NORWICH
City Council

Committee name: Planning Applications Committee

Committee date: 13/11/2025

Report title: 25/00832/F- 437 Unthank Road

Report from: Head of planning and regulatory services

OPEN PUBLIC ITEM

Purpose:

To determine:

Application no: 25/00832/F

Site Address: 437 Unthank Road, Norwich, NR4 7QN

Decision due by: 21/11/2025

Proposal:

Single storey rear extension to garage, replacement conservatory with traditional style orangery, first-floor gable extension and new glazed garden room element to rear.

Key considerations: Design & Heritage, Amenity

Ward: Eaton

Case Officer: James Kettley

Applicant/agent: Agent - Mr Kristian Molloy

Applicant – I Lyon

Reason at Committee: Called in by Cllr Lubbock

Recommendation:

It is recommended to approve the application for the reasons given in the report and subject to the planning conditions set out at the end of this report, and grant planning permission.

The site and surroundings

1. 437 Unthank Road is a detached residential dwelling, located within the Eaton ward. The area is mostly residential, and the nearby properties are similar in design. The surrounding area is characterised by large dwellings on large plots, that are all set back with a large driveway.

2. The dwelling is set back from the highway with a large driveway accommodating parking for several vehicles. To the rear of the site is a large private garden with landscaping along the borders.

3. The existing materials compromise red brick at ground floor and white render at first floor.

Constraints

4. The property is located in the Unthank & Christchurch Conservation Area.

Relevant Planning History

5. The records held by the city council show the following planning history for the site.

Ref	Proposal	Decision	Date
4/1994/0728	Replacement of flat roof with pitched roof.	Approved	16/09/1994
21/01673/TCA	Leylandii (T1) - Reduce lower branches over hanging Unthank Road, in order to protect the tree and vehicles from damage or causing obstruction from approx. 4m to 2.5/3m (from tip of branch to central stem). Following the reduction of lower branches, any other protruding branches to be lightly reduced in order to retain natural tree shape and balance the tree's canopy.	No TPO Served	24/12/2021
22/01498/TCA	T1 Ash: Tidy/remove stubs where the tree had been previously poorly pruned and to lift the canopy to 4m above ground level in order to balance the tree and provide additional light to the garden & reduce/thin canopy by 30% from 4m spread to 2.8m in order to maintain the growth of the tree, provide light to the garden and reduce over extended limbs leading to potential failure.	No TPO Served	09/12/2022

The Proposal

6. The first element of the proposal is the removal of the existing rear conservatory, located near the centre of the dwelling, and replacing it with a new two storey extension. This extension will extend up to the height of the existing roof, incorporating the same styled pitched roof and measuring the same height of 8.2m. The two-storey extension will measure 5.8m in length and 2.9m in width, taking up the space of the existing conservatory and extending into the space above. This extension will have 3 windows, 2 facing the neighbours at 439 Unthank Road.

7. The second element of the proposal is a single storey rear extension that is attached to the proposed two-storey extension. The first part of the extension is a new orangery style room which will measure 5.6m in length from the existing dwelling and will have a height of 2.6m. This orangery room will incorporate a flat roof with two skylights. The second part of the extension is adjacent to the orangery room and will occupy the space in front of the garage, this part of the extension does not go as far out as the other part of the extension and measures 2.5m from the existing dwelling. This part of the extension will incorporate a pitched roof which measures 4.5m to the ridge of the roof. This part of the extension leaves a clear passageway between the extension and the boundary, with the pitched roof overhanging and covering this space. The height of the eaves of this roof will be 1.9m.

8. The total width of the rear extension measures 9.8m, with a further 1.7m of open space that the roof hangs over. There will be the development of 3 different roofs, a pitched roof that adjoins the existing roof for the two-storey extension, the flat roof for the orangery, and a pitched roof for the extension in front of the garage that joins the existing roof.

9. A separate proposed garden room will be developed in front of the existing dining room. This will be 1.8m in length, 4.6m in width, and will be 2.2m in height. It will use glazed windows facing the garden and a flat roof.

10. The materials used for the walls of the extension will match the existing materials used for the main dwelling and to match the existing garage. The proposal will match the existing windows and doors, using a mix of timber and upvc frames in white. The proposed roofs will use existing red tiles.

Representations

11. Adjacent and neighbouring properties have been notified in writing. 1 letter of representation has been received citing the issues as summarised in the table below.

Issues raised	**Response**
Overshadowing to courtyard area east of neighbour's house	See Main Issue 2: Amenity
Oppressive extension imposing on the boundary	See Main issue 1: Design & Heritage
Pitched roof masking first floor windows	See Main Issue 2: Amenity
Safety concerns of ice forming as a result of extension blocking sunlight	See Main Issue 2: Amenity
Removal of garden hedge	The hedge by the neighbouring boundary is not intended to be removed to facilitate the proposal. This has been confirmed with the agent.
Suggestion of new plans to replace the proposal	The objection letter suggested new designs to replace the proposal. We can only review the current proposal designed by the applicant and therefore cannot assess any potential proposals given to us by non-applicants.

Consultation responses

12. Consultation responses are summarised below. The full responses are available to view at http://planning.norwich.gov.uk/online-applications/ by entering the application number.

Design and Conservation (Norwich City Council)

13. In respect of the above, the Conservation & Design Team will not be offering detailed comments on this application. This should not be taken as an indication that the proposals are acceptable or otherwise. The application should be determined in accordance with the policies of the NPPF, the Development Plan, and any extant consents where relevant.

Assessment of Planning Considerations

Relevant Development Plan Policies

14. **Greater Norwich Local Plan for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk adopted March 2024 (GNLP)**

    - GNLP2 Sustainable Communities
    - GNLP3 Environmental Protection and Enhancement
    - GNLP5 Homes
    - GNLP7.1 Growth in the Norwich Urban Area and fringes

15. **Norwich Development Management Policies Local Plan adopted Dec. 2014 (DM Plan)**

    - DM1 Achieving and delivering sustainable development
    - DM2 Ensuring satisfactory living and working conditions
    - DM3 Delivering high quality design
    - DM9 Safeguarding Norwich's heritage

Other material considerations

16. **Relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (NPPF):**

    - NPPF2 Achieving sustainable development
    - NPPF4 Decision-making
    - NPPF12 Achieving well-designed places
    - NPPF15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
    - NPPF16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Case Assessment

17. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Relevant development plan polices are detailed above. Material considerations include policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the council's standing duties, other policy documents and guidance detailed above, and any other matters referred to specifically in the assessment below. The following paragraphs provide an assessment of the main planning issues in this case against relevant policies and material considerations.

Main Issue 1. Design & Heritage

18. Key policies and NPPF Sections– GNLP2, GNLP3, DM3, DM9, NPPF Sections 12 & 16.

19. Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 place a statutory duty on the local authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess and to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. Case law (specifically *Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v East Northamptonshire DC* [2014]) has held that this means that considerable importance and weight must be given to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings and conservation areas when carrying out the balancing exercise.

20. The total development will be happening at the rear of the property and there will be minimal visible change at the front of the property. The property has a large plot that can take the size of the extensions whilst maintaining a large garden space for the property. The scale of the design fits the site of the property appropriately. The layout of the design is an efficient use of the land by keeping close to the property and extending into the open space which will make for a well laid out property.

21. The materials proposed for the extension will match the existing materials used which will help the proposal maintain the character and design of the area. The proposal will use a mix of red brick and white render, and the doors and windows will match period existing style. The roof will use matching red tiles. The proposal is acceptable in continuing the style of the properties on this street and not detracting from the overall character of the area.

22. The extension is using appropriate roof forms. The second-storey extension will match the existing roofing and the new roof to the extension in front of the garage will be a continuation of the existing pitched roof. The new orangery style room will implement a flat roof with skylights. These roofs are acceptable in design and fit the scale of the property appropriately.

23. The neighbour consider that the proposals will appear oppressive. Whilst it is not disputed that the proposal would be noticeable, Officers consider that the due to the height of the roof at the boundary measuring c.1.9m, this is not of height that would be considered oppressive. The ridge of the roof would raise to c. 4.4m, however as this slopes away from the boundary, this is unlikely to result in significantly detrimental conditions.

24. The proposed extension does not go right up to the boundary. It will sit at approx 1.7m away from the boundary. There is then open space between the walls of the extension and the boundary due to the continuation of the garage's pitched roof overhang that leaves a void underneath. This will assist in maintaining the distance between the new wall and the neighbouring boundary. The roof will continue and will slope away from the neighbour to help alleviate overbearing/overshadowing concerns. The height of the roof at the point it meets the boundary is approx 1.9m. This is considered acceptable.

25. With the extensions being located towards the rear of the site, there will be no significant impact on the wider conservation area, and the proposals are considered to be acceptable in heritage terms. It should be noted that the Conservation & Design Team reviewed the proposals and had no comments to make.

Main Issue 2. Amenity

26. Key policies and NPPF Section – DM2, NPPF Section 12.

27. The proposed extension does not go right up to the boundary. It will sit at approx 1.7m away from the boundary. There is then open space between the walls of the extension and the boundary due to the continuation of the garage's pitched roof overhang that leaves a void underneath. This will assist in maintaining the distance between the new wall and the neighbouring boundary. The roof will continue and will slope away from the neighbour to help alleviate overbearing/overshadowing concerns. The height of the roof at the point it meets the boundary is approx 1.9m. This is considered acceptable.

28. The pitched roof on the garage will be extended forward 2.4m and reduce the gap that this area gets sunlight from. This may result in the area feeling slightly more closed off. However, the time when this area receives direct sunlight is very early morning in the summer and therefore its impact is minimal.

29. One aspect that may see change are the windows on the ground floor of 439. This is a valid concern, however with extension set a little away from the boundary they will not be completely blocked. Given the modest height of the extended garage roof, together with the, the sloped roof form, this is considered sufficient to mitigate overshadowing problems.

30. The new two storey extension is close to the centre of the property at 437 unthank road and therefore should not cause overshadowing problems. Furthermore, it is not anticipated that there will be any significant change in overshadowing, the path of the sun moves round the front of the property and the main cause for overshadowing will be the existing dwelling, which mostly shadows its own rear amenity space.

31. The neighbour has expressed concern that the extended garage roof may have been designed to mask two proposed first-floor bathroom windows, which they believe could otherwise overlook their ground floor rooms. Officers have previously addressed the impact of the introduction of the extended garage roof and consider this to be an acceptable relationship. Notwithstanding, the proposed first-floor windows serve bathrooms and are therefore expected to be obscurely glazed, mitigating any potential for overlooking. This is recommended to be secured via condition. Furthermore, even in the absence of the extended garage roof, the windows are set sufficiently far from the

boundary to avoid direct views into neighbouring ground floor rooms. The roof design is considered to be a functional architectural feature rather than a device to conceal fenestration.

32. The concern regarding reduced light is noted and has been addressed above. However, the neighbour comments also note the, the potential for increased ice formation and associated safety risks. This matter is speculative and not a material planning consideration.

33. Due to the location of the proposal, the neighbours at 435 Unthank Road will not have their amenity impacted by the extension due to the space in between the two properties.

34. Given the size and scale of both the extension and the existing dwellings, that are situated on large plots, it is considered that the overall amenity of the neighbouring dwelling at no. 439 would not be significantly impacted by the proposals and would retain a high standard of amenity.

Other Matters

Assessment of Impacts under the Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2017 (as amended)

Site Affected:	(a)	Broads SAC/Broadland Ramsar
	(b)	River Wensum SAC
Potential effect:	(a)	Increased nitrogen and phosphorus loading
	(b)	Increased phosphorous loading

The application represents a 'proposal or project' under the above regulations. Before deciding whether approval can be granted, the Council as a competent authority must undertake an appropriate assessment to determine whether or not the proposal is likely, either on its own or in combination with other projects, to have any likely significant effects upon the Broads SAC, and if so, whether or not those effects can be mitigated against.

The Council's assessment is set out below and is based on advice contained in the letter from Natural England to LPA Chief Executives and Heads of Planning dated 16th March 2022.

(a) Broads SAC/Broadland Ramsar

i. Does the plan or project create a source of water pollution or have an impact on water quality (e.g. alters dilution)? AND

ii. Is the plan or project within the hydrological catchment of a habitats site which includes interest features that are sensitive to the water quality impacts from the plan or project?

Answer: NO

The proposal is for works to an existing dwelling and will not impact upon the average occupancy figures for dwellings across the catchment and will therefore not impact upon water quality in the SAC.

Conclusion: It is not necessary to carry out an assessment under the Habitats

regs.

(b) River Wensum SAC

i. Does the plan or project create a source of water pollution or have an impact on water quality (e.g. alters dilution)? AND
ii. Is the plan or project within the hydrological catchment of a habitats site which includes interest features that are sensitive to the water quality impacts from the plan or project?

Answer: NO

The proposal is for works to an existing dwelling and will not impact upon the average occupancy figures for dwellings across the catchment and will therefore not impact upon water quality in the SAC. In addition, the discharge for WwTW is downstream of the SAC.

Conclusion: It is not necessary to carry out an assessment under the Habitats regs.

Equalities and diversity issues

35. There are no equality or diversity issues.

Local finance considerations

36. Under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the council is required when determining planning applications to have regard to any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application. Local finance considerations are defined as a government grant or the Community Infrastructure Levy. Whether or not a local finance consideration is material to a particular decision will depend on whether it could help to make the development acceptable in planning terms. It would not be appropriate to make a decision on the potential for the development to raise money for a local authority. In this case local finance considerations are/are not considered to be material to the case.

Human Rights Act 1998

37. Officers have considered the implications of the Human Rights Act 1998 in reaching a recommendation to approve this application. They consider that the interference with the human rights of the applicant under Article 8/Article 1 of Protocol 1 is justifiable and proportionate for the protection of the rights and freedom of others or the control of his/her property in this way is in accordance with the general interest.

Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

38. Officers have considered, with due regard, the likely effect of the proposal on the need to reduce crime and disorder as part of the determination of this application, in accordance with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. In reaching a recommendation to grant planning permission, officers consider that the proposal will not undermine crime prevention or the promotion of community.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

39. The development is in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Development Plan, and it has been concluded that there are no material considerations that indicate it should be determined otherwise.

Recommendation

40. To approve application 25/00832/F 437 Unthank Road and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

    1. Standard time limit;
    2. In accordance with plans;
    3. Obscured Glazing

41. And the following informative:

    1. Biodiversity net gain not required

Contact officer: Planning Officer

Name: James Kettley

Telephone number: 01603 987760

Email address: Jameskettley@norwich.gov.uk

IN TRAN communication for all	If you would like this agenda in an alternative format, such as a larger or smaller font, audio or Braille, or in a different language, please contact the committee officer above.