

ERPINGHAM - PF/24/1364- Erection of two storey side and single storey rear extension, other external alterations including to shape of roof and replacement windows.

Householder Development

Target Date: 18 November 2024

Extension of time: 5th May 2025

Case Officer: Alice Walker

Householder Planning Permission

RELEVANT SITE CONSTRAINTS:

Within a Countryside Policy Area
Within Hanworth Conservation Area
Within an area susceptible to Groundwater flooding
Within the River Bure Nutrient Neutrality catchment area
Within the GIRAMS Zone of influence

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

PF/92/1270
Erection of Extension
Approved 10.11.1992

BACKGROUND

The application was considered by the Development Committee on 14 November 2024. After considerable debate, the Committee RESOLVED by 9 votes for and 1 abstention that Planning Application PF/24/1364 be deferred.

The reasons for referral related to matters of design, scale and massing with the Committee raising concerns that the extension should be more subservient to the host dwelling and materials more in keeping with the local vernacular to blend the extension with the host dwelling.

The Committee Report and the Development Committee Minutes from the meeting of 14th November 2024 are included at **Appendix 1** and **2** of this report.

THE APPLICATION AND ACTIONS SINCE NOVEMBER 2024

The proposals seek alterations to the existing cottage, including modifications to the existing roof and a two-storey side extension with a single storey rear extension to replace the existing lean to car port. As originally submitted, plans for a contemporary two storey side/rear extension were recommended for approval by officers when presented to Committee in November 2024. The application was deferred by committee members on the basis of design concerns from the proposed scale, unsympathetic contemporary design and materials of the extension and the resultant heritage harm to the Hanworth Conservation Area. The applicant has since worked proactively with Officers to revise the design, endeavouring to address the issues raised by members of the committee.

A second scheme was submitted and re-consulted on 18th December 2024. These proposals raised further concerns and have now been superseded..

The scheme presented today is an amendment of the second scheme with plans received on the 5th March 2025. These design revisions are discussed below. All other matters remain as before, and are otherwise considered acceptable by officers.

This report should be read in conjunction with the Committee Report and the Development Committee Minutes from the meeting of 14th November 2024 and these are included at **Appendix 1** and **2** of this report.

CONSULTEE COMMENTS:

Conservation and Design: **No Objection** (to revised scheme submitted 05/03/25)
Objected to plans submitted 18/12/24)

Hanworth Parish Council: **Object** (on plans submitted 18/12/24)

LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION:

Three letters of representation received in **OBJECTION** to the revised plans and public consultation of 18/12/24. The issues raised are summarised as below:

- The proposal would not visually enhance The Common.
- The proposal would damage the history of the dwelling originally built by the stonemason to the village.
- The size of the proposed cottage would be far too large for its prominent position on the common.
- The loss of the hipped roof would change the character of the property and should be retained.
- The proposed extension would make the property too large/ unaffordable to local people.
- Revised plans do not sufficiently address the concerns of the committee.
- Materials remain the same.

OFFICER ASSESSMENT:

Design

The application site is centrally positioned on Hanworth Common and occupies a prominent position within Hanworth Conservation Area. The topography of the landscape is such that all elevations of the dwelling feature in a series of long-range views from points along both Parrow Lane and The Common. The core of the cottage is likely to date to at least the mid-19th century, and no doubt has long had a close relationship with the common grassland which surrounds it and is still grazed. However over the years there have been several alterations including UPVC glazing, a replacement roof likely dating from the 1970s and a single storey extension in the 1990s. The building is neither a nationally or locally listed building.

In terms of design, whilst the original cottage is a nice example of simple, rural vernacular, it is considered to be of limited architectural or historic merit. The modern additions to the south and west sides are of poor quality and detract from the overall character of the both the host building and the wider conservation area. The removal of one of these additions and the alterations to the other would offer an opportunity for enhancement, along with the replacement of the existing uPVC windows with timber joinery across the main elevations.

The dwelling is situated within a reasonably sized plot which is able to accommodate the proposed additional built form and complies with Policies EN 4 and HO 8 in this regard. The

two-storey extension retains elements of the contemporary character from the originally submitted scheme, notably the off-centre window and a partially jettied first-floor (designed to allow vehicular access to the side of the dwelling for parking). Officers consider that the scale of this section remains subordinate to the host dwelling whilst creating a new addition with design qualities that support the distinct character of the cottage.

The side extension is predominantly constructed from “soft” coloured red brick to match existing brick work which would not dominate or detract from the host dwelling, particularly on the approaches from the east.

On the front elevation, the proposed facing material is “un-finished” hardwood timber boarding. This material will silver down and contrast against the red brick of the existing cottage. The divergence in materials will breaking up the scale and massing of the front elevation whilst providing a visual distinction between old and new.

Alterations are also proposed to the existing roof of the host dwelling. The cottage has been much altered over the years, the existing roof structure is not original. The proposal seeks to remove the partially hipped gables and create a more traditional fully gabled roof. A full gabled end would also visually enhance the subservience of the side extension on the east elevation and simplifies this connection. Officers consider that keeping the existing ‘gablets’ would create an awkward juncture between the two elements. The farmhouse opposite the cottage and the property on the common to the east are predominantly gabled, there are also several fully hipped properties on Parrow Lane. This alteration is considered to be in keeping with the wider Conservation Area and local vernacular character. It is also proposed that the existing chimney stack would be modestly increased by approximately 3 brick courses as part of the new roofline. This emphasises the verticality of the stack and draws the eye upward over the wider design.

The rear extension is reduced by 750mm from the design considered by members at the November meeting, it is now single storey. The roof arrangement has been amended to a low pitched zinc roof which sits against a parapet brick wall that is intended to emulate a garden wall, tapering down at the end. The parapet feature affords the wall a good capping detail of creasing tiles under a brick coping. This will soften its appearance, and drop heights at the southern end. Long-range views from the east will in any event be softened by screening from the existing vegetation, together with the addition of the parapet wall then impact is substantively reduced from the rear extension on the conservation area.

In terms of the impact on the conservation area, the scheme proposes a design that lends the host dwelling a distinct character and makes use of high-quality traditional materials such as red clay pantiles, sot red brick and natural timber cladding, juxtaposed with the innovative use of more contemporary materials such as the Zinc roof to the rear.

There remains a slight reservation in Officers minds as to the footprint of the single storey addition, the lean-to style roof now has to span a wider area than might be considered ideal. The combined effect with a rather shallow pitch gives it a somewhat stretched quality to this element of the design. However, views from the south and west are likely to be limited to long range or being softened by existing vegetation. With that in mind, these reservations are outweighed by the limited impact and more substantive benefits that the wider scheme offers.

Officers will require submission of full materials and joinery details via condition, subject to suitable details being agreed then the application be compliant with the requirement of Local Plan Policies EN 4 and EN 8, as well as Para 212 of the NPPF.

Planning Balance and Conclusion:

Overall the principle of extending an existing dwelling in this location is acceptable in accordance with Policies SS1 and SS2 of the Core Strategy. The scheme, as now revised, is compliant in terms of scale, massing, design and impact on the designated heritage asset under Policies HO 8, EN 2, EN 4 and EN 8.

Ecological enhancements and mitigation can be secured via condition to ensure compliance with Policy EN 9. Furthermore, there are no significant negative impacts in terms of residential amenity and highways.

Overall, the application is considered acceptable and Approval is therefore recommended subject to the imposition of conditions.

RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVAL subject to conditions relating to the following matters:

- Time limit 3 years
- Development in accordance with approved plans
- Materials as submitted
- Ecology-Bat Licence
- Ecology- Mitigation and enhancements
- External lighting

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

APPENDIX 1

ERPINGHAM - PF/24/1364- Erection of two storey rear extension, infill extension and porch to dwelling; other external alterations including to shape of roof and replacement windows to Owlets, The Common, Hanworth.

Householder Development

Target Date: 18th November

Extension of time: 18th November

Case Officer: Alice Walker

Householder Planning Permission

RELEVANT SITE CONSTRAINTS:

Within a Countryside policy area
Within Hanworth Conservation Area
Within an area susceptible to Groundwater flooding
Within the River Bure Nutrient Neutrality catchment area
Within the GIRAMS Zone of influence

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

PF/92/1270
Erection of Extension
Approved 10.11.1992

THE APPLICATION:

Seeks permission for the erection of a two storey rear extension and infill extension to dwelling; other external alterations including to shape of roof and replacement windows.

REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE:

The item was called into Committee by Cllr John Teye – as ward member for the site. The item was called in on 30 October 2024 and the grounds for call-in are:

“1. This historical small cottage is in a prominent position on Hanworth common which should be considered as part of the character of the conservation area would be changed beyond recognition should this application be approved.

2. I believe that the glazing and finishes to the property will be out of keeping. Proposed retention of trees and hedging along with improvements will not hide this development.

3. Call in-based on concerns regarding non-compliance with Core Strategy Policies SS 1, SS 2, HO 8, EN 2, EN 4 and EN 8”.

REPRESENTATIONS:

1 letter of representation was received making comments neither supporting nor objecting to the proposal.

5 representations have been made objecting to this application. The key points raised in **OBJECTION** are as follows (summarised):

- Scale massing and materials not in keeping with the surrounding conservation area.
- Extension not subservient to main dwelling
- Object to use of cladding
- Common land should not be fenced in or have wall
- Very visible position
- Too big for the plot
- Very visible position and would detract from the Common
- Would completely change the look of the property
- Concerns regarding capacity and location of the septic tank
- Sets a precedent for future proposed extensions

CONSULTATIONS:

Ward Councillor – Comments provided as above

Hanworth Parish Council – Object. The comments in summary are:

- Would not reflect the heritage of the site.
- Would not comply with the aims of the Conservation Area.
- The proposals would not preserve the character, appearance and heritage of the Common.
- The proposed materials are not in keeping with other buildings on the common or conservation area.
- The proposed extension would not be subservient or sympathetic to the existing dwelling.
- Increased occupancy would increase fowl water and sewage.
- Would set a precedent for the expansion of other modest buildings on or around the common.
- Would result in the loss of a small dwelling for local use.
- The alterations would change the settlement character.

Conservation and Design - Support. The comments in summary are:

- The existing extensions are of poor quality and detract from the overall character of the both the host building and the wider conservation area.
- The removal of one of these additions and the altered roof arrangement of the other will offer an improvement, as would the replacement of uPVC windows with timber joinery across the main elevation.
- The revisions also retain the existing porch, and the volume of glazing in the west elevation of the extension has been reduced, both of which are considered to be positive changes.
- The ridge height and overall length of the new extension have been reduced in line with previous recommendations. The reductions help the main dwelling remain the

dominant structure in the wider streetscape and within views from the surrounding common.

- The replacement hedging to the rear will also in time help with some additional screening.
- Although there remains some hesitation about how comfortably the contemporary design sits against the modest existing building, the revisions combined with the enhancements the scheme offers are considered sufficient to allow C&D to conclude the scheme will no longer result in harm to the character and appearance of the Hanworth Conservation Area.

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 (2008):

Policy SS 1 Spatial Strategy for North Norfolk

Policy SS 2 Development in the Countryside

Policy HO 8 House Extensions and Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside

Policy EN 2 Protection and Enhancement of Landscape and Settlement Character

Policy EN 4 Design

Policy EN 8 Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Policy EN 13 Pollution and Hazard Prevention and minimisation

Policy CT 5 Traffic Impact of New Development

Policy CT 6 Parking Provision

Material Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023):

Chapter 2 Achieving sustainable development

Chapter 4 Decision-making

Chapter 12 Achieving well-designed and beautiful places

Chapter 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance:

OFFICER ASSESSMENT:

MAIN ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION:

- 1. Principle of Development**
- 2. Design and heritage impact**
- 3. Amenity**
- 4. Ecology**
- 5. Highways**

1. Principle of Development

Planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Policy SS 1 sets out that the majority of new development in North Norfolk will take place in the towns and larger villages, defined as Principal and Secondary Settlements and a smaller amount of new development will be permitted within in several designated Service and Coastal Service Villages. The rest of North Norfolk, including all settlements that do not fall under the above criteria such as Hanworth, will be designated as Countryside.

Policy SS 2 limits development in Countryside policy areas to that which requires a rural location in order to protect the character of the rural environment. Policy SS 2 does, however, permit alterations and extensions to existing rural residential properties. The proposal seeks an extension and alterations to an existing dwelling.

Policy HO 8 also has a presumption in favour of proposals to extend dwellings within the countryside where they do not result in a scale of dwelling which is disproportionate to the original dwelling.

Subject to compliance to all relevant Core Strategy policies, the proposal is considered acceptable in principle.

2. Design and heritage impact

Policy EN 4 requires that all development should be designed to a high-quality reinforcing local distinctiveness, be expected to be suitably designed for the context within which it is set and ensure that the scale and massing of buildings relate sympathetically to the surrounding area.

Policy HO 8 only permits extensions and alterations to dwellings in countryside areas that would not result in a disproportionately large increase in the height or scale of the original dwelling and would not materially increase the impact of the dwelling on the appearance of the surrounding countryside.

Furthermore, Policy EN 8 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect the historic environment, in this case the Hanworth Conservation Area, which for the purposes of the NPPF is considered a designated heritage asset. Any development within this area should preserve and enhance the character of the area.

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 states that

with respect to any buildings or other land within a conservation area, in the exercise of relevant functions under the Planning Acts, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

The application site is centrally positioned on The Common and occupies a prominent position within Hanworth Conservation Area. Owlets is likely to date to at least the mid-19th century, and no doubt has long had a close relationship with the common grassland which surrounds it and is still grazed. The topography of the landscape is such that all elevations of the dwelling feature in a series of long-range views from various points along both Parrow Lane and The Common.

The proposal seeks alterations to the existing cottage including alterations to the roof and a contemporary two-storey side/rear extension to replace the existing lean to car port. As originally submitted, the proposed plans were not considered acceptable by officers however a revised proposal has since been submitted.

In terms of design, whilst the original cottage is a nice example of simple, rural vernacular, the existing modern additions to the south and west sides are of poor quality and detract from the overall character of the both the host building and the wider conservation area. The removal of one of these additions and the altered roof arrangement of the other will offer an improvement, as would the replacement of uPVC windows with timber joinery across the main elevation. The revised proposals also retain the existing porch, and the volume of glazing in the west elevation of the extension has been reduced, both of which are considered to be positive changes. The replacement hedging to the rear will also in time help with some additional screening.

With regards to policy HO 8, the dwelling is situated within a reasonable plot that can accommodate the additional built form. The proposed extension would be set back from the front elevation. The ridge height and overall length of the new extension have been reduced in line with previous recommendations. Although the reductions of 300mm and 500mm may seem minor, together they help the main dwelling remain the dominant structure in the wider streetscape and within views from the surrounding common. The proposal would not be considered to result in a disproportionately large increase in the height or scale of the original dwelling.

In terms of the impact on the conservation area, the scheme proposes a contemporary design with high quality traditional materials such as red clay pantiles, brick and natural timber cladding, juxtaposed with more modern materials such as a glazed link and Zinc dormer. Although there remains some hesitation about how comfortably the contemporary design sits against the modest existing building, the revisions combined with the enhancements the scheme offers are considered sufficient to allow Officers to conclude the scheme would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the Hanworth Conservation Area. As such, the application considered to comply with the requirements of Local Plan Policies HO 8, EN 2, EN 4 and EN 8 as well as Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

3. Residential Amenity

Policy EN 4 sets out that development proposals should not have a significantly detrimental effect on the residential amenity of nearby occupiers. Residents have the right to adequate privacy levels and to be kept free from excessive noise and unwanted social contact.

Owlets has no immediate neighbours on the Common, the closest being a collection of farm buildings at Sycamore Farm to the North. Given the location, scale and nature of the proposal, separation distances and existing boundary treatments there would not be any significant

negative impact as a result of the development in terms of overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing.

The proposal would comply with Core Strategy Policy EN 4.

4. Ecology

Due to the nature of the proposed works to the roof it is considered that there may be potential for protected species to be impacted by these works. The application is supported by Bat Survey Report prepared by Biome Consulting in August 2024. A Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) and subsequent nocturnal (dusk emergence) surveys were undertaken. Following the PRA, the dwelling was assessed to be a confirmed roost of Brown Long-Eared bat (day roost of likely one individual) and of moderate potential for other roosting bats. Prior to the commencement of any works, a licence from Natural England will need to be obtained and the recommended mitigation and enhancement measures can be secured via condition.

Subject to the imposition of conditions, the proposal would comply with Core Strategy Policy EN 9.

5. Highways

Policy CT 5 requires development to provide safe and convenient access for all modes of transport, including access to the highway network. Policy CT 6 requires new development to have sufficient parking facilities as set out in Appendix C of the Adopted Core Strategy. Paragraph 111 of the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

There are no proposed changes to the exiting access and sufficient parking facilities are provided on site. Therefore the proposal is considered to comply with the aims of Policies CT 5 and CT 6 in terms of Highways Safety.

Other matters

Nutrient Neutrality

As the application is a householder extension to an existing dwelling it would be exempt from Nutrient Neutrality requirements. Objectors have raised concerns regarding the foul water drainage and sewage arrangements at the property, however as this is a householder extension this is outside the scope of this application.

GIRAMS

As the application is a householder extension is would be exempt from the requirements of GIRAMS.

Planning Balance and Conclusion:

Overall the principle of extending an existing dwelling in this location is acceptable in accordance with Policies SS1 and SS2 of the Core Strategy. The scheme is considered to be broadly compliant in terms of scale, massing, design and impact on the designated heritage asset under Policies HO 8, EN 2, EN 4 and EN 8. Ecological enhancements and mitigation

can be secured via condition to ensure compliance with Policy EN 9. Furthermore, there are no significant negative impacts in terms of residential amenity and highways. Overall, the application is considered acceptable and Approval is therefore recommended subject to the imposition of conditions.

RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVAL subject to conditions relating to the following matters:

- Time limit 3 years
- Development in accordance with approved plans
- Materials as submitted
- Ecology-Bat Licence
- Ecology- Mitigation and enhancements
- External lighting

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

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Development Committee held on Thursday, 14 November 2024 in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 9.30 am

Committee Cllr P Heinrich (Chairman)

Members Present: Cllr R Macdonald (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr A Brown

Cllr P Fisher

Cllr A Fitch-Tillett

Cllr M Hankins

Cllr V Holliday

Cllr G Mancini-Boyle

Substitute Cllr C Ringer

Members Present: Cllr L Paterson

Members also Cllr T Adams

attending: Cllr W Fredericks

Officers in Development Manager (DM)

Attendance: Senior Planning Officer (SPO-AW)

Senior Planning Officer (SPO-MB)

Senior Landscape Officer (SLO-CB)

Development Management Team Leader (DMTL-CR)

Planning Officer (PO-IM)

Trainee Planning Officer (TPO-NW)

Solicitor

Assistant Director for Planning (ADP)

Community Housing Enabler (CHE)

Democratic Services Officer

77 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr M Batey, Cllr K Toye, Cllr J Toye, Cllr L Vickers, Cllr P Neatherway, Cllr A Varley.

78 SUBSTITUTES

Cllrs C Ringer and L Paterson were present as substitutes.

79 MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Committee meeting held Thursday 17th October 2024 were approved as a correct record.

80 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

81 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr L Paterson declared an interest with respect to the S106 appendix item to note (Oak Farm) he is the landowner.

Cllr A Brown declared a non-pecuniary interest in items 10 and 11, he considered himself pre-determined with respect to the applications, and therefore advised he would abstain from voting on the applications but would speak.

Cllr P Fisher declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 9, he is the Local Ward Member for Wells-next-the-sea.

82 HANWORTH - PF/24/1364- ERECTION OF TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION, INFILL EXTENSION AND PORCH TO DWELLING; OTHER EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS INCLUDING TO SHAPE OF ROOF AND REPLACEMENT WINDOWS TO OWLETS, THE COMMON, HANWORTH.

Officers report

The SPO-AW introduced the Officers report and recommendation for approval subject to conditions.

She outlined the sites' location, located within the designated countryside under policy SS1 and SS2 of the Core Strategy, and set on the common itself. The site was located within the Hanworth Conservation area and open common land. It was understood that Hanworth is one of the largest fenced commons in England.

The SPO confirmed the existing and proposed floor plans and elevations. Officers

concluded that the building as built was not representative of the majority of the conservation area and, therefore, there was scope for improvement. Further, Officers considered that the proposed dwelling would sit comfortably within the plot.

Following advice from the Conservation and Design Team, revised plans had been received which amended the massing of the extension. Whilst there would be a visible increase in built form, this was considered to be fairly contained and was not considered to be disproportionately large in the context of Policy HO8. The footprint of the extension would remain fairly large, but Officers felt this was acceptable given the size of the plot and the revised height and mass of the extension. Conservation and Design Officers were satisfied that the scheme would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the Hanworth Conservation Area.

In terms of policies EN2 and EN4, Officers considered the proposal to be a contemporary design which makes good use of quality traditional materials including pantiles, brick and natural timber cladding, which would silver down over time and tie in with the grey flints seen on other buildings. The juxtaposition between the existing and proposed extension would help to read this as a modern addition to the dwelling.

Ecological mitigation and enhancements would be appropriately conditioned, and the proposed extension was not considered to have a negative impact on neighbours' amenity.

Concerns had been raised locally regarding the capacity of the septic tank on site, however as this was a householder application this was outside the scope of the application.

Public speakers

Gill Wilton – Hanworth Parish Council

Louise Rice – Objecting

Nick Payne – Supporting

Local Member

The Local Member – Cllr J Toye – outlined the unique history of Owlets, which had a special connection with the village, and which invoked the image of a small rural cottage and not a large four-bedroom house. He considered it important to understand the history which underpinned the significance of why local residents were so concerned about development, its scale and finish.

The Local Member stressed the special character of Hanworth Common, and argued the development would negatively change the views and site lines of the common.

Cllr J Toye was critical of the Conservation and Design teams' assessment, and felt due regard had not been given to local knowledge or to Hanworth Conservation area. He further disagreed with their comments that the existing dwelling was of 'limited architectural and historic merit'. The Local Member considered the proposed extension was not in keeping with the area and failed to be subservient to the host dwelling.

With respect of planning policy EN4, the Local Member considered to proposal would

neither preserve nor enhance the character and quality of the area. Further he challenged whether the application complied with policy EN8, or chapter 16, paragraph 198 of the NPPF.

Cllr J Toye argued that permission would not be granted for a new dwelling on the common, and this scheme, effectively doubling the size of the existing dwelling and which ignores the historical context was unacceptable.

Cllr V Holiday arrived at 9.58am

Members debate

- a. Cllr R Macdonald expressed some concern whether the application would comply with policy HO8 given the size of the extension. He agreed with local residents' comments that if the applicant (who had recently purchased the dwelling) wanted a 4-bedroom house, should they not have purchased a 4-bedroom house.
- b. Cllr L Paterson considered the scale and mass of the extension to be significant and asked what the percentage increase would be to the dwelling's footprint.
- c. The DM advised that figures were unavailable for the percentage increase. With respect to policy HO8 there were two key policy tests for the Committee to consider – whether the proposal would result in a disproportionately large increase in the height and scale of the dwelling, and, if this would materially increase the impact of the dwelling on the appearance of the surrounding countryside. Officers were satisfied the proposal complied with policy HO8, though it was a matter for the Committee to consider the planning balance.
- d. Cllr L Paterson asked if there was a policy consideration in instances where the gentrification of an existing property would make it unaffordable.
- e. The DM advised there was no such policy test within the core strategy.
- f. Cllr A Brown shared in the Committee's concern that this was a disproportionately large extension which would have an overbearing impact on the highly sensitive landscape. He was surprised that the property was not locally listed given its history, nor that the site was afforded greater protection. Cllr A Brown was critical of the Conservation and Design Teams assessment of the scheme.
- g. The Chairman asked if the Conservation and Design Team were available to comment.
- h. The DM advised the Conservation and Design Team weren't available for the meeting. He affirmed that the Planning Authority had a statutory duty to preserve and protect the character and appearance of a Conservation Area. The Officer recommendation gave weight to the submission from the Conservation Officer. He argued that if the Committee were minded to refuse

the application, policy reasons would need to be articulated for this decision.

- i. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett affirmed that an extension should be subservient to the host dwelling, she was unconvinced this rule had been applied.
- j. The SPO advised that Officers took a visual assessment of the height, scale and overall massing of an extension. In this instance the proposed ridgeline was stepped down from the host dwelling and would be set back from the front elevation.
- k. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle asked how many other properties had been extended locally.
- l. The SPO advised other properties had been extended locally, she noted the representation from the parish council that other extensions had been approved without concern.
- m. Cllr C Ringer held significant reservations whether the application was compliant with policy HO8, and felt the Officers report and assessment significantly understated the significance of Hanworth Common and the dwellings relationship with it. He argued the application was contrary to policy EN2 and endorsed refusal of the application.
- n. The Chairman recognised the Committee's concern regarding the scale and massing of the extension and advised that the Committee had the option to defer consideration. He invited the ADP to advise.
- o. The ADP confirmed the outcomes available to the Committee and stated that if Members considered the information presented to be lacking, this would be a valid reason to defer. He noted Members comments and the desire for additional information with respect to the scale and massing, and the attention of Conservation and Design officers to respond to Committee Comments. He noted that the Committee had previously deferred an application at Binham to allow a better proposal to come forward.
- p. Cllr A Brown considered there may be merit for a site visit.
- q. The Chairman stated a site visit at this time of year presented challenges and would result in a speedy resolution.
- r. Cllr L Paterson did not consider deferral necessary as he felt the application unacceptable due to the scale and massing. He distinguished the differences between this and the Binham application.
- s. The Chairman noted the Committee were not against an extension to the dwelling in principle, but took issue with the design, scale and massing. He commented that deferral may allow for an improved scheme, and that there was merit in discussing the application with a Conservation Officer present.

- t. Cllr C Ringer stated he was not against the application in principle, or deferral, but that there would need to be marked improvement to the scheme for him to consider it acceptable.
- u. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett proposed deferral of the application.
- v. Cllr C Ringer seconded.
- w. The DM sought clarity what the Committee would like to be re-negotiated with the applicant. He confirmed that the applicant was within their rights to have their application as submitted considered.
- x. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett detailed the Committees requests; that the extension should be more subservient to the host dwelling, and that materials used be more in keeping with the local vernacular.
- y. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle added that more should be done to blend the extension with the host dwelling in a sympathetic manor, as the proposed scheme looked like an entirely separate house.
- z. The SPO noted the proposal made use of clay pantiles and red brick and sought clarity which materials were at issue.
- aa. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett stated it was the cladding at issue. She stated the host dwelling was a traditional Norfolk cottage, and considered the proposals modern design was not in keeping.
- bb. The DM reflected it was a fine balance and commented that it was not unusual for a traditional building to get a modern extension in the district. He thanked Members for their clarity for the matters at issue.

RESOLVED by 9 votes for and 1 abstention.

That Planning Application PF/24/1364 be deferred.

END