

Weybourne – PF/22/1885 – Erection of single-storey front and rear extensions and rendering of property, Heath View, Holt Road, Weybourne, for Christopher Harwood

- Target Date: 10th December 2022

Case Officer: Fran Watson

Householder application

RELEVANT SITE CONSTRAINTS

- LDF Residential Area
- LDF Settlement Boundary
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

n/a

THE APPLICATION

The application proposes a single-storey rear extension and front porch, along with the rendering of the existing bungalow. It is positioned towards the southern edge of the village within a residential development of primarily single-storey dwellings, with agricultural land to the west. The existing property is of a standard brick and pantile construction with shared gravel driveway and a row of three garages to the rear. Single-storey dwellings neighbour the site to the north and east, with a two-storey dwelling to the south.

REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

At the request of Cllr V Holliday due to concerns regarding compliance with policies EN 1, EN 2 and EN 4 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy, para. 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and loss of biodiversity as a result of front hedge removal.

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL

Weybourne Parish Council: Object due to detrimental effect on neighbouring houses, light pollution, overdevelopment and impact on the environment due to the large footprint.

CONSULTATIONS

n/a

REPRESENTATIONS

To date, three public objections have been received raising the following concerns (summarised):

- Proposed extension is very close to shared driveway with concerns regarding access for emergency vehicles to property to the rear.
- Development is too big/out of scale in a quiet residential area as the property is a holiday let, and with little parking facilities, will come up to edge of boundary.

- Rendering is different to other buildings, property is in a prominent position.
- Increase in traffic, cars having to reverse out of site onto busy road.

HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

It is considered that the proposed development may raise issues relevant to:

- Article 8: The Right to respect for private and family life.
- Article 1 of the First Protocol: The right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions.

Having considered the likely impact on an individual's Human Rights, and the general interest of the public, approval of this application as recommended is considered to be justified, proportionate and in accordance with planning law.

LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS

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 not considered to be material to this case.

STANDING DUTIES

Due regard has been given to the following duties: Environment Act 2021 Equality Act 2010 Crime and Disorder Act, 1998 (S17) Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act 2006 (S40) The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (R9) Planning Act 2008 (S183) Human Rights Act 1998 – this incorporates the rights of the European Convention on Human Rights into UK Law - Article 8 – Right to Respect for Private and Family Life Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (S66(1) and S72)

RELEVANT POLICIES

North Norfolk Core Strategy (adopted September 2008):

SS 1 - Spatial Strategy for North Norfolk
 SS 3 - Housing
 EN 1 - Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Broads
 EN2 – Protection and Enhancement of Landscape and Settlement Character
 EN 4 - Design
 CT 5 - The Transport Impact of New Development
 CT 6 - Parking Provision

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

Section 2 – Achieving sustainable development
 Section 4 – Decision-making
 Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
 Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

MAIN ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

1. **Whether the proposed development is acceptable in principle:** *policies SS 1 and SS 3*
2. **The effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area:** *policy EN 4*
3. **The effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings:** *policy EN 4*
4. **Whether the proposed development will result in a detrimental impact upon the surrounding landscape/AONB:** *policies EN 1 and EN 2*
5. **The impact of the proposed development on highway safety and parking:** *policies CT 5 and CT 6*

1. Whether the proposed development is acceptable in principle

The site is located within Weybourne's designated Settlement Boundary as a Coastal Service Village under policy SS 1 and is within a designated Residential Area. Within such area, policy SS 3 indicates that appropriate residential development will be permitted. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in principle but to be acceptable overall it must comply with all other relevant development plan policies unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

2. Effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area

The dwelling is a bungalow likely to have been built during the mid-20th century. A block of three garages sits to the side rear of it with a dwelling (Beecholme) to the rear. Other than Lee Cottage to the south which is a two storey brick and flint dwelling, nearby dwellings are all bungalows with a fairly standard appearance.

As referred to above, the proposed extensions would result in a large increase in the footprint of the dwelling. The vast majority of the extension would sit to the rear of the existing dwelling and would have a flat roof form. It is however considered this would not result in any material harm to the character and appearance of either the dwelling or the surrounding area as public views of it would be relatively restricted and as it would be seen in the context of existing development such as the adjacent garage block. The front extension would enhance the appearance of the dwelling with the projecting gable design adding visual interest. Due to the size of the plot, it is considered that the proposed development would not appear cramped within it.

Render is proposed to both the walls of the extension and over the existing external brickwork of the dwelling. Whilst it is accepted that none of the surrounding dwellings within whose context the development would be seen are finished in render, this does not necessarily make it unacceptable. As the site is not within a conservation area and the building is not listed, the North Norfolk Design Guide SPD indicates that render can be acceptable, but the resultant building should pay due regard to its immediate setting. Although render is not commonplace within the village, there are some buildings where render and painted brick is used, including within the conservation area. On balance, given the general character of the surrounding development, it is considered that the use of render would not result in any material harm.

The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of policy EN 4 for the reasons stated.

3. The effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings

As the proposed extension would be single storey, there would be no material impacts with regards to loss of privacy or outlook. There would be no material overbearing or overshadowing impact. The south side wall of the proposed extension would sit 0.8m from the common boundary with the garden to Lee Cottage and would be to the north of the neighbouring dwelling and so would not cause any material overshadowing of the neighbouring garden. The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of policy EN 4.

4. Whether the proposed development will result in a detrimental impact upon the surrounding landscape/AONB

The dwelling faces undeveloped land to the west but to the east is a small suburban style housing estate of bungalows in a cul-de-sac (Springfield Close). There is some limited street lighting and from the aerial photography it can be seen that a number of dwellings have rear and side conservatories with glazed roofs as does a dwelling (Westmead) on Holt Road just to the north of the site. A nearby dwelling on the same side of Holt Road has two large roof lights in its front elevation and there are a number of dwellings within the complex at Home Farm nearby, on the west side of Holt Road which have roof lights.

The site is within the Norfolk Coast AONB where, amongst other things, a low level of development and population density, leading to dark night skies and a general sense of remoteness and tranquillity away from busier roads and settlements, contribute to its qualities and natural beauty.

Weybourne Parish Council have raised concerns regarding light pollution, but do not identify the specific area/s of concern with the proposals in this respect. The proposal includes 3 glazed sliding doors in the rear elevation of the proposed extension in an opening with a width of approximately 4.8 metres and a glazed roof lantern (2.4m x 3.0m) in the flat roof. Whilst the dwelling is not located within a Dark Skies Reserve or Dark Sky Discovery Site, the requirement to take light pollution into account when assessing the impacts of a development is within para. 185 of the NPPF which requires that new development "limits the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation".

The glazed doors in the rear elevation of the proposed extension are considered acceptable given they would be on the rear of the property which faces towards a built-up area rather than open land. Similarly given the roof lantern would also be to the rear and the site's proximity to a housing estate where there are other dwellings in the vicinity with glazed roof conservatory extensions as noted above, it is considered that any light spill through the roof light in the proposed extension would be limited and would not result in any material increase in light pollution.

Concerns regarding the overdevelopment of the site have been raised by both the Parish Council and in representations. This is considered in more detail below, but in general, whilst the proposed extensions would increase the footprint of the dwelling by approximately 90%, the majority of this would sit to the rear of the dwelling such that any impact would be limited. The front extension which would be more visible in public views is considered to be modest and would have no harmful impact. The dwelling sits on the edge of a built-up area and is seen within the context of other dwellings.

For the reasons stated above, it is considered the proposed development would not have any material impact on surrounding landscape or the special qualities of the AONB and therefore complies with policy EN 1 and EN 2.

5. The impact of the proposed development on highway safety and parking

There would be no change to the existing vehicle access to Holt Road, which also serves the dwelling to the rear (Beecholme). It is considered that the proposed development would not result in any material increase in vehicle movements and visibility out of the access to Holt Road is adequate and has been improved by the removal of a hedge on the south side of the access. The proposal would however increase the number of bedrooms from 3 to 4 which increases the on-site parking requirement to 3 spaces in accordance with the current adopted parking standards. The proposed plan shows three parking spaces and as such it complies with policy CT 6.

The representation from the occupiers of Beecholme regarding obstructing the access are noted. From what is referred to in the representation they have a right of access over the land which forms part of Heath View. The gap between the corner of the proposed extension and the garage block to the rear would be approximately 4.5 metres which is similar to the gap between the gable end of the garages and an existing boundary fence on the access to Beecholme and is sufficient for a car to be able to drive through. Furthermore, the granting of planning permission would not override any legal rights of access which in any event are a civil matter between the parties concerned. Any arrangement that would be needed to temporarily restrict access to construct the extension for example, would similarly be a civil matter.

With regard to access for emergency vehicles this has been checked with NCC Highways who have confirmed there would be no issues as vehicles such as a fire appliance would not enter further into the site than fronting the existing garage block in the event of an emergency and could service either of the dwellings from that point. There would be no requirement for the appliance to be manoeuvred further into the site.

6. Other matters

Although reference is made to holiday accommodation in the representations, there is nothing in the application that indicates the dwelling would or would not be used for holiday accommodation purposes. If this is done on a commercial basis rather than a second home for example it may be possible that there would be a material change of use from a dwelling. As it stands however, the application must be determined on the basis of what is applied for which is a householder application for extensions to a dwelling.

Regarding hedge removal, a box hedge to the front of the dwelling has been removed, however, removal of this would not have required planning permission and as such, is not a material consideration in determination of this application.

Conclusion:

The proposals are considered to be acceptable in design with no significantly detrimental impact upon amenity nor the AONB, and therefore comply with the relevant Development Plan policies as outlined above.

RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVAL subject to conditions to cover the matters listed below and any other considered necessary by the Assistant Director – Planning

- Time limit for implementation
- Approved plans
- Materials as submitted

Final wording of conditions to be delegated to the Assistant Director – Planning.