

**Report to** Planning applications committee  
**Date** 7 August 2014  
**Report of** Deputy chief executive (operations)  
**Subject** 14/00742/F 44A Mount Pleasant, Norwich, NR2 2DH

---

**Item**  
**4(2)**

## SUMMARY

<b>Description:</b>	Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 1 No. four bed replacement dwelling [revised].
<b>Reason for consideration at Committee:</b>	Objections
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Approve subject to conditions
<b>Ward:</b>	Town Close
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	Mr James Bonner Planner 01603 212542
<b>Valid Date:</b>	4th June 2014
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Nigel Garioch
<b>Agent:</b>	A Squared Architects

## INTRODUCTION

### The Site

#### Location and Context

1. The application site is located on the north east side of Mount Pleasant, ~50m north west of Newmarket Street. Currently the site contains a 1950s detached bungalow with garage.
2. The surrounding area is almost entirely residential in character with a mixture of small terraces, semi-detached and detached properties set back at varying distances along Mount Pleasant. To the rear of the application site are terraced properties along Bury Street (~19m from the existing bungalow).

#### Constraints

3. The existing property is not of any historical or architectural significance but is within the Newmarket Road conservation area. Sitting either side and opposite are a number of locally listed buildings and numbers 36 and 38 Mount Pleasant (on the corner with Newmarket Street) are grade II listed.
4. There are a number of trees in and around the site; those most affected being the two in the front garden and two in the back.

#### Planning History

5. None.

## Equality and Diversity Issues

There are no significant equality or diversity issues.

## The Proposal

6. Proposed is the demolition of the existing house and garage (~182m<sup>2</sup>) and the erection of a two storey four bedroom dwelling (~311m<sup>2</sup>). Included is a substantial single storey wing at the rear which will house the kitchen. Beyond this is an air raid shelter which will be retained and used for storage.
7. The scheme has been amended slightly to replace the render on the front with brick and to amend the front door surround and the windows. A side facing dormer has been relocated to the rear and the garage has been reduced in height.

## Representations Received

8. Advertised on site and in the press. Adjacent and neighbouring properties have been notified in writing. Eleven letters of representation have been received (from nine different parties) citing the issues as summarised in the table below. The application has been re-advertised and this consultation period ends on August 1.

Issues Raised	Response
<p>(1) While the existing property is not in keeping with the general profile of the road, a modern house is inappropriate for what is now a conservation area.</p> <p>A major concern raised with contractor vehicles during demolition and construction. The traffic situation is already at a premium, especially during term time. Issue also raised with possibility of multi-vehicle household adding to difficulties already experienced in road.</p>	<p>Design – paragraphs 24 - 28.</p> <p>Traffic – paragraphs 29 and 30.</p>
<p>(2) Render finish would not be sympathetic to area though shape of new house would.</p> <p>The mature Leylandii tree in rear provides privacy. New planting would not be possible along boundary as single storey building is right up against wall.</p> <p>Maintenance of new building and old boundary wall would be compromised unless moved away from wall.</p>	<p>Design – paragraphs 24 - 28.</p> <p>Tree – paragraph 34.</p> <p>Maintenance – paragraph 36.</p>
<p>(3) This design is mediocre, poor quality and pastiche and should not be happening in a conservation area.</p>	<p>See paragraphs 24 - 28.</p>
<p>(4) The NPPF (and associated guidance) sets out need to raise standards of design. High standards needed in conservation area with careful analysis of the local environment. This application fails on: 1. Attention to aspect; 2. Attention to sustainability; 3. No attention to the aesthetic quietness of the street scene; 4. An opportunity lost to produce a sensitive contemporary home as an</p>	<p>See paragraphs 24 - 28.</p>

<p>example of design excellence; 5. No consideration of opportunities offered for private and public space. Mediocrity is simply not acceptable in this day and age.</p> <p><b>Following re-consultation:</b></p> <p>I again object to this application. There is always a sense of disappointment with pastiche architecture. NPPF enables us to be more creative and raise design standards - why is it not happening here? The drawings as submitted do not attempt to embody any part of NPPF and sadly lay in our very negative pastiche past. Chronological progression is important within our historic areas. Reference made to NPPF paragraphs 56 and 59 to 64. Drawings as submitted have not been part of a creative exercise and certainly cannot be justified as a well-considered design. Change to brick does not raise the lack of quality in this application. It still scores a zero out of 10 and needs to go back to the drawing board. Research and development needs to be done in order to unlock a creative solution.</p>	
<p>(5) Generally very supportive of the proposed application but feel the use of reclaimed bricks at the front would be more in keeping with the surrounding houses.</p>	<p>Amendment replaced render with brick on front elevation.</p>
<p>(6) We have a small garden backing onto the application site and the large coniferous tree in 44A blocks sunlight to our garden. We'd like to request this be trimmed/ removed to allow us to enjoy our garden. Also requested no structure erected blocks direct sunlight to garden for the whole day.</p>	<p>Tree is being removed. Overshadowing addressed in paragraph 19.</p>
<p>(7) No objection to the demolition but the proposed replacement is not in keeping with the adjoining houses in what is a historic conservation area. It is disproportionally large for the plot and the rendered style is deeply unattractive, two mature trees would be felled. There is insufficient detail in the plans about the front garden but the low wall at the front should be retained.</p> <p><b>Following re-consultation:</b></p> <p>The use of brick over render is improvement but still object on grounds of (i) disproportionate size for plot; (ii) brick/lintel/soldier coursing not matching neighbouring properties; (iii) mature trees being removed; (iv) nothing said about fate of low wall at front boundary wall which matches those along the road.</p>	<p>Design – paragraphs 24 - 28.</p> <p>Trees – paragraph 34.</p> <p>Landscaping – paragraph 35.</p>
<p>(8) The proposed dwelling needs to be in keeping with the rest of the properties in the immediate area. This includes careful consideration of colour and type of materials used as well as positioning of chimney stack and roof pitch. The front elevation does not currently convey this [<i>following re-consultation</i>].</p>	<p>See paragraph 24.</p>
<p>(9) <i>Norwich society</i> – support the change from render to brick but it must be an appropriate colour to match, as near as possible, the surrounding properties [<i>following re-consultation</i>].</p>	<p>Noted. Strict detailing referred to in paragraph 27.</p>

## **Consultation Responses**

9. **Local highway authority** – Proposed development suitable in transportation terms for its location. Access is suitable and cycle and refuse storage would need to be conditioned. Hardstanding for driveway should be porous and there may be more suitable materials for this purpose than suggested. As a replacement dwelling it would be eligible for parking permits.
10. **Tree officer** – Proposals are acceptable providing a condition to ensure full compliance with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement. There should be a landscaping scheme that covers tree species selection, tree planting specification and a five year maintenance plan which can be subject to condition.
11. **Landscaping** – Concern raised over pleached trees for the ‘live boundary’ in terms of their maintenance as access to all sides will be required. N.B. Landscaping plans to be conditioned.
12. **Environmental Health** – No comment.

## **ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Relevant Planning Policies**

#### **National Planning Policy Framework:**

Statement 4 – Promoting sustainable transport

Statement 6 – Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

Statement 7 – Requiring good design

Statement 10 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

#### **Relevant policies of the adopted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk 2014:**

Policy 1 – Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets

Policy 2 – Promoting good design

Policy 3 – Energy and water

Policy 4 – Housing delivery

Policy 6 – Access and transportation

Policy 9 – Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area

Policy 12 – Remainder of Norwich area

Policy 20 – Implementation

#### **Relevant Saved Policies of the adopted City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan 2004:**

NE3 – Tree protection control of cutting, lopping etc.

NE9 – Comprehensive landscaping scheme and tree planting

HBE8 – Development in Conservation Areas

HBE9 – Listed Buildings and development affecting them

HBE12 – High quality of design

EP16 – Water conservation and sustainable drainage systems

EP22 – High standard of amenity for residential occupiers  
HOU13 – Proposals for new housing development on other sites  
TRA3 – Modal shift measures in support of NATS  
TRA7 – Cycle parking standard  
TRA8 – Servicing provision

**Other Material Considerations including:**

Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth March 2011

**Procedural Matters Relating to the Development Plan and the NPPF**

The Joint Core Strategy and Replacement Local Plan (RLP) have been adopted since the introduction of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act in 2004. With regard to paragraphs 211 and 215-216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), both sets of policies have been subjected to a test of compliance with the NPPF. Both the 2014 JCS policies and the 2004 RLP policies above are considered to be compliant with the NPPF. The Council has also reached submission stage of the emerging new Local Plan policies, and considers most of these to be wholly consistent with the NPPF. Where discrepancies or inconsistent policies relate to this application they are identified and discussed within the report; varying degrees of weight are apportioned as appropriate.

**Emerging DM Policies**

**DM1** - Achieving and delivering sustainable development

**\*DM2** - Ensuring satisfactory living and working conditions

**\*DM3** - Delivering high quality design

**DM7** - Trees and development

**DM9** - Safeguarding Norwich's heritage

**\*DM12** - Ensuring well-planned housing development – **no weight can be applied**

**\*DM28** - Encouraging sustainable travel

**\*DM30** - Access and highway safety – **only limited weight can be applied**

**\*DM31** - Car parking and servicing

**Other Material Considerations**

Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth March 2011

**Principle of Development**

**Policy Considerations**

13. The principle of residential use is accepted here. The replacement dwelling is subject primarily to consideration of design, amenity, trees and transport. Given the redevelopment of the site is within the same application, the principle of demolishing the existing property is fine given its neutral status within the conservation area.

**Impact on Living Conditions**

**Noise and Disturbance**

14. This is a larger property but the increase in day-to-day noise from the existing levels will be negligible.

15. During demolition and construction there is expected to be a degree of disruption but not to the extent that could be considered unacceptable. There is a generous area at the front of the property that would enable construction vehicles to have minimised impacts upon the surrounding street.

## **Overlooking**

16. The introduction of habitable rooms at first floor level will introduce the potential for increased overlooking. The replacement dwelling is the same distance (~15m) from the rear boundary as the existing building and the nearest habitable rooms to the rear are at least 22.5m away at Bury Street. This does not give the potential for unacceptable levels of overlooking. Three of the four side facing windows on the first floor belong to bathrooms or en-suites; the fourth is a secondary window for a bedroom. All will be conditioned to be obscure glazed and fixed shut.
17. The combination of the loss of the large tree and the addition of habitable rooms at first floor level will lead to some loss of privacy in the garden of 46 Mount Pleasant in particular. This in itself is not considered a reason to substantiate refusal, particularly given the assessment of the tree and the fairly tight knit urban nature of the site. The applicant has the intention to landscape the garden of the family home which should bring about an overall improvement to amenity levels (given the overshadowing the large tree causes to other gardens). Subject to condition there are no outstanding overlooking or privacy concerns.

## **Overshadowing**

18. The additional storey will lead to some overshadowing to the neighbours either side, but given the orientation and the building line, this will only have a noticeable impact on side windows. With the separation distance between the two storey aspect and the neighbours (both around 4.5m) this is unlikely to be significant, a position supported by the use of a hipped roof.
19. Due to the distance between the new house and the rear neighbour (Bury Street) there are no concerns for overshadowing to their property or garden. The single storey part does not raise concerns for loss of amenity given its scale compared to the north and west boundary walls.
20. Despite the loss of the large tree, there are no significant concerns for overshadowing or loss of light as a result of the development.

## **Overbearing Nature of Development**

21. While the replacement dwelling is larger, it is of a scale that is more in-keeping with the neighbouring houses than the existing dwelling. The design and separation distances ensure that the development will not be overbearing.

## **Amenity for Future Occupiers**

22. The property would be served by a rear garden slightly smaller than that which serves the current house. For a dwelling of this size it is considered acceptable and further landscaping detail will be required to ensure a decent level of amenity. Accordingly the proposal complies with saved policy EP22 of the RLP and emerging policy DM2, to which some weight can be attached.

## **Design**

23. The design of the front elevation takes reference from 50 Mount Pleasant and, although clearly pastiche in its approach, presents a dwelling of form and scale that is much more appropriate to its surroundings than the existing dwelling. Excluding the single storey wing, its footprint is essentially the same as the existing property. Including this, it is not considered over-intensive for the size of the site.

24. When viewed in the street scene the proposed roof is at odds with those neighbouring. A 3-D visualisation was provided which shows a shallower hip roof to match the prevailing roof form, but given the depth of the new house within the plot this involved the top of the roof being chopped off. While this may have looked fine in some views, in others it would look peculiar and having a flat roof on top may introduce maintenance issues. The originally proposed roof with the dormer relocated to the rear is considered the most sensible option and subject to condition on the eaves and materials, would still look acceptable in street views. The inclusion of a chimney in this position is unlikely to look incongruous and subject to condition is fine.
25. The front elevation originally included a number of design features which required addressing, in particular the cramped feeling the windows and door surrounds. These have been reduced in size alongside the height of the garage. One fairly consistent objection was the use of render on the front elevation which has now been replaced with brick (a reclaimed Costessey white was discussed as an appropriate choice). There are a number of properties in the surrounding area that utilise a similar approach of differing materials on the front and side elevations and this would suitably address the concern. The design shown on the front elevation is appropriate in the context of the surrounding properties and further detail on the brick and render will be secured through condition.
26. Contrasting from the traditional approach of the main house, the contemporary single storey element at the rear feels more like an extension. It is of generous footprint but its height and design ensure its impact will be minimal, particularly as it will not be visible from the street.
27. It is accepted that there is a risk in attempting to emulate the prevailing style of property in an area instead of opting for a contemporary approach (despite the lack of a clear dominant architectural style in the wider area). While certainly not an innovative design, it will provide a house of more sympathetic form and scale that will sit much more comfortably in the street scene than the existing bungalow. Attention to detail will be crucial to avoid cheapening and drawing undue attention to the pastiche design. The proposed conditions should ensure a high quality build that sits comfortably in its surroundings. In particular this will require concentration on crucial elements such as the brickwork, render, joinery, and door/window surrounds.
28. Although it could be argued as a missed opportunity, the reality is that this is the client's preference for their future home. Subject to conditions there is no substantive reason to refuse this scheme on the basis of visual harm to the street scene or conservation area as the proposal will successfully preserve its character. There are no adverse impacts on the setting of the locally or statutory listed buildings, particularly when viewed against what it replaces.

### **Vehicular Access and Servicing**

29. The development will utilise the existing dwelling and no significant transportation issues are raised. Refuse storage has not been indicated but has been agreed to be conditioned. Given the space on the site there is no reason to suggest this would not be feasible.

### **Car Parking**

30. Five existing spaces will be retained. Layout and access will be confirmed through condition. With the generous space provided and the potential to use on-street permits there is no concern for impact on traffic compared to the existing situation.

### **Cycling Parking**

31. As with refuse storage, cycling provision will be conditioned.

## **Environmental Issues**

### **Sustainable Construction**

32. The use of local materials has been indicated but again this detail is more appropriate at a later stage.

### **Water Conservation**

33. Given the scale of development the dwelling would not need to have on-site renewable energy provision. Water efficiency would need to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 for water usage and a condition is recommended to ensure this.

## **Trees and Landscaping**

### **Loss of Trees or Impact on Trees**

34. The proposal involves the loss of two trees, the most significant of which is a mature to over-mature Cypress species tree in the rear garden. In the submitted AIA the tree has been assessed as overly large for its location with an extremely wide crown spread covering approximately one third of the back garden area. It features over-weighted limbs and poor branch attachments and causes a substantial amount of shading to the neighbouring properties. Also lost is a small Holly species tree in the front garden which is considered of little arboricultural or landscape value. This assessment and the method statement provided have been viewed by the council's tree officer and are considered acceptable. As part of the justification for the loss of the trees, the planting of new trees is suggested in the AIA and this will be conditioned as part of the landscaping scheme. Providing compliance with the protection measures for the existing trees, the development is acceptable from this perspective and there are no objections from the tree protection officer.

### **Landscaping**

35. Nothing on the proposed plans suggests that the front boundary wall will be removed. The agent has confirmed that the landscaping of the front garden has not been considered in detail. Any changes to the front boundary would form part of the conditioned landscaping scheme and any impact on the visual amenity of the street will be assessed when it is submitted.

### **Other matters**

36. Despite being right up against the boundary the issue of maintenance is not material to this consideration and does not raise any significant concerns, as it does not in numerous other similar scenarios in other residential areas. Whether this restricts the landscaping scheme is conjectural at the moment as a scheme has not been formulated. When this is submitted a maintenance scheme will also be expected which will be assessed for its practicality.

## **Local Finance Considerations**

37. Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact or



local finances. It is a material consideration when assessing this application. The benefits from the finance contributions for the council however must be weighed against the above planning issues. In this case the financial considerations are relatively limited and therefore limited weight should be given to them.

<b>Financial Liability</b>	<b>Liable?</b>	<b>Amount</b>
New Homes Bonus	No	-
Council Tax	Yes	Band not yet known
CIL	Yes	311sq m of proposed floorspace minus 182sqm of lawful floorspace = 129sqm of chargeable area, at £75 per square metre = at least £9675 (unless any relief for self-build is successful).

## Conclusions

38. The amended scheme provides a replacement dwelling of a form and scale that is more sympathetic to the surrounding area than the existing bungalow. While pastiche in its approach, subject to high quality detailing, there are no concerns that the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the wider conservation area. The dwelling would sit comfortably within the street scene and would have no adverse impacts upon the setting of the locally or statutory listed buildings.
39. Although the proposal involves the loss of trees, this is considered justified providing a comprehensive planting plan is submitted and approved prior to commencement. Given the lack of significant amenity or transport concerns, subject to conditions, the proposal is acceptable as it accords with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 12 and 20 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2014), saved policies NE3, NE9, HBE8, HBE9, HBE12, EP16, EP22, TRA3, TRA7 and TRA8 of the City of Norwich Replacement Local Plan (2004) and all other material considerations.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

To approve 14/00742/F (44A Mount Pleasant) and grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:-

- 1) STLC (3 years)
- 2) In accordance with the approved plans
- 3) External facing materials
  - a) Brickwork (including sample panel)
  - b) Render (including sample)
  - c) Roof material (including sample)
  - d) Chimney detail
  - e) Window and door surrounds (including sample and scale drawings)
  - f) Window and door joinery (including material, finish and scale drawings)
  - g) Eaves detail (including material, finish and scale drawings)
  - h) Rooflights specifications
  - i) Dormer design and materials


- 4) Landscaping
- 5) Bin and cycle store details
- 6) Side windows fixed shut and obscure glazed
- 7) Water conservation

**Article 31(1)(cc) Statement**


The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 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 the application has been approved subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.

**Informatives:**

- 1) Considerate construction
- 2) CIL
- 3) Parking permits
- 4) Permeable hardstanding



EXISTING ELEVATIONS 1:100



Side (North-West)



Side (South-East)




Rear (North-East)



Front (South-West)


PROPOSED ELEVATIONS 1:100



Side (South-East)



Front (South-West)




Side (North-West)



Rear (North-East)



EXISTING SITE PLAN 1:200



PROPOSED SITE PLAN 1:200

A SQUARED ARCHITECTS



Chartered Practice

1 NETHERCONESFORD  
93-95 KING STREET  
NORWICH NR1 1PW

T: (01603) 664379  
F: (01603) 631352

www.asquaredarchitects.com

mail@asquaredarchitects.com

Client  
Mr N Garioch

Job  
Extensions & Alterations to  
44a Mount Pleasant  
Norwich

Drawing Title  
Elevations & Site Plans  
Existing & Proposed

Scale  
1:100/200@A1

Date  
February 2014

Drawn By  
mja

Checked By

Drawing No.

Rev.

Job No.

14 13 02 A



A SQUARED ARCHITECTS

RIBA

Chartered Practice

1 NETHERCONESFORD  
93-95 KING STREET  
NORWICH, NR1 1PW  
T: (01603) 864379  
F: (01603) 651352

www.asquaredarchitects.com
mail@asquaredarchitects.com

Client

Mr N Garioch

Job

Extensions & Alterations to  
44a Mount Pleasant  
Norwich

Drawing Title

Street Elevations  
Existing & Proposed

Scale

1:100@A1

Date

February 2014

Drawn By

mja






Checked By

Drawing No.

14 13 03 A

Rev.

Job No.



- | Notes |  |     |          |
|-------|--|-----|----------|
| 1.    | No Dimensions are to be scaled from this drawing.  |     |          |
| 2.    | Contractors must verify all figured dimensions at site before commencing any work or making any Shop drawings.   |     |          |
| 3.    | This drawing is the sole copyright of A Squared Architects Ltd and no part may be reproduced without the written consent of the above.                 |     |          |
| 4.    | Site Location Plans are prepared from the Ordnance Survey Map with the sanction of the Controller of H.M. Stationery Office. Crown Copyright Reserved. |     |          |
| No.   | Revisions  | By  | Date     |
| A     | Revisions following discussion with planning officer   | mja | 27.06.14 |