

BLAKENEY – PF/25/0522 – Demolition of two-storey dwelling and erection of replacement two-storey dwelling (part-retrospective) at 8 Langham Road, Blakeney, Holt, Norfolk, NR25 7PG

Minor Development

- Target Date: 15th May 2025

Extension of time: N/A

Case Officer: Colin Reuben

Full Planning Permission

RELEVANT SITE CONSTRAINTS

Within a Settlement Boundary (Blakeney)

Within a Residential Area

Within the Norfolk Coast National Landscape

Landscape Character Area – Rolling Heath and Arable

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Ref	PF/23/1577
Description	Installation of two dormer windows (front and side), enlargement of first floor rear windows and rendering of property
Outcome	APP - Approve
Ref	RV/23/2332
Description	Installation of two dormer windows (front and side), enlargement of first floor rear windows and rendering of property without complying with condition 2 (approved plans) of planning permission PF/23/1577 to allow for amendments to approved design
Outcome	APP - Approve
Ref	RV/24/1921
Description	Installation of two dormer windows (front and side), enlargement of first floor rear windows and rendering of property without complying with condition 2 (approved plans) of planning permission RV/23/2332 (variation of PF/23/1577) to allow further amendments to approved design
Outcome	APP - Approve

THE APPLICATION

The application seeks to erect a two-storey dwelling to replace an existing two-storey dwelling which has already been demolished and part-rebuilt – this follows the approval of three previous applications on the site, one to extend the existing dwelling and two subsequent applications to vary the design. The site lies along the west side of Langham Road which is lined with residential properties, within the development boundary of Blakeney. The village centre lies further to the north, with neighbouring dwellings to the north and west, a doctor's surgery to the south, dwellings opposite along the east side of Langham Road.

REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

At the request of Cllr V Holliday for the following reasons:

"I do not think this complies with Policy EN4. This will have detrimental effect on the residential amenity of nearby occupiers, blocking light from the southern elevation of the house to the north (which I understand includes a bedroom window). It doesn't seem to comply with the North Norfolk Design Guide which says (page 21) that the distance between secondary elevations to blank should be (at least) 8.5m - this does not appear to be the case from the plans.

There is concern about the general bulk being over-powering and the roof height being higher than adjacent properties.

I have concerns with this application complying with Policy CT6 in that the parking layout is unrealistic and therefore inadequate for the number of bedrooms".

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL

Cley Parish Council - Comment, raising the following matters:

- This property has shown a complete abuse of the planning system, and contempt of the entire planning process.

CONSULTATIONS

None

REPRESENTATIONS

To date, **one** public **objection** has been received raising the following concerns (summarised):

- the new building's bulk and appearance are completely out of proportion compared with neighbouring properties.
- object to the new roofline because of its intimidating height and overbearing nature.

HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

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 above matters, approval of this application as recommended is considered to be justified, proportionate and in accordance with planning law.

CRIME AND DISORDER

The application raises no significant crime and disorder issues.

EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES

The application raises no significant equality and diversity 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 (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

EN 2 – Protection and enhancement of landscape and settlement character

EN 4 – Design

CT 6 – Parking provision

Material Considerations:

Blakeney Neighbourhood Plan (2023)

Policy 2 – Managing Second Home Ownership

Policy 6 – Design of Development

Policy 7 – Improving the Design of New and Replacement Homes

Policy 9 – Existing Dwelling Replacement

Policy 12 – Dark Night Skies

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024)

Chapter 4 – Decision-making

Chapter 12 – Achieving well-designed places

Chapter 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

North Norfolk Emerging Local Plan

The Council's Emerging Local Plan was subject to a further round of examination in April 2025 and, following receipt of the Inspector's letter dated 08 May 2025, subject to completion of required Main Modifications, six-week public consultation and completion of any additional modifications, the plan is expected to be found sound and adopted in Autumn 2025. At this stage, whilst the Emerging Local Plan is capable of attracting some weight for decision making purposes, this would be considered "limited" at this stage and, in any event, there are no specific proposed new policies that would lead to a materially different planning outcome than the policies within the existing Core Strategy documents.

OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Main issues for consideration:

- 1. Principle of Development and Site History**
- 2. Design**
- 3. Residential Amenity**
- 4. Landscape Impact**

5. Parking

1. Principle of Development and Site History

The site lies within the Development Boundary of Blakeney (Policy SS1) and designated Residential area (Policy SS 3) where extensions and alterations to existing dwellings, along with the replacement of existing dwellings, are considered to be acceptable in principle. The site has benefitted from three previous planning consents as follows:

- PF/23/1577 – Installation of two dormers (front and side), enlargement of first floor rear windows and rendering of property
- RV/23/2332 - Installation of two dormers (front and side), enlargement of first floor rear windows and rendering of property without complying with condition 2 (approve plans) of planning permission PF/23/1577 to allow for amendments to approved design – this allowed the north extension not be extend in length along with the addition of rooflights and internal layout changes
- RV/24/1921 - Installation of two dormers (front and side), enlargement of first floor rear windows and rendering of property without complying with condition 2 (approve plans) of planning permission RV/23/2332 to allow further amendments to approved design - Removal of dormer window and raising of eaves on the north elevation; Reconfiguration of the south elevation including removal of dormer, part raising of eaves but reduction in roof height, replacement of two-storey gabled extension with a two-storey mono-pitch extension and a further single-storey extension, along with porch canopy; and Minor alterations to fenestration on east and west elevations.

Following the continuation of works on the site, it transpired that the entire property had been demolished, resulting in unauthorised works which were not in accordance with the most recent planning approval (ref: RV/24/1921). It was therefore necessary for the applicant to submit a full planning application to regularise the situation. The application, rather than being extensions and alterations to an existing property, is therefore for the full replacement of the previously existing dwelling. However, as the property lies within the Development Boundary of Blakeney, this does not alter the acceptability of the development which would remain compliant with strategic policies SS 1 and SS 3 of the Core Strategy and Policy 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

2. Design

In terms of the design, a couple of further minor alterations have been made to the scheme as approved under RV/24/1921 which include:

- The addition of external brick and flint rather than render;
- Minor alterations to fenestration to the side and rear;
- Addition of chimney to the rear; and
- A further small extension to the front to enclose a porch area and create a first floor ensuite.

Given that there is a wide mix of materials in the locality, the use of brick and flint rather than render is considered to be acceptable, noting that the previously existing property consisted of brick. The further extensions, whilst contributing to an additional size increase, are considered to be relatively minor in the context of what has been previously approved. The fenestration alterations are again very modest and largely confined to the side and rear of the property, whilst the chimney similarly raises no concerns.

Accordingly, the additional design alterations are considered to be acceptable and compliant with Policy EN 4 of the Core Strategy and Policies 6, 7 and 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

3. Residential Amenity

In terms of amenity, there have been concerns raised in regard to the proximity of the new property to the south-facing first floor side window of the neighbouring property. With the new property having almost been completed, it has become clear that this relationship is close, and it is likely this has resulted in some moderate loss of light to the neighbour's first floor window, though not fully. It is understood from the applicant that this is an unobscured bathroom window, however the local planning authority cannot be certain on this point so have assessed this window as potentially serving a primary or secondary living space. Nevertheless, given that the new dwelling is set slightly further back from the neighbouring dwelling and given angle of the new roof, it is considered that the neighbour's window would still benefit from sunlight. It is also reiterated that this is a situation which was accepted under the previously approved application (with no objections raised at the time), and the current application does not alter the amenity situation, the only difference being that the project now constitutes a rebuild rather than an extension, with the end result being the same. This being the case, it is considered that refusal of the current application on amenity grounds could not be justified.

It is also accepted that the replacement dwelling has a bulkier appearance and greater scale than the previously existing dwelling. Whilst the overall ridge height of the main section of the property has not changed, the eaves height has increased in part but again, this is no different from the previous approved application. Given that much of the new dwelling would be in line with the neighbouring property and outbuildings, it is considered that this would not result in a significantly overbearing development or adverse amenity impacts.

Accordingly and on balance, it is considered that in respect of amenity, the proposed development complies with the requirements of policy EN 4 of the Core Strategy and policies 6, 7 and 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

4. Landscape Impact

As the property lies within a residential area of Blakeney and between existing buildings, it is considered that the development would not have any wider detrimental landscape impact. Accordingly, it is considered that proposed development complies with the requirements of Policies EN 1 and EN 2 of the Core Strategy and Policies 6, 7 and 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

5. Parking

The parking situation on the site remains unchanged – the number of bedrooms, compared to the previous existing dwelling, remains the same (a 4-bed property) and as such, there is no requirement for any additional parking on site, and the number of on-site parking spaces has not reduced. Accordingly, there are no concerns in regard to Policy CT 6 of the Core Strategy and Policy 7 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

It is clear that the development has evolved to the point where the situation has necessitated the rebuilding, rather than extension of, the existing property. However, as explained above, the principle of development remains acceptable. The relationship with the neighbouring property is to an extent uncomfortable, however, it is not considered that any impact in terms of loss of light and being overbearing, would be significantly detrimental. It also has to be acknowledged that, with the exception of the additional small extensions and fenestration alterations, this has been accepted under the previously approved application, with no objections. The overall design and appearance of the property is acceptable, and no alterations are proposed to the on-site parking arrangements.

It is therefore concluded that, subject to conditions, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable and compliant with the relevant Development Plan policies as outlined above.

RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVAL subject to conditions relating to the following matters:

- Accordance with approved plans
- Materials as submitted
- Removal of permitted development rights

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