

**Holt – PF/21/2573** - Extension and alterations to existing bungalow including first floor extension; erection of detached dwelling to rear and associated works at 21 Peacock Lane, Holt for a Mr and Mrs Roberts.

### **Minor Development**

**- Target Date: 23 November 2021**

Case Officer: Miss J Smith

Full Planning Permission

### RELEVANT CONSTRAINTS

Conservation Area

Contaminated Land

Residential Area

Settlement Boundary

Surface Water Flooding

### RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Refval	PF/20/2399
Description	Alterations to existing bungalow including first floor extension; new detached 2 storey dwelling to rear and associated works
Outcome	WDN - Application Withdrawn
Status	WDN - Application Withdrawn
Refval	DE21/16/0914
Description	Erection of single-storey dwelling and 2 garages (to mirror development at No.19, next door) with creation of wider joint access with No.19
Outcome	AG - Advice Given (for pre-apps)
Status	AG - Advice Given

### THE APPLICATION

The application seeks permission to extend the existing bungalow of No 21 Peacock Lane with a first floor extension including a front and rear single storey extension to create a three-bedroom dwelling. An additional one and a half storey, three-bedroom dwelling is also proposed in the rear garden of the application site.

The scheme provides parking and manoeuvring for a minimum of two cars for each dwelling, residential amenity space and bin storage. The dwellings would comprise a mix of render, fibre cement boarding under a slate roof with grey aluminium or UPVC joinery.

The application is a re-submission of a previous scheme at this site (PF/20/2399) which was withdrawn due to concerns regarding scale of development, impact upon neighbouring amenity and highways objections.

### REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

At the request of Cllr Perry Warnes due to the social well-being and rights of the applicant would be adversely affected, contrary to NPPF 8, and that the highways objections are not substantial enough to outweigh that detrimental effect.

### PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL

No comment to make at this time.

### REPRESENTATIONS

Four letters of objection received on the following grounds:

- Insufficient consultation/notification – removal of planning notice.
- Loss of light.
- Overbearing.
- Overshadowing.

- Loss of light/air.
- Design not in keeping with other properties along Peacock Lane.
- Congestion along Peacock lane due to construction traffic.
- Parking for construction workers and construction traffic.
- Noise and inconvenience to existing residents due to construction/building.
- Highways safety concerns due to substandard nature of Peacock Lane and inadequate narrow junction with Cromer Road.
- Paving the front for parking with destroy natural habitation.
- Insufficient parking provision.
- Insufficient width (less than the required 4.5 metres) and turning space on the driveway plus the visibility to the north of the access drive is restricted by vegetation outside the applicant's control.
- No provision with person for disabilities.

## CONSULTATIONS

County Council Highways: Object. The site has an existing access from the adopted section of Peacock Lane, which is less than 4.5m in width (a prerequisite requirement for an additional dwelling) and has restricted visibility to the north due to the boundary wall piers and vegetation within third party land. However, the revised plans show a widened access and lowered wall piers, as such, it is considered that these shortcomings could be addressed.

The TRICS database (Trip Rate Information Computer Services Version 2005b) evidences that a residential dwelling will typically generate 6 vehicular trips per day, therefore, it is evident that the proposed development would engender an increase of that magnitude over the narrow Peacock Lane. NCC have previously considered the suitability of Peacock Lane to serve additional greenfield development to which has been consistently resisted and further new build development due to the severely substandard nature of Peacock Lane. Peacock Lane is not suitable for redevelopment whatsoever as it is not possible to make any suitable improvements to the inadequate junction and narrow carriageway, making a NCC resolution to continue with long standing objection to 'greenfield' sites off Peacock Lane due to concerns with increased vehicular traffic on all users, including those more vulnerable.

With consideration of the shortcomings and limitations of Peacock Lane itself, together with its substandard junction with Cromer Road, refusal is recommended on the following grounds;

- The proposed development does not adequately provide for pedestrians /people with disabilities (those confined to a wheelchair or others with mobility difficulties).
- The application is not supported by sufficient highways information to demonstrate that the proposed development will not be prejudicial to highway safety.

Conservation and Design Officer. Comments have yet to be received. However, in design terms the scheme as proposed is similar to that considered through the previously withdrawn application (PF/20/2399). The Conservation and Design Officer raised no substantive objection to the previous scheme based on the following; (i) Although the application site is situated within the Glaven Valley Conservation Area, it has to be acknowledged that this part of the designation is not the most representative or sensitive, and is, therefore, better able to accommodate change; (ii) The existing bungalow offers little in the way of architectural or historic merit, thus, there is no objection to it being significantly altered; (iii) as plot 2 will be fairly set back from the road, and obscured from view by plot 1, it is unlikely the building will be prominent in views within the Glaven Valley Conservation Area, nor from the Holt Conservation Area; (iiii) this part of Holt has seen a number of infill developments and demonstrates a variety of architectural styles and is, therefore, better able to accommodate change.

As a result, it is considered that the application will not result in harm to any heritage assets, preserving the existing character and appearance of the conservation area. Thus, there's no obvious reason for Conservation and Design to sustain an objection to the application.

Landscape Officer: No comments received to date, however the Preliminary Roost Assessment submitted with

the application was assessed as having negligible potential to support roosting bats.

Environmental Health: No comment

## 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, refusal 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.

## POLICIES

### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

Section 2: Achieving sustainable development

Section 5: Delivering sufficient supply of homes

Section 9: Promoting sustainable transport

Section 12: Achieving well designed places

Section 15: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

### Relevant Planning Policy

SS 1: North Norfolk Spatial Strategy

SS 3: Housing

SS 9: Holt

EN 4: Design

EN 8: Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment

CT 5: The Transport Impact of New Development

CT 6: Parking Provision

## MAIN ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

1. Principle of Development
2. Design
3. Amenity
4. Biodiversity
5. Highways and parking

## APPRAISAL

### 1. Principle of Development

The proposed site is located in an established residential area within the settlement boundary of Holt Town, where the principle of residential development is considered to be acceptable in relation to Development Plan Policies, SS 1, SS 3 and SS 9 of the adopted Core Strategy and section 2 of the NPPF.

### 2. Design

Peacock Lane contains a mix of dwellings which vary in size, scale, styles and materials and contains other 'infill' types of development. As a result, this allows for a site that better accommodate change. In the immediate context, there are both single and two storey dwellings along with a set of two storey block of flats located to the north of the application site.

In terms of the design, the form and massing of the dwellings are considered acceptable along with the mixed pallet of materials, with the use of render, cladding and slate roofing. Therefore, given the mixed form of development in the immediate context, the overall design approach is considered acceptable in this regard.

The combination of design, scale, massing and materials would not be out of context within the immediate setting where the principle of extending the existing dwelling (Plot 1) and a proposed new dwelling to the rear (Plot 2) are not considered to result in harm to either the Glaven Valley or Holt Conservation Area. The proposal is considered to comply with Policies EN 4 and EN 8 of the adopted Core Strategy and Section 12 and 16 of the NPPF.

### 3. Amenity

#### Relationship between existing dwellings

Given the relationship between the existing bungalow and proposed new dwelling including the flats to the north of the site and the detached two storey dwelling to the south of the site, there is already a high level of indivisibility between these dwellings due to positioning of existing windows.

#### Plot 1

The existing bungalow contains a hipped roof and conservatory that extends past the existing gable end 'building line' of the (Regal Court flats) to the north of the site. The proposed first extension to the existing bungalow will result in a two storey dwelling where the front and rear walls reflect the Regal Court gable width only. The proposed single storey element extends to the west past the gable of Regal Court by an approximate 4.7 metres and is proposed at 2.6 metres in height (with a flat roof). There is a gap of an approximate 0.7 metres between the proposed extension and the boundary fence to the north. There is a flat at ground floor of No 3, Regal Court containing three windows where there is a request to reduce the height for this single storey element by 0.4 metres due to impacts of over bearing and loss of light. However, given the combination of pulling back of the existing roof of the bungalow whereby the rear wall of the proposed extension would be in line with that of Regal Court Gable, along with the proposed height and distance from the boundary, this relationship is not considered to result in significant loss of light or overbearing impact to warrant a request to change its height or recommendation of refusal.

There is an obscure window proposed to the south elevation at first floor of the proposed dwelling to facilitate a bathroom. The dwelling to the south contains a first floor window within its northern elevation, where there would be an approximate 6 metres distance between both properties. Whilst the NNDC Supplementary Planning Document Design Guide recommends 8.5 metres between blank wall and secondary windows (bedroom), whilst this relationship results in a slight shortfall, in the context of the site this is not considered to result in significant overshadowing or overbearing of this property and considered acceptable in this regard.

#### Plot 2

The proposed new one and a half storey dwelling to the rear of the plot has been designed to be set in a similar line with the gable with of Regal Court at first four level. There is a single storey element proposed to the east, extending past Regal Court by some 1.6 metres. Given the distance from the boundary to the north by some 1.3 metres and the proposed height of 2.6 metres, this is not considered to result in any greater overshadowing that the existing fence.

Regard has been given to the relationship between the proposed dwelling and the single storey dwelling to the south (Pippins Lodge). Given the dwellings position on the plot which proposes a building line similar to that of Pippins Lodge and that the proposed new dwelling will be located to the north of Pippins Lodge, it is not considered to result in significant overbearing impacts. Objections have been raised with regards to overlooking of this property by way of the proposed first floor windows. Amended plans have been received which reconfigure the internal layout of the first floor resulting in a bathroom window (to the west elevation) closest to this southern boundary with this neighbour boundary which will be obscure glazed and right side hung, along with a central window to be fixed shut. This reconfiguration will also reduce potential to result in loss of privacy and overlooking to Cockaday Court to the west.

As far as the amenity issues are concerned, Plots 1 and 2 would be served by amenity space that would accord with the requirements of NNDC Supplementary Planning Document Design Guide which recommends that the plot given over to private amenity space should be no less than the footprint of the dwelling on the site.

It is considered that the proposed dwellings have been designed in a manner which would adequately protect the residential amenities of the occupants of surrounding properties, as well as provide adequate amenity for any future occupants of the proposed dwelling. It is recognised that given the residential context there is more of a tight knit form of development and for the reason stated above, would make it difficult to justify the refusal of the application on the grounds of overbearing, loss of light or loss of privacy. It is therefore considered that the scheme would comply with Policy EN 4 and EN 13 of the adopted Core Strategy, Section 3.3.10 of the North Norfolk Design Guide and Section 12 of the NPPF.

#### 4. Biodiversity

The application was submitted with a Preliminary Roost Assessment which assessed the house as having negligible potential for bats. Subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, the proposed scheme is considered to be acceptable with regards to Policy EN 9 of the adopted Core Strategy and Section 15 of the NPPF.

#### 5. Highways and parking

In respect to access and turning arrangements, in the case of a three-bedroom dwelling, this requires a minimum of two spaces per dwelling. Based on the layout for the existing and host dwelling, this would be sufficient to accord to Core Strategy Requirements. As a result, the Highways Authority raise no objection to this element of the proposed scheme.

The Highways Officer observes that whilst the existing access from the adopted section of Peacock Lane, (which is less than 4.5m in width and a prerequisite requirement for an additional dwelling), and has restricted visibility to the north due to the boundary wall piers and vegetation within third party land. The submitted plans show a widened access and lowered wall piers, and therefore considers that these shortcomings can be addressed and raises no objection to this element of the scheme.

However, due to the substandard junction with Cromer Road, the intensification of use of this access would result in a highways objection to the proposal. NCC have previously considered the suitability of Peacock Lane to serve additional greenfield development to which further new build development has been consistently resisted due to the severely substandard nature of Peacock Lane where it is not possible to make any suitable improvements to the inadequate junction and narrow carriageway.

With consideration of the shortcomings and limitations of Peacock Lane itself, together with its substandard junction with Cromer Road, refusal is recommended on the following grounds;

- The proposed development does not adequately provide for pedestrians /people with disabilities (those confined to a wheelchair or others with mobility difficulties) – contrary to Policy CT 6 of the adopted Core Strategy
- The application is not supported by sufficient highways information to demonstrate that the proposed development will not be prejudicial to highway safety - contrary to Policy CT 6 of the adopted Core Strategy.

#### Other Matters

Three site notices were placed up around the site. Upon being advised that the site notice to the front of the property has been removed, the Case Officer replaced this with a further notice.

#### Conclusion and Recommendation

It is considered that the size, layout, design and appearance of the development are acceptable and would not have a significantly adverse impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties (subject to appropriate conditions). However, the proposed scheme raises a highway objection due to the shortcomings and limitations of Peacock Lane itself, together with its substandard junction with Cromer Road. As such, refusal is recommended on highway grounds.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Delegate authority to the Head of Planning to REFUSE for the following reasons:

- The proposed development does not adequately provide for pedestrians /people with disabilities (those confined to a wheelchair or others with mobility difficulties) – contrary to Policy CT 6 of the adopted Core Strategy
- The application is not supported by sufficient highways information to demonstrate that the proposed development will not be prejudicial to highway safety - contrary to Policy CT 6 of the adopted Core Strategy.