

HOVETON - PF/24/0113 - Single storey rear extension to dwelling; replacement roof with higher ridge level and rear dormer to provide first floor accommodation; porch extension to front; external alterations at 83 Grange Close, Hoveton, Norwich for Mr Mark Hoare

Householder Development

Target Date: 18 March 2024

Extension of time: TBC

Case Officer: Chris Green

Full Planning Permission

RELEVANT SITE CONSTRAINTS

Areas Susceptible to Groundwater

Landscape Character Assessment: Low Plains Farmland

Within Residential Area

Within Settlement Boundary

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None

THE APPLICATION

This application is for domestic extensions and in three parts:

- A 5m deep full width rear flat roofed extension using a proprietary membrane roof.
- An alteration to the roof pitch of the existing house to increase to 45 degrees and addition of a slightly under full width box dormer to the rear up to the existing rear wall line to accommodate a master bedroom, ensuite bath and shower room and dressing room. This raises the ridge by 1.6m but leaves the eaves as they are.
- To the front to provide an enclosed extended porch and a new bay window to the left of the porch to expand the second bedroom slightly

The rear extension and box dormer are shown as timber clad construction in natural spruce.

REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

At the request of Cllr Dixon for the following reasons:

Cllr Dixon considers that this is an application that tests the fine line between acceptable development and development conducted as permitted development and will lead to a loss of privacy where privacy has hitherto been of a very high level and where there are no other first floor developments locally. Older estates had a higher level of privacy than more recent ones and this should be preserved. There is therefore an established local character requiring protection.

REPRESENTATIONS

Comments from six adjoining neighbours summarised as follows:

Objections

- Privacy: Two windows at first floor level that overlook garden areas and include a Juliet balcony with bigger impact as it is a viewing point. Currently our garden is not overlooked. This raises serious concerns around privacy and safeguarding.
- Loss of light: Loss of morning sunlight to neighbouring rear garden.
- Overbearing impact: The increase in overall roof height would dominate gardens and street-scene and be taller than the other bungalows.
- The design of this extension is of very poor quality visually and deemed an 'eyesore'.

Support expressed by neighbours for the single level extension and front porch.

CONSULTATIONS:

Landscape NNDC: **No objection** Preliminary Roost Assessment is not required in this case.

Hoveton Town Council: **No comments** submitted.

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.

CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998 - SECTION 17

The application raises no significant crime and disorder issues.

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.

RELEVANT POLICIES

North Norfolk Core Strategy

SS 1 - Spatial Strategy for North Norfolk

SS 3 – Housing

EN 2 - Protection and enhancement of landscape and settlement character

EN 4 - Design

EN 6 - Sustainable Construction and Energy Efficiency

EN 9 - Biodiversity and geology

CT 5 - The transport impact of new development

CT 6 - Parking provision

Material Considerations:

Supplementary Planning Documents

North Norfolk Design Guide SPD (2008)

North Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment SPD (2021)

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

Chapter 2 – Achieving sustainable development

Chapter 4 – Decision-making

Chapter 12 - Achieving well-designed and beautiful places

Chapter 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

OFFICER ASSESSMENT

MAIN ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

- 1. Whether the proposed development is acceptable in principle**
- 2. The effect on the street-scene from the raising of the building's roofline.**
- 3. The effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby dwellings**

1. Principle – policies SS 1 and SS 3

The property is located within Hoveton's Settlement Boundary and a designated residential area. Extensions to existing dwellings is a type of development acceptable in principle in such locations and the proposal complies with these spatial policies.

2. Design and effect on the street-scene - policy EN 4

This proposal reworks this building's design extensively in terms of material treatment but retains the basic form to the front, albeit with the addition of a large porch. The neighbouring property to the left (as viewed from the road) is entirely brick and that to the right brick has large areas of render to the front. The retaining of grey interlocking tiles will allow a degree of continuity in the group and the larger rendered areas reflect the property to the right. The raising of the ridge is not considered to create an overwhelming scale change that would harm the street-scene. The proposal is considered acceptable in design terms.

A materials condition is required because it is not clear that the roofing materials will be the same as existing, while the description is the same in the submitted information, this could lead to a different grey tile being used from the double roll interlocking concrete pantile currently on site, and this would lose some of the beneficial congruity across the group.

The rear dormer and extension do differ in materials being vertical timber clad and roofed with a proprietary membrane roof. These features are not considered to have any impact on the street-scene by being generally concealed from it. They are materials not found elsewhere in the locality, there are however mineral felt flat roofs on garages for example. The design guide suggests that generally extensions should use similar materials to those found in the original building, it also suggests extensions should generally be to the rear,

where 'competition' with the original building is less likely. While therefore the material choice does not conform strictly with the guidance, the impact of the change to the rear in this mid-20th century development is not considered detrimental, and in aesthetic terms adding some limited interest. The proposal would therefore, on balance, accord with design requirements of Policy EN 4.

3. Living conditions and amenity - policy EN 4

The neighbouring property to the left (southeast) features a high-level secondary light into the room on the northwest corner of that property. As this is a secondary light the small change in light incident on the window arising from the raised roof is not considered to be materially harmful. The property to the right (northwest) has a garage adjacent to the site and the side window will lose some light, but as a non-habitable space this is not materially significant.

To the rear the new upper windows are not considered to impact materially on privacy as the distance to the rear boundary from these is 26m and the distance to the residences at the rear 46m. The separation distance is well in excess of the Amenity Criteria recommendations in this respect in the North Norfolk Design Guide SPD. A condition or note to reinforce that the Juliette balcony should not be changed to give access to the roof of the ground floor extension should be added to flag that this would require planning permission.

Officers recognise that the addition of a box dormer creates the potential for impact on neighbouring privacy. However, some works to create a box dormer can fall within permitted development rights and Officer assessment of amenity impacts has to have regard to what can be added to a dwelling using householder permitted development rights.

In this case, a box dormer of the scale proposed might be difficult to construct on the existing roof as the existing roof is only 2.1m high from eaves to ridge. Nevertheless the permitted development rights reflect the principle that overlooking of rear gardens is accorded less weight in planning terms than that where windows are looked into directly. Because the bedroom window is in the centre of the roof space, outlook to neighbour's gardens is oblique and this is not changed by a Juliette balcony as such features have no significant projection from the plane of the window they serve. The dressing room window is closer to the boundary, however the function ascribed is non-habitable and the applicant has agreed to it being obscure glazed. A condition requiring obscured glass could be applied.

The proposed ground floor rear extension is not considered to affect light or outlook for the neighbours to left or right because of the driveway separation on both sides and the lack of lateral windows. A flue is shown on the southeast side of this rear extension, as to whether this will draft correctly and not impact on amenity by way of smell, is a matter for the Building Regulation considerations. If, however the flue has to be higher than shown as a result, a further planning application may be required.

Other considerations

- *Landscape impact - policy EN 2:* The works would not readily evident in long views outside this housing estate so, the modest increase in ridge height (of approximately 1600mm) is not considered to give rise to conflict with this policy.
- *Sustainable construction and energy efficiency - Policy EN 6:* This policy specifies sustainability and energy efficiency requirements for new developments. No information is shown in the application; however, it is noted that the over-rendering and the extensions proposed can potentially improve the performance of the building.

- Ecology – *policy EN 9*: This site is 300m from any woodland in a modern housing estate. No ecology interest is deemed to arise.
- Highway safety and parking - *policies CT5 and CT6*. The proposal does not change the driveway/access arrangement or garage. To meet the adopted parking standards two parking spaces are required for both two- and three-bedroom dwellings and there remains sufficient car standing space on site for compliance with this.

CONCLUSION AND PLANNING BALANCE

While there is some change to privacy in the lower parts of adjacent gardens, and there is also a change to the character of the area brought about by a higher ridge line, this change is considered acceptable within an estate where the established character does not demand absolute uniformity, this has to be set against the reasonable right to enjoyment of one's home enshrined in the human rights act and the economic benefits of small scale development activity.

The proposal is considered to comply with the relevant policies in the North Norfolk Core Strategy referred to above. Approval with conditions is therefore recommended.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVAL subject to conditions relating to the following matters

- Time limit for implementation
- Approved plans
- Roof materials
- Flat roof not to be used as a balcony or similar
- Obscure glazing to dressing room window

Final wording of conditions and any others considered necessary to be delegated to the Assistant Director – Planning