NORWICH City Council

Minutes

Planning applications committee

09:30 to 11:35 **9 November 2017**

Present: Councillors Driver (chair), Maxwell (vice chair), Bradford, Bremner (substitute for Councillor Sands (M)), Button, Carlo, Jackson, Lubbock (substitute for Councillor Wright), Malik, Peek, and Woollard

Apologies: Councillor Henderson, Sands (M) and Wright

1. Declarations of interest

Councillor Jackson referred to item 4 (below), Application no 17/01259/MA - 19 Leopold Road, Norwich, NR4 7AD and said that he had spoken to the resident of the adjacent property but did not have a pre-determined view on this application.

2. Minutes

RESOLVED to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 12 October 2017.

3. Application no 17/01515/F, Somerley Residential Care Home, Somerleyton Street, Norwich NR2 2BT

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. During the presentation she explained the measures that the applicant had agreed to address concerns received from adjacent residents about the change of use from a care home to student accommodation.

The planner and the area development manager (inner area) referred to the report and answered members' questions. It was not possible to move the bus stop because of the narrow pavement in Unthank Road. However, the use of a plastic grid which was over-seeded would protect the tree roots and facilitate the informal extension of the pavement, making more room for pedestrians and people waiting at the bus stop. A hedge was not proposed to protect the tree roots as it would obstruct the view of the trees and open space. The scheme was for the conversion of an existing building and measures to encourage biodiversity were not required. However, bio-diversity enhancement would be considered as part of the landscaping scheme, particularly in relation to boundary treatments. Members were referred to the plans and advised that the room sizes and bathroom provision complied or exceeded national space standards. Members also asked about cycle storage provision and sought reassurance that more could be provided if required. A member pointed out that there would be congestion at the start and end of term when students were dropped off. Officers advised that arrangements for this could

be incorporated into the management plan where residents would be given a time slot.

Members commented on the change of use from a residential care home to student accommodation and noted that there residents had been relocated to the new care home at Bowthorpe. Councillor Bradford expressed concern about the loss of a residential care home at this site as he said that it was in an "ideal location" for older people, near to the city and adjacent to a bus stop and that residents missed their neighbours. Other members noted that this application would bring back a vacant building into use, provide student accommodation and help free up housing for families rather than converting family homes to houses in multiple-occupation.

Discussion ensued on the provision of cycle parking and members noted that 40 spaces for 66 residents did not meet the council's policy. There was no provision for the bicycles of visitors. A member said that whilst this deficiency did not outweigh the benefits of the scheme, the agreement on cycle storage details should demonstrate that additional storage could be provided to ensure that demand was met. Members were advised that the emerging cycle hire scheme had not been taken into account when assessing the amount of cycle storage but experience from other sites showed that not all of the cycle parking spaces were being taken up when the full policy compliant number of spaces was provided.

RESOLVED, with 10 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Maxwell, Button, Bremner, Carlo, Jackson, Wright, Malik, Peek and Woollard) and 1 member voting against (Councillor Bradford) to approve application no. 17/01515/F - Somerley Residential Care Home, Somerleyton Street, Norwich, NR2 2BT and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Cycle storage details to be agreed;
4. Management arrangements to be agreed;
5. Refuse arrangements to be agreed;
6. Landscaping scheme to be agreed;
7. Method for protecting the bare earth bank to the front of the site to be agreed;
8. Security measures to be agreed;
9. Matching materials.

4. Application no 17/01259/MA - 19 Leopold Road, Norwich, NR4 7AD

The area development manager (inner area) presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

The immediate neighbour of the site addressed the committee and outlined her concerns and those of other local residents about the development of the site and that it was not in accordance with the agreed plans and was detrimental to the amenity of existing neighbours. This included concern that the porch extension of the first floor of the detached house would result in higher occupancy. The larger dormer windows of the terraced houses would result in loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties. Other concerns included the lack of car parking on the site and the discrepancy in the roof line with existing buildings in Melrose Road.

The agent addressed the committee on behalf of the applicant. He explained that the height of the buildings had been constructed in accordance with the original planning permission. The dormer windows were no higher or larger than the approved dormer windows. However, building regulations required the windows to be used as a secondary means of escape and therefore the sills had been lowered and the windows could open out to allow egress. Plot 1 (the detached house) had the same ground floor footprint as the original plan. The first floor was slightly larger.

The area development manager (inner area) referred to the report and responded to the issues raised by the speakers and members' questions. He explained which elements of the application were included in the retrospective application. The existing consent did not include car parking and therefore it would be unreasonable to include it as part of this application. The height of the adjacent building had been misrepresented in the original plans but this was a corner plot and the difference in the roofline did not make a material difference to the street scene. The applicant had not breached the planning permission as the buildings had been constructed to the approved roof height of 8.6 metres. The applicant had given no reason for the removal of the solar panels from the scheme and there was no policy to support this requirement. The size of the solar panels would not have produced a great deal of energy.

Discussion ensued in which members considered the application. Members expressed concern about the loss of the solar panels from the scheme.

Councillor Jackson said that he was concerned about the amendments to the planning permission for this scheme. He considered that the changes to the detached house and the dormer windows of the terraced houses were detrimental to the amenity of the neighbouring properties at 21 Leopold Road and 52 Melrose Road. He also regretted the loss of the solar panels from the scheme. Councillor Wright expressed his concern about the removal of the solar panels from the scheme and the misstating of the ridge height in the original plans, and that the scheme was not being built in accordance with the approved plans.

RESOLVED, with 6 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Maxwell, Button, Peek, Woollard and Bradford), 2 members voting against (Councillors Jackson and Wright) and 3 members abstaining from voting (Councillors Bremner, Carlo and Malik) to approve application no. 17/01259/MA - 19 Leopold Road, Norwich, NR4 7AD and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. In accordance with plans;
2. Materials, boundary treatments and external lighting in accordance with application 14/00770/D;
3. Obscure glazing to rear of plot 1 (upper floor);
4. Bin and bike stores in accordance with 14/00770/D;
5. No occupation until vehicular access shown on drawing 5800A-P01 rev L have been extinguished and adjacent footway reinstated with full height kerbs in accordance with 14/00770/D;
6. Landscaping of plots 2-4 in accordance with details approved under 14/00770/D;
7. Details of landscaping to plot 1 to be agreed prior to occupation;
8. Water efficiency;
9. No occupation until verification report submitted;

10. Monitoring, maintenance and contingency action in relation to condition 9.

Article 35(2) Statement
The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations and has approved the application subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

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

5. Application no 17/01192/O - 215 Woodcock Road, Norwich, NR3 3TE

The senior planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. He referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports which was circulated at the meeting and contained a summary of two further representations from objectors and the officer response. Members were advised that the application was an outline planning application for the principle of development and that details would be considered in a reserved matters application.

The senior planner, together with the area development manager (inner area), referred to the report and answered members' questions. He explained that the plans were indicative of the layout of the scheme for two houses and one bungalow.

During discussion, Councillor Carlo expressed her concern that the council did not have an approved policy on the development of garden land. She objected to the development on a garden site when there were designated brownfield sites with planning consent which had not been developed. Other members considered that the garden space was sufficiently large enough for the two houses and a bungalow and that residential dwellings overlooking St Clements Park would improve safety. A member said that as the scheme contributed to the five year land supply, it would be pointless to refuse this outline application as the council did not have a policy on development of garden land.

RESOLVED, with 10 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Maxwell, Button, Bremner, Jackson, Wright, Malik, Peek, Woollard and Bradford), and 1 member voting against (Councillor Carlo) to approve application no. 17/01192/O - 215 Woodcock Road, Norwich, NR3 3TE and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Application for reserved matters to be made within 3 years of the date of permission, development to commence within 2 years of approval of reserved matters
2. No development to take place without approval of reserved matters relating to appearance, landscaping, scale, layout and access.
3. Unexpected contamination to be reported.
4. Imported topsoil/subsoil to be certified.
5. No occupation to take place without details of bicycle storage, vehicle parking and servicing facilities being approved and the approved details to be implemented in full.

6. No development to take place until a scheme to mitigate the impacts of surface water flooding has been submitted for approval and approved scheme to be implemented in full.
7. Water efficiency condition.
8. Two no. street trees to be provided on grass verge outside 217 Woodcock Road.

Article 35(2) Statement:
The local planning authority in making its recommendation has had due regard to paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations, following negotiations with the applicant and subsequent amendments the application has been recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

6. Application nos 17/00896/F and 17/00902/L - 68 St Stephens Road, Norwich, NR1 3RE

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides.

During discussion, the planner referred to the report and answered members' questions. He explained that the interior of the listed building had been changed many times over the years and that the window that was proposed to be removed was not the original one. The current ground floor layout was not conducive to modern family living. There were no changes to the façade. A member suggested that the roof of the extension should be a flat, sedum roof. The planner advised that whilst he would normally support the suggestion of a sedum roof, in this case it was not in keeping with the listed building. The proposal did not affect the arrangements for parking on the site.

Councillor Jackson said that he would be voting against the proposal because he did not think the benefits of the extension justified tampering with a listed building, which was not unusable as a house.

Discussion ensued in which members noted that the terraced housing had been a nurses' home and original features had been stripped out and reinstated as part of the refurbishment prior to sale.

RESOLVED, with 10 members voting in favour (Councillors Driver, Maxwell, Button, Bremner, Carlo, Wright, Malik, Peek, Woollard and Bradford) and 1 member (Councillor Jackson) to approve:

(1) application no. 17/00896/F - 68 St Stephens Road Norwich NR1 3RE and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;

(2) application no. 17/00902/F - 68 St Stephens Road, Norwich, NR1 3RE and grant Listed Building Consent subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Details of materials: including brick sample and sample panel including brick bond and mortar, roof covering, fascia details, rainwater goods, specification of doors and rooflight.
4. Demolition by hand to new opening to rear wall and enlargement of opening between existing kitchen and dining room.
5. Section details of increased structural openings
6. Listed building making good
7. Stop works if unidentified features revealed.

Reason for approval - 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.

CHAIR