

**Report to** Planning applications committee

**Item**

13 February 2020

**Report of** Area development manager

**Subject** Application no 19/01702/F - 47 Connaught Road,  
Norwich, NR2 3BP

**4(e)**

**Reason  
for referral** Objections

---

<b>Ward:</b>	Nelson
<b>Case officer</b>	Stephen Little - <a href="mailto:stephenlittle@norwich.gov.uk">stephenlittle@norwich.gov.uk</a>

<b>Development proposal</b>		
Single storey rear extension.		
<b>Representations</b>		
Object	Comment	Support
2	0	0

<b>Main issues</b>	<b>Key considerations</b>
1 Residential Amenity	The impact of the proposals on neighbouring properties; loss of light & outlook.
<b>Expiry date</b>	17 February 2020
<b>Recommendation</b>	Approve

## The site and surroundings

1. The subject dwelling is situated on the west side of Connaught Road, a residential suburban street 1km west of the city centre. The street is characterised by two-storey Victorian terraces of which the subject dwelling is typical. The terraces are relatively uniform in appearance, though many have been altered to the front and rear.
2. The subject dwelling is buff brick to the front and white render to the rear with a red pantile roof. Along its north boundary it has a small two-storey pitch-roofed section original to the house (as other terraces in the row) and also a single storey flat roofed extension projecting 5.5m further to the rear. The garden extends 28m further to the rear.
3. To the north is no.45 which has a two-storey section and single storey rear extension of matching length adjoined to those of the subject property. However, there is a drop in land toward no.45 meaning that these elements are 800mm lower than those of the subject property. It has a rear-facing box room window.
4. To the south is no.49. No.49 has recently been extended to the rear, its extension being approved concurrently (ref: 19/01118/F) with the former application at no.47 (ref: 19/01119/F). The design of the extension closely matches/reflects the approved, but unimplemented, proposals for the subject dwelling.

## Constraints

5. Critical drainage area (Policy DM3, DM5 - Critical Drainage Catchment)

## Relevant planning history

Ref	Proposal	Decision	Date
19/01119/F	Single storey rear extension.	APPR	27/09/2019
19/01547/NM A	Non-material amendment to 19/01119/F to change the roof type on the proposed extension and to upgrade the existing flat roof.	WITHDN	28/11/2019

## The proposal

6. The previously approved application (19/01119/F) was for an extension to match that next door, infilling an area 4.6m long to the side of its rear single and two-storey elements. Reflecting that next door, it is to have a shallow pitch roof facing to the side and to the rear, the latter element partially covering the existing rear extension.
7. The new application varies that proposal by the following:

- a) Existing flat roof on rear extension (5.5m in length) replaced with a side-facing mono-pitch roof and parapet wall. On the boundary with no.45, this will raise the height of the roof by 0.8m.
- b) Side-facing glass roof (originally proposed to match the next door conservatory) replaced with tiled roof and rooflights.

## Representations

8. 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 <http://planning.norwich.gov.uk/online-applications/> by entering the application number.

Issues raised	Response
Loss of outlook - with an increase in height of 80cm, the raised roof will obscure the view out of the neighbouring box room window.	See main issue 1.
Loss of light – the raised roof will block sunlight to the neighbouring box room window and two neighbouring properties	See main issue 1.

## Consultation responses

9. No consultations have been undertaken.

## Assessment of planning considerations

### Relevant development plan policies

10. **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
11. **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

12. **Relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 (NPPF):**
  - NPPF7 Requiring good design

## **Case Assessment**

13. 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: Amenity**

14. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs – DM2, NPPF paragraph 127.
15. As the former plans for the extension have been approved, the assessment below principally focuses on the proposed amendments. The main issue for consideration relates to loss of outlook and increased overshadowing for the box room window of the neighbouring property by the raising and replacing of the flat roof with a pitch roof (paragraph 8a).
16. With the former approved plans the rear-facing pitch roof did raise the current height of the roof, where it meets the existing house and close to the box room window, by 0.6m. With the amended plans this is raised to 0.8m and, as the newly proposed roof pitches to the side, there is now no reduction in height toward the rear. The parapet along the boundary will be roughly level with the top of the glazing in the neighbouring box room window, which is positioned 0.75m from the boundary.
17. The raised roof/wall is directly to the south of the neighbouring window and property. This means that the sun will be at a relatively high trajectory when shining from the direction of the roof. The window will get some light all year, and this will vary from winter months, when just the top of the window will still get some sunlight, to summer months when the window will be scarcely affected. When considering that, for ground floor extensions, it is very common for eaves on the boundary to be notably higher than the top of a neighbouring window, with a greater degree of overshadowing than would be experienced here, the impact in this case will be at a level which can be considered acceptable.
18. In terms of loss of outlook, while most of the immediate view to the left side of the window will be blocked, the window is set 0.75m distant from the boundary and available view of the sky and surrounds, along with levels of diffuse daylight, will still be well within acceptable levels.
19. While the objections also mention the potential for overshadowing to both neighbouring properties, the raising of the roof will not have a noticeable effect on any other windows.
20. There are no amenity implications relating to the change of the side facing pitch from glass to tile/rooflight (paragraph 8b).

21. In conclusion, though there will be some loss of light and outlook to the neighbouring box room window, this impact is not considered to be significant enough to warrant objection and the proposals are acceptable in terms of amenity.

### **Other issues**

22. In terms of design, the pitch roof will represent an aesthetic improvement on the existing flat roof, though the significance of this in determining the application is limited given the lack of visibility of the extension from the public realm. With no other material concerns, the changes are acceptable in terms of design, scale and form.

### **Equalities and diversity issues**

23. There are no significant equality or diversity issues.

### **Local finance considerations**

24. 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.
25. 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.
26. In this case local finance considerations are not considered to be material to the case.

### **Conclusion**

27. Though there will be some impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of loss of light and outlook, this is not considered to be significant enough to warrant refusal. With no other material concerns, the amended proposals are acceptable.

### **Recommendation**

To approve application no. 19/01702/F - 47 Connaught Road, Norwich, NR2 3BP and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

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