local finance considerations are defined as a government grant or the Community Infrastructure Levy.
53. Whether or not a local finance consideration is material to a particular decision will depend on whether it could help to make the development acceptable in planning terms. It would not be appropriate to make a decision on the potential for the development to raise money for a local authority.
54. In this case local finance considerations are not considered to be material to the case.

### **Conclusion**

55. The development is in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Development Plan, and it has been concluded that there are no material considerations that indicate it should be determined otherwise.
56. The proposal is of an acceptable design and is considered to have a minimal impact on the overall character of the immediate surroundings.
57. It is considered that the amenity impact of the proposal can be sufficiently controlled by conditions.
58. The proposal subsequently meets the criteria outlined within the relevant policies of the Norwich Development Management Policies Local Plan (2014) and of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

## Recommendation


To approve application no. 21/00737/F - 24 - 28 Prince Of Wales Road Norwich NR1 1LG and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. No sale of alcohol on the second floor after midnight;
4. No amplified music on the second floor after midnight;
5. Sound limiter to be applied for amplified music played on the second floor.
6. Terrace doors to be kept closed except for entry and exit.


...



— RED LINE INDICATED OUTLINE OF ROOF AREA  
— BLACK LINE INDICATED OUTLINE OF WHOLE BUILDING




BLOCK PLAN OF BUILDING  
SCALE 1:500@A1




Metres  
1:1250  
24-26 Prince of Wales Rd  
Norwich  
NR1 1LG


SITE PLAN  
SCALE 1:1250@A1  
— OUTLINE OF SITE  
— OUTLINE OF LAND UNDER COMMON OWNERSHIP (GROUND FLOOR)




EXISTING ROOF PLAN  
SCALE 1:100@A1



PROPOSED ROOF PLAN  
SCALE 1:100@A1




PROPOSED SECOND FLOOR PLAN  
SCALE 1:100@A1



EXISTING SECTION A-A  
SCALE 1:100@A1



EXISTING PHOTO FROM STREET LEVEL SHOWING LEVEL OF SECOND FLOOR, CEILING AND ROOF  
NO SCALE @A1



PROPOSED SECTION A-A  
SCALE 1:100@A1

REVISION	DATE	DESCRIPTION

**DESIGN AT SOURCE**  
INTERIOR DESIGN & ARCHITECTURE

Tel: +44 (0) 1203 678 044 E-mail: info@designatsource.co.uk  
Design At Source Ltd 3-4 High Street, Greatton, Walsingham, Norfolk NR21 4JL

CLIENT: Recum UK

JOB TITLE: Ex Liquid - Norwich

DRAWING TITLE: Proposed Roof Works

JOB NO: 2009

DRAWING NO: P01 SCALE: A1 - 1:100

REVISION: DATE: May 2021

DRAWN BY: SR CHECKED BY: SET

