

### PLANNING ISSUES WITH APPROVED DRAWINGS

1. The North Elevation as approved see attached indicates 4 No. vertical members apparently supporting the balconies, marked in blue. The section sizes indicated would not be adequate to support 5 stories of balcony. It is not clear on the approved drawing how this is intended to support the structure above.
2. In addition, the balconies are shown as cantilevered on the Eastern side which would further increase the loadings on the proposed supports.
3. Further, the indicated balcony supports above 5<sup>th</sup> floor level appear to show diagonal members, marked in green at 45 degrees of a much thinner section ( possibly wires) There is no way the sections indicated would support the cantilevered 5<sup>th</sup> Floor roof overhang.
4. Also at 5<sup>th</sup> Floor level on the Eastern end of the terrace is further indicated a short vertical support marked in red with diagonal members but this vertical support seems to be have no base support and therefore not capable of providing any support to the roof.
5. The layout shown for the structure supports would lead to a cantilever of both the 5<sup>th</sup> floor balcony and 5<sup>th</sup> floor roof overhang of 3.50m from West to East and 2.00m South to North, which cannot be structurally achieved.
6. The positioning of the balcony supports is not in line with internal structural grid lines and therefore could not be tied into the main structural grid
7. The approved North Elevation as approved indicates a stone corbel at each floor level (circled red) on the North west corner of the existing building. The planning officer refers to this in his e.mail. In reality this corbel only wraps round the corner at head of first floor level. At head of ground, second and third levels this corbel finishes level with the corner. See attached original survey drawing.
8. There is a discrepancy on Lower and Upper ground floor approved plans in regards to the position of the West wall and its position to the boundary. We have taken a line to provide minimum acceptable pedestrian access.

## NORTH ELEVATION – DRAWING J100 – ST - 166

1. We have revised the north elevation handrails to have the tapered edge. We have removed the vertical lattice framing which seems to serve no purpose. The vertical supports for balcony handrails remain as our structural columns which are part hidden behind the balustrade and painted RAL7016 to match the windows. We consider this far less intrusive than the lattice frames approved. It should be noted that drawing 1301/39A does appear to indicate a vertical support to the canopy overhang from U.G floor level to underside of the canopy.
2. The corner column is a structural requirement in order to support the overhanging 5<sup>th</sup> Floor canopy. The approved drawing 1301/38 indicates the canopy overhang to be approx. 3.0m x 8.00m with no support. Clearly from a structural viewpoint this is not possible. The brick cladding surrounding this column has been removed so the stone cornices on the existing building and the roof eaves detail will remain visible behind the column which will be circular and RAL 7016 painted as the windows.
3. The floor levels are dictated by the floor-to-floor minimum dimensions required. The approved drawings indicated 5 floors being placed within a dimension of 13500mm. This would have required a floor-to-floor dimension of 2700mm. Allowing for a minimum ceiling height of 2350mm this would only leave 350mm for floor build up and structural frame. This is clearly not sufficient for a 5-storey building structure. The approved drawings have not properly considered this aspect. The current design is based on a floor-to-floor dimension of 2927mm to provide 2350mm minimum ceiling height. In order to keep to this minimum, the maximum steel depth used is 368mm.
4. The Planning Officers comments regarding the cantilever balconies would be difficult to achieve with only a structural support depth of only 368mm. To resist cantilever these would likely have needed to be 500mm deep. The balconies are fully supported on the circular columns behind the handrail.
5. Our current design indicates the brick plinth to U.G. Floor level only and we would prefer it to remain this way. The Approved drawing 1301/43A shows the top of this plinth approx. mid-point in the depth of the UG. Floor entrance door.
6. The approved drawing 1301/43A states the desire to create a very strong vertical and horizontal rhythm and we felt that our drawing J100 – ST – 166 – Rev G demonstrates that principal. The changes from the Approved drawing are initiated through structural requirements not fully considered on the original drawings.
7. The entrance canopy is indicated on drawing J100 – ST - 200

## WEST ELEVATION – DRAWING J100 \_ ST - 151

1. The area of Trespa Cladding on this elevation has been brought forward 200mm clear of the brick slip to provide the feature as required by the Approved drawings.
2. It is unclear on the approved drawing 1301/43A what is indicated at the junction with the west elevation at roof level. Both North and West elevations at this point are brick slip so the intention is that the corner would be formed in the same material.

3. All eaves and verges on the West Elevation have been detailed to have a minimum 300 tapered overhang soffit/facia.

#### SOUTH ELEVATION – DRAWING J100 – ST - 165

1. The eaves line has been raised and the reasons are as noted in North Elevation – Note 3. The area between the new and existing roof on the East Elevation will be clad with brick slip cladding as the South Elevation. This particular element of cladding will be hardly visible. It should be noted that the existing rear roof slope does not have a single fall. This is indicated on drawing ST165. It changes in slope approx. 1.50m back from the rear wall so there would always have been a need to install an infill at this location. The proposed brick cladding outer face finishes 100mm behind the existing building rear corner.
2. We have removed the vertical lattice framing which seems to serve no purpose. The vertical supports for balcony handrails remain as our structural columns which are part hidden behind the balustrade and painted RAL7016 to match the windows.
3. The rear column against the existing building will be incorporated within the rear wall so will not be visible. The new brick slip will finish 100mm back from the existing brickwork. The approved plans indicate a new wall extending out to align with the outside edge of the balcony line. We have not included this in our design but could if it were essential to planning.
4. We believe the small increase in depth of the dormer windows is not detrimental to the elevation and in some ways distracts attention from the PV panels positioned on this roof slope.
5. The rear overhanging roof canopy will have a tapered fascia/soffit detail as indicated on the drawing.
6. The approved drawing 1301/43A states the desire to create a very strong vertical and horizontal rhythm and we felt that our drawing J100 – ST – 166 – Rev G demonstrates that principal. The changes from the Approved drawing are initiated through structural requirements not fully considered on the original approved drawings.

Our Ref: 1648

Planning Department  
North Norfolk District Council  
Council Offices  
Holt Road  
Cromer  
Norfolk  
NR27 9EN

10<sup>th</sup> February 2021

Dear Sir or Madam,

**Proposal: Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of planning permission PF/14/0887 (Partial demolition of hotel and erection of six residential apartments and single-storey rear extension to hotel) to amend the design.**

**Location: Former Burlington Hotel, The Esplanade, Sheringham.**

This letter is submitted in support of the above planning application which we understand is due to be considered by the Planning Committee on the 25<sup>th</sup> February 2021. Our letter is in direct response to the comments received from the Conservation Design and Landscape Officer, Chris Young (Conservation). We will respond below in turn to each of the points raised.

By way of background, we are fully aware the Planning Officer and Conservation Officer objected and recommended refusal of the previously approved scheme and in the context of the current application we can see these objections have persisted. As highlighted above, this letter seeks to provide further information and additional commentary to demonstrate that the revised scheme is acceptable and that planning permission can now be granted.

Attached at Appendix 2 is also a response from the applicant's Heritage Consultant in response to the Conservation comments which should be read in conjunction with this letter. The Heritage Consultant concludes that the amended scheme has constructively addressed several of the difficult design and practical construction issues that have arisen from the previously approved scheme in a very positive manner, and it is considered that the benefits of the scheme outweigh any perceived harm.

### North Elevation

Comments have been made regarding the projection of the extension in front of the original building and the resultant hindered views of the stone dressings. As can be seen from the enclosed drawing J100-ST-202 although the aforementioned column projects forward of the existing North corner of the existing brick return it does not extend past the front line of the complete existing North façade line. The column is in line with the front feature gable wall and also behind the projecting bay windows which extend to second floor level. It is proposed that this steel section will be covered with a circular profile aluminium cover with a RAL 7016 finish to match adjoining windows. It should also be noted that this column is not visible at all from the East Elevation as shown on drawing no. J100 – ST - 203

In relation to the eaves and cornice detail, the enclosed plan drawing J100-ST-165 Rev J & 16 Rev K has been amended to show this detailing being reinstated, rather than the previously stated retained, and also shows the bracing removed, which ensures the corner post will remain a prominent architectural feature and will be fully visible behind the post.

It is noted comments have also been made regarding the balconies and how the corner post would be supported laterally. The corner post will be tied back to the new structure by means of a similar aluminium cover profile to that of the column. This return profile will only be at new floor levels and will not interfere with the existing stone corbel features. Having discussed this with Contura Heritage Consultancy they do not consider this a major issue.

Detailed commentary has been provided by Conservation regarding the increase in the height of the attic storey. As already highlighted, the previously approved scheme was a complex proposal and due to the poor quality of the approved drawings, has resulted in extreme difficulties in interpreting and implementing the permission as approved. This has been acknowledged by the Council in their correspondence which led to the submission of this current Section 73 application. It is interesting to note that several aspects, as acknowledged by Conservation in the recent consultation responses, were approved as part of the discharge of condition application (Ref CDB/14/0887). The plans were available to the Council at that time and there were no fundamental objections raised at that point (as referenced in an email from Jo Medler on 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2020 attached at Appendix 1), only the request that the S73 application be submitted to 'capture' the variations. If the substantial objections now raised were highlighted at that point, it would have made resolution easier to achieve if there could have been clarity at that stage. This scheme seeks to incorporate the technical amendments necessary to make the original planning permission implementable and the minor variations to the design have been incorporated to allow for the structural limitations of the originally approved scheme to be addressed. The result is a scheme which is considered acceptable, responds positively to the site's prominent location and is viable both structurally and financially.

The previously approved drawings indicated 5 storeys over a total height of 13.593m. This would require a floor-to-floor dimension of 2718mm. The minimum floor to ceiling height allowed is 2350mm which would leave only 368mm in which to fit structural steel, floor slab, floor screed and services, which would not be possible. This was clearly not considered when the approved scheme was submitted, and this application seeks to rectify the structural limitations of the previously approved scheme.

It is noted comments have been made regarding the removal of the lattice vertical supports and that these would provide valuable support as well as contributing to visually interest, depth and quality of the elevation as a whole. These concerns have been taken on board and whilst they are a purely cosmetic feature in the updated design, our clients are keen to accommodate the request by Conservation and attached plan J100-ST-165 Rev J & 166 Rev K which shows them reinstated on the elevations.

#### West Elevation

We welcome the positive comments from Conservation regarding our amendment showing the Trespa cladding being pulled 200mm out from the face of the brick slips. We acknowledge that this would provide relief and a shadow line between the two materials on this elevation. We can advise that the Trespa cladding

will project 200mm forward of the brick slip on an extended rainscreen bracket system. At its junction, the Trespa will be returned 200mm to the face of the brick slip.

In terms of the comments made regarding the eaves and verges having a minimum 300mm overhang, please find enclosed amended drawing J100-ST-166- Rev K which further highlight this feature on the West elevation. Hopefully, this now avoids any uncertainty in this regard.

It is noted comments have been made regarding the second chimney on this elevation and we can advise that the approved drawings of permission PF/14/0887, in particular drawing 041A allowed for the demolition of the rear secondary chimney (west elevation) and which has been removed. Therefore, there is no proposal to reinstate this chimney, particularly in light of the structural difficulties to reinstate the chimney and the fact its removal was agreed as part of the previous approval.

### South Elevation

It is noted comments have been made regarding the two roof pitches, which Conservation considers results in a less than comfortable co-existence. As previously highlighted, the existing rear roof pitch consists of two different existing slopes, which means there has always been a requirement for a brick slip return to the existing roof. The difference in the roof slope was not shown on the originally approved plans in error, and therefore was not taken into consideration in the design of the previously approved scheme. It should also be noted that the rear south eaves line is 300mm lower than the north elevation. The current application seeks to address this previous errata and proposes a solution which takes into consideration the two roof pitches and different slopes, ensuring the proposed extension can adjoin the existing building in an acceptable manner, both structurally and visually. The attached photo shows there are 2 different roof slopes to the existing, adjacent to the new build.

It is also noted a new setting out plan above the third floor was requested and this has now been provided – please see drawing no.J100 – ST – 155 Rev E.

There have been comments made by Conservation regarding the dormer on this elevation, having reviewed this matter further it has become apparent that the original approved drawing No. 41A has significant errors. There are no dimensions shown on this drawing but using comparative scaling the dimension scaled from the head of 4th floor window to the head of dormer window shows approx. 4.30m (this dimension on North Elevation is 2.75m.). Also the ridge to eaves on the South elevation scales over 8.00m when in reality it is actually 6.00m. It should be noted the proposed dormer roof level is 1.70m from the ridge and the approved drawing scales the same dimension. Therefore the applicant remains of the view that the proposed dormer window is acceptable and would not be detrimental to this elevation and would not result in any significant harm to the design ethos of the scheme or materially impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Comments have been made regarding the removal of the vertical lattice framing and that this is a retrograde move. Again, our clients have taken these concerns on board and the attached revised drawings J100-SR-165 Rev J & 166 Rev K shows the lattice framing reinstated.

As can be seen from the detailed issues highlighted above due to the poor quality of the previously approved drawings, the applicant would have extreme difficulties in implementing the existing permission. The previously approved drawings have not been thought through in relation to the practicalities of the proposed building and its construction. This application seeks to vary condition 2 to allow the building to be erected according to a design which allows for the structural limitations of the originally approved scheme to be addressed and produces a scheme which is viable both structurally and financially. As highlighted within the supporting Planning Statement, the amended plans show a slightly more conservative design but a proposal that remains considerate to the streetscene in terms of elevational treatment, materials, and architectural features, all in context of the site's prominent location.

### Overview

The site is located within the development boundary of Sheringham, there can be no argument that the scheme will make a demonstrably positive contribution in bolstering the Council's housing supply and would make efficient and effective use of a sustainably located site. The Council state they can currently demonstrate a five year supply of housing; however, the five year housing land supply is a minimum number of homes to be planned for and not a maximum allowance. Irrespective, there is currently debate as to whether the Council can demonstrate a five year housing land supply, which is being debated as part of an appeal by Gladman Developments Ltd Reference APP/Y2620/W/20/3248468 on land off Beresford Road, Holt, NR25 6EW, where the arguments range from a supply of 4.06 years to 5.52 years. It should also be acknowledged that the Council's supply and delivery of housing within the District will also be impacted on by the current COVID-19 pandemic and therefore further weight should be given to the provision of residential units within sustainable locations such as this.

This letter, in conjunction with previous correspondence and supporting Planning Statement, clearly highlights the benefits of this scheme and how the amendments provide an implementable scheme which is sensitive to its location, to the adjacent former hotel building and to Sheringham Conservation Area. The proposal would help to bolster the District's housing supply and it is considered the proposal makes efficient use of a sustainably located site and provides clear economic, social and environmental benefits and therefore should be supported.

Whilst the current application relates to the construction of six flats, it is clearly linked to the overall re-development and re-use of the former Burlington Hotel and ensures the most efficient use of the site whilst respecting its location. Without a scheme that can be developed practically there is a risk that the site as a whole, including the former Burlington Hotel would fall into a further state of disrepair. If that were to occur, the site would remain undeveloped which would impact on this non-designated heritage asset as well as the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal seeks to provide an acceptable development on the site which can viably be constructed, and which ensures the long-term re-use of the site and the former Burlington Hotel.

### Conclusion

As outlined above, the applicant has addressed many of the issues raised during the course of the application and most recently within the response from Conservation. The previously approved drawings have not been thought through in relation to the practicalities of the proposed building, a fact well known to the Council, and

previously questioned by Officers. This application to vary condition 2 will allow the building to be erected according to a design which allows for the structural limitations of the originally approved scheme without causing any material harm to the site or its surroundings.

The revised scheme is considered to take full account of its sensitive location and will ensure the long-term re-use of the site and the former Burlington Hotel and therefore should be supported. In conclusion, the proposal is considered to provide an acceptable form of development in planning terms and is considered to comply with the Local Plan and the NPPF.

We trust that the further information and additional commentary provided within and appended to this letter demonstrate that the scheme is acceptable and that planning permission can now be granted.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D Sherman', written in a cursive style.

**Debi Sherman** BA (Hons) MA MRTPI MILM  
**Head of Planning**  
One Planning Ltd