



Planning applications committee

09:45 to 13:45

13 February 2020

Present: Councillors Maxwell (vice chair, in the chair), Bogelein, Button, Lubbock, Neale, Oliver (substitute for Councillor Driver), Peek, Ryan, Sands (M), Sarmezey, Stutely and Utton

Apologies: Councillors Driver (chair), Button and Huntley

1. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Utton declared an other interest in item 3(below), Application no 19/01389/F and 19/01390/L - 191 King Street, Norwich, NR1 2DF, as a resident and member of King Street Neighbours.

Councillor Peek declared a pecuniary interest in item 5(below). Application no 19/01581/F - Chiswick House, 3 Christchurch Road, Norwich, NR2 2AD because he worked for the same company that operated the care facility at Chiswick House.

Councillor Sarmezey, in relation to item 5(below). Application no 19/01581/F - Chiswick House, 3 Christchurch Road, Norwich, NR2 2AD, said that when visiting the site from the public realm, a member of staff had invited her into the premises. Councillor Sarmezey explained that she did not have a pre-determined view. However, on advice that there could be a perception that she had access to information that was not available to other members because of the visit inside the building. She agreed not to participate in the determination of this item.

2. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 9 January 2020.

3. Application no 19/01389/F and 19/01390/L - 191 King Street, Norwich, NR1 2DF

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

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. She also referred to the supplementary report of updates to reports, circulated at the meeting, comprising additional consultation responses and the officer response.

The planner and the area development manager (outer) referred to the report and answered members' questions. This included an explanation that the previous consent was material to the current application and that as it was a complex site, the

applicant had been unable to discharge conditions before planning consent had expired. Members also asked questions relating to the discharge of the proposed conditions and the completion of the S106 agreement and the potential to extend the Riverside Walk if the site to the north became available. A member commented that the area under the Novi Sad Bridge needed to be cleaned-up, and the committee noted that this was a highways issue. The planner explained that the Council for British Archaeology and Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings had not commented on the current application. Members noted that the Ferry Boat Inn was a Grade II listed building but that the part of the building to be demolished was in poor repair and not part of the original building.

Discussion ensued on the legal agreement and provision of affordable housing. The planner and area development manager (outer) referred to the report and explained that the 11.2 per cent profit for the developer was reasonable for a brownfield development and that there was a mechanism to review viability if the scheme if it was not built out. A member expressed concern that the developer would hold back development of part of the site to increase profit when market conditions were more favourable. The area development manager (outer) said that he did not consider that the developer would phase the works because of the financial implications and that first occupancy would not be achieved until completion. Members noted that the developer would be required to make a community infrastructure levy (CIL) contribution. Information on local finance considerations were usually not material planning considerations but information on these were included in the report for completeness.

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

During discussion, several members commented that that the site was an eyesore and that they would like the development to take place as soon as possible. Members also welcomed the contribution that this site could have to extending the riverside walk in the future and improving the public realm. There was some concern that conditions requiring the reduction of the time limit for the development to take place could have the opposite effect. Members also commented that they were disappointed that the energy and biodiversity standards were not “future proofed” and that there should be more than one electric charging point in the communal car park. Members noted that officers could be raise this with the applicant during the discharge of conditions but the policy required one electric charging unit per communal car park.

The chair invited the agent and applicant invited to speak in support of the application. They explained that investment in the scheme was subject to planning consent and it was their intention that construction would be commence as soon as possible. The applicant said that they could review the number of electric charging points or the infrastructure to support an increase in points during the discharge of conditions. Discussions on the legal agreement could include the timescale for the viability review.

The area development manager referred to the council’s affordable housing supplementary planning document (SPD) and said that the timescale for the affordable review was consistent with the development of a brownfield site.

Members considered that a discretion had been applied; with the affordable housing review moving from 12 months to 15 months.

With the majority of members voting in favour, a procedural motion to move to the vote was carried and it was:

RESOLVED, with 10 members voting in favour (Councillors Maxwell, Sands, Bogelein, Lubbock, Neale, Oliver, Peek, Ryan, Utton and Sarmezey) and 1 member voting against (Councillor Stutely) to approve:

- (1) application no. 19/01389/F - 191 King Street Norwich NR1 2DF 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. Archaeological written scheme of investigation to be provided
 4. Materials and details to be agreed
 5. Heritage Interpretation scheme to be agreed
 6. Full on-site landscaping details condition, including biodiversity measures
 7. Details of public realm improvements to highway verge
 8. External lighting scheme to be agreed
 9. Bin storage and car parking to be laid out as shown on the approved plans, made available for use prior to occupation and retained as such thereafter
 10. Full details of cycle storage to be submitted, including product, layout and security measures
 11. Details of electric charging points
 12. Management, maintenance, and public accessibility arrangements for whole site including riverside walk to be agreed
 13. Full details of works to and around historic arch;
 14. Photographic record of buildings to be demolished;
 15. Construction method statement
 16. Flood warning and evacuation plan to be provided
 17. SUDS details to be agreed and provided
 18. Remediation strategy; verification plan; and monitoring, maintenance & contingency plan
 19. Works to stop if unknown contamination is found
 20. Topsoil certification to be submitted
 21. Details of compensatory flood storage
 22. Any excavated material arising from the provision of the compensatory flood storage scheme shall be removed from the flood plain
 23. Demasting moorings to be provided prior to occupation
 24. Water efficiency measures to be installed in accordance with submitted strategy
 25. Renewable energy to be provided in accordance with submitted energy strategy
 26. No works during bird nesting season without prior consent
 27. 10% of the dwellings to meet requirement M4(2) of the 2015 Building Regulations for accessible and adaptable dwellings
 28. PD rights removed – extract flues, plant & machinery

29. Prior to first occupation of any part of the development the approved works to the listed building shall be completed to the written satisfaction of the local planning authority;
30. Outbuildings to be demolished by hand.

Informatives:

1. Six informatives regarding Anglian Water assets and consents as per AW consultation comments
 2. This permission is subject to a legal agreement
 3. The landscape works within the highway will require a S278 agreement and will be subject to the payment of fees
 4. A planning brief for the archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation will be provided by Norfolk County Council, Historic Environment Service and will specify the nature of the investigation required for this site
 5. Residents will not be eligible for on-street parking permits
- (2) application no. 19/01390/L - 191 King Street Norwich NR1 2DF and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:
1. Standard time limit;
 2. In accordance with plans;
 3. Photographic survey
 4. Full schedule of repairs
 5. Details to be submitted, including:
 - (a) New/replacement external joinery;
 - (b) New/replacement internal joinery;
 - (c) Fire protection;
 - (d) Internal finishes
 - (e) Rainwater goods;
 - (f) Bricks, including samples;
 - (g) Service routes;
 - (h) External decoration;
 6. Any damage to be made good;
 7. All works of repair to match adjacent work;
 8. Any historic features not previously identified to be retained and reported.

Informatives:

1. Only the works shown are approved
2. Original historic fabric to be retained
3. It is an offence to carry out work to a listed building until conditions have been complied with.

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

5. Application no 19/01597/F - 73 College Road, Norwich, NR2 3JP

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. He pointed out that in the report he had mixed up the description of the neighbouring properties and confirmed that no 75 was to the north (sharing the side return) and no 71 to the south (where the rear gable projected) to no 73. He referred to the supplementary report of updates to the reports, circulated at the meeting comprising a summary from the doctor of the occupant of no 71, supporting her concerns about the impact that the extension would have on her health and the officer response.

Three residents of College Road (including a resident who lived opposite and the adjacent neighbours of no 73) addressed the committee with their objections to the proposal. This included: concern that the extension would alter the form of the original terrace and take light from the neighbouring properties; that the no 73 was a rental property and that the concerns of longstanding residents should be taken into account; detrimental impact on the residential amenity of no 71 in that the first floor extension would obscure the view to the left from the rear window for a room used for hobbies and relaxation and have a serious impact on the owner's health and wellbeing; and that the first floor elevation would block light to the kitchen on no 75 requiring the occupant to use electric light. (Slides provided by the resident of no 71 were displayed during the presentations.)

The planner referred to the reports and responded to the issues raised. He explained that his shadow assessment was in alignment with the one provided by the applicant. The impact on neighbouring properties was considered to be limited. He also pointed out that the extension was to an existing bedroom and that there were no transport or highways issues arising from this proposal.

Discussion ensued in which the planner referred to the reports and answered members' questions. This included confirmation that the property was currently in use as a small house in multiple occupation which could return to Class 3 residential use; that the extension enlarged the bedroom and created a first floor to the existing single storey extension and did not extend the footprint. Members noted there were other properties with a first floor extension at the rear, including a house within the same terrace block. The planner answered questions about the slides he had taken and his response to the residents' health concerns as set out in the supplementary report.

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

Discussion ensued, in which a procedural motion to move to the vote was lost. Several members expressed concern that this was a finely balanced application but that they considered there were not sufficient grounds for refusal. The planner confirmed that the extension was on top of the existing extension and, therefore, there was no extension to the footprint. Another member commented that there were other first floor extensions and that this did not affect the character of the area.

Councillor Utton said that he would be voting against the application because of the cumulative effect that this could have and that it would have an overbearing impact on the neighbouring properties. The area development manager (outer) said that

due to the orientation of the properties, he considered that greatest impact would be at no 75, which was to the north, where there would loss of light in the morning.

On being moved to the vote, it was:

RESOLVED, with 6 members voting in favour (Councillors Maxwell, Sands, Bogelein, Lubbock, Peek and Ryan), 1 member voting against (Councillor Utton), 4 members abstaining from voting (Councillors Neale, Oliver, Stutely and Sarmezey) to approve application no. 19/01597/F - 73 College Road Norwich NR2 3JP and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

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

(Councillor Ryan left the meeting at this point.)

6. Application no 19/01581/F - Chiswick House,. 3 Christchurch Road, Norwich, NR2 2AD

(Councillors Peek and Sarmezey having declared an interest left the meeting at this point.)

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

During discussion, the planner referred to the report and answered members' questions. There were no permitted development rights and therefore any further extension to the building would require planning consent. The landscaping proposal would ensure that species planted would contribute to biodiversity and agreed at the discharge of conditions stage. The planner also explained that the Beech tree referred to in the previous application had been lost during a storm in 2018.

The chair moved and Councillor Sands seconded the recommendations in the report.

Councillor Lubbock, Eaton Ward councillor, expressed sympathy to the local residents who had objected but said that notwithstanding the extension would improve the amenity for the care home residents, providing ensuite facilities.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 19/01581/F - Chiswick House 3 Christchurch Road Norwich NR2 2AD and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Materials to match
4. Replacement tree planting
5. Landscape scheme along southwest boundary
6. Cycle storage to be agreed
7. Lighting to be agreed
8. Plant to be agreed
9. Surface water drainage to be agreed
10. Water efficiency

(Councillors Peek and Sarmezey were readmitted to the meeting at this point.)

7. Application no 19/01365/F - 66 Clabon Road, Norwich, NR3 4HG

The planner presented the report with the aid of plans and slides. He explained that there had been three objections to the initial scheme and the objectors had not responded to the consultation on the second set of plans.

During discussion, the planner and the area development manager (outer) referred to the report and answered members' questions. Members noted that there was a mixed use of housing around the junction of Clabon Road and Denton Road, and that the new development would be on Denton Road where the scale and form of the development was considered acceptable. Members sought clarification on the boundary treatments and noted that this would be hedgerow and that the existing bank would be retained.

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

Members of the committee considered that the revised plans were sensitive to the needs of the immediate neighbours with its use of obscure glazing, no overlooking windows and proposed use of hedging to promote biodiversity.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 19/01365/F - 66 Clabon Road, Norwich, NR3 4HG and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. In accordance with arboricultural impact assessment and method statement;
4. Landscaping scheme and replacement planting;
5. Bin/bike store details and provision;
6. Surface water drainage scheme;
7. Water efficiency;
8. Obscure glazing to first floor south landing and bathroom windows.

(Councillor Lubbock left the meeting at this point.)

8. Application no 19/01702/F - 47 Connaught Road, Norwich, NR2 3BP

(The wrong site plan had been attached to the report. The correct site plan had been circulated to members in advance of the meeting and published on the council's website.)

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

During discussion, the planner and the area development manager (outer) referred to the report and answered members' questions. Members noted that the orientation of the sun would reduce the impact of the pitched roof on the neighbouring properties and that it was a distance from the window of the adjacent property.

Members also considered that the pitched roof would be an improvement on the existing flat roof.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve application no. 19/01702/F - 47 Connaught Road, Norwich, NR2 3BP and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

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

CHAIR