

**Report to** Planning Applications Committee

**Item**

9 March 2023

**Report of** Head of Planning & Regulatory Services

**Subject** Application no 23/00075/F – 36 Norvic Drive, Norwich  
NR4 7NN

**4c**

**Reason for referral** Called in by Councillor Judith Lubbock

---

<b>Ward</b>	Eaton
<b>Case officer</b>	Amber Moll - <a href="mailto:AmberMoll@norwich.gov.uk">AmberMoll@norwich.gov.uk</a>
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr Robert and Mrs Mary Jones

<b>Development proposal</b>		
Single storey side and rear extension.		
<b>Representations</b>		
Object	Comment	Support
4 (three household, one councillor call in)	0	0

<b>Main issues</b>	<b>Key considerations</b>
1	Design
2	Amenity
<b>Expiry Date</b>	17 March 2023
<b>Recommendation</b>	Approve

## **The site and surroundings**

1. The site is located on the east side of Norvic Drive, a residential street to the south-west of the city. The subject property is a two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse of mid-late 20<sup>th</sup> century construction with red brick, concrete rooftiles and white doors and windows. The street consists mostly of semi-detached dwellings of a similar age and design to the subject property, some of which have been extended or altered.
2. The site includes a front garden with a driveway leading to a flat roof attached garage to the side and with a larger garden to the rear. The subject property has previously been extended by way of a flat roof rear extension and a flat roof extension to the rear of the garage.
3. The site is bordered on the north side by no.38 Norvic Drive, the adjoining semi-detached dwelling and by no.34 Norvic Drive to the south, a similar semi-detached dwelling. The site is bordered on the east by the rear gardens of nos. 31 and 33 Leng Crescent.

## **Constraints**

4. There is a line of trees along the eastern boundary of the rear garden at the site.

## **Relevant planning history**

5. The records held by the city council show no relevant history for the site.

## **The proposal**

6. The proposal is for the construction of a single storey side extension to comprise a bedroom, en-suite and shower room and a single storey rear extension to provide additional living and dining space and a study.
7. The proposal first involves the demolition of the existing flat roof garage and extension to this attached to the side of the dwelling together with the demolition of the existing extension to the rear of the dwelling.
8. The single storey extension is proposed to wrap around the side and rear of the existing dwelling. The extension projects 3.5m from the side of the dwelling and 2.5m from the rear, and has a mono-pitched roof which measures 2.3m to the eaves and 3.5m at the highest point. The extension is set back from the front elevation by 0.2m. The proposal includes two rooflights on the side extension and two casement windows positioned either side of sliding doors on the eastern elevation of the rear extension.
9. The external walls of the extensions are proposed to be facing brickwork and white upvc windows and doors to match the existing dwelling together with concrete rooftiles to match the existing roof.

## **Representations**

10. Adjacent and neighbouring properties have been notified in writing. Five letters of representation have been received citing the issues as summarised in the table below.

<b>Issues raised</b>	<b>Response</b>
The impact of the partial removal of the existing rear extension and re-building on the structural integrity of the party wall.	This is a civil matter and for building regulations and is not a planning consideration.
Loss of natural light to the living space of the adjoining property by the pitched roof on the rear extension.	See main issue 2: amenity.
The potential for damp and noise issues from the installation of an en-suite against the party wall.	The alterations to the internal layout do not require planning permission, but these may be matters for building control consideration.
Impact of the additional bathrooms on the shared drainage system, which has had some previous issues.	The alterations to the internal layout to provide additional bathrooms do not require planning permission.
Noise concerns around the relocation of the kitchen along the party wall.	The alterations to the internal layout do not require planning permission. The general day-to day noise of people using the space as a dwellinghouse is part of the normal semi-detached experience.
Concerns around use of the dwelling as an HMO.	The proposed use is C3 single dwellinghouse and a future change of use to C4 small HMO would not require planning consent.
Size of the extension having an adverse impact on the amenity of the neighbours.	See main issue 2: amenity.
Reduction in parking due to removal of the garage, with a possibility of more on-road parking and impact on the bus route.	See other matters.

### **Consultation responses**

11. 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.

### **Tree protection officer**

12. No objections from an arboricultural perspective.

### **Assessment of planning considerations**

#### **Relevant development plan policies**

13. **Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk adopted March 2011 amendments adopted Jan. 2014 (JCS)**
- JCS1 Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
  - JCS2 Promoting good design
14. **Norwich Development Management Policies Local Plan adopted Dec. 2014 (DM Plan)**
- DM1 Achieving and delivering sustainable development





(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 16<sup>th</sup> 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.

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

**Equalities and diversity issues**

32. There are no equality or diversity issues.

## **Local finance considerations**

33. 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 not considered to be material to the case.

## **Conclusion**

34. The proposal will result in an enlarged dwelling which is considered to be of an appropriate scale, which does not cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the subject property or surrounding area.
35. The proposed development will have a limited impact upon the residential amenities of neighbouring properties with significant harm not being caused by way of overshadowing, overlooking, loss of outlook or by being overbearing.
36. 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**

To approve application 23/00075/F - 36 Norvic Drive, Norwich, NR4 7NN and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans.