| Report to | Planning applications committee | Item |
|------------------------|---|------|
| | 09 March 2017 | |
| Report of | Head of planning services | |
| Subject | Application no 17/00107/F - 475 Unthank Road Norwich NR4 7QN | 4(e) |
| Reason for referral | Objection / Enforcement Action | |

| Ward: | Eaton |
|--------------|--|
| Case officer | Stephen Polley - <u>stephenpolley@norwich.gov.uk</u> |

| Development proposal | | | | | |
|---|---------|---------|--|--|--|
| Two storey rear extension with balcony. | | | | | |
| Representations | | | | | |
| Object | Comment | Support | | | |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | | | |

| Main issues | Key considerations |
|-----------------------|--|
| 1 Design and heritage | Impact of the proposals upon the appearance of parent building and the character and appearance of the conservation area. |
| 2 Residential amenity | Impact of the proposed extension on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. |
| Expiry date | 14 March 2017 |
| Recommendation | Refuse |



© Crown Copyright and database right 2017. Ordnance Survey 100019747. Planning Application No 17/00107/F Site Address 475 Unthank Road

Scale

1:1,250





PLANNING SERVICES



The site and surroundings

- 1. The site is located on the west side of Unthank Road to the south-west of the city.
- 2. The subject property is a detached 2 storey dwelling originally constructed circa 1950 using red bricks, red clay pantiles and painted timber windows and doors. The property sits on a large plot with a gravel driveway to the front and a long, mature garden to the rear. The property has recently been extended and altered extensively in a matching style. A timber shed has been placed to the side (south) of the main house.
- 3. The prevailing character of the surrounding area is residential with most properties being large detached dwellings, many of which have been extended and altered. The site is bordered by no. 477 to the south and no. 453 to the north. The boundaries are marked by 2m high fencing and mature planting.
- 4. It should be noted that the current application has been submitted following consent being granted on two previous occasions for a similar development. Following the commencement of construction it has become apparent that the development has not been carried out in accordance with the previously approved plans.
- 5. Construction of the rear extension has commenced with the majority of the structural work having been completed at the time of the most recent site visit.

Constraints

6. Conservation Area: Unthank and Christchurch

Relevant planning history

| Ref | Proposal | Decision | Date |
|------------------|---|----------|------------|
| 07/00507/F | Two-storey extensions at front and side and single storey extensions and dormer window at rear of dwelling. | APPR | 18/06/2007 |
| 16/00200/F | Two storey rear extension. | APPR | 06/04/2016 |
| 16/00705/NM A | Amendment to planning permission 16/00200/F to allow juliet balcony. | CANCLD | 16/06/2016 |
| 16/01137/F | Two storey rear extension with balcony. | APPR | 30/09/2016 |

The proposal

- 7. The proposal is for the construction of a two storey rear extension with a balcony. The proposed extension is to be constructed on the south-west corner, projecting 6.5m into the rear garden on its north elevation and 7.1m along its south elevation. The proposed extension has a width of 5m and is to cover an area of 32.5m².
- 8. The extension features a rear facing gable end and an irregularly shaped roof with the north elevation being considerably taller than the south. The extension has an eaves height of 5.5m matching the original on the southern elevation whilst the northern elevation is 7.5m to eaves. The ridge height of the extension matches that of the main house at a height of 8.2m.
- 9. The proposal includes a rear facing bay window at ground floor level which allows for the creation of a 1m deep balcony above at first floor level. A set of patio doors are proposed on both the north and south facing elevations.

Representations

10. Advertised on site and in the press. Adjacent and neighbouring properties have been notified in writing. 3 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 |
|---|------------------|
| Design too large and unsympathetic to character of property and surrounding conservation area | See main issue 1 |
| Design not in accordance with previously approved plans. | |
| Design is overbearing | See main issue 2 |
| Balcony results in a loss of privacy | |
| Patio doors result in noise disturbance | |

Consultation responses

11. Consultation responses are summarised below the full responses are available to view at <u>http://planning.norwich.gov.uk/online-applications/</u> by entering the application number.

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

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
- DM9 Safeguarding Norwich's heritage

Other material considerations

- 14. Relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 (NPPF):
 - NPPF0 Achieving sustainable development
 - NPPF6 Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
 - NPPF7 Requiring good design
 - NPPF10 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
 - NPPF11 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
 - NPPF12 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment
 - NPPF13 Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals

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 1: Design & Heritage

- 16. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs JCS2, DM3, DM9, NPPF paragraphs 9, 17, 56, 60-66 and 128-141.
- 17. The extension is to be constructed using matching materials including red bricks, red clay pantiles and painted timber windows and doors. The proposal is to contain a study at ground floor level, a bedroom at first floor level and a storage area within the roof space
- 18. Particular concern has been raised that the proposed design is neither in keeping with the character of the property nor that of the surrounding conservation area. The proposed roof does not appear to be subservient to the main roof line as its ridge matches the overall height. The 7.5m tall north elevation results in a large expansive area of predominantly solid wall, dwarfing the main house. The taller north elevation leads to the creation of an unequally pitched roof and an asymmetrical rear facing gable.

- 19. The overall height of the proposed extension has resulted in it being clearly visible from outside of the site. As such, the extension will appear as an overbearing presence to the neighbouring property to the south and will be clearly visible from Unthank Road and consequently unduly prominent and incongruous in the street scene.
- 20. The design of the proposed extension has been altered significantly from the previously approved plans which included a smaller roof which was both symmetrical and hipped in design. Policy DM3 seeks to promote good design and policy DM9 seeks to protect and enhance the character of conservation. The proposed extension is therefore considered to be contrary to polices DM3 and DM9 being of an inappropriate scale and design which will cause harm to the character and appearance of the subject property, and the surrounding conservation area.

Main issue 2: Amenity

- 21. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs DM2, DM11, NPPF paragraphs 9 and 17.
- 22. The proposed enlargement will result in an improved living space for the occupants of the subject property, however the scale may lead to some impacts on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.
- 23. Particular concern was raised that the proposed balcony would result in a loss of privacy. The inclusion of a balcony will allow for some overlooking of the rear garden of no. 477, however the layout of the neighbouring property ensures that the only views possible are not of the main outdoor living space area, which is well screened by an earlier extension and mature planting.
- 24. As discussed earlier, the design of the roof including a gable end and a height matching the main roof will lead to the extension appearing overbearing along the shared boundary with the neighbouring property to the south.
- 25. Particular concern was also raised that the inclusion of patio doors to the proposed south elevation would result in noise disturbance to the neighbouring property. The proposed doors are located within close proximity of the boundary and neighbouring property and might lead to some noise disturbance. The inclusion of doors within the ground floor is however is not considered to be likely to result in significant harm and represents a typical arrangement for a property within this area of the city.
- 26. Particular concern was also raised that the extension would result in noise disturbance at properties located on Bek Close to the west as a result of an increased number of occupants at the subject property. The proposed extension is for the creation of only two additional rooms and as such will not result in significantly more occupants living at the property. The properties on Bek Close are located a minimum of 50m from the subject property and there also being substantial areas of mature planting in between, ensuring that noise disturbance will not be an issue.

Other matters

- 27. The following matters have been assessed and considered satisfactory and in accordance with relevant development plan policies, subject to appropriate conditions and mitigation:
- 28. Concern was raised that the submitted block plans contained some inaccuracies which may have prejudiced earlier decision making. It is accepted that the location plan does not wholly accurately represent the site and it's surroundings, however decisions have been made following extensive site visits which have formed the basis of decision making.

Equalities and diversity issues

29. There are no significant equality or diversity issues.

Local finance considerations

- 30. 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.
- 31. 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.
- 32. In this case local finance considerations are not considered to be material to the case.

Conclusion

- 33. The proposed extension is considered to be contrary to policies DM3 and DM9 as it is of a poor design which is harmful to the character and appearance of the subject property and surrounding conservation area.
- 34. The proposal will have some impacts on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties, particularly as the extension appears as an overbearing presence along the shared boundary with the neighbouring property to the south.

Recommendation

To:

- (1) refuse application no. 17/00107/F 475 Unthank Road Norwich NR4 7QN for the following reasons:
 - 1. The proposed development will result in an overly large extension which is of a poor design, causing harm to the character and appearance of the subject property and surrounding conservation area. The development would therefore be

contrary to policies DM3 and DM9 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014, and paragraphs 128-141 of the NPPF.

- The proposed development by way of its scale would result in overbearing impacts to the neighbouring property. This would result in an unacceptable standard of amenity for the neighbours. The development would therefore be contrary to Policy 2 of the Joint core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk 2011 (amended 2014), Policy 2 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 and paragraphs 9, 17 and section 7 of the NPPF.
- (2) authorise enforcement action under section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure the removal of the unauthorised extension.





