Report to	Planning applications committee	ltem
	9 February 2017	
Report of	Head of planning services	
Subject	Application no 16/01720/F - 1 Salter Avenue, Norwich NR4 7LX	4(f)
Reason for referral	Objection	

Ward:	University
Case officer	Katherine Brumpton - <u>katherinebrumpton@norwich.gov.uk</u>

Development proposal				
Single storey side and rear extension				
Representations				
Object	Comment	Support		
2	0	0		

Main issues	Key considerations	
1 Design	Impact on existing dwelling and	
	surrounding area	
2 Amenity	Impact upon neighbouring occupiers	
Expiry date	13 February 2017	
Recommendation	Approve	



© Crown Copyright and database right 2017. Ordnance Survey 100019747.

Planning Application No16/01720/FSite Address1 Salter Avenue

Scale

1:1,000





PLANNING SERVICES



The site and surroundings

- 1. The property is a detached dwelling and forms part of a wider development in the area which appears to date from the 1970's. Dwellings are generally two storied with low dual pitched roofs and often with a flat roof attached garage.
- 2. The applicant's dwelling is finished in buff bricks on the ground floor with hanging brown tiles on the first floor. An attached flat roof garage is located on the front (south) and side (east) elevation.
- 3. The site partially borders a dwelling on Bluebell Road. The dwellings here are older and of a different character, although also largely detached and two storey.

Constraints

4. No constraints.

Relevant planning history

5. No recent relevant planning history.

The proposal

- 6. The proposal is to erect a flat roof side/rear extension along the east (side) and north (rear) elevations. This would replace a small brick outbuilding/shed which is attached to the side of the dwelling.
- 7. The extension would lie along the eastern boundary and provide for a new kitchen, cloakroom and new sitting room.
- 8. The original plans indicated an extension which would extend 10.8m from the rear elevation. Following discussions with the agent and applicant regarding the scale and design of the proposal amended plans were received which has reduced the length to extend 8m from the rear elevation. These amended plans are considered below.
- 9. The amended plans were re-advertised (reply by date is 9 February 2017). Committee will be updated regarding any further representations received as a result.

Summary information

Proposal	Key facts		
Scale			
Max. dimensions	Between 8m and 15.7m in length, and 2.4m and 5.5m in width. 2.75m in height.		
Appearance			
Materials	Fenestration and bricks to match the existing dwelling, with		

Proposal	Key facts
	the roof finished in bituminous material.

Representations

 Adjacent and neighbouring properties have been notified in writing. Two letters of representation have been received citing the issues as summarised in the table below. All representations are available to view in full at <u>http://planning.norwich.gov.uk/online-applications/</u> by entering the application number.

Issues raised	Response
Extension may lead to more students living at the dwelling, and exacerbating the impact they already have (going out drunk late at night and nosily returning in the early hours of the morning).	See main issue 2 and other matters
Potential increase in number of students could result in more cars parking on the path and not leaving enough space for pushchairs/wheelchairs etc.	See main issue 2
Out of scale development/over dominant building	See main issue 1
Create overlooking into their bedroom windows (250 Bluebell Road)	See main issue 2
Soakaway is too close to their property (250 Bluebell Road)	There is no concern regarding the location of the soakaway; it is not anticipated to create any flooding for the adjacent properties.

Consultation responses

11. No consultations were undertaken.

Assessment of planning considerations

Relevant development plan policies

- 12. 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

 JCS12 The remainder of the Norwich urban area including the fringe parishes

13. 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

Other material considerations

- 14. Relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 (NPPF):
 - NPPF0 Achieving sustainable development
 - NPPF7 Requiring good design

Case Assessment

15. 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 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 2: Design

- 16. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs JCS2, DM3, NPPF paragraphs 9, 17, 56 and 60-66.
- 17. The proposed extension would continue from the existing garage, extending the flat roof along the whole side of the house and into the rear garden. The extension would however have a roof height of 2.75m, whereas the garage roof is 2.4m. Wider than the garage, from the road a section would be visible which would be served with a full length glazed door and a full length window. The extension here would be visibly subordinate; sat to the rear of both the garage and main elevation, and relatively small in size. The impact upon the street scene is therefore considered acceptable.
- 18. Whilst the extension would extend 15.7m along the east elevation it would not be visible as a whole; it would lie predominantly alongside the neighbouring property. A section measuring just over 5m would be visible beyond the neighbouring dwelling to the east. This part would also have a visible skylight.
- 19. The impact at the rear would be more significant, with the extension extending from the rear wall by 8m and sited 3.8m from the rear boundary. However there are several flat roof extensions and outbuildings in the immediate area that also have a significant footprint in comparison to the main two storey part of the dwelling. As a flat roof the visual impact would be reduced upon the wider area simply due to its height. Whilst a better design could be achieved which was more integrated with the original dwelling, refusal of the application based on design grounds is not

considered to be justified in this case due to the character of the wider area and the level that the extension would be screened.

Main issue 6: Amenity

- 20. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs DM2, DM11, NPPF paragraphs 9 and 17.
- 21. The section of the extension to the front and immediately to the side of the applicant's dwelling is not anticipated to have any impact upon neighbour's amenity as it would sit alongside the blank two storey wall of the neighbour's dwelling.
- 22. The rear section would lie along the boundary with the neighbour to the east, and at 2.8m high be taller than the 2m boundary walls/fences allowed under permitted development. However the extension would be sited to the west of the neighbouring dwelling, and as such the level of overshadowing is not anticipated to be significant. There are no overlooking concerns as the only window on this elevation would be obscure glazed and fixed, and face the neighbour's own single storey rear extension.
- 23. Windows sited within the western elevation would provide views across the applicant's own garden. Beyond this lies a boarded fence measuring approx. 1.8m and a neighbour's outbuilding (250 Bluebell Road). This neighbour's dwelling then lies approximately 30m from the proposed extension. Given the distance and the level of screening there is no concern that the proposed would result in significant overlooking to this neighbour.
- 24. A window to the rear would be high level, and therefore there are also no concerns regarding overlooking here.

Other matters

25. Given that the house is understood to be used for student lets, it is considered prudent to add a note on any permission to inform the applicant that planning permission would be required for a change of use to a large House of Multiple Occupancy (HMO) if the building is to be occupied by more than 6 residents. The proposed plans do not show more bedrooms on the ground floor; however it would be conceivable that some of the rooms shown could be used as bedrooms at a later date and therefore an informative is recommended to remind the applicant of this matter.

Equalities and diversity issues

26. There are no significant equality or diversity issues.

S106 Obligations

27. There are no s106 Obligations.

Local finance considerations

28. 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.

- 29. 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.
- 30. In this case local finance considerations are not considered to be material to the case.

Conclusion

31. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of its design, impact on the character of the area and impact on residential amenity. As such the development is considered to be 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. 16/01720/F - 1 Salter Avenue Norwich NR4 7LX and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

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

Article 35(2) Statement

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations and has approved the application subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.



