

Planning Regulatory Urgent Business Sub-Committee

Minutes of the Meeting Held on 17 September 2010

Present:

Mr J Rogers
Mr J Shrimplin
Mr A Wright

Also in Attendance:

Ms F Croxen	- Legal Services
Ms N Levett	- Environment, Transport and Development
Mr N Johnson	- Environment, Transport and Development
Mr P Rudkin	- Environment, Transport and Development
Mr J Shaw	- Environment, Transport and Development

1. Apologies and Substitutions:

Apologies were received from Mr Gunson and Mr Harrison.

2. Election of Chairman

Mr Rogers was elected Chairman of the Sub-Committee.

3. Election of Vice-Chairman

Mr Shrimplin was elected Vice-Chairman of the Sub-Committee.

4. Declarations of Interest

Mr Rogers declared a prejudicial interest in Item 5b as he was a governor at Wayland Community High School. He would leave the room and not take part in any discussion or vote on that item.

5. Developments by the County Council

- a. **Y/4/2010/4009 City Academy, Bluebell Road, Norwich, Demolition of existing school and construction of a new academy and sports centre, including improved access and car parking arrangements and new landscaping of site**

The officer presenting the report stated that Norwich City Council had submitted their comments on the application to the Department the evening before the meeting. Most issues had been addressed in the report, although there were two additional matters that had not been previously raised. These covered archaeology and contaminated land. The officer stated that there was no indication that the land was contaminated and if the Sub-Committee was minded to agree the recommendation to approve the application, then it would be subject to consultation taking place on the two issues raised in order to impose suitable conditions if appropriate.

The following comments were made in response to questions from the Committee:

- There would be a temporary car park to the south of the site and when the new building was finished there would be a new car park built on the site of the former building. At no point would there be insufficient car parking spaces for all those that needed one.
- Floodlighting of the courts would not affect the residential properties around the boundaries, as to the north of the site there would be dense planting all the way along the road. There should be no light spillage from the site as the lights were downward facing and were programmed to cut off at a certain time.
- The flat roof incorporated a small fall to facilitate surface water draining away.

Mr Hudson, neighbouring resident, spoke in objection to the application raising the following points on behalf of the residents of Bluebell Close as well as himself:

- The development was too close to Bluebell Road and properties on that road would be overlooked by the windows on all three stories of the new building.
- Even with planting around the boundary people would be able to see out of the third storey and over the top of the trees into surrounding properties.
- The proposed building would be 50 metres away from the nearest house so there would be a serious intrusion into resident's privacy.
- The proposal did not match with the options in the initial analysis and he felt that the proposed site was too close to Bluebell Road.
- He felt that if the new building was to be located nearer to the west of the site then the green space could be placed to the east of the site and all the pitches could be placed together along the Bluebell Road boundary.

The following comments were made in response to questions from the Sub-Committee.

- There was an arboricultural method statement but more detail was required regarding the small details around tree planting and demolition that needed to take place. A comprehensive plan of landscaping along Bluebell Road would put the proposed building into context on the site. There was existing planting but more would be required.

- The existing large building would be replaced by a similar sized building.

The Local Member for University said that he felt positive about the changes to the site and to those responses received from the consultation, which he felt was excellent. Although there had been initial problems with Bluebell Road not being consulted, this was rectified. He felt that the properties would be well shielded and the parking provision would be good. Any traffic channelled into Bluebell Road would be better going down the B1108 as this would be more suitable and would not block up as easily. He also felt that people objecting to the application should have been told about the meeting.

The officer explained that the issue over the consultation was an administrative error and as far as he was aware letters had gone out to residents in both Earlham and Bluebell Road. As soon as it became evident that Bluebell Road residents had not received the consultation, amends were made and an extra 14 days was given to these residents to respond so they were not disadvantaged. The Academy had also held open meetings and submitted a community statement as part of the application documentation.

The Highways Engineer stated that the new development would mean an increase in the volume of traffic on Bluebell Road. Norfolk County Council and Norwich City Council had looked at this issue and as Earlham Road was a main distributor route it was more important to move traffic to Bluebell Road as this would be more beneficial to the traffic situation in the city.

The Local Member for Mancroft asked that a condition be imposed calling for consultation to take place with the Cycling Officer at Norwich City Council before a decision was made on alterations to the cycleway from Bluebell Road.

It was noted that the City Council had been consulted on the application and looked into cycling requirements. The alterations to be made were in relation to the access way and there were only minor alterations to the cycleway near the car park accesses.

The recommendation, as amended, was proposed by Mr Shrimplin and seconded by Mr Wright. It was unanimously **RESOLVED**:

That the Director of Environment, Transport and Development be authorised to grant planning permission subject to conditions including:

- Three year time limit for commencement of development
- The development shall be built in accordance with the approved plans
- Compliance with Flood Risk Assessment
- Submission of a scheme to protect and ensure the continuity of the existing playing fields during construction work.
- A detailed assessment of ground conditions on the land proposed for the new

junior football pitch (currently under the existing school buildings), to ensure that the playing field will be provided to an acceptable quality

- Compliance with Arboricultural Impact Assessment and implementation,
 - Completion of vehicular access, parking, servicing, loading, turning and waiting areas before the building is brought into use
 - Completion of off site highway works before building is brought into use
 - Compliance with Construction Traffic Management Plan
 - Submission and approval of an updated Travel Plan before building is brought into use
 - Compliance with the recommendations in the submitted Phase 2 Habitat Surveys from Kepwick Ecological Services, and the recommendations for hedgehog mitigation proposed by NCC Ecologist.
 - Compliance with the submitted Noise Mitigation that the total noise level from plant and equipment will not exceed existing background noise levels during the day (07:00 -23:00 hours) and will not exceed a level 5 dB below the existing background noise levels at any other time
- ii) The delegation of powers to officers to discharge conditions where those detailed above require the submission and implementation of a scheme, or further details, either before development commences, or within a specified date of planning permission being granted
- iii) subject to consultation taking place on the two issues raised by Norwich City Council (archaeology and contamination) in order to impose suitable conditions if appropriate.

5b. Y/3/2010/3004 Wayland Community High School, Merton Road, Watton, Erection of single storey extension to provide two class bases, two meeting rooms, two store rooms, general office and toilet facilities for special resource base

As the Chairman had declared a prejudicial interest in the item and would need to leave the room, the meeting became inquorate. The item would need to be deferred until the meeting of the Planning Regulatory Committee on 1 October 2010.

The meeting finished at 11.00am

CHAIRMAN



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Customer Services Centre on 0344 800 8020 or Textphone 0344 8008011 and we will do our best to help.