



PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

09:30 to 10:15	8th August 2024

Present:	Councillors (M) Sands (In the Chair), Caine, Harper, Haynes Lubbock (S) Sands, Smith and Young.
-----------------	--

Apologies: Councillors David, Driver and Prinsley.

(In the absence of the chair, Councillor Sands (M), vice chair, was in the chair.)

1. Declaration of Interests

Councillors Harper, (M) Sands and (S) Sands, asked that it be noted that they had visited the property in Southgate Lane as part of the National Garden Scheme (NGS) and they all declared that they did not have a predetermined view in respect of this application (no: 23/00383/F) in relation to Southgate House and Butter Hills House, Southgate Lane, Norwich NR1 2AQ

2. Minutes

RESOLVED

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting held on 13th June be confirmed as a correct record of proceedings and the Chair of the Committee was authorised to sign them accordingly.

3. Application No. 23 00383F - Southgate House, Southgate Lane

Proposal: Garage and pool extensions at Southgate House and detached annexe accommodation at Butter Hills House, 7 Southgate Lane.

The Planner (case officer) presented the report (which had been circulated prior to the meeting and was available on the council's website) with the aid of plans and slides describing the application site and the key features of the application. Accordingly, the Committee raised a number of questions, and these may be summarised as follows:

Committee **noted** that:

- The adjacent and neighbouring properties have been notified in writing regarding the proposal. However, no letters of representation had been

received and the application was being brought before the committee because the applicant is a relative of a councillor.

- The proposed development is within the setting of a residential property and would be an addition to residential properties and ancillary to the use of the main dwellings. However, in principle the proposed developments are considered to be acceptable.
- Norwich City Council Design and Conservation Team had indicated that whilst in principle they had no objection to the proposed works a few concerns had been acknowledged in regard to **(a)** the flint on the swimming pool should match the flint on the existing property, **(b)** the proposal to reinstate original materials on the boundary wall and garage roof that is supported, **(c)** the gate that should be timber and of a traditional style to match the character of the Conservation Area; and **(d)** the annexe at Butter Hills House that the bricks are red clay in Flemish bond. Cladding is appropriate on the elevation facing Butter Hills House. Therefore, in terms of design the proposed developments are considered to be acceptable subject to conditions for details of flint to be submitted for assessment and for the roof tiles to be black clay pantile and bricks to match in colour finish and bond with the existing roof tiles.
- Norfolk County Council Highways (local highways authority) had stated that whilst the proposal was acceptable it is important to note that **(1)** if the site is subdivided vehicle access to annexe would be through third party land. condition requiring the use of the annexe to be ancillary to the main dwelling should be attached, **(2)** visibility from Southgate House is restricted however as the cul de sac has low traffic movements and the access is extant it is difficult to justify an objection; **(3)** landscaping details would be beneficial and EV charging point can be accommodated in the garage. Therefore, the local highways authority had made a number of recommendations including the provision of EV charging points and landscaping for parking.
- Whilst the City Council's Tree Protection Officer had raised no objection from an arboricultural perspective. They had indicated that to ensure the protection of retained trees it was noted that it would be appropriate to apply condition TR4- arb supervision for works within root protection areas and, TR7- works on site in accordance with AIA/AMS/TPP.
- Southgate House is locally listed and features elements which are of historic interest. The property whilst constructed circa 18th century it has been altered from its original form since then. Some of the notable historic elements include, sash windows, flint walls, quoins, and pilasters.
- Within a wider context there are several other locally listed properties within the vicinity of the site, nevertheless it is considered that the proposed works will not result in harm to the setting of the heritage assets
- The proposed works to Southgate House are considered to be adding to the historic interests of the property by incorporating some of the historic materials such as flint walls and also reinstating original pantiles and reflecting the roof form of the main dwelling adding to a consistent form at the property. Overall, the proposed works are enhancing the historic interest of the property.
- The annexe at Butter Hills House has been designed in such a way that the orientation and positioning of the annexe does not result in any harm to amenity by overlooking and overshadowing and outlook. In addition, whilst the

annexe has glazing facing towards the main dwelling, nevertheless it is considered that given the distance between the two properties it is not a significant harm to amenity.

Discussion ensued in which the Planner, Development Management Team Leader and Development Manager referred to the report and presentation and answered members' questions. This included discussions about nutrient neutrality, and it was noted that the planned development would not cause an increase in 'nutrient pollution' to the water catchment area. In addition, it was noted that **(i)** Nutrient neutrality is a concept primarily aimed at ensuring that new developments do not increase the levels of nutrient pollution in specific areas, particularly in sensitive habitats and water bodies; **(ii)** the future nutrient load from land use on the site after development would not impact upon the water quality and therefore it is not necessary to conduct an assessment under the Habitats Regulations; and **(iii)** the application had been submitted prior to the requirement for the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) which has mandated that post-development biodiversity value must exceed pre-development value by at least 10%.

Recommendation:

The Chair **moved** and Councillor Harper **seconded** the recommendation as set out in the report.

Accordingly, the Committee on a unanimous vote **RESOLVED:**

to approve the application for the reasons given in the report and subject to the planning conditions as set out in paragraph 101 of this report, and grant planning permission.

4. Close of Meeting

With no other business to discuss, the Chair called this meeting to a close and thanked everybody for their attendance and participation this afternoon.