

**Cromer – PF/20/2569 – Two storey side extension with balcony to front, single storey rear extension and detached outbuilding in rear garden, Somerville House, 55 Runton Road, Cromer for Mr & Mrs Davies**

**- Target Date: 24 December 2021**

Case Officer: Joe Barrow

Householder application

#### RELEVANT SITE CONSTRAINTS

- Civil Parish – Cromer
- District Ward - Cromer Town
- Agricultural Land Classification: Urban
- Areas Susceptible to Groundwater SFRA – Classification: <25%
- Landscape Character Area – Type: CS1 (Coastal Shelf)
- Landscape Character Assessment - Description: Coastal Towns and Villages
- Residential Area LDF
- Settlement Boundary LDF

#### RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

PF/20/1732: Two storey side extension with roof terrace above following demolition of attached garage; single storey rear extension; detached outbuilding in rear garden. Application withdrawn.

#### THE APPLICATION

Planning permission is sought for the following:

- Demolition of existing single storey attached garage and its replacement with a two storey side extension with balcony to front.
- Single storey rear extension.
- Detached single storey outbuilding in rear garden.

Detailed plans and supporting documents are available to view on <https://idoxpa.north-norfolk.gov.uk/online-applications/>

#### REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

At the request of Councillor Tim Adams. He considers the application should be refused as the scale and massing of the proposed development would result in an overdevelopment of the site, which along with elements of the design, would be out of keeping with the existing form and character of the area, and the host property and building (including the neighbouring attached property).

Cllr Adams also refers to other nearby proposals recently, including that at nearby 61 Runton Road, which was recently refused.

He believes the proposal to be contrary to EN 4.

#### PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL

### Cromer Town Council:

No objections but consider that the site is overcrowded. The rear extension is too long and adversely effects the light to the neighbouring property on the western flank.

### CONSULTATIONS

None required.

### REPRESENTATIONS

Two objections to the most recent revisions to proposals, summarised as follows:

- Design not in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in terms of form and materials palette, particularly focusing on the amount of glazing.
- Lack of balance across the pair of semi-detached dwellings.
- Impact on privacy caused by the balcony.
- Overshadowing and dominance over the adjacent detached neighbour.

### POLICIES

North Norfolk Core Strategy (Adopted September 2008):

SS 1 - Spatial Strategy for North Norfolk

SS 3 - Housing

EN 4 - Design

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

Section 4 - Decision-making

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places

Supplementary Planning Documents

North Norfolk Design Guide SPD (2008)

### MAIN ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

1. Principle of development
2. Design
3. Residential amenity
4. Highways

### APPRAISAL

Somerville House is a 2 storey semi-detached property along the south side of Runton Road.

The attached neighbour is sited to the west, with a detached neighbour in close proximity to the east as well.

To the rear there is a reasonable size garden, with a residential area beyond that, and to the north is Runton Road itself, with seaside attractions, Cromer beach, and the North Sea beyond that.

## 1. Principle of Development

The application proposes an extension to this dwelling within the residential area and settlement boundary of Cromer.

In line with Policies SS1, SS3 and SS7 proposals to extend residential properties in locations such as this are considered acceptable in principle.

## 2. Design

This proposal is comprised of three main parts; a two storey side extension containing a balcony to the front, a single story flat roof rear extension, and a single storey dual-pitch roof outbuilding in the rear garden.

The applicant property (and its attached neighbour to the west) are not aligned parallel to the road, with the western side of the pair further forwards than the eastern side. The detached neighbour to the east is more parallel to the road, with the boundary between these dwellings perpendicular to the highway, and therefore parallel with this neighbour.

The two storey side extension proposed is designed to be parallel with the eastern boundary. The eaves height of this element matches the existing, with a reduced ridge height, creating a subservient relationship between the applicant property and this proposed structure.

The roof design is hipped to the east, with a balcony a first floor level facing north. The materials palette is to match the existing property for this element.

The additional width provided by this extension is not considered to be excessive, and the dropped ridgeline and hipped roof design retain a subservient relationship to the host dwelling.

Further to the above, the stepped down design is a relatively simple overall form for the dwelling from the streetscene perspective, and is not considered to unbalance or dominate the pair of dwellings, or the streetscene.

The single storey extension to the rear would be largely secluded from public view, and sits between the two two-storey elements of the dwelling. Its form and style are considered acceptable in terms of impact on the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Lastly, the single storey outbuilding in the rear garden, much like the above extension, is also secluded largely from public view. Its scale, siting and design are all factors which results in an overall acceptable impact on the area in terms of character and appearance.

Overall, the cumulative impact of the three elements of this proposal are, whilst large in scale, acceptable in terms of their impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. It is considered that this application is therefore acceptable in terms of design, in accordance with Policy EN4 of the Adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy, Section 12 of the NPPF (2021), and the North Norfolk Design Guide.

## 3. Residential amenity

The key relationship to consider in terms of amenity impact of this proposal is the impact of the scheme on the eastern neighbour (No. 53). As mentioned before, this property is oriented parallel to Runtun Road to the north, and the side elevation of the dwelling is parallel to the boundary with the applicant property (and the proposed side elevation of the scheme).

No. 53's side wall contains a first floor bathroom window as well as two ground floor side windows, the larger of which serving a room to the rear, with a significant alternative source of light to the south.

The proposed side elevation would include a first floor obscure glazed bathroom window, a ground floor obscure glazed bathroom window, a ground floor bedroom window (with an alternative window the front), and finally, a ground floor side door serving a boot room.

The boundary between these properties is currently treated with a close board timber fence, with the proposal detailing a 6'6" brick wall to be constructed along this boundary, providing a significant level of privacy screening at ground floor level. The proposal would leave each of the dwellings with a pedestrian side access between their side elevations and this boundary.

The two storey element of this proposal is designed to project no further rear than the rear elevation of No. 53, with no overbearing or enclosure therefore experience to the rear of these dwellings. The single storey element is also considered to be of an acceptable height and position to avoid any overbearing effects.

Officers acknowledge the close proximity of this new elevation to the existing side elevation of No. 53. In considering this, due regard must be had to the hipped roof design, dropped ridge height, and the orientation of the properties. The applicant property is to the west of No. 53 and would already cause a reasonable level of overshadowing.

The extension's design avoids loss of light to the south, likely cause overshadowing only more towards the end of the day, and not at a level significantly more detrimental than the existing layout already creates.

In terms of general sense of overbearing, it is considered that each of the property's retaining their pedestrian side accesses, along with the stepped design elements help to keep any sense of overbearing to an acceptable level.

The proposal is not considered to create harm in terms of impact on amenity with respect to the single storey outbuilding and the single storey extension, when considering additional other neighbours and the surrounding area.

Consideration is also given to the balcony, which projects from the first floor of the front elevation of the property, serving a first floor living room.

The balcony would not provide overlooking to the west, as it extends no further north than the existing bay window feature at first floor level, and the side of the balcony is pulled away from the eastern elevation of the applicant property to significantly reduce any potential for overlooking relative to No. 53.

It is considered that the design of the balcony goes far enough to ensure that a view is only offered to public spaces to the north, and the North Sea beyond that. As a result, the balcony is considered to be acceptable in terms of privacy impact.

Officers recommend that permitted development rights be removed for alterations/extensions to the dwelling and its roof, to allow control over the future amenity impact of any further elements that could create additional overdominance or privacy concerns.

It is also recommended that the use of the outbuilding be restricted to ancillary use so that uses of the building which may be more intense and create further concerns are prohibited.

On balance, subject to the conditions discussed above, and whilst acknowledging the proximity created by this layout, it is considered that the design includes enough measures to limit and mitigate any harm caused by the development in terms of amenity.

It is therefore considered that this application is acceptable in terms of amenity impact, according with Policy EN4 of the Adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy, Section 12 of the NPPF (2021).

#### 4. Highways

This application involves the loss of an attached garage, but retains the site frontage for parking. The proposal keeps the number of bedrooms in the applicant property to three, so the parking requirement does not increase.

It is considered that the site's frontage can provide the required number of parking spaces, and with no other highway safety issues, this application is considered acceptable in terms of highway safety and parking provision in accordance with policies CT5 and CT6 of the Adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy as well as Section 9 of the NPPF (2021).

#### CONCLUSION AND PLANNING BALANCE:

Taking account of all relevant factors and material planning considerations the application is considered to be acceptable in principle, with an acceptable impact on character and appearance, amenity, and highway safety.

The proposal is deemed to comply with the relevant policies from the Adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021), and the North Norfolk Design Guide.

On balance, it is recommended that this application be approved.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

APPROVAL, subject to conditions to cover the matters listed below, and any others considered necessary by the Assistant Director – Planning:

1. Time limit for implementation
2. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans submitted details and specifications
3. Materials for the proposed development to be in accordance with details submitted as part of the application.
4. Use of detached outbuilding to be incidental to use of Somerville House
5. Removal of permitted development rights relating to Classes A, B and C of Schedule 2, Part 1

Final wording of the conditions to be delegated to the Assistant Director – 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.