NORWICH City Council

Committee name: Planning applications

Committee date: 13/11/2025

Report title: 24/00398/F 2 Orwell Road Norwich NR2 2ND

Report from: Head of planning and regulatory services

OPEN PUBLIC ITEM

Purpose:

To determine:

Application no:	24/00398/F
Site Address:	2 Orwell Road Norwich NR2 2ND
Decision due by:	18/11/2025
Proposal:	Demolition of building in grounds of 2 Orwell Road and construction of single storey dwelling.
Key considerations:	Principle of development; Design and Heritage; Amenity; Highway; Trees; Biodiversity
Ward:	Town Close
Case Officer:	Vishnu Sainath
Agent:	Mr David Marris
Reason at Committee:	Objections

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. The application site is located approximately 2 km south of the city centre, within the garden of No. 2 Orwell Road, a large semi-detached property that is a Grade II listed building in the Newmarket Road Conservation Area

2. To the north, 12 and 13 Town Close Road are semi-detached dwellings that are also Grade II listed. The dwelling to the east, on the opposite side of the driveway, is locally listed.

3. No. 2 Orwell Road benefits from two access points: the primary access from Orwell Road to the west of the site, and a gravel-surfaced private driveway to the east. Access to the proposed new dwelling will be via the private driveway.

Constraints

4. Orwell road is a Grade II listed building - *The list description of the subject property is as follows: Nos. 1 and 2 (The Laurels) - II Pair of houses. Mid C19 with later alterations. Yellow brick; hipped slate roof; 3 brick ridge chimneys. 2 storeys; 7 first-floor windows. Rusticated brick quoins. No. 1 has central panelled door with plain overlight in rendered architrave with plain hood on consoles. No. 2 has later C19 rendered and glazed porch with dentilled cornice. Square-fronted ground-floor bay window to right has large-paned sashes with horns. Canted ground-floor bays with full-height sashes to left of each unit. Other windows have sashes with glazing bars under flat gauged brick arches. Wings set back, to left and right have one ground and first-floor window, hipped* slate roof and brick chimney.

5. There are other grade II listed and locally listed property in the area and the site falls within the Newmarket Road Conservation Area.

6. Trees within the site and along Orwell Road are protected by tree preservation orders.

7. The site falls within a critical drainage area.

Relevant Planning History

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

Ref	Proposal	Decision	Date
4/2003/0005	Alterations & extension to form dining area off kitchen at rear of dwelling.	Approved	18/02/2003
4/2003/0004	Extension to kitchen at rear of dwelling.	Approved	18/02/2003
4/1992/0597	2-storey extension to existing dwelling and construction of new garage and store.	Approved	14/10/1992
4/1992/0921	Conversion of stables to form residential annexe.	Approved	08/02/1993
4/1992/0922	Conversion of stables to form residential annexe.	Approved	08/02/1993
4/1992/0591	2-storey extension to existing dwelling and construction of new garage and	Approved	14/10/1992

	store.		
4/1993/0151	Condition 2: Details of roof and external facing materials for previous permission 4920591/F and 4920597/L "2-storey extension to existing dwelling and construction of new garage and store".	Approved	15/03/1993
4/1993/0173	Approval of details of materials required by Condition 2 of Planning Permission 4920591/F.	Approved	15/03/1993
4/1996/0551	Erection of garden building to provide garage, pavilion and greenhouse.	Approved	17/09/1996
4/1996/0552	Alterations to existing stable building and erection of garden building to provide garage, pavilion and greenhouse.	Approved Approved	17/09/1996
4/1996/0937	Condition 2: details of roofing and facing materials; Condition 3: details of external joinery; for previous permission 4960551/F "Erection of garden building".	Approved	23/01/1997
04/00321/D	Details for condition 2a) brick & bond; 2b) external joinery for previous permissions 4/2003/0004/F & 4/2003/0005/LB for extension to kitchen.	Approved	30/04/2004
14/00876/F	Erection of conservatory to south elevation of dwelling.	Approved	25/07/2014
14/00877/L	Erection of conservatory to south elevation of dwelling.	Approved	25/07/2014
15/00781/TPO	Lime: Reduce height from 17m to 5m due to large branch failure.	Approved	12/06/2015
20/00561/TCA	Leylandii (T1, T2 & T3): Reduce height to 7m.	No TPO served	11/06/2020

The Proposal

9. The application seeks planning permission for the demolition of a single-storey outbuilding and the construction of a single-storey, three-bedroom dwelling.

10. The proposal would result in the subdivision of the rear garden to provide access and amenity space for the new dwelling.

11. Access to the proposed dwelling is proposed to be via the adjacent private access road.

Summary of Proposal – Key facts:

12. The key facts of the proposal are summarised below:

Scale	**Key Facts**
Total floorspace	199 sqm
No. of storeys	1
Max. dimensions	Eaves: 2.6m Ridge: 3.8 Width: 12m Depth: 25.4m

Appearance	Key Facts
Materials	Handmade red facing bricks Powder coated metal windows Slate coloured Zinc roofs Brown pantiles

Transport Matters	Key Facts
Vehicular access	Accessed via private road which is connected to Town Close Road
No of car parking spaces	2
No of cycle parking spaces	Shed proposed in rear garden where cycle storage could be provided

Energy	Key facts
Energy efficiency	Indicates fabric first approach potentially in combination with PV installation.

Representations

13. Adjacent and neighbouring properties were notified in writing. Six letters of representation from two neighbouring properties objecting to the proposal have been received, along with one letter of representation from a neighbour in support of the proposed development. The issues raised are summarised in the table below.

Issues raised	Response
Inadequate width of the access road, limiting access for fire service vehicles, delivery trucks, and bin collection	See main issue 4
Intensification of traffic on the private road	See main issue 4
Lack of proper turning radius	See main issue 4
Substandard visibility from the private road when accessing the public highway	See main issue 4
Norwich Freemen's Charity has formally ruled that access via the rear shared private drive (back lane) to Town Close Road is not permitted	Not a material planning consideration. The applicant has confirmed that the Charity, which sold No. 2 Orwell Road to the applicant and included a covenant restricting subdivision, has the right to modify, waive, or release this covenant to allow development in return for a payment or charitable donation. The Charity has also confirmed that it has previously exercised this right. This is a private matter to be taken up between landowners.
Additional traffic on Town Close Road	See main issue 4
Subdivision of the garden causing harm to the character and	See main issue 2

Issues raised	Response
conservation area	
Negative impact on trees	See main issue 5
The use of private access is restricted by existing Covenants	Not a material planning consideration. This is a private matter to be taken up between landowners.
Harm to the significance of conservation area	See main issue 2

Consultation responses

14. 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.

Conservation and Design officer – Norwich City Council

15. The proposal seeks to demolish the existing late 1990's outbuilding and to construct a 3-bedroom single storey dwelling in its place. The complete loss of the existing outbuilding would not negatively impact the significance of Grade II listed building. A common feature of the residential dwellings within the Newmarket Road Conservation Area are large open plots of land with small outbuildings, most commonly former coach houses.

16. Whilst there are some concerns over the sub-division of the Site it is considered that the division of the Site is sympathetic and will leave ample space for the existing dwelling. Looking at the 1884 Town Plan Map (see image below) there is a clear division within the garden, with an indication that a wall or other form of structural divider was in place, which the proposal, in some degree, will still be following. Overall, it is considered to be an acceptable location to divide the Site to accommodate the new dwelling.

17. It is the opinion of this Conservation and Design Officer that the scale of the proposed dwelling it acceptable and that the single storey design will not dominate the existing listed building. The low-level design of the proposal will not project above the proposed new boundary wall, and it is considered that there will be a very low level of harm caused towards the significance of the surrounding heritage assets.

18. The choice of materials, red brick with a central glazed hallway, are welcome and will not be at odds within the setting of the listed building. At the rear of the Site is a private access road that the properties on Ipswich Road also share a rear boundary with.

19. Within this private road there are high level boundary walls; the increase of height proposed for the new boundary wall at 2 Orwell Road will not be out of character and not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. In addition, it is proposed to erect two additional piers at either end of the boundary wall to match the existing; this is a welcome design choice and will have consistent appearance to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. I would recommend applying a condition for a material sample panel to be made on site to compare with the surrounding structures

20. The outbuilding to the north of the Site is considered to be curtilage listed to 2 Orwell Road. Section 1(5b) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990, states that *any object or structure within the curtilage of the building which, although not fixed to the building, forms part of the land and has done so since before 1st July 1948.* This outbuilding is clearly indicated on the 1884 Town Plan Map (see below) and the age of the structure pre-dates 1st July 1948. Therefore, any works towards the outbuilding that affects its special character, and appearance would require listed building consent

21. Conclusion - It is considered that the proposal offers a low level of harm to the overall significance of the Grade II listed building and the character and appearance of the Newmarket Road Conservation Area. I would recommend applying the following conditions:

    - Details and samples of external materials including manufacturer, product name and colour.
    - HA8 – Preservation and protection of features – piers either side of the existing gate.

22. It is therefore considered that the proposal satisfies the requirements of Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended; Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF); and Policies DM1, DM3 and DM9 of the Norwich Local Plan (Development Management Policies 2014).

Highways – Norfolk County Council

23. It is understood that this is a proposal for a 3 bedroom dwelling with two car parking spaces on land within the grounds of 2 Orwell Road, with its vehicle access via an un-named gravel track that is not adopted.

24. In principle there is not a highway objection to the development of a single dwelling in this location, given the residential character of the area. However there are matters of layout concerning vehicle turning and parking that your authority may wish to consider further.

25. Given that the gravel track is a private route assessment is primarily a matter for your authority to consider, however it is appreciated that this track is narrow, and there is no formal turning head at its cul de sac end, these factors do have potential material impacts on the use of Town Close Road by vehicles associated with the proposed dwelling.

26. For planning purposes we assume that all dwellings (of any size) have the potential on average of generating 6 vehicular movements per day, and Norfolk parking guidelines indicate that for a 3 bedroom dwelling, two car parking spaces are required.

27. Based on my site visit it is noted that the gravel track is of variable width, from between 3.5m to 4.5m in extent approximately due to the presence of boundary walls and hedges, and that there is no formal turning head. Visibility onto Town Close Road is adequate given the presence of waiting restrictions, 20mph speed limit and streetlighting, although the adjacent hedge somewhat affected visibility in the critical direction of approaching traffic.

28. The highway concern is that vehicles travelling to and from the proposed dwelling may encounter other vehicles on the gravel track at its junction with Town Close Road and cause delay or abrupt stopping when entering

29. In addition given the lack of formal turning facilities there is a risk that service vehicles, such as online delivery vans would have limited space to turn around within the site and may need to reverse back the length of the access track, approximately 100m in length, this poses a potential hazard if reversing back onto Lime Tree Road. It is presumed what the refuse truck has to undertake already. Please note that on my site visit I attempted to turn a car around the cul de sac end of the access track without using any adjacent vehicle accesses, and experienced considerable difficulty in doing so without striking adjacent walls. This turning movement would be impossible for service vehicles such as supermarket trucks and would probably necessitate reversing back the entire length of the access track, or using a private vehicle access.

30. However there is no injury accident history in this location and the amount of traffic on this access track is assumed to be relatively low in volume and speed. Notwithstanding these concerns road safety risks are likely to be low and for that reason difficult to substantiate a highway objection. It is important to note that the development does have the potential to mitigate the risk of reversing traffic on the access track if the site layout is improved

31. Your authority may wish to consider the following points:

    I. Provision of space for a Type 5 turning head within the site (8m x8m) to facilitate turning by service vehicles. This turning head to be of hardstanding e.g. block paving rather than gravel.

    II. Restriction on the future provision of gates to the dwelling, to ensure that the turning facility is safeguarded in perpetuity.

    III. Revised layout of the car parking spaces to enable easier means of entry and exit from the site.

    IV. Provision of EV charging

    V. Provision of cycle storage

32. I am able to comment that in relation to highways issues only, that Norfolk County Council does not wish to restrict the grant of consent. Should your Authority be minded to approve the application I would be grateful for the inclusion of the following conditions on any consent notice issued;-

33. SHC 21 amended

    Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted space sufficient to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority shall be provided within the site to enable two cars /delivery vehicle to park, turn and re-enter the highway in forward gear with provision of a Type 5 turning head. EV charging to be provided. This area shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced, drained and be retained thereafter available for that specific use.

    Reason:To ensure the permanent availability of the parking/manoeuvring areas, in the interests of satisfactory development and highway safety

34. SHC 11 amended

    Notwithstanding the provision of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order (2015), (or any Order revoking, amending or re-enacting that Order) no gates/bollard/chain/other means of obstruction shall be erected across the approved access unless details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any such gate shall be set back within the site to facilitate turning at the cul de sac end of the un-named access track serving the site sufficient for service vehicle movements (Type 5 turning head).
    Reason: In the interests of highway safety

    Informative
35. New dwellings in controlled parking zones in Norwich are not entitled to on-street parking permits

Additional response to comments from an expert advice submitted by one of the neighbours objecting the proposal

36. The key highways concern is the visibility splay for approaching traffic. The standard 2.4 m X distance is substandard at 11 m (red line), but relaxing the set-back to 2 m provides the necessary visibility (yellow line). The unnamed track is a private lane, so assessment of site access and turning is the responsibility of the local authority. There are concerns about the lack of turning space for service vehicles, but this is typical for adjacent properties. Some vans may need to reverse onto Town Close Road, which is a low-speed, lightly trafficked, unclassified road. While not ideal, on balance it would be difficult to defend a refusal at appeal, and no updated advice is being issued.

Tree officer – Norwich City Council

37. No Objections from an arboricultural perspective

38. Proximity of significant trees on site is such that they do not warrant any temporary protective measures. Trees in neighbouring properties overhanging private access drive at the rear may require crown lifting to avoid any potential damage.

39. Crown-lifting the tree (to approx. 5m from ground level over the access road) and maybe some pruning back of other smaller vegetation, would be sufficient (and maintaining this clearance in the future). It’s a reasonable recommendation, and standard practice on public highways - but as it’s a private road, I’m not sure we could enforce this?

Norfolk Fire Services

40. This proposal will need to meet all the functional requirements stated within B5: Access and facilities for the fire service of Approved Document B, 2019 edition incorporating 2020 and 2022 amendments – for use in England.

41. These sections deal with the following requirement from Part B of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010.

42. Access and facilities for the fire service B5

(1) The building shall be designed and constructed so as to provide reasonable facilities to assist fire fighters in the protection of life.

(2) Reasonable provision shall be made within the site of the building to enable fire appliances to gain access to the building.

43. Please see ADB Volume 1: Dwellings for relevant details.

44. Water supplies for firefighting should be in accordance with ADB Vol 2, Sec 16 and “National Guidance Document on the Provision for Fire Fighting” published by Local Government Association and WaterUK: https://www.water.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/national-guidance-document-onwater-for-ffg-final.pdf

45. For further information please contact the Water Officer by email on FireWaterOfficer@norfolk.gov.uk

46. It is noted that the following specific points relate to this proposal:

47. Access routes and hard-standings should comply with the guidance in Table 13.1.

48. Dead-end access routes longer than 20m require turning facilities, as in Diagram 13.1.

49. Turning facilities should comply with the guidance in Table 13.1.

50. The approval of Building Control will be required to Part B of the Building Regulations 2010.

51. Early liaison should be held with this Authority in relation to fixed firefighting facilities, early fire suppression and access (Approved Document B).

52. The external access provisions for a building should be planned to complement the internal access requirements for a fire attack plan. (Guide E Fire safety engineering (2019).

History Environment Services

53. Archaeological desk-based assessment was received (along with heritage statement) but not needed. No comments necessary from HES.

Natural England

54. NO OBJECTION - SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATE MITIGATION BEING SECURED

Without appropriate mitigation the application would have an adverse effect on the integrity of:

- The Broads Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Broadland Ramsar
- European designated sites scoped into the Norfolk Green Infrastructure and Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (‘GIRAMS’)

In order to mitigate these adverse effects and make the development acceptable, the following proposed mitigation measures should be secured:

- A suitable contribution per new dwelling towards the Norfolk Green Infrastructure and Recreational Impact Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (GIRAMS).

- Purchase of credits to mitigate the nutrient load of phosphorous (P) and nitrogen (N)

We advise that an appropriate planning condition or obligation is attached to any planning permission to secure these measures. Natural England's further advice on designated sites/landscapes and advice on other natural environment issues is set out below.

Assessment of Planning Considerations

Relevant Development Plan Policies

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

    - GNLP1 Growth Strategy
    - GNLP2 Sustainable Communities
    - GNLP3 Environmental Protection and Enhancement
    - GNLP4 Strategic Infrastructure
    - GNLP5 Homes
    - GNLP7.1 Growth in the Norwich Urban Area and fringes

56. **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
    - DM4 Providing for renewable and low carbon energy
    - DM6 Protecting and enhancing the natural environment
    - DM7 Trees and development
    - DM9 Safeguarding Norwich's heritage
    - DM12 Ensuring well-planned housing development
    - DM28 Encouraging sustainable travel
    - DM30 Access and highway safety
    - DM31 Car parking and servicing

Other material considerations

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

    - NPPF2 Achieving sustainable development
    - NPPF4 Decision-making
    - NPPF5 Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
    - NPPF8 Promoting healthy and safe communities
    - NPPF9 Promoting sustainable transport

- NPPF11 Making effective use of land
- NPPF12 Achieving well-designed places
- NPPF15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- NPPF 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Case Assessment

58. 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. Principle of development

59. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs – GNLP5, DM12, NPPF Paragraph 11 and Section 5.

60. The proposal involves the demolition of an existing ancillary building within the curtilage of the dwelling and the subdivision of this curtilage to create a new dwelling

61. Paragraph 75 of the NPPF states that local authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development in residential gardens. The council considered this matter as part of the development of policies in the local plan and concluded that the criteria-based policies in DM3 and DM12 are satisfactory to determine applications for dwellings in gardens. Therefore, there are no specific local policies restricting new dwellings in the gardens of existing properties.

62. he outbuilding proposed for demolition is not included in the heritage listing of the Grade II listed 2 Orwell Road. Consequently, the loss of the existing outbuilding would not negatively impact the significance of the Grade II listed building.

63. The principle of residential development is acceptable on this site under policy DM12, subject to the criteria in the second part of DM12 and subject to the other policy and material considerations detailed below, given that:

    - The site is not designated for other purposes;
    - The site is not in a hazardous installation notification zone;
    - The site is not in the late night activity zone;
    - It does not involve the conversion of high quality office space; and
    - It is not in the primary or secondary retail area or in a district or local centre.

64. Criteria from a) to f) in the second part of policy DM12 are considered further below.

a) The proposed dwelling is not considered to compromise the delivery of any wider regeneration proposals and is consistent with overall spatial planning objectives of sustainable development as set out in the GNLP and DM1.

b) The design and impacts on amenity are all assessed in more detail in the sections below.

c) As the proposal results in the creation of one additional unit of residential accommodation, it can be considered to contribute positively to the overall housing delivery targets as set out in the GNLP.

d) The proposal results in the creation of 1no single storey, three-bedroom dwelling which contributes to the mix of housing types available within the area.

e) The proposal results in a housing density considered to be in keeping with the existing character and function of the area.

65. As the proposal is for a development of less than ten dwellings criterion f is not applicable

66. Norwich City Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This engages the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as outlined in paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF. In such circumstances, planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF provides a clear reason for refusal. In the assessment of this case, there are no overriding constraints or significant adverse impacts that would demonstrably outweigh the benefits of providing additional housing in this location.

Main Issue 2. Design and Heritage

Key polices and NPPF Sections- GNLP2, GNLP3 DM3, DM9, NPPF Section 12, NPPF Section 16 Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

67. The proposal is to demolish the existing outbuilding, dating from the late 1990s, and to construct a single-storey, three-bedroom dwelling in its place. The Conservation Officer has reviewed the proposal and confirmed that the complete loss of the existing outbuilding would not harm or negatively impact the significance of the Grade II listed building.

68. The site is located within the Newmarket Road Conservation Area, where a common characteristic of residential dwellings is large open plots of land with small outbuildings, most commonly former coach houses

69. Representations have raised concerns regarding the subdivision of the plot, as covenants are said to restrict such subdivision. However, covenants are non-material planning considerations. The impact of the subdivision of the garden on the wider setting of the Newmarket Road Conservation Area has been reviewed by the Conservation Officer, who concluded that the proposed subdivision of the site is sympathetic and would leave ample space for the existing dwelling.

70. The Conservation Officer also identified evidence from the 1884 town plan map indicating a clear historical division within the garden, suggesting that a wall or other structural boundary once existed in this location. The current proposal, to

an extent, follows this same pattern. Therefore, the proposed division of the site to accommodate the new dwelling is considered acceptable

71. The scale of the proposed dwelling is appropriate, being single storey and not dominating the existing listed building. The design ensures that the building will not project above the proposed new boundary wall. The choice of materials ,red brick with a central glazed hallway, is welcomed and considered compatible with the setting of the listed building. To the east of the site is a private access road, which the properties on Ipswich Road also share as a rear boundary.

72. it is proposed to erect two additional piers at either end of the boundary wall to match the existing; this is a welcome design choice and will have consistent appearance to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

73. It is considered that the proposal would result in a low level of harm to the overall significance of the Grade II listed building and to the character and appearance of the Newmarket Road Conservation Area.

74. Subject to the recommended conditions for the details and samples of external materials and preservation and protection , the proposal satisfies the requirements of Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended; Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF); and Policies DM1, DM3 and DM9 of the Norwich Local Plan (Development Management Policies 2014).

Main Issue 3. Amenity

Key policies and NPPF Sections– GNLP2, DM2, DM11, NPPF Section 12.

75. The residential dwellings in the area are mostly detached or semi-detached and located within large plots of land. By virtue of its proposed location and design, the development would not result in any overlooking, overshadowing, or restriction of outlook for future occupants.

76. The proposed dwelling is located at a reasonable distance from the existing dwelling at 2 Orwell Road, such that there would be minimal impact on the amenity of either existing or future occupiers in terms of noise or lighting.

77. In summary, it is considered that a single dwelling could be reasonably accommodated within the site without resulting in any significant detrimental impacts upon the residential amenity of existing properties, in accordance with local and national policies.

Main Issue 4. Highways

78. Key policies and NPPF Sections – GNLP2, GNLP4, DM28, DM30, DM31, NPPF Section 9.

79. The existing dwelling on the site has two vehicular access points: one from Orwell Road and the other from the private access drive to the east of the site, which connects to Town Close Road. Access to the proposed new dwelling would be via the private drive, which also serves No. 1 Orwell Road and three

other properties. Services, including bin collection, currently use this private road.

80. From the site visit, it is understood that the private road has no formal turning head at the end of the cul-de-sac. The road is accessed from Town Close Road via a gravel track with a variable width of 3.5 to 4.5 m, as confirmed by Highways, extending up to 2 Orwell Road. Beyond this point, the road is poorly maintained with overgrown grass. It is noted that 18 Ipswich Road, although having a right of access, does not use this road. Highways have confirmed that the varying width of the road is primarily due to boundary walls and overgrown hedges, particularly at the boundary of 1 Orwell Road.

81. The Highways Officer has visited the site and confirmed that the lack of a formal turning radius at the cul-de-sac could create a risk for service vehicles, including delivery vans, as they would have limited space to turn within the site and may need to reverse along the access track, which is approximately 100 m long, posing a potential hazard when reversing to Town Close Road.

82. The applicant and neighbours have confirmed that reversing to Town Close Road is the current practice for delivery trucks and bin collection vehicles. Consequently, Highways have recommended a condition requiring the creation of a Type 5 turning head within the site to facilitate turning for service vehicles. The drawings have been amended to include this turning head, which has been confirmed and supported by Highways.

83. To ensure that access remains unobstructed, permitted development rights to introduce gates, bollards, chains, or any other obstructions will be removed, secured through a condition. The applicant has been informed and has agreed to this.

84. Fire services were consulted and following that. The applicant submitted an additional drawing confirming that the proposed Type 5 turning radius would be accessible to fire engines, which has been supported by Highways.

85. Representations have raised concerns about additional traffic on the private road and potential visibility issues where it joins Town Close Road. Highways have reviewed the proposal and raised no objection, noting that the proposed dwelling is expected to generate an average of six vehicular movements per day and meets parking requirements

86. Concerns were also raised about visibility onto Town Close Road. Highways have confirmed that visibility is adequate due to waiting restrictions, a 20 mph speed limit, and street lighting, although adjacent hedges may partially restrict sightlines

87. Representations raised questions regarding ownership of the proposed access road and rights of access. The applicant provided a statement confirming that each property adjoining the access road owns half its width along their frontage and has vehicular access rights over the remainder to Town Close Road. As the road is private, covenants are non-material planning considerations. With the proposed turning head, the driveway will be functional for the access and servicing of the new dwelling.

88. The current restriction in road width is mainly caused by overgrown hedges and a lime tree near 1 Orwell Road. The road is actively used by cars, delivery trucks, and bin lorries

89. The Arboriculture Officer confirmed that crown lifting the lime tree to approximately 5 m and pruning back surrounding vegetation is acceptable and sufficient to maintain clearance of the driveway in the future. While this is standard practice on public highways, it is not enforceable on private roads

90. With support from the Highways and Arboriculture Officers, and subject to recommended conditions, the proposed access to the dwelling is considered satisfactory. Although the new dwelling may generate additional traffic on the private road, this would not cause significant harm. Highways have also confirmed that there is no record of injury accidents in this location, and traffic volume and speed on this access track are relatively low

91. Existing trees would benefit from selective crown lifting, and adjacent shrubbery requires trimming to maintain adequate visibility and vehicle clearance. As the access road is privately owned, it is anticipated that landowners or interested parties will agree on ongoing vegetation maintenance to ensure safe and unobstructed access. Any associated financial or maintenance arrangements would be private matters.

92. The applicant submitted a Construction Traffic Management Plan, ensuring that the condition of the access road is recorded before construction, with any damage restored afterward. The plan includes details of security fencing, site parking, demolition arrangements, and material and service delivery, which has been reviewed and supported by Highways.

93. One representation included comments from a transport consultancy, which were shared with the Highways Officer at the County Council. Although visibility from the private road when approaching the highway is substandard, relaxing the setback to 2 metres could improve sightlines. With the proposed turning radius at the end of the access way, the likelihood of vehicles reversing onto the highway is reduced, and the proposal is therefore supported.

94. The layout provides sufficient onsite parking for the new dwelling in accordance with the Council's adopted parking standards. Parking for the existing host property would also be retained

95. Cycle storage has not been demonstrated explicitly; however this can be readily accommodated within a shed in the rear garden. Furthermore, there is ample room for bin storage to be provided in the rear amenity space.

96. Subject to the imposition of the aforementioned conditions, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of highways safety and parking provision.

Main Issue 5. Trees

97. Key policies and NPPF Sections – GNLP2, GNLP3, DM7, NPPF Section 15.

98. The lime tree located at the boundary of 1 Orwell Road may require crown lifting to approximately 5 m above ground level, which is supported by the Tree Officer. The proposed development will not have any impact on the existing trees, and therefore there are no objections from an arboricultural perspective.

99. The tree near the access, located on the neighbouring property, would benefit from minor crown lifting, and the surrounding shrubbery requires trimming to maintain adequate clearance. As this is a private road, it is up to the relevant parties to agree on the ongoing maintenance of vegetation to ensure safe vehicle access. Any arrangements for such maintenance would be a private matter between the parties involved.

Main Issue 6. Biodiversity

100. Key policies and NPPF Sections – GNLP3, DM6, NPPF Section 15.

101. As the application was submitted before the statutory legislation of Biodiversity Net Gain was introduced, a 10% Net Gain is not required.

102. Although the site is exempt from Biodiversity Net Gain requirements, adopted policy DM6 'protecting and enhancing the natural environment' requires that "*Opportunities should be taken to incorporate and integrate biodiversity, green infrastructure and wildlife friendly features in the design of individual schemes*". Specific details of ecology improvements have not been provided however it is considered reasonable to secure these via condition.

103. The preliminary ecological appraisal submitted with the application concluded that the habitat on the site is of low ecological value, and no further surveys are required. However, the recommended mitigation measures outlined in the report will be secured through a planning condition

104. GIRAMS is a county-wide strategy designed to mitigate the recreational impacts of new residential development on protected habitats across Norfolk. It ensures compliance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 by funding measures that manage visitor pressure on sensitive sites. All qualifying developments are required to contribute a set tariff per dwelling, which supports the delivery of green infrastructure and visitor management initiatives. The Council is applying this tariff in line with adopted policy GNLP3.

105. In accordance with Natural England's guidance on nutrient neutrality, the proposed development falls within the Broads Special Area of Conservation (SAC) catchment and has the potential to contribute to increased nitrate and phosphate loading. To mitigate this impact, the applicant has purchased credits through Wendling Beck and the appropriate certificates confirming purchase have been provided. These credits, confirmed would offset the development's nutrient output, ensuring no adverse effect on the integrity of the Broads SAC. The Council, as Competent Authority, has reviewed the submitted evidence and completed a Habitats Regulation Assessment which has been referred to Natural England for consultation. Natural England's response can be seen in the consultations section above or in full on the council's public access website.

Other matters

106. The site is located within a critical drainage catchment. Most of the proposed new dwelling will be constructed on the hard-surfaced area currently occupied by the outbuilding, which is to be demolished. However, some parts of the new build will extend onto green areas, and therefore a sustainable drainage scheme (SUDS) is recommended for the development.

107. To promote responsible water usage, a condition has been included requiring the proposed dwellings to meet the water efficiency standard set out in Regulation 36(2)(b) of Part G2 of the Building Regulations 2015.

108. As required by policy GNLP2, high speed broadband is required to be provided for new dwellings. A condition is recommended.

Equalities and diversity issues

109. There are no equality or diversity issues.

S106 Obligations

110. A GIRAMS Unilateral Undertaking has been agreed for this application.

Local finance considerations

111. 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

112. 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.

113. 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

114. For the reasons set out within this report, it is considered that the proposed development accords with all relevant national and local planning policies and it would not result in any significant detrimental harm in respect of the relevant material planning considerations.

115. Given that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of land for housing, the tilted balance set out in paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is engaged. As stated out in paragraph 20 this sets in place a presumption in favour of

sustainable residential development. In such circumstances, planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF provides a clear reason for refusal. In the assessment of this case, there are no overriding constraints or significant adverse impacts that would demonstrably outweigh the benefits of providing additional housing in this location.

116. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

Recommendation

117. To approve application 24/00398/F 2 Orwell Road Norwich NR2 2ND and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Parking and turning;
4. Restriction on the future provision of gates to the dwelling, to ensure that the turning facility is safeguarded in perpetuity.
5. Details of Cycle storage
6. In accordance with the access and construction traffic management plan
7. Ecology improvements;
8. In accordance with the mitigations proposed in the Preliminary ecological appraisal
9. Details of SuDS
10. Details and samples of external materials
11. Preservation and protection features
12. Water efficiency
13. No occupation of the development hereby permitted shall take place until broadband infrastructure to provide speeds of at least 24Mbps has been delivered.

Informatives

1. BNG not required
2. New dwellings in controlled parking zones in Norwich are not entitled to on-street parking permits

Appendices: None

Contact officer: Planning officer

Name: Vishnu Sainath

Telephone number: 077854 89905

Email address: VishnuSainath@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.