

BODHAM - PF/24/2705 - Demolition of workshop building and erection of building for use as a live/work unit, recladding of retained storage building, demolition of other storage buildings and erection of cart shed at Old Scarfe Brothers Workshop, Church Road, Lower Bodham.

ADDENDUM REPORT

REASON FOR ADDENDUM REPORT

This Addendum Report is to update members with regards to the matters that led to their deferral of this planning application at the meeting of the Development Committee on 27 June 2025. This report should be read in conjunction with the Committee Report and the Development Committee Minutes from the meeting of 27 June 2025 and these are included at **Appendices 1 and 2** of this report.

UPDATE

At the meeting on 27 June 2025, the application was deferred to allow the applicant to provide a Landscape Impact Assessment (LIA) and further consideration to be given to the height, scale and massing of the proposed building, in particular the scale of the ridgeline.

An amended plan has been submitted reducing the ridge height of the building from approximately 9.8 metres to 8.2 metres, a reduction of 1.6 metres. Additionally, a series of aerial photographs have also been submitted captured by a drone to show how the existing building sits within the existing landscape from various viewpoints surrounding the site. No supporting statement or justification (such as a LIA) has been provided other than the agent's brief assessment stating amongst other things that the *"the drone footage of the site demonstrates that the site has minimal impact visually. There are no footpaths anywhere near the site and the site it is well screened within in a dip and surrounded by trees. A fleeting glimpse is viewable as you drive down the road"*.

Whilst Officers welcome the reduction in height from 9.8 metres to 8.2 metres as a positive step, concerns remain regarding the overall cumulative impact of the building's scale, appearance and massing. The applicant has not sought to address the building's 28-metre-long uninterrupted ridgeline. This extent of ridgeline is uncharacteristic for domestic premises and is more akin to the ridgeline of a large agricultural building. Furthermore, the revised proposal has not adequately addressed issues related to the overall design approach, particularly the extent and impact of glazing, which may exacerbate the building's visibility and affect its integration with the local character.

Whilst the building is now clearly lower in height by 1.6m, Officers consider that the issues raised within the Committee report have not been fully addressed and additional amendments are still recommended to meaningfully mitigate the visual and contextual impact of the proposed development.

Planning Balance and Conclusion:

Section 38(6) of the Town and Country Planning Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

In terms of the residential element, the development has been found to conflict with CS Policies, SS 1 and SS 2, which seek to limit development within the Countryside to that which requires a rural location.

Whilst the site can be considered 'isolated' and therefore afforded weight under NPPF paragraph 84 as an exception to the plan-led approach, within the context of NPPF paragraph 84, then the proposals do not re-use redundant or disused buildings as required by criterion c) and are not considered to be exceptional in terms of design which may be otherwise be supported by paragraph 84e).

The site is considered to meet the definition of "previously developed land" (brownfield) and this would attract moderate weight in favour.

As the council is currently unable to demonstrate deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing, planning applications must be considered in line with paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF which requires that:

Where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless:

- i) the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

CS Policies SS 1 and SS 2 are therefore considered to be out of date in accordance with NPPF paragraph 11d). Recent appeal decisions have however, continued to confirm that these policies remain broadly consistent with the NPPF in respect of setting an overall strategy for the distribution of sufficient housing and focusing significant amounts in locations which are sustainable, thus limiting the need to travel, offering a choice of transport modes and helping to reduce congestion and emissions, so as to improve air quality and public health.

The benefits of the proposal are:

Social - the proposals would only add a single dwelling to the housing supply. which is afforded limited weight in meeting the undersupply of housing within the district..

Economic - these would be provided through the construction of the development with work for local contractors, trades people and suppliers. This, however, would be limited and short lived. Occupiers of the development would contribute to the local economy by spending within the surrounding area and the wider District The relocation and expansion of an existing business would also attract some weight, especially if the proposal helps to maintain employment opportunities in the local area.

Environmental – the development would involve the reuse of a site of which is previously developed / brownfield land, albeit demolition rather than conversion. The replacement building would be energy efficient and make use of renewable energy sources. Some minor biodiversity gains could be secured through a condition.

On balance, the reuse of previously developed land for appropriate economic uses is supported in principle enabling an existing business to relocate, expand and improve its offer to its customers. However, the case for a dwelling to accompany the retail unit is less convincing and the design, scale and massing of the building(s) would result in a visually

discordant and overly dominant element of built form which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape.

The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to CS Policies SS 1, SS 2 EN 2 and EN 4 for the reasons stated.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE permission on the following grounds:

1. Whilst the site is considered to be “previously developed land” the proposed residential element of the live/work unit would be located on land designated as 'Countryside' where there is a general presumption against residential development and in a location with poor access to a full range of basic services. The future occupiers would therefore be highly dependent on the car to be able to reach such services. There is no overriding justification for the proposed development in this unsustainable location, and the proposal therefore represents an undesirable and sporadic form of residential development in the countryside. The proposal would therefore not be sustainable development and is contrary to policies SS 1, SS 2 and SS 4 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy. Whilst the location of the development is considered to be isolated in terms of paragraph 84 of the National Planning Policy Framework, no evidence has been provided that the provision of such a dwelling would meet the criteria in paragraph 84.

2. The proposed development by reason of design, scale and massing would result in a visually discordant and overly dominant element of built form which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape. As such, the proposal would be contrary to the aims of North Norfolk Core Strategy Policies EN,2 and EN 4.

The proposals are contrary to North Norfolk Core Strategy Policies SS 1, SS 2, SS 4, EN 2 and EN 4

Final wording of reasons for refusal and any others considered to be necessary, to be delegated to the Assistant Director – Planning.