

Project:		Anglia Square		Job no.:		N.A.	
Client:		N.A.		Date:		22.11.19	
No.	Question	Committee report ref.	NS comments	NCC	NS		
<b>Integrating into the neighbourhood</b>							
<b>1 Connections</b>							
Does the scheme integrate into its surroundings by reinforcing existing connections and creating new ones, while also respecting existing buildings and land uses around the development site?							
1a	Where should vehicles come in and out of the development?	<b>320-323</b>	The delivery/service layby (11), car park entrance for hotel and residents (12), and taxi rank (14) are all located on Pitt Street to the west of the site. This gyratory is already congested, especially at rush hour, and we are concerned at this huge increase in traffic movements.				
1b	Should there be pedestrian and cycle only routes into and through the development? If so where should they go?	<b>319,324</b>	There is no vehicular access into the site; the new east-west and north-south routes would only be for pedestrians and cyclists. We support this approach.				
1c	Where should new streets be placed and could they be used to cross the development site and help create	<b>317,318</b>	Although the scheme reinstates 2 important connections – St George’s Street and Botolph Street – it removes Ann’s Walk, an existing pedestrian route between Cowgate and Pitt Street. The arguments justifying this in the report are unsustainable; the design could and should have been re-worked to encourage this and other pedestrian routes through the site. As				

	linkages across the scheme and into the existing neighbourhood?		the report states: 'If such a secondary connection had been provided it would have given the development greater permeability and a layout more in keeping with the intricate street pattern elsewhere in the city centre.'		
1d	How should the new development relate to existing development? What should happen at the edges of the development site?	<b>325-332</b>	<p>This is one of the major areas of concern from the Norwich Society, and much of the harmful impact has been picked up in the Committee report, summarised as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Edward Street: Some of the benefit to the edge condition of the street that would be gained by providing new buildings on Edward Street would be negated by the overshadowing caused by the 9-storey height of the buildings to the south of the street, which would leave it in almost permanent shadow and give it an unbalanced cross-section with much taller buildings on the south side of the street than the north.</li> <li>2. The 'heat map' included in the Built Heritage Statement is a crude tool with severe limitations. The proposals often exceed even these criteria, especially with the addition of roof plant etc.</li> <li>3. The street sections show a more extreme ratio of height to width than is characteristic of the conservation area. Overall the mass of the whole development would make it look, from certain vantage points as a "city within a city" in contrast to the scale and character of its surroundings.</li> <li>4. We do not believe that the negative aspects of the existing Anglia Square development can be used to justify similar aspects of the new development.</li> <li>5. The mass of the development, which is a result of the height of the proposed building combined with their large footprints, will not successfully harmonise with its surroundings.</li> <li>6. Despite attempts to modulate the height and massing of buildings, it is clear that they create a development that is overall greater in height and building/block footprint than any other part of the city centre. (The report cites the areas around Surrey Street, All Saints Green and St Stephens Street, however we would question that these areas reach</li> </ol>		

			<p>similar overall densities as those proposed for Anglia Square.)</p> <p>7. The abrupt change in scale of Block A on the south side of Edward Street, which rises from seven to nine storeys, will fail to integrate well into its surrounding in terms of scale. This is also apparent and problematic in views from further away to the north</p> <p>8. The buildings behind the Magdalen Street frontage build up quickly from 4 to 7, 9 and 11 storeys and this discordant relationship will be strongly apparent in views towards Magdalen Street from Cowgate (view 35)</p> <p>9. The twelve storey hotel building on the corner of Pitt Street and St Crispin's Road will present a sudden change in scale from its surroundings</p> <p>10. The absence of buildings of any scale to the west of Pitt Street will mean that this edge will mark a very strong change in the character of building within this part of the city. [Red]</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

## 2 Facilities and services

Does the development provide (or is it close to) community facilities, such as shops, schools, workplaces, parks, play areas, pubs or cafes?

2a	<p>Are there enough facilities and services in the local area to support the development? If not, what is needed? Where new facilities are proposed:</p>	<b>333-334</b>	Generally the area is well provided with local facilities and services.		
2b	Are these facilities what the area needs?	<b>333-334</b>	The concern is the extent to which the existing speciality shops and arts/crafts-related workshops etc. will be supported and can survive within the new retail environment.		
2c	<p>Are these new facilities located in the right place? If not, where should they</p>	<b>333-334</b>	Generally their location within the scheme are appropriate.		

	go?																																														
<b>3 Public transport</b>																																															
Does the scheme have good access to public transport to help reduce car dependency?																																															
3a	What can the development do to encourage more people (both existing and new residents) to use public transport more often?	<b>335-336</b>	<p>The site is very well served by public transport and close to the City centre amenities. We therefore consider that the 72.8% parking provision for residents is excessive. Similar residential schemes in the city centre have a 50% provision.</p> <p>We do not understand why only 75% of the required residential cycle parking is proposed, as a maximum.</p> <p>If the Council is serious about carbon reduction, new schemes should aim to reduce car use in the City centre through promoting park-and-ride and public transport. We consider that the 600 public parking spaces should therefore be re-considered.</p>																																												
3b	Where should new public transport stops be located?	<b>335-336</b>	Magdalen Street is a principal bus route and is the appropriate location for the bus stop plaza (21)																																												
<b>4 Meeting local housing requirements</b>																																															
Does the development have a mix of housing types and tenures that suit local requirements?																																															
4a	What types of homes, tenure and price range are needed in the area (for example, starter homes, family homes or homes for those downsizing)?	<b>182-223</b> <b>337-338</b>	<p>The latest SHMA update from June 2017 for NCC requires a mix of units shown in the following table, which show their wide divergence from the mix proposed:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>No. beds</th> <th>SMHA Affordable</th> <th>Pro-posed</th> <th>Variance</th> <th>SMHA Market</th> <th>Proposal</th> <th>Variance</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>36%</td> <td>92.5%</td> <td>+56.5%</td> <td>11%</td> <td>45% (563)</td> <td>+34%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>32%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>-32%</td> <td>24%</td> <td>54.3% (678)</td> <td>+30.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>25%</td> <td>7.5%</td> <td>-17.5%</td> <td>52%</td> <td>0.7% (9)</td> <td>-51.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>6%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>-6%</td> <td>11%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>-11%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>1%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>-1%</td> <td>2%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>-2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	No. beds	SMHA Affordable	Pro-posed	Variance	SMHA Market	Proposal	Variance	1	36%	92.5%	+56.5%	11%	45% (563)	+34%	2	32%	0%	-32%	24%	54.3% (678)	+30.3%	3	25%	7.5%	-17.5%	52%	0.7% (9)	-51.3%	4	6%	0%	-6%	11%	0%	-11%	5	1%	0%	-1%	2%	0%	-2%		
No. beds	SMHA Affordable	Pro-posed	Variance	SMHA Market	Proposal	Variance																																									
1	36%	92.5%	+56.5%	11%	45% (563)	+34%																																									
2	32%	0%	-32%	24%	54.3% (678)	+30.3%																																									
3	25%	7.5%	-17.5%	52%	0.7% (9)	-51.3%																																									
4	6%	0%	-6%	11%	0%	-11%																																									
5	1%	0%	-1%	2%	0%	-2%																																									

		<p>The Affordable Housing Statement justifies this from the 2011 census which is likely to be considerably out of date. We accept in principle that this area will have a higher predominance of smaller households but there is insufficient evidence to support such a large deviation from the SHMA.</p> <p>We do not accept the justification for this variance that the 'housing has to be located above ground floor commercial uses in order for the Site's role as part of a Large District Centre to be maintained.' In our view this is another reason to question the pre-conception on which the design criteria of the proposals have been based.</p> <p>Building for Life recommend that 'creating too many larger or too many smaller homes from being grouped together' should be avoided. We consider that there is insufficient consideration of providing starter homes and homes for the elderly.</p> <p>For all the above reasons we do not consider that this scheme provides the variety of size and tenure to support a diversified and balanced community, and therefore has been assessed as red.</p>		
4b	Is there a need for different types of home ownership (such as part buy and part rent) or rented properties to help people on lower incomes?	<p>JCS Policy 4 – Housing Delivery requires 33% of proposed dwellings to be affordable. The proposals include 120 affordable units out of 1250 total, representing just 9.6%. However we accept that increased development costs will affect the viability of providing the full amount.</p> <p>The proposed tenure split is 85% social rented and 15% intermediate, in accordance with NCC's policy.</p> <p>There are no affordable units in Phase 1, with 95 in phase 2. The remainder are not provided until Phase 4, which causes some concern in terms of deliverability.</p>		
<b>CREATING A PLACE</b>				
<b>5 Character</b>				

Does the scheme create a place with a locally inspired or otherwise distinctive character?					
5a	How can the development be designed to have a local or distinctive identity?	<b>339-341</b>	<p>The question is not if the development will have a different character from its context, but if that character is distinctive from other similar developments, and to what extent is it derived from local inspiration of urban form and building vernacular.</p> <p>BfL recommends that where an area has a strong and positive local identity, this can be used as a cue to reinforce the place's overall character. We see no reason therefore why the development should not step back to re-create the traditional fine-grain development pattern that survives in Magdalen Street and St Augustine's Street, Calvert Street and St George's Street from before the arrival of Anglia Square and St Crispin's Road.</p> <p>BfL also warns against using the lack of local character as a justification for further nondescript or placeless development.</p> <p>In our view, this development is not distinctive from other similar developments elsewhere, e.g. Canary Wharf, and does not have any local identity. We therefore have given it a red rating.</p>		
5b	Are there any distinctive characteristics within the area, such as building shapes, styles, colours and materials or the character of streets and spaces that the development should draw inspiration from?	<b>339-341</b>	<p>The only tenuous mention of local vernacular is the 'choice of brick as the predominant façade material helps to integrate the scheme into its locality because brick is widely used in the locality.' Astonishingly no other reference is made to the rich local context and distinctive characteristics of this area of Norwich:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The former wharfs now converted to offices/residential, generally of red brick with stone/concrete detailing and large metal casement windows.</li> <li>• the ornate Norwich University of Arts building.</li> <li>• Doughty's Hospital</li> <li>• Flint and stone prevalent on all churches</li> <li>• weavers/merchant houses along St George Street which use flint walls with simply decorated entrances</li> </ul>		

## 6 Working with the site and its context

Does the scheme take advantage of existing topography, landscape features (including water courses), wildlife habitats, existing buildings, site orientation and microclimates?

6a	Are there any views into or from the site that need to be carefully considered?	<b>342, 345</b>	A major concern of the Norwich Society is the impact on the views of the development from elsewhere in the City, in particular from the 63 designated view-points described in the Built Heritage Statement. These are reviewed in more detail in the main paper, but the number of adverse impacts of both the tower and the main body of development result in a red rating.		
6b	Are there any existing trees, hedgerows or other features, such as streams that need to be carefully designed into the development?	<b>343</b>	The mature trees on the St Crispin's Road frontage are being retained with new tree planting. The roof gardens will offer additional habitat for flora and fauna on a site that is currently ecologically barren.		
6c	Should the development keep any existing building(s) on the site? If so, how could they be used?	<b>344</b>	Most of the existing buildings on the site would be demolished, however this unfortunately includes the locally listed buildings at 43-45 Pitt Street. Surry Chapel is also due to be demolished and re-provided off site; it would save £2m if this was retained as part of the proposals.		

## 7 Creating well defined streets and spaces

Are buildings designed and positioned with landscaping to define and enhance streets and spaces and are buildings designed to turn street corners well?

7a	Good streets and spaces are created by enclosing them with buildings and a strong landscaping scheme. Are buildings used to create enclosed streets and spaces?	<b>346-349</b>	We are concerned that some of the streets feel cavernous – particularly sections 1 and 7 from DAS. This is a direct consequence of the very high density of the scheme. We agree with the comments in the report that the buildings surrounding Anglia Square and Sovereign Way will be oddly proportioned as a group, with 6-11 storeys on one side and just two on the other. The view of the Cathedral will be better enhanced by gaps and viewpoints through the buildings rather than skewed views over.		
7b	Good buildings 'turn'		No comment at this stage.		

	corners. Do buildings turn corners well?				
7c	Do all fronts of buildings, including front doors, face the street?		Yes, but at the cost of very long single-sided corridors to access the individual flats from the stair cores – sometimes 13-14 flats between stairs, which will feel oppressive.		
<b>8 Easy to find your way around</b>					
Is the scheme designed to make it easy to find your way around?					
8a	Will the development be easy to find your way around? If not, what could be done to make it easier to find your way around?		7c refers to this issue; long corridors without windows will feel dis-orienting.  We agree that the clear sight-line to St Augustine's Church will help wayfinding and enhance its setting. The new view of the Anglican Cathedral from within Anglia Square when walking east towards Magdalen Street is beneficial, although we feel more could have been done to open up this view.		
<b>STREET AND HOME</b>					
<b>9 Streets for all</b>					
Are streets designed in a way that encourage low vehicle speeds and allow them to function as social spaces?					
9a	Are streets pedestrian friendly and are they designed to encourage cars to drive slower and more carefully?	<b>351-353</b>	There is no vehicular access to the development therefore this is acceptable. However we refer to 7a, where we are concerned that some of the streets will feel cavernous and oppressive due to their width:height ratio.		
9b	Are streets designed in a way that they can be used as social spaces, such as places for children to play safely?	<b>351-353</b>	As most of the street frontages have commercial use, there are limited opportunities for play; apart from a water feature within Anglia Square, the proposals are limited to improving connections to nearby play spaces, viz. Leonards Street playground, and Gildencroft Park through a better crossing point over Pitt Street.		



<b>10 Car parking</b>					
Is resident and visitor parking sufficient and well integrated so that it does not dominate the street?					
10a	Is there enough parking for residents and visitors?	354	Refer to response 3a		
10b	Is parking positioned close to people's homes?	354	Parking is located in multi-storey car parks which are secure, but not visible.		
10c	Are any parking courtyards small in size (generally no more than five properties should use a parking courtyard) and are they well overlooked by neighbouring properties?	354	N.A.		
10d	Are garages well positioned so that they do not dominate the street scene?	354	N.A.		
<b>11 Public and private spaces</b>					
Will public and private spaces be clearly defined and designed to be attractive, well managed and safe?					
11a	What types of open space should be provided within this development?	355-358	<p>The two main open spaces, St George's Square and Anglia Square, are well proportioned and attractively landscaped. Additional entry points associated with more pedestrian permeability would have been beneficial.</p> <p>The problem with St George's Square is that overshadowing will make it unattractive during the day – it seems a cop-out to say that it will therefore be used in the evening!</p>		

			It is a concern that the spaces will be publicly accessible but privately owned and managed. Steps must be taken to ensure that the spaces remain accessible to all 24-hours a day.		
11b	Is there a need for play facilities for children and teenagers? If so, is this the right place or should the developer contribute towards an existing facility in the area that could be made better?		<b>N.A.</b>		
<b>12 External storage and amenity space</b>					
Is there adequate external storage space for bins and recycling as well as vehicles and cycles?					
12a	Is there enough storage space for bins and recycling, as well as vehicles and cycles?	<b>359</b>	The balconies will be big enough for two people to sit on but without additional space for personalisation. However, residents have access to very large shared podium gardens. The waste storage is well considered and will not undermine the quality of the public realm.		
			<b>Total number of greens</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>
			<b>Total number of ambers</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>
			<b>Total number of reds</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>