

**Planning Applications Committee: 9 June, 2011**

**Late additions to reports for consideration.**

---

**Application No: 11/00675/C - Item 5(3)**  
**111 Newmarket Road**

**Page 99**

**Updates:**

It has been noted that the report did not mention that the proposal involves the loss of a short length of the original wall (around 1.5m).

The loss of this short length of original wall is considered acceptable and as set out in the inspector's report (paragraph 7), it is considered that the short length of the original wall to be removed represents a small proportion of the remaining original wall such that it cannot be said to make other than a small contribution to the Conservation Area.

---

**Application No: 11/00663/F - Item 5(2)**  
**Larch House, 12A Branksome Road**

**Page 91**

**Updates:**

A letter was sent on the 11<sup>th</sup> May from the applicant's builder to neighbours explaining the circumstances that led to the garage being built with a steeper pitched roof than originally approved. A copy of this letter was sent to Norwich City Council for information only.

**Further representations:**

Three further representations have been received relating to the letter from the applicant's builders.

The representations raise the following points:

Issues Raised	Response
Do not accept the apology letter from the builders. Planning permission must be complied with or the garage should be knocked down and rebuilt to the original planning permission. Planning permission must be the same for all citizens and action should be taken.	The liability for the error and the responsibility for bearing any additional costs associated with resolving the error are private matters between the owner and the builder and are not considered to be material to the planning considerations of this application.
Happy for the applicant that the builder has taken sole responsibility for the construction of a 'dormer style	The liability for the error and the responsibility for bearing any additional costs associated with

house' as the applicant will not have to incur any costs to return the building to its original plans. We are sure that the applicant will be happy for this to happen as this larger building must be a distraction for them as it is for the neighbours.	resolving the error are private matters between the owner and the builder and are not considered to be material to the planning considerations of this application.
The letter from the builder does not justify the fact that the garage should remain as a 'dormer style house'.	The liability for the error and the responsibility for bearing any additional costs associated with resolving the error are private matters between the owner and the builder and are not considered to be material to the planning considerations of this application.
The sensible course of action for the applicants would be to conform with the original plans.	The liability for the error and the responsibility for bearing any additional costs associated with resolving the error are private matters between the owner and the builder and are not considered to be material to the planning considerations of this application.
The house and (largely due to the error), the garage is very visible from Sunningdale and is much worse in winter as the hedge isn't evergreen. It raises the question as to whether the house was built according to plans and this should also be investigated. When the original application was granted it was said that the impact on outlook would be minimal. The photos attached show that the impact is much greater than anticipated.	See paragraph 10 of report
Question the use of sky lights in the garage. A condition should be attached that the garage should only ever be used as a garage.	See paragraph 11 of report
There is a gap in the hedging and this should be replaced by trees/shrubs that will achieve the same height and thickness than the current surrounding hedge.	See paragraphs 10 and 13 of report

An additional representation has been received following the case officer's visit to neighbouring properties which raises the following points:

- The view of the garage from the lounge window is more prominent
- If the original plan had been adhered to, the sight line from ground level would make the highest point of the garage roof at hedge level.

As it stands the garage roof is a yard higher when viewed from ground level and is a lot more visible when viewed from first floor level. It has to be borne in mind that this hedge is deciduous and the impact in winter is much greater

- As soon as the roof struts were put in place the suspected breach of planning was reported to the Council but building still continued.

Response: See paragraph 10 of report.