

**Binham – PF/21/2926 – Two storey side/rear extension to dwelling, 87 Warham Road, Binham, for Mr & Mrs Wales**

**- Target Date: 28<sup>th</sup> December 2021**

Case Officer: Fran Watson

Householder application

RELEVANT SITE CONSTRAINTS

- Landscape Character Area
- SFRA - Areas Susceptible to Groundwater Flooding
- LDF – Countryside
- Conservation Area
- LDF Tourism Asset Zone
- C Road

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

PF/19/2153: Two-storey rear and single storey side extensions – approved 06/10/2020

THE APPLICATION

A two-storey extension to the south side of the detached dwelling is proposed. It would project beyond the rear elevation of the main part of the dwelling. Ridge and eaves heights would be the same as the existing, and the extension would have a gable to part of the front (west elevation). The walls of the extension would mainly be clad with vertical timber boarding. Where it would attach to the existing dwelling there would be a double height glazed link/curtain wall on the west elevation with a slight set back at first floor. The glazing would be to the first floor only on the east (rear elevation). The roof covering would be reclaimed pantiles.

REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

At the request of Councillor Richard Kershaw as he considers the proposal is compatible with SS1 and SS2, EN4 and H08.

Cllr Kershaw states: *“The application is supported by the Parish Council and neighbours and the scale of the extension is smaller than most that have been granted planning permission on that side of Westgate.*

*At present this is a holiday cottage which the owners would like to become their home. They are a third generation farming family running the dairy herd at Abbey Farm and have won awards for previous conversions. The applicants are moving here to allow their son to continue with the Farm whilst they run the newly constructed Tea Room and shop next to the Priory. Living at Pebble Cottage will enable them to do that in a sustainable manner as it is walking distance from then Tea rooms. I do not feel there is any harm with this application set in the context of the surrounding houses”.*

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL

Binham Parish Council: support. The PC consider the proposed extension is sympathetic to the surrounding landscape and conservation area. The proposed extension is in character and complimentary to the existing building and; would not over dominate in the surrounding

landscape. It is understood that materials to be used will maintain the character of the building and be in keeping with the vernacular style of the area.

Due to the rural location of the property, the PC ask that consideration is given to the impact of any additional lighting sources to wildlife and preserving a dark skies environment.

As the property is located on one of the main busy roads through the village the PC ask that every effort is made by the contractors to park on site as opposed to the highway and to implement traffic management and supervision of traffic and during deliveries to the site for safety reasons.

## CONSULTATIONS

None required.

## REPRESENTATIONS

None received in response to press and site notices.

## POLICIES

North Norfolk Core Strategy (Adopted September 2008):

SS 1 - Spatial Strategy for North Norfolk

SS 2 - Development in the Countryside

HO 8 - House extensions and replacement dwellings in the Countryside

EN 4 - Design

EN 8 - Protecting and enhancing the historic environment

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

Section 2 – Achieving sustainable development

Section 4 – Decision-making

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places

Section 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Supplementary Planning Documents

North Norfolk Design Guide – Supplementary Planning Document (2008)

## MAIN ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

### **Main Issues:**

- Whether the proposed development is acceptable in principle: *policies SS 1, SS 2 and HO 8*
- The effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the Binham Conservation Area: *policies HO 8, EN 4 and EN 8*
- The effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings: *policy EN 4*
- Highway safety and parking: *policies CT 5 and CT 6*

### Principle of development

The property, a detached two storey house, is situated within the area designated Countryside

under policy SS 1. Policy SS 2 lists the types of development that can be acceptable in principle within the Countryside and these include extensions to existing dwellings. The proposed development is therefore acceptable in principle and complies with Policies SS 1 and SS 2. To be acceptable overall however, the proposed development must comply with all other relevant development plan policies unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

#### Effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the Binham Conservation Area

Policy EN 4 states that all development will be designed to a high quality, and design which fails to have regard to local context and does not preserve or enhance the character and quality of an area will not be acceptable. Development proposals such as extensions and alterations to existing dwellings are expected to have regard to the North Norfolk Design Guide, which as a Supplementary Planning Document is a material consideration.

The North Norfolk Design Guide gives clear guidance regarding the appropriate design of extensions. The scale of an extension should ensure that the architectural character of the original building is not harmed and remains dominant. Extensions should use forms, detailing and materials which are compatible with the original building.

The property is located within the Binham Conservation Area. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, places a statutory duty on local planning authorities in respect of proposed development with a conservation area and states "*special attention shall be made to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area*". This is reflected in the requirements of policy EN 8.

Policy HO 8 indicates proposals to extend existing dwellings within the Countryside will be permitted provided that the proposal would not result in a disproportionately large increase in the height or scale of the original dwelling, and would not materially increase the impact of the dwelling on the appearance of the surrounding countryside.

The proposed extension would not be subservient in terms of its scale and would appear as an incongruous addition, completely at odds with the traditional design of the dwelling's principal elevation. Due to its overall scale and massing, height, appearance (including proposed materials) and its expanse across the side of the dwelling, with the projection to the rear, it is considered that the proposal would be an unacceptable form of development which would be out of keeping with the form and character of the original dwelling. Whilst the principle elevation of the dwelling sits side on to Warham Road and the extension would be sited predominantly to the side and rear of the property, given the orientation of the dwelling, the extension would be visible from the road, albeit set back, and is considered would have a detrimental visual impact in the street scene.

The proposed extension is identical to that first submitted under the previous application (PF/19/2153). The Conservation & Design officer's comments on the 2019 application (which are equally relevant now given the commonality of plans were as follows:

*The property is of mid-19th century origin and stands gable end-on to Warham Road. It features a 'politely' detailed front elevation facing west and a vernacular rear elevation under a traditional catslide roof facing east. Although not of special architectural or historical interest, it is nonetheless an attractive and prominent property, which makes a positive contribution to the form and character of this part of Binham.*

*Against this context, it is difficult to see how Conservation & Design can possibly support this application. By virtue of its size, form, design and materials, it is considered that the proposed new build would neither be compatible with or subservient to the existing building and would*

*thus fail to accord with some of the principles contained in section 3.6 of the North Norfolk Design Guide.*

*More specifically, the concerns can be summarised as follows: -*

- The extension would 'plug' directly into the south-facing gable where it would compete directly with the existing building.*
- Notwithstanding its largely glazed connection, and the slight setback at first floor level on its western side, there would be no meaningful separation between the existing and proposed elements. Instead, it would finish flush with the 'polite' face of building and feature matching ridge and eaves heights.*
- The addition would introduce a new cross wing which would not only be longer than the existing building but which would also be discordant with its simple linear form. It would also completely mask the existing building when viewed from the garden and agricultural land to the south.*
- Elevationally, the new build would feature contrasting timber cladding and relatively plain window styles. Whilst such a divergent approach can be successful, it requires clear separation from the host building. In this case, the addition would be conjoined rather than separate and would not be viewed as its own discrete entity.*

*For these reasons, and because both sides of the property are visible from public vantage points, the only conclusion is that the proposed development would have a detrimental impact upon its appearance and character, and thus would result in harm being caused to the overall significance of the wider designated heritage asset. Therefore, unless there are other material planning considerations or public benefits accruing from the proposals to outweigh the identified harm, the application would need to be refused in accordance with paras 193 & 196 of the NPPF, as well as Policies EN4 and EN8 of the Core Strategy.*

Officers subsequently advised that the recommendation for the previous scheme would be one of refusal, which led to a series of amendments, eventually resulting in approval in October 2020. The approved scheme was substantially different to that first submitted, with amongst other things, the side extension reduced to a single storey. Even as amended however, the approved scheme was considered to be pushing the envelope as to acceptability of design terms. The Conservation Officer considered that it was a matter of fine judgement as to whether the proposals would preserve the appearance and character of the existing building or the overall significance of the wider conservation area. The recommendation to approve the application was made on the basis of the revised scheme creating significantly less harm than that originally (and now) proposed.

The concerns raised in 2019, (see above italicised section), remain directly relevant. As such, the proposed development is considered unacceptable in design terms and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of both the existing property and the Binham Conservation Area. It is therefore contrary to Policies EN 4, EN 8 and HO 8 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy and the principles set out in the North Norfolk Design Guide SPD. Whilst the development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the conservation area (a designated heritage asset), in such cases paragraph 202 of the NPPF states that *"this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use"*. In this case, there would be no public benefits, the benefits would be private for the owners/occupiers of the dwelling.

Living conditions

Policy EN 4 of the Core Strategy and the North Norfolk Design Guide requires that proposed development must not significantly impact upon the residential amenities of the occupiers of nearby dwellings in respect of light, privacy and disturbance.

It is considered that there would be no material effects on the occupiers of the closest dwellings and the proposed development would adequately safeguard residential amenity in accordance with Policy EN 4 and the North Norfolk Design Guide.

#### Highway safety

The proposed extensions and alterations to the dwelling would not have any material effects in terms of access, parking arrangements and highway safety. The proposal therefore complies with Policies CT 5 and CT 6.

#### **Conclusion and Recommendation:**

Whilst the proposal is acceptable in principle, it is a poor design and is not considered to be in accordance with the requirements of the Development Plan, being contrary to Policies EN 4, EN 8 and HO 8 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy 2008, paragraph 202 of the NPPF and the North Norfolk Design Guide SPD. Refusal is therefore recommended

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

REFUSAL, for the following reasons:

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed two-storey extension, by reason of its scale, massing, height, appearance, materials and its extent across the side of the dwelling, would be an incongruous addition to the existing dwelling that would be harmful to its form, character and appearance and, which consequently, would be harmful the character and appearance of the Binham Conservation Area within which the dwelling is located. As such, the proposed development contrary to Policies HO 8, EN 4 and EN 8 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy, Sections 12 and 16 of the NPPF and the principles set out in the North Norfolk Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.

Final wording of the reasons to be delegated to the Assistant Director – Planning.

#### **HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS**

Richard 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.