



Planning applications committee

11:20 to 13:10

29 September 2022

Present: Councillors Driver (chair), Sands (M) (vice chair), Champion, Grahame, Lubbock, Peek, Sands (S), Stutely, Thomas (Va) and Thomas (Vi)

Apologies: Councillors Bogelein, Davis and Young

1. Declarations of interests

There were no declarations of interest.

2. Application nos 22/00570/F and 22/00571/L – (Lasdun) Teaching Wall Building 3, Norfolk Road, University of East Anglia, Norwich

(The following members of the committee had undertaken a site visit in relation to item 2 (below): Councillors Driver, Sands (M), Champion, Grahame, Lubbock, Sands (S), Thomas (Va) and Thomas (Vi).)

The area development manager provided a brief summary of the site visit to the University of East Anglia (UEA) for the benefit of members of the committee who had not attended and any members of the public viewing the live stream. The committee had visited the exterior of the Lasdun Teaching Wall and viewed where the proposed extension would be located, the location of trees to be removed as part of the development and viewed the multi-storeyed teaching building internally and externally, with regard to layout and issues relating to the condition of the building, including structural issues and asbestos.

The senior planner (case officer) gave a detailed presentation of the report with the aid of plans and slides. In conclusion the senior planner explained that the planning permission and listed building consent were recommended for approval, subject to conditions, as set out in the report, and in some instances that conditions might be subject to further discussion and negotiation before permission could be granted. Members were referred to Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Listed Buildings Act) which states that “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a Listed Building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.” There were no photos of the

interior of the teaching wall in the presentation, but it was noted that members had the opportunity to see inside the building 3 on the site visit. It was noted that the interior fabric of the building was important, some of which could be retained or redesigned to maintain a uniformity with the design across the entirety of the Lasdun Wall. There had been some unfortunate additions which would hopefully be removed or rectified as a full phased refit came forward in its place. Members were advised that great weight has been given to the conservation of heritage assets and, in line with Historic England, considered the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the listed building and other assets within this area and such harm was outweighed by the public benefit, which included reducing the cost of maintenance for safety, retaining its useability as a teaching and research facility and enhancing education facilities, preventing reputational damage to the university, de-risking the building and avoiding the consequences of the building failing. Also, in line with the NPPF the proposals represent sustainable development.

At the chair's discretion, Stephen Wells, Director of Estates and Facilities at the UEA addressed the committee in support of the application. He referred to: the unique building and its facilities for students, staff and the wider community; its critical condition that should it fail would disable 48 per cent of the university estate; that £8 million had been used to provide spandrel panels for temporary support to the façade; that Lasdun had proposed that the building would be adaptable for future needs; provide an accessible entrance; increase the building's thermal performance in accordance with the university's commitment to net zero carbon; contribute to the university's green infrastructure with additional planting as part of this scheme and address structural issues and asbestos in the building by stripping right back to its framework. The proposal offered a sustainable, viable and deliverable solution and there was no other viable solution. Therefore, the benefit to the public outweighed the less than substantial harm to the listed building.

During discussion, the senior planner, together with the area development manager referred to the report and answered members' questions. In response to a member's question, it was acknowledged that the south side of the building overheated due to the glazing, with film currently being used as a filter, and that the proposal sought to address this. Although the council had requested natural ventilation, mechanical ventilation would be used throughout the building because of the need for a hermetically sealed environment for scientific and research purposes. There would be some inherent heat loss due to the design of the windows, even with triple or double glazing. The fabric first approach, by improving insulation, would prevent the most heat loss from the building, as set out in paragraphs 186 and 187 of the report. A member also asked about the relocation of the telephone masts from the teaching building and was advised that there would be further discussion with the university about relocating these and the also potentially ones on the library roof to another location on the campus to enhance the original rooflines of these buildings.

Discussion ensued on the representations received from the Twentieth Century Society and Historic England and the weight given to these representations by the local planning authority in assessing the planning and listed building applications. The Twentieth Century Society whilst they no longer objected to the replacement windows had maintained its assessment that the proposal would cause substantial harm to the listed building. Historic England considered that the revised scheme would cause less than substantial harm to the listed building. Members were referred to paragraph 92 (page 33 of the agenda papers) where the five fundamental

pillars of the university's justification for the refurbishment strategy, which was integral to the proposed development, and that these had been taken into consideration as part of the officer's assessment of planning balance and as appropriate afforded suitable weight to lead to the recommendations of approval.

Members also sought further information about biodiversity net gain and tree replacement. The senior planner referred to the Main Issue 5: Trees and Main Issue 6: Biodiversity sections of the report. The nine trees lost resulting from this development would be replaced with 9 new trees either within the site, such as within the Swale, but also along Cow Drive. This formed part of the biodiversity net gain calculation as explained within the report. A tree replacement calculation had also been undertaken which indicated 52 trees were required to replace these nine trees in accordance with local policy DM7. Members were referred to paragraph 118 and advised that an audit of the number and species of trees across the campus was required to provide a benchmark for a wider green infrastructure strategy, this strategy being aimed at enhancing and preserving the environment and beauty of the campus setting in a historic park. The additional planting such as the Swale and adjacent landscape areas would provide 1 per cent biodiversity net gain within the red line area and other increase would be within the wider campus. The Swale would also act as part of the surface water mitigation on site. The university's green infrastructure strategy would cover the entire campus and potentially link into the council's own strategies, including Earlham Park. The green infrastructure strategy could be pursued through this application.

A member asked whether the increased floor space would result in increased student capacity out of concern that this would lead to problems of parking in adjacent residential areas. The senior planner referred to the report. Policy for the controlled growth of the university had been revised in 2019 as part of the evidence base supporting university proposals within the emerging Greater Norwich Development Plan. He confirmed that this application did not increase student numbers but there was potential to increase numbers in the future. Members were also referred to the arrangements to the phased refurbishment and reoccupation of the Lasdun Teaching Wall as set out in the report. It was not appropriate, at this stage, to ask for S106 payments to contribute to controlled parking zones or other wider cycle access improvements because the increased floorspace did not result in increased student numbers.

In reply to a member's question, the senior planner said that the space on the roof was constrained by plant and machinery, PV panels and air source heat pumps etc., and, therefore, there was no space for a green or brown roof. There was betterment of biodiversity gain within the redline area and further opportunities around the wider campus and Broad. Members were referred to paragraphs 182 and 183 of the report. Whilst grey water recycling and rainwater harvesting had been discounted now, except for the water capture within the sustainable drainage basin in the Swale, and as part of hard surface areas, it could be investigated and potentially included in future upgrades. Options for the location of the basins or tanks would be discussed with Anglian Water. Members were also referred to the section of the report which addressed nutrient neutrality. The mound, that was part of the original golf course could contain pollutants and issues of nutrient neutrality and site contamination had been assessed within the report, with each having slightly different triggers for assessment. It was considered that the proposal was not constrained by the Natural

England advice in relation to nutrients, but issues of existing site contamination would be dealt with by appropriate conditions.

The senior planner assured members that the university had been asked to share sensitive information about the funding of the scheme and its growth plans with the council. The maintenance of the building was costly. Such financial information had been assessed as part of the planning balance exercise but was commercially sensitive in some regards and it was not appropriate for it to be explicitly discussed in public. The area development manager said that without the investment the building would be unsafe and not used as an active space. Referring to the report, he said that he did not believe as the Twentieth Century Society did that the proposal would result in substantial harm to the listed building. The Lasdun Teaching Wall was a Grade II listed building because it was unique. The Twentieth Century Society and Historic England did not include the planning balance in their assessments as this was for the planning authority to undertake as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The report and points raised in the meeting demonstrates the public benefits that outweigh the harm from this proposal.

The chair moved and the vice chair seconded the recommendations in the report.

Discussion ensued. A member expressed her regret that no natural ventilation was proposed in the building and suggested that there might be areas where it could have been considered and that the roof space was not being used more sustainably. Other members said that they fully supported the proposal to enable the university to maintain the building and meet the needs of twenty first century students. Members also welcomed that: the retention of concrete reduced emissions from embedded carbon by 60 per cent, that the scheme contributed to the university's net zero strategy by reducing heat loss in the building and improved thermal capacity in the extension, and increased biodiversity net gain. Another member endorsed the comments of the previous speakers and said that this was an exciting new phase for the university whilst retaining the historic fabric of the building. Members considered that on balance the less than substantial harm to the listed building was outweighed. It would benefit students and many of whom stayed in the city after graduation and contributed to the local economy.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to:

- (1) approve application no. 22/00570/F - Teaching Wall Norfolk Road University of East Anglia Norwich and grant planning permission subject to conditions such as those listed below (with delegated authority to the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services to agree the final number and form of conditions):
 1. Standard time limit;
 2. In accordance with plans;
 3. Details of external facing materials including final cladding detailing of joints, corners and pattern or tessellation of boards; windows/doors/curtain walling and glazing; joinery; plant enclosure material(s), railing, finish and fixings; rainwater goods; cctv; soffits/cappings; external louvers; manifestations, steel frame finish for covered service access and refuse enclosure; glass roof fixings etc.;
 4. Details of phasing programme for occupation of the building and decant of phases of the Lasdun Wall;

5. Timing of and details of replacement cycle provision for on-site shortfall as required on re-occupation of buildings;
6. Construction Management Statement / Plan and site set up for temporary material stores; safe entrance and delivery points; main office management facilities; site management and noise reduction; safe bus, cycle and pedestrian access; wheel washing facilities etc.;
7. Compliance with the 'Construction Traffic Access Route' within any Construction Management Statement / Plan;
8. Details of cycle parking, EV charge points, car parking, bins and servicing areas;
9. Details of final layout of cycle access via University Drive;
10. Link to UEA travel plan;
11. Details of progress update for movement strategy report and findings;
12. Details landscaping scheme (including tree specification, surface water capture for landscape area irrigation, ecology enhancements on/off-site e.g. nesting boxes, soft and hard landscaping, furniture, handrails means of enclosure and retaining walls, Cow Drive edge works, treatment of felled tree materials etc.) implementation programme; written specifications; landscape management plan;
13. Details of mitigation Programme as Green Infrastructure Strategy including scope of activities / works, planting, tree replacements (and quota), management and implementation programme;
14. Clearance outside of Bird Nesting Season unless supervised;
15. Details of external lighting;
16. Arboricultural meeting and site monitoring;
17. In accord with Arboricultural Impact Assessment etc.;
18. Details of additional Arboricultural Method Statement – tree removal; pruning; no dig construction and hard surface design; root pruning; site set up and compound; design and operation of temporary setback areas;
19. Details of location of services and methodology for installation if within RPA's;
20. Restriction of activities within root protection areas;
21. Details of low zero carbon technologies photovoltaic panels (PV's) array and air source heat pumps (ASHP)
22. Details of new building connections to campus CHP / DHM;
23. Details of water conservation measures;
24. Details of on-site foul water drainage strategy for works, connection point and discharge rate
25. Details of surface water strategy / scheme including maintenance and management;
26. No hard surfaces shall be laid out unless in accordance with surface water strategy;
27. Stop works and details of remediation if unknown contamination is found;
28. Removal of telecoms equipment prior to extension occupation and details of timeline suitable alternative on-site provision being provided.
29. Details of plant and machinery;
30. Details of fume and flue extraction.

Article 35 (2) statement

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 38 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 at the pre-application and application stage the application has been approved subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

Informative Notes

1. Unexploded ordnance;
 2. Comments of Anglian Water in relation to notice under the Water Industry Act 1991 to connect to a drain, protection of existing AW assets (public drain), statutory easement width of 3 metres from the pipeline, sewer adoption agreement and that an application to discharge trade effluent must be made to AW.
 3. Comments of Norfolk Constabulary;
 4. Comments of LLFA;
 5. Environmental protection/mitigation measures
 6. Site clearance and consideration of wildlife;
 7. Protected species;
 8. Considerate constructor;
 9. Removal of asbestos;
 10. Notification of timing of works to avoid impacts on highway network.
- (2) approve application no. 22/00571/L - Teaching Wall Norfolk Road University of East Anglia Norwich and grant listed building consent subject to conditions such as those listed below (with delegated authority to the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services to agree the final number and form of conditions):
1. Standard time limit;
 2. In accordance with plans;
 3. Details external materials including final cladding detailing of joints, corners and pattern or tessellation of boards; windows/doors/curtain walling and glazing; joinery; internal joinery for doors/frames/openings; final sill detail, mullion detail and glazing; plant enclosure material(s), railing, finish and fixings; rainwater goods; cctv; soffits/cappings; external louvers; manifestations; supply and extract cowls, internal plant and machinery equipment (including vents and pipes position, size and finish), internal and external lighting, building signage; cctv; method, timing and extent of ceiling/soffit paint removal; design for wall or ceiling junctions; insulation including around the window openings; final design(s) of rear fixing of spandrel panel; intumescent paint; steel frame finish for covered service access and refuse enclosure; glass roof fixings etc.
 4. For the avoidance of doubt removal of external fixings previously agreed
 5. Details of document for a longer-term strategy for internal layout and finishes based on draft submitted with application;
 6. Related details of internal fixtures and fittings specification of fixed interior elements;

7. Details of strategy for materials recycling for furniture, blocks and doors / fittings.
8. Listed building – making good.

Reason for Approval

The proposed alterations, subject to conditions, on balance will relate satisfactorily to the former arts areas and will respect the specific architectural character of these parts of the listed Teaching Wall. Subject to agreement of final details as outlined the works overall result in an appropriate form of alteration in the context of the internal and external design and layout of the building and will help to secure the optimum site operation through providing improved Campus facilities. The scheme provides an appropriate simple form of development. The continued functional use of spaces is of heritage benefit and some impact on the key elevations and internal spaces as a result of that, in the heritage led form of design interventions that should respond to the design and materiality of the listed building, is considered acceptable.

Whilst there is some impact this is considered to result in less than substantial harm to heritage assets or setting. The public benefit of the new academic spaces and potential this allows for the phased refurbishment of the listed Lasdun Wall buildings, improvements to the safety of the building for public use and de-risking of specialist and other teaching infrastructure along with betterment of lab design to align with modern needs thereby maintaining a teaching use within the Lasdun Teaching Wall which arise from the proposal is weighed against the harm to the significance of the building(s) and setting as required in paragraph 202 of the NPPF, given the nature of this application and the nature of the works and mitigation for the extent of changes it may be considered that the limited harm created is acceptable. As such the works to the listed building, subject to conditions, are considered to be appropriate and in accordance with the objectives of the NPPF, policies 1 and 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2011) and policies DM3 and DM9 of the adopted Development Management Policies Plan (December 2014).

Informative Notes

1. This consent relates only to the works specifically shown and described on the approved drawings. All other works, the need for which becomes apparent as alterations and repairs proceed, are not covered by this consent and may require a further specific consent. Details of any other works, submitted as part of a further application for listed building consent if required, should be submitted to the local planning authority and approved before work continues.

CHAIR