NORWICH
City Council

Committee name: Planning Applications Committee

Committee date: 13/11/2025

Report title: 25/00761/F 1 Denmead Close, Norwich NR4 6NB

Report from: Head of planning and regulatory services

OPEN PUBLIC ITEM

Purpose:

To determine:

Application no:	25/00761/F
Site Address:	1 Denmead Close, Norwich, NR4 6NB
Decision due by:	21/11/2025
Proposal:	Single storey rear and side extension and additional works to front garden to raise ground level.
Key considerations:	Design; Amenity; Transport
Ward:	Eaton
Case Officer:	Lara Emerson
Applicant/agent:	Mr Tom and Mrs Georgina Skinner
Reason at Committee:	Called in by Cllr Judith Lubbock

Recommendation:

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

The site and surroundings

1. The site is located on the west side of Denmead Close, adjacent the junction with Abinger Way and contains a two-storey, detached dwellinghouse.

2. Denmead Close is a residential cul-de-sac, primarily consisting of two-storey detached dwellinghouses originally constructed with a similar design as part of a wider, purpose-built housing development. Many properties within the surrounding area have been enlarged or altered in some form.

3. The subject site differs somewhat to others on Denmead Close, as the principal elevation is south facing, with the main entrance facing Abinger Way. There is a flat roofed, single width detached garage situated against the western boundary, with vehicular access and driveway from Abinger Way.

4. The main building is situated in the eastern half of the site, with the main area of useable garden space on the west side of the site. The building line is set back from Abinger Way with close board timber fencing separating the private garden space from the front garden area against the southern boundary.

5. Ground level within the site and surrounding area inclines gently towards the north so ground levels at the subject property are lower than those within neighbouring properties within Denmead Close.

Constraints

6. There are no relevant site constraints, aside from the removal of permitted development rights as set out below.

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
41911	Development of land by the construction of roads and foot-paths and the erection of 86 houses and garages at Eaton Vale, Marston Lane.	Approved	8th March 1973

7. From the council's records, it appears that the original planning permission for the subject property, and for the surrounding estate, is 41911, set out above. The permission included Condition 5 which restricts certain permitted development rights:

   Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3(1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development) Order 1963, no garage, car port, fence, wall or other means of enclosure or any other structure shall be erected on the site which is the subject of this permission except in pursuance of an express planning permission granted in that behalf by the Council as local planning authority or an appeal by the Secretary of State for the Environment.

8. There is some ambiguity in the wording of this condition as to whether it would remove permitted development rights relating to extensions to houses, but for the avoidance of doubt, and due to the term "structures" within the condition, officers have interpreted that it does have the effect of removing permitted development rights relating to extensions to houses.

The Proposal

9. The proposed development includes the demolition of an existing conservatory and the erection of a single storey rear and side extension that would extend 3.6m from the rear wall of the existing building and 2.45m from the west side. It's length would be a total of 13.45m. There would be 1m distance between the proposed rear wall and the boundary fence. The mono-pitched roof would be 2.45m at the eaves and 3.53m against the main building. The roof as it extends to the side would be 3.68m at the highest point.

10. There would be 5no. velux windows inserted into the single storey roof. 1no. casement window would be installed in the east side wall, bifold doors would be installed in the west side and a set of double doors would be installed in the north elevation of the extension.

11. It is also proposed to increase the ground height of an area within the front garden by up to 1m to create a level area to be used as garden space. A 1m high retaining wall would be installed adjacent the highway to facilitate the proposed groundworks. This would usually be permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order (GPDO), but condition 5 of planning permission 41911 removes this permitted development right.

Context

12. The application was originally submitted to propose a two-storey rear extension and single storey rear and side extension. A consultation went out to neighbours with that proposal description and objections received. The proposal was subsequently revised by the applicant to remove the two-storey element of the proposal and include raising of the ground level to the front during the assessment period. Further consultations have been carried out with a revised description and plans.

13. The application was originally due to be considered at the Planning Applications Committee meeting on 25th September 2025. However, between publication of the report and the meeting itself, 2 further matters were raised by an objector which have required further investigation:

    1) Removal of permitted development rights for the subject property. This matter is addressed in paragraphs 7 and 8, above, and the report has been adjusted to reflect the fact that certain permitted development rights have been removed.

    2) Inaccurate plans showing the erection of a fence atop the retaining wall on Arbinger Way. A new plan has since been submitted which corrects the error on the previous plan. To clarify, the application includes the building up of land and the erection of an associated retaining wall, but was never intended to include the provision of any solid boundary treatment. The report has been adjusted accordingly.

Representations

14. Adjacent and neighbouring properties were notified in writing upon initial receipt of the application. Four letters of objection were received from one

household and one letter from a ward councillor citing the issues as summarised in the table below.

Initial consultation period (two storey rear and single storey side and rear extensions)	
Issues raised	**Response**
The proposal description as submitted is misleading.	The proposal was submitted and neighbours notified with the description 'Demolition of existing conservatory and construction of two-storey rear extension.' This was amended to 'Demolition of existing conservatory and construction of two-storey rear and single storey rear and side extensions' and neighbours renotified within 7 days of the original letters being sent.
The proposal would result in an approx. 75% increase in footprint and is an overdevelopment of the site.	See Main Issue 1 – Design
Development is not in-keeping with the character of the area.	The development has been reduced in scale during the course of the application.
Severe loss of daylight to south facing window at no. 2.	The development has been reduced in scale during the course of the application.
Significant loss of outlook from south facing window at no. 2.	The development has been reduced in scale during the course of the application.
The proposal is significantly over-bearing.	The development has been reduced in scale during the course of the application.
Site access and parking during construction would negatively impact road safety and bus route.	See Main Issue 3 – Transport
Noise and dust from construction would negatively impact neighbours ability to work from home and would harm the physical and mental health of neighbouring residents and pets.	See Main Issue 2 – Amenity

15. Upon receipt of the revised proposals (reducing the extension from two storey to single storey), neighbours were reconsulted with a revised proposal description and drawings. Three letters of representation were received on behalf of one household citing the issues as summarised in the table below.

Additional consultation period (single storey rear and side extensions)	
Issues raised	**Response**
Severe loss of outlook and daylight to the side window of no. 2 due to the roof form, height, width and proximity of the revised extension.	See Main Issue 2 – Amenity
Increased footprint of 75% is unjustifiable on a corner plot and would set a dangerous precedent.	See Main Issue 1 – Design

Additional consultation period (single storey rear and side extensions)	
Issues raised	**Response**
The property has historically been used by families and there is no need for it to be made larger to function as a family home.	It is not reasonable or appropriate to judge within the planning process whether a family needs more space in their home. The principle of householder development within a residential setting is acceptable and assessment of the proposed scheme must be based on material planning considerations.
Retaining wall along Abinger Way needs Highways Department input and would reduce useable width of footway by 500mm.	Highways have been consulted on the revised proposal and their response is summarised below. There is no indication from the submitted drawings that the retaining wall would extend into or overhang the highway.
Moving the fence to the new boundary line will impact safety and visibility of neighbours using their driveway.	No fence is proposed. See Main Issue 3 – Transport.
There are inaccuracies and lacking information in the submitted plans that mean the impact on no. 2 cannot be properly assessed as follows: Site and location plans do not accurately demonstrate that the western elevation of no. 1 is set further west than no. 2 and is not parallel as shown on OS mapping data. The extension footprint and distance to the boundary differ from site plan to floorplans. Ground levels have not been demonstrated in submitted plans. The dimension for the thickness of the roof has been omitted and does not appear to be thick enough to account for construction materials. Drawings do not show the foundations.	A revised site and location plan which rectifies the issue with the OS map base has been submitted by the applicant. A site visit was undertaken by the planning officer and the location of no. 1 and no. 2 in relation to each other noted. Measurements against the boundary were taken from both sides to establish where there is a difference in ground level between the two sites. This enables proper assessment of the proposal. Due to the scale of the application and the context of the area it was not deemed necessary to have a full topographical survey submitted. The distance from the proposed rear wall to the boundary fence is clearly shown as 1m on the proposed floor plans. Due to the scale of site plans and the thickness of the red line specific measurements like distances to boundaries are not always easy to obtain. However, this does not affect the ability to assess the impacts or the dimensions of the proposed development. The submitted drawings are scaled and measurements for any element of the proposal, including the external roof thickness can be taken from the

Additional consultation period (single storey rear and side extensions)	
Issues raised	**Response**
	drawing. Sections to show the internal/construction measurements and inclusion of the foundations are not required for an application of this type.
Concerns the development will be built across the existing sewerage network.	An inspection chamber within the neighbour's garden was noted during a site visit. Control of below ground works in relation to pipework/sewerage networks would be a Building Control issue and is not a material planning consideration. As such the matter does not form part of the assessment of the planning impacts of the proposed development.
Concerns new boundary fencing will be installed and negatively impact the character of the area.	No new fencing or boundary treatments on top of the raised ground level or retaining wall are proposed within the scope of this application. In future, should any new fencing be installed adjacent the highway, an application for planning permission may be required and the impact on the street scene and character of the area would be considered.
The neighbouring party are not agreeable to any party wall agreements and will not allow access to facilitate scaffolding on their land.	Party wall agreements and access rights are civil legal matters separate to planning legislation. They are not material planning considerations and as such are not part of the assessment of the proposed development.
The proximity and roof form of the proposal form an oppressive and overbearing development to no. 2.	See Main Issue 2 – Amenity
No BRE daylight/sunlight or overshadowing assessment submitted.	This is not considered necessary for a development that is so minor in scale and impact.
Ground floor area is 48m2, which is a 75% increase in footprint and is an overdevelopment of the site and out of character for the area.	See Main Issue 1 – Design
Extension will infill amenity space to the rear of the property, leaving only amenity space to the side.	See Main Issue 2 – Amenity
Noise and disturbance from construction will impact neighbours' ability to work from home in a quiet environment, putting jobs at risk and will be detrimental to the physical and mental health of the occupants of no. 2 and their elderly pet.	See Main Issue 2 – Amenity

16. Since the publication of the previous committee report, approximately 19 further letters of representation have been received from the same household, largely reiterating the same concerns previously raised, but adding the following points.

Further comments	
Issues raised	**Response**
The extension will limit access for maintenance of the southern wall and roof of 2 Denmead Close, in conflict with the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015.	Maintenance access is not a material planning consideration and does not form part of the assessment of this planning application. Nevertheless, No 2 Denmead Close has a 1.08m gap between its southern wall and its southern boundary. This would be retained. Furthermore, the proposed extension would be placed a further 1m beyond the boundary. As such, 2.08m would be retained between the properties. Access to the neighbouring property may be required to facilitate maintenance access to the southern wall or roof slope of no.2 Denmead Close, just as it is now. Should any such access be required, this would be a private matter to be agreed between landowners.
The extension will limit access for maintenance of the northern wall and roof of the subject property.	As above, this is a matter for the landowners to manage.
Access to no.2 Denmead Close will not be granted during construction.	Noted. Access rights are not a material planning consideration, and this does not form part of the assessment of this planning application.
The loss of the fence along Abinger Way creates an unprotected drop.	See Main Issue 2 – Amenity
The extension would cause a fire risk due to the amount of wood in the wall of no. 2 Denmead Close.	This is a matter for Building Control.
Queries about whether permitted development rights have been removed for the subject property.	See paragraphs 7 & 8, above.
Lack of structural calculations and drawings.	Such information is not required in order to make a planning assessment.
Lack of ground investigation and piling strategy.	Such information is not required in order to make a planning assessment.
No party wall notice has been served.	Party wall agreements are civil matters to be agreed between landowners and do not constitute a material planning consideration.

Further comments	
Issues raised	**Response**
Request for extension to be reduced 1m in width.	The proposals as submitted will be assessed on their merits.

Consultation responses

17. 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.

Statutory and non-statutory consultees

Highways (local highways authority) (Norfolk County Council)

18. The proposed raised garden and retaining wall will abut a streetlight, this is unlikely to cause a problem for that apparatus as all the power supply is within the footway. For the avoidance of doubt, it would be useful if an informative can be applied to ensure that any works do not affect the footway.

19. *Further comments were sought following the submission of the updated plan showing a retaining wall with no fence atop it fronting Abinger Way.*

20. In a 20mph street, on an unclassified road with low traffic levels, we can relax the visibility assessment to a 2m X distance (rather than 2.4m). and the Y distance to 25m. *[NB: the highway officer's reference to X distance is the distance from an emerging driver to the edge of the road in front of them, and the Y distance is the distance that they can see left and right]*. The footway provides the necessary visibility when a car emerges from the parking space onto Abinger Road. So the proposed works do not cause a concern. Nor is visibility at the junction with Denmead Close adversely affected. A fence on top of the retaining wall would not be a concern. They just need to be careful that the retaining wall meets building control standards, and any digging doesn't damage the footway and utilities beneath

Tree Protection Officer (Norwich City Council)

21. No objections from an arboricultural perspective.

Assessment of Planning Considerations

Relevant Development Plan Policies

22. **Greater Norwich Local Planfor Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk adopted March 2024 (GNLP)**

    - GNLP2 Sustainable Communities

23. **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
    - DM7 Trees and development

- DM30 Access and highway safety

24. **Relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (NPPF):**

    - NPPF2 Achieving sustainable development
    - NPPF4 Decision-making
    - NPPF12 Achieving well-designed places

Case Assessment

25. 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

26. Key policies and NPPF Sections– GNLP2, DM3, NPPF Section 12.

27. The size of the subject site is large enough to accommodate an extension of the proposed scale without becoming overcrowded and as the existing layout forms the main garden area to the side of the main building, development to the rear of the dwellinghouse makes efficient use of the land and is in keeping with the existing character of the site. The proposed development would not be considered overdevelopment considering the size of the plot and the distance of the extension from boundaries. The pitched roof form of the extension is reflective of the host building and materials are proposed to match the existing. The width of the extension beyond the western side wall is subservient to the existing building and as it is set back adjacent the rear elevation, will not have any significant impact on the character and appearance of the existing building, or the appearance of the site within the street scene.

28. Concerns have been raised regarding the impact of the proposal on the character of the street scene. In it's original form, the scale and massing of the two-storey extension in line with the eastern side of the property may have been detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene where there are wide, clear gaps between the dwellings. Removal of the second storey element as proposed in the revised scheme preserves the distance between the dwellings at first floor level and maintains the visual separation that is characteristic of the surrounding area. The proposed extension does not extend beyond the length of the existing conservatory and its appearance by virtue of its height and form would not alter the character and appearance of the site on approach from Denmead Close or Abinger Way in such a way that is significantly harmful.

29. It is proposed to raise the ground level of the front garden by up to 1m behind a retaining wall 1m in height and to level out the ground area against the existing garden space. Use of hedging or low level fencing as boundary treatments directly adjacent the highway is common within Abinger Way and the increased

ground level would not significantly disrupt the appearance of the street scene as it would be contained behind the low-level wall. Hedging can be planted atop the wall without the need for planning permission to enable the area to be used as private garden space. To provide the property with a private amenity space, and to prevent a drop between the garden and the pavement, a condition is recommended to agree hedging along the top of the retaining wall. This would be in keeping with the character of the area. Installation of fencing atop the raised ground area is not proposed within this application but would require planning permission if proposed in future.

30. Overall, the proposals are considered to be minor in scale and impact, and appropriate for the area. The proposals are considered to accord with the relevant design policy, DM3.

Main Issue 2. Amenity

31. Key policies and NPPF Section – DM2, DM11, NPPF Section 12.

32. There are no amenity impacts which result from the proposed retaining wall and levelled garden area.

33. In relation to the proposed single storey extension, the main matters for consideration are impact on neighbour amenity resulting from overshadowing, overlooking and loss of outlook. The subject property shares boundaries with 9 Abinger Way, to the west, and 2 Denmead Close, to the north. The proposals are a significant distance from the boundary with 9 Abinger Way, so no amenity impacts are likely to result, but the proposals are closer to 2 Denmead Close.

34. 2 Denmead Close has a ground floor side facing window which has the potential to be affected by development in the proposed location. It is a long window with a high sill and it currently looks out towards the boundary fence and provides views into the neighbouring garden and rear facing windows of no. 1 Denmead Close. This window is the only window which serves a dining room, although the room also benefits from borrowed light via a glazed door from the adjacent lounge which is at the front of the house. The kitchen, located at the rear of the property, has a rear facing window. The garden serving 2 Denmead Close has a patio located outside the kitchen. There is a close-boarded fence running along the boundary between the two properties. It measures approximately 1.8m high at the point where the extension would be located.

35. The proposed extension runs a total length of 13.45m. The lean-to roof pitches down towards the boundary, so that the eaves, which would be closest to the boundary, would stand at a height of 2.2m. There would be a 1m gap between the extension and the boundary, and a further 1.08m gap between the boundary and the neighbour's property. There is a slight rise in ground level between the subject property and 2 Denmead Close. which further mitigates any harm. Overall, given the 2.08m distance the extension would be from the affected dining room window, and the modest 2.2m height of the eaves, it is not anticipated that there would be any significant impact in terms of loss of light or loss of outlook. It should be noted that a 1.8m high fence sits currently along the boundary so a modest 0.4m of wall would be visible above this.

36. Overshadowing and loss of outlook to nearest ground floor rear window of no. 2 would be minimal and unlikely to have a notable impact.

37. The proposed extension does not have any windows which face towards the neighbouring property at 2 Denmead Close, so there would be no anticipated loss of privacy. The existing property does have ground floor windows and a fully glazed conservatory facing towards the neighbour, so privacy for both neighbours would be improved.

38. The extension provides a modest expansion of the subject property's internal floorspace, whilst retaining sufficient external amenity space for the subject property, as most of its garden is located to the west side of the house.

39. Adverse impacts from construction noise and disturbance are temporary. It is understood that personal circumstances may make it more difficult for some individuals nearby the development site to accommodate for disturbances from construction noise, however, the temporary nature of such an impact from a development of the proposed scale is not a reason for refusal. The Council has guidelines that site contractors are expected to follow to minimise disruption from construction and occurrences outside of those guidelines could be reported as an environmental issue via the appropriate channels should they arise. An informative is recommended to this effect.

40. The submitted site plan now indicates that there is not proposed to be a fence atop the retaining wall fronting Abinger Way surrounding the re-levelled garden space. This aids somewhat in retaining some visibility for drivers emerging from the driveway, but this visibility is not considered necessary for highway safety. The lack of a fence would leave the garden open to views from the street and would create a drop of up to 1m between the garden and the pavement. As such, in order to protect the privacy and safety of the residents of 1 Denmead Close, a condition is recommended to agree details of hedge along this boundary.

Main Issue 3. Transport

41. The levelled garden space and retaining wall are located adjacent to the subject property's driveway and garage. As such, visibility and highway safety are a consideration. The driveway already has limited visibility to the west due to a high hedge, and the raising of the garden level has the potential to limit visibility to the east. However, on consultation with the Highway Authority, no safety concerns were raised. The street has a 20mph speed limit and does not experience significant traffic flows. Furthermore, the pavement provides sufficient visibility for cars emerging from the driveway. The highway officer has confirmed that in these circumstances, the distance between the emerging driver and the road (the X distance) can be relaxed to 2m, and the visibility distance left and right (the Y distance) can be relaxed to 25m.

42. An informative is recommended to remind the applicant of the requirement to protect the adjacent street light during construction.

43. The site is not in a controlled parking zone and any increase in the number of vehicles visiting the site during the construction period would be temporary. The scale of the proposed development would not lead to such significant construction traffic, noise or disruption so as to warrant the submission of a construction management plan.

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.

44. In England, biodiversity net gain is required under a statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Environment Act 2021). The proposed development is subject of a householder application and therefore, in accordance with The Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024, is exempt from the statutory requirement to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat.

Equalities and diversity issues

45. There are some equality or diversity issues. Issues raised in representations received refer to the potential detriment to the mental and physical wellbeing of nearby occupiers with protected characteristics. For the reasons set out above, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of nearby occupiers.

46. In considering this planning application due regard has been had to the public sector equality duty (PSED) under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which means that the Council must have due regard to the need (in discharging its functions) to put an end to unlawful behaviour that is banned by the Equality Act, including discrimination, harassment and victimisation and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who have a protected characteristic and those who do not.

Local finance considerations

47. 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.

Human Rights Act 1998

48. 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.

49. 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

50. Whilst permitted development rights were referred to as a fall back position in the previous report, that was not the sole reason for the officer recommendation of approval. Having now ascertained that permitted development rights have been removed for the subject property, officers remain of the opinion that the development is acceptable on its own merits and maintain their recommendation of approval.

51. 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

52. To approve application 25/00761/F at 1 Denmead Close, Norwich, NR4 6NB and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

    1. Standard time limit;
    2. In accordance with plans;
    3. Details of hedging to be agreed

    And the following informatives:
    1. Protection of footway & streetlight
    2. Considerate construction
    3. BNG not required

Appendices: None

Contact officer: Development Management Team Leader

Name: Lara Emerson

Telephone number: 01603 989351

Email address: laraemerson@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.