

The proposal

10. The proposed single-storey extension projects 5m at its maximum to the rear (slightly shorter at 4.2m for much of its width) and with an eaves height of 2.75m. It wraps round the house to the side, with a utility/lobby area joining onto a storage area and re-constructed shallow gable-roofed garage positioned at a 30 degree angle to the house, 0.3m from the boundary with no.30 to the north. The combination of these elements extends 9m to the side of the house at its furthest point. To the south the extension is approx 0.25m from the boundary with no.32. The glazing to the rear includes 4 panes of glazed bi-fold doors.
11. As part of the proposed loft conversion, two gable roof dormers will be installed to the front. The roof will be extended to the side, replacing the current hip roof arrangement, and creating new side-facing and small front-facing first floor walls. To the rear, a flat roof dormer will be added covering almost the full width of the main dwelling, with its side 0.5m from the boundary, its lowest point set back 0.6m from the eaves and its roof 0.15m lower than the existing roof ridge.
12. Note: these plans are amended from those submitted originally, which proposed a two-storey rear extension with balcony.

Proposal	Key facts
Scale	
Total floorspace	Combined area of 146.8sq.m (excluding garage/storage area: 107.1sq.m) Demolition: 49.3sq.m (incl garage & conservatories)
Max. dimensions	Ground floor extension: 7.4m from front to rear; 18.5m wide. First floor dormer: projects 3.8m outward, and 2.8m upward, from the roof. Proposed first floor area: 7.2m from front to back; 9.2m wide.
Appearance	
Materials	Walls for rear extension and dormers - 'Buttermilk' coloured render; Windows/door - uPVC, white as existing to front, anthracite grey to rear; Front gable roof – sloping pin tiles; Garage – grey Hardie plank cladding for walls with sloping pin tiles for the roof.

Representations Received

13. Adjacent and neighbouring properties have been notified in writing. Four letters of representation have been received responding to the original plans (which included a balcony and two storey rear extension) citing the following issues:

- NPPF2 Achieving sustainable development
- NPPF12 Achieving well-designed places

Case Assessment

18. 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 policies are detailed above. Material considerations include policies in the National Planning Framework (NPPF), the Councils 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, scale and form

19. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs – JCS2, DM3, NPPF paragraphs 8, 127-131.
20. The issues to consider concern the overall massing of the extension and its visual impact, both in the context of the property and surrounding area.
21. The extension is relatively large in terms of footprint and increases the overall floor area of the house and garage by 80%. While significant, the increase in itself doesn't deem the extension unacceptable though it does suggest potential for a development which appears out of scale and/or incongruous.
22. In terms of the impression to the front of the building, the plans have been amended from those originally submitted to reduce the size of the front-facing wall of the first-floor side extension and this is now sufficiently reduced in visual impact. It would have been preferable to have slightly reduced the height of the side roof extension and set it back from the current ridge, so that the original roof form could still be read. Such an approach was the approved design for no.28, though this has not been built according to plans and the final built form is more prominent than that proposed here. Given this and the overall context of these properties, which have been substantially altered with a variety of extension forms, it would be difficult to insist on retaining this specific reference to the original roof line.
23. The gabled front dormers are a relatively sympathetic design and, while it would have been preferable to match the smaller size of those on no.32, this would be difficult to insist on given the current lack of symmetry, in this respect, between the two properties. For the same reason, it would also not be reasonable to require matching the first floor side extension with the smaller side dormer on no.32.
24. The rear dormer, while contributing to the overall scale, would be in itself permitted development and is not obviously visible from the public realm or neighbouring properties. The flat roof of the ground floor extension, while far from ideal design-wise, does at least have the virtue in this context of diminishing the extension's wider visual impact. And while it would have been preferable for the flat roof to be level with the eaves of the original bungalow, the present height allows for adequate insulation and, particularly given how far the dwelling is set back from the street, is not a major design concern.

34. 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.
35. In this case local finance considerations are not considered to be material to the case.

Conclusion

36. While, as outlined above, the overall design is far from ideal, in the context of the property and surrounding area it is not sufficiently out of keeping or scale to warrant refusal on these grounds. With the amended design having little or no impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties, the proposals are considered acceptable.
37. The development is sufficiently 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 no. 19/00928/F – 31 Spelman Road, Norwich NR2 3NJ and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Provision of water butts.