

**47 BINHAM - PF/24/0841 - FRONT AND REAR EXTENSIONS TO DWELLING, EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS AT BUNKERS HILL BARN, BUNKERS HILL, BINHAM, FAKENHAM, NORFOLK, NR21 0DF**

Officers Report

The PO-NW introduced the Officers report and recommendation for approval subject to conditions.

The PO-NW outlined the sites location, relationship with listed buildings and neighbouring dwellings, and detailed proposed and existing floor plans and elevations as well and provided images in and around the site.

Whilst the proposed extensions were considered to be large, Officers contended that they were subservient to the host dwelling. Further, the rear extension could be developed under permitted development. Officers did not consider the application to be contrary to Core Policy HO8.

With respect to heritage and design and the impact on the character of the area, Officers did not consider that there would be a significant adverse impact by way of the proposal and acknowledged that the materials used were sympathetic with the area and the dwelling was in a sheltered location, not easily visible from the outside courtyard. There was not considered to be significant harm to the conservation area or the over character of the area.

The principal concern was the impact to the neighbouring property, Pilgrims Barn, however it was noted that the agent had provided studies which established that there was already an existing level of overshadowing across the front of Pilgrims Barn. Sun Studies supplied by the agent, established that although there would be an increase in shadowing before midday, after midday there would be no change year-round. The PO-DW stated that there was not a demonstrable adverse impact regarding overshadowing, and therefore this policy requirement was not met.

Public Speakers

Ian Tooley – Objecting  
Gaery Pearce (agent) – Supporting

Local Member

The Local Member – Cllr S Butikofer – advised that she had referred this application to Committee due to two main concerns, which were shared by the Parish Council.

First, the application was contained within the Binham Conservation Area, an area the Parish Council had taken an active role to preserve and maintain. It was perhaps a matter of opinion what the impact of the front extension would have to the two attached barns, and the visual line and character of the barns overall. She argued that the rear extension would impact the historic character of the Bunkers Hill area, which was an important feature in the Binham Conservation Area. The Local Member stated the Local Planning Authority should work to uphold Conservation Areas and support the Parish Council in their efforts to retain as much of the original charm and characteristics of the area as possible. The entrance to the Bunkers Hill site passed immediately through two grade II\* listed properties, further, access passed the village green, home of a scheduled ancient monument, Binham Market cross.

The Local Member noted within the Officers report that no concerns were raised provided the drawings were accurate, something which the Local Member considered should be expected as they were part of the formal planning process. Additionally, Officers agreed that the rear extension would over domesticate that part of the building. Therefore, Cllr S Butikofer argued, it was known that the rear extension would impact the character of the area. To approve the application, she argued, would be in contravention of policy EN 4 and EN 8.

Secondly, The Local Member contended that proper regard had not been afforded to policy EN 4. She considered that if the proposal were to be built out, it would have a significantly detrimental impact on the occupiers of Pilgrim Barn, given the development would block light to the most significant habitable room in the property (The Lounge). Cllr S Butikofer argued that overshadowing was oppressive to occupiers and would negatively impact the life of habitants.

### Members Debate

- a. Cllr L Paterson disagreed with the Officers recommendation and considered the proposal would have a detrimental impact and was not in keeping with its setting.
- b. The Chairman advised Members the options available to them including deferral.
- c. Cllr L Vickers stated that she was not wholly opposed to development in conservation areas and recognised that buildings needed to be lived in if they were to be preserved. However, she shared in Cllr L Paterson's concerns regarding loss of light.
- d. Cllr K Toye considered there to be a lack of information and images to justify approval, and agreed it was important to understand the link between this development and the impact to neighbouring dwellings, specifically the front extension.
- e. Cllr P Neatherway echoed Cllr K Toye's comments and endorsed deferment.
- f. Cllr J Toye expressed his support for deferment.
- g. Cllr L Vickers proposed deferment of the application to enable discussion between the applicant and affected neighbours regarding the front extension. Cllr J Toye seconded the motion.
- h. The DM acknowledged the front extension would have an impact on the neighbour and noted that an existing wall was already causing some overshadowing. He recognised that the applicant was entitled to have their decision determined and reserved the right to refuse negotiation and appeal the decision.
- i. The applicant's agent indicated the applicant would be supportive of deferral.
- j. Cllr V Holliday asked, if the application was to be negotiated, if the rear glazing could also be discussed.

- k. The DM stated that it would be beneficial for Officers to understand which aspects of the proposal the Committee would like to be amended. He noted that, from the Committee's discussion, the front extension was at issue.
- l. Cllr R Macdonald agreed that it was the front extension at issue, otherwise the application was fine.

**UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED** by 13 votes for.

**That Planning Application PF/24/0841 be DEFFERED.**