

**CROMER - PF/19/0801 - Single-storey front extension & minor increase in hardstanding area; 9 Bridge Close, Cromer, NR27 0FJ for Mr Soobrayen**

**- Target Date: 08 July 2019**

Case Officer: Miss J Hodgkin

Householder application

**RELEVANT SITE CONSTRAINTS**

LDF Tourism Asset Zone

Unclassified Road

Enforcement Enquiry

Landscape Character Area

LDF - Principal Routes

LDF - Settlement Boundary

Contaminated Land

Development within 60m of Class A road

Mixed Use Allocation

**RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

PM/10/0671 PM

Land at Jubilee Lane and Station Road Cromer: Erection of ten dwellings - Approved  
17/12/2010

PF/13/0451 PF

The Embankment, Jubilee Lane, Cromer, NR27 0EN: Erection of ten dwellings - Approved  
25/07/2013

PF/14/0865 PF

The Embankment, Jubilee Lane, Cromer, NR27 0EN: Erection of three dwellings (revised siting) revised siting of entrance retaining wall and revised parking layout - Approved  
23/10/2014

**THE APPLICATION**

This application seeks permission for a single-storey front extension to the dwelling and a minor increase in the hardstanding area to the property's frontage. The proposal also includes the repositioning of the existing outside parking space.

**REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE**

At the request of Councillor E Spagnola who considers the proposed extension to be of a significant size, distinguishing the property from other houses within the development and impacting upon neighbouring amenity, contrary to Core Strategy Policy EN 4. Councillor Spagnola also considers the repositioned parking space will affect the clear access to two neighbouring properties, contrary to Policy CT 6 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy.

**PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL**

Cromer Town Council: No objections.

Northrepps Parish Council: No objections.

**CONSULTATIONS**

Environmental Health: No comment but recommended an informative note advising that the land within the application site has the potential to be contaminated.

County Council (Highway): No objection to the revised position of the parking space.

## REPRESENTATIONS

Four letters of objection to the original plans submitted and the revised plans received on the following grounds:

- Proposed extension's scale and massing is inappropriate, out of character with the small residential estate and would be overdevelopment of the area.
- Proposed extension would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of 2 adjoining properties and the amenity of No.9.
- Proposal would affect the usability of the applicant's amenity space
- Proposal will have an detrimental impact on existing landscaping and the openness of the area, blurring and eroding the distinction between shared public space and private space
- Existing parking space shown on the plan is incorrect
- Repositioned parking space does not meet the standard parking space size requirements
- 2 parking spaces serving the property are not adequate and is a departure from Policy CT 6.
- Proposed relocated parking space and the extending the area of hard standing encroaches onto land outside the applicant's ownership, the proposed plans and submitted ownership certificate are incorrect
- Proposed relocated parking space affects vehicular access and manoeuvring for residents of 3 neighbouring properties
- Proposal would block access for emergency services
- Construction process will cause significant amenity, health and safety and access issues for all residents

## POLICIES

North Norfolk Core Strategy (Adopted September 2008):

SS 1: Spatial Strategy for North Norfolk

SS 3 - Housing

SS 7: Cromer

EN 2: Protection and enhancement of landscape and settlement character

EN 4: Design

CT 5: The transport impact on new development .

CT 6: Parking provision

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places

## MAIN ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

- Principle
- Design and visual impact
- Amenity
- Parking provision

## APPRAISAL

Principle:

The application site lies within a defined Residential Area of the Cromer settlement boundary where, under Policies SS 1, SS 3 and SS 7, proposals to extend and alter existing residential properties are deemed acceptable in principle subject to compliance with other relevant Core

Strategy policies.

#### Design and Visual Impact:

At 5.3 metres the length of the front extension originally proposed was considered to be excessive, creating an unbalanced and unsympathetic addition to the original dwelling. Whilst it was considered that the proposal was unlikely to cause significant overshadowing impacts on the adjacent property, (no.8), due to its single storey form and separation distance of approximately 5 metres from the porch of No.8, it would have resulted in overbearing impacts.

Amendments to the scheme have subsequently been received. The revised plans show a reduction in the extension's projection by 1.2 metres, leaving its overall length at 4.1m.

The extension's north-east side elevation would be sited adjacent to the property's boundary along which there is 1.8m high close boarded fencing. Given the elevation would be screened by the boundary fencing and only the shallow pitched hipped roof would be visible above the fence from the neighbouring driveway of The Embankment (the neighbouring properties to the north-east of the application site), the length of the extension would not result in a detrimental visual impact on the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, the extension's south-west side elevation will appear shorter given that the existing garage projects forward by 1m.

Whilst a slightly greater reduction in the length would have been preferable, it is not considered that refusal on the grounds of inappropriate scale could be sustained as the proposal is subordinate to the host dwelling and the position and orientation of the dwelling is such that the proposal's visual impact on the area is considered to be acceptable.

The proposal's front elevation is considered to be appropriately proportioned and sympathetic to original dwelling in terms of its detailing and shallow pitched hipped roof form which complements the main roof of the house. The materials proposed include red brickwork, a pantiled roof and upvc joinery which the materials used on the original dwelling.

The overall design of the proposed front extension is considered to be acceptable in terms of Policy EN 4 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The increase in the area of hardstanding with matching Brindle block paviors would result in the loss of a small grassed area to the property's frontage. There is some planting in this area approved on the original landscaping plan for residential development (drawing no. 861 P-014 Rev.E), however there was no condition on the permission (PF/14/0865) for that development requiring retention of the landscaping.

Objectors state that the small grassed area is not within the applicant's ownership and is instead owned by the Bridge Close Management Company. The applicant has however, confirmed that he purchased the small land parcel at the same time as buying the property. A Land Registry search confirms that this land is within the applicant's ownership.

Concern has also been raised that the proposal erodes a public area of valued green space. Given that the land is owned by the applicant, the proposed works will leave a small section of grass and planting remaining and, that the current landscaped area is not considered to make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the residential estate with no requirement for it to be retained, it is considered that the loss of part of it and its replacement with paving within the property boundary would not result in an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of Policy EN 4.

### Amenity:

The proposed front extension features a front window which is an adequate separation distance from the neighbouring properties opposite to the south-east. The proposed south-west facing window will allow a view to No.8's front canopy porch, the shared garage and parking area of No.8 and No.7 and an angled view of the No.7's side elevation which does not have windows at ground floor level. As such the proposal is not considered to result in any significant impacts on the privacy of neighbouring properties.

Due to its reduced size, the proposed extension would not result in any significant overshadowing or overbearing impacts on the neighbouring properties.

It is considered that the revised proposal complies with Policy EN 4 in this respect.

### Parking Provision:

The property currently has two parking spaces, one being within the integral garage with the other located outside the lounge window, in accordance with the 'External Works & Landscaping Plan' (drawing no: 861 - P-014 Rev.E) approved under the original planning permission (PF/14/0865). As the dwelling is a 4 bed roomed house to comply with the adopted parking standards and policy CT 6, three parking spaces would normally have been required. However, as approved under the original permissions PF/13/0451 and PF/14/0865, two parking spaces were considered to be acceptable in this case.

The current proposal would simply reposition the existing external parking space and would not reduce the overall number previously considered acceptable. The proposal would not result in any increase in the number of bedrooms and as such the parking demands for the property would not increase. In these circumstances an increase in the amount of parking space for the property cannot be required retrospectively.

On the plans first submitted, the relocated parking space was shown in front of the applicant's garage, however in this position the parking space would have partially encroached over the property's boundary.

As stated within objections and evident on the previously approved parking plan for the development (ref: PF/14/0865), the existing parking plans submitted are incorrect as the external space should be located directly outside the front lounge window of the dwelling and not in front of the garage or the canopy porch as now shown. Additionally, the width of the proposed parking space did quite meet the standard space requirement.

A revised plan (drg no. 9/7D) received on 20.09.19 shows the existing parking space in the correct position and the proposed parking space measuring the required 4.8 by 2.4m.

The reduction in length of the proposed extension combined with the proposed increase in hardstanding, does allow sufficient room for the external parking space to be relocated in front of the proposed extension.

The Highway Authority advise that the revised parking arrangement is acceptable and that the parking space can be accommodated within the property boundary whilst allowing sufficient room to manoeuvre into and out of the parking space.

The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of Policy CT 6 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy.

### Other considerations

An objector has raised concerns over the Health and Safety of the residents being compromised during construction of the proposal. The Highway Authority have no concerns in this respect. Given the small scale of the proposal any impact would be limited and for a relatively short duration. A Construction Management plan would not generally be considered necessary or reasonable for this type of small scale domestic extension.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Approve, subject to conditions to cover the matters listed, and any others considered necessary by the Head of Planning:

- Time limit for implementation
- Development to be carried out in accordance with submitted plans
- Materials for the proposed development to be in accordance with details submitted as part of the application.

Final wording of the conditions to be delegated to the Head of Planning

### **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.