

**Beeston Regis & The Runtons – PF/21/2593 - Removal of existing outbuilding and raised paving and steps to rear of building; two storey side extension; new outbuildings to side and rear; raised rear seating area and glass wind screen to rear of building incorporating ramp and steps; new fire escape stair; pergola and glass wind screen to front of building; replacement of 2 no. roof windows by dormer windows; change window to bi-fold doors from restaurant to outside seating area; 2m high screen fence to eastern boundary (Retrospective) for Mr S Brundle.**

**Other Minor Development (Commercial)**

- Target Date: 25<sup>th</sup> November 2021

- Extension of time 22nd February 2022

Case Officer: Mrs L Starling

Full Planning Permission

**CONSTRAINTS**

Article 4 Direction

Advertising Control

Countryside

Agricultural Land Classification – Grade 3

Enforcement Enquiry

Landscape Character Area Type RV1 (Coastal Shelf)

Undeveloped Coast

**RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (Post 1990 onwards)**

ADV/21/1260 - Installation of free standing external non-illuminated sign - Pending Consideration

IS1/20/1831 - Replacement sign - Advice Given (for pre-apps)

ADV/20/0464 - Display of non-illuminated pole mounted advertisements - Refused

PF/19/1682 - Erection of two storey and single storey front and side extensions, bin storage area, external fire escapes, raised outdoor paved seating area and associated landscaping including glass panel screen and flint retaining wall, second floor balcony, first floor glazed juliet balconies, installation of external air conditioning and heating units, vertical and horizontal timber cladding, and addition of disabled car parking spaces – Approved

ADV/19/0324 - Display of non-illuminated advertisement panel mounted on posts – Refused and Dismissed at Appeal

ADV/18/1195 - Display of non-illuminated advertisement panel mounted on posts to replace existing sign mounted on posts (retrospective) – Refused

PF/18/0512 - Remodelling & enlargement of hotel; demolition of existing front canopy; various alterations (new porch, changes to windows & doors & juliet balconies to first floor new french doors); erection of single-storey side extension (beer store); single & two-storey rear extension (restaurant on ground floor & function room on first floor) & first floor balconies; new balcony in west elevation roof; surface treatments of roof tiles & slates; erection of smoking shelter to

front garden with landscaping; rear decking area; laying out of car park & landscaping at rear  
- Application Withdrawn

PF/05/0988 – Erection of single-storey rear extension for function room and associated facilities - Withdrawn

AI/98/0824 – Retention of illuminated advertisement - Approved

## **THE APPLICATION**

This full planning application is seeking planning permission for alterations and extensions works, including associated buildings and landscaping works, to The Dormy House Hotel which fronts onto Cromer Road in West Runton.

The site comprises of a detached well established hotel which has been substantially altered and extended over many years, including by some recent works approved in 2020 under planning permission Ref: PF/19/1682. This latest application proposes both amendments to elements of the previously approved scheme, as well as the inclusion of additional works/structures. This current application is predominantly retrospective given that some works have already been commenced or completed.

The works (part retrospective) subject of this current application are summarised as follows;

- Removal of existing outbuilding and raised paving and steps to rear of building
- Two storey flat roof side (east) extension and new fire escape stairwell
- New outbuildings to side and rear
- Raised seating area and glass wind screen to rear of building incorporating ramp and steps
- Pergola and glass wind screen to front of building
- Replacement of 2 no. previously approved rooflights with 2 no. dormer windows and balcony changes
- Replacement of restaurant window with bi-fold doors to access outside seating area  
2m high screen fence to eastern boundary

Residential properties lie directly to the east and north-east with Cromer Road to the South, the carpark with the coast/coastal footpath beyond to the north and open land to the west. Access to the site and car park would remain served via the existing access off Cromer Road.

## **REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE**

At the request of Councillor S Butikofer for the reasons of the scheme being a departure from agreed plans and lies in the area designated as Countryside and Undeveloped Coast area and is a prominent structure on the Cromer Road.

## **PARISH COUNCIL**

East and West Runton Parish Council – No objections.

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

One letter of objection has been received from the owners of a neighbouring property to the east on following grounds (summarised);

- Detrimental impact of the pergola on highway safety grounds due to the structure extending to the front boundary and at height which blocks view of traffic approaching from west on a busy road where the 30mph speed limit is frequently exceeded. This is causing safety issues exiting driveway and affecting neighbours to the east and hotel guests exiting the car parking. If the pergola were reduced in length by half this would ease our difficulties.
- Detrimental impact of the pergola and landscaping to front of the hotel resulting in loss of car parking space. Whilst the form states no reduction in car parking spaces would result, this is not the case. Although the existing plans show an additional parcel of land highlighted in red, this has not been secured. The rear terrace has been significantly enlarged with available parking spaces reduced resulting in cars frequently parked on the grass verge to the front west. The original permission appears to have been granted on the assumption of this extra parcel of land being secured for parking. Highways should be consulted on this matter.
- Construction of footing for beer store undermined adjacent boundary. The proximity of this building so close to the fence is such that the cladding has not been completed (contrary to the application statement) as to do so would require accessing our property, removal of several fence panels and disturbance of garden planting, none of this stated on the original 2019 planning application.

## **CONSULTATIONS**

NNDC Landscape Officer (Verbal response) – No objections subject to conditions re-imposed from the 2019 permission including works to be carried out in accordance with the accompanying Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment and a condition to control the installation of any future additional external lighting.

County Council Highways – No objections or conditions requested. Comments that in relation to highways issues only, as this proposal does not affect the current traffic patterns or the free flow of traffic, that Norfolk County Council does not wish to restrict the grant of consent.

In light of the highway safety concerns raised by the occupants of the adjoining properties, this was raised with Highways by the Case Officer. However, the Highways Officer confirmed this did not alter the Highway view offered.

Environmental Protection Team NNDC – No objections or conditions requested based on the additional information and technical data submitted by the agent following their original holding objection made due to concerns in respect of noise and disturbance resulting from equipment, music and the use of the site) and refuse details. It was also confirmed that the originally required Noise Impact Assessment was no longer considered necessary. Commented that should any future noise disturbance occur Environmental Protection have powers to investigate where necessary.

Economic Growth NNDC – Confirmed support for the application based on the economic impacts of the application. Comments as follows;

*Consideration of the proposal has been given alongside the applicant's business plan. We note that the use of the proposed extension and new outbuildings will encompass activities*

*relating to the operational aspect of the business. The additional space will be an improvement on the current space and will also assist with a more efficient operation of the business.*

*This proposal will provide Dormy House Hotel the opportunity to operate a more viable business and enable sufficient resilience to overcome the economic fallout and challenges businesses face from the Covid-19 pandemic.*

*It is also recognised that there are potential economic benefits that would be derived by such a proposal, in particular the creation of a number of new jobs. There are also potential benefits to local businesses, the local supply chain and the visitor economy.*

## **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**

### North Norfolk Core Strategy (Adopted September 2008):

SS 2 - Development in the Countryside

SS 4 – Environment

SS 5 – Economy

SS 6 – Access and infrastructure

EC 3 – Extensions to businesses in the Countryside

EN 2 - Protection and enhancement of landscape and settlement character

EN 3 – Undeveloped Coast

EN 4 - Design

EN 9 - Biodiversity and geology

EN 13 – Pollution and hazard prevention and minimisation

CT 5 - The transport impact of new development

CT 6 - Parking provision

### National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021)

Section 2: Achieving sustainable development

Section 4: Decision-making

Section 6: Building a strong, competitive economy

Section 12: Achieving well-designed places

Section 15: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

### North Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment (SPD) January 2021

### North Norfolk Design Guide (SPD) Adopted 2008

## **MAIN ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **1. Principle and site history**

- 2. Design**
- 3. Landscape impacts including upon the Undeveloped Coast**
- 4. Residential amenity and environmental considerations**
- 5. Highway safety**

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1.Principle and site history (Policies SS 2, SS 5 and EC 3)**

The application site lies within a rural location on the periphery of the village of West Runton, on land defined as 'Countryside' by Policy SS 2 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy. Within such areas, Policies SS 2 and EC 3 of the North Core Strategy support the principle of proposals for alterations to and extensions of existing businesses where the scale is appropriate to the host development and subject to compliance with other relevant local and national planning policies.

Given the existing commercial use of the building on this site, the scheme is considered acceptable in principle.

The applicant has provided supporting information based on economic and Covid-19 related factors which resulted in changes needing to be made to the approved 2019 scheme and why works, particularly in respect of the two-storey extension, were necessary. Members attention is also drawn to the support received from the NNDC Economic Growth Team based on economic factors only.

### **2. Design (Policy EN 4 and Section 12 of the NPPF)**

The scheme includes a range of new outbuildings located within the site, extended raised rear seating areas with windscreens, landscaping works including a pergola with wind screening and seating situated to the front of the hotel and alterations to the main building including new dormer windows. Whilst certain elements are not considered ideal in design terms, it is considered difficult to argue that they would have a significantly detrimental impact to an extent which would warrant a refusal on design terms and they would, on balance, comply with the requirements of Policy EN 4 and Section 12 of the NPPF.

However, the contentious element of this scheme relates to the two-storey flat roof clad extension constructed on the eastern gable of the hotel. Whilst it is acknowledged that the extension is of a similar scale to that approved under the 2019 approval and similarly set back some distance from the building's front elevation, its two-storey flat roof design protruding above the existing eaves line, along with dark clad colour finish, results in an incongruous 'utilitarian' form of development which is considered unacceptable in design terms and detrimental to both the visual amenities of the area and character of the host building. Whilst its set-back position offers an element of screening, the extension as built, due to its height and contrasting colour finish results in it being prominent when viewed from Cromer Road, compounding its visual impact in the streetscene and detrimental to the character of the host building.

It is therefore considered that the scheme would be contrary to Policy EN4 of the Core Strategy, Section 12 of the NPPF and the principles of the North Norfolk Design Guide as it

would be unacceptable in design terms and fail to adequately protect the character of the host building.

### **3. Landscape impacts including upon the Undeveloped Coast (Policies SS 4, EN 2, EN 3 and EN 9 and Section 15 of the NPPF)**

Whilst situated within the 'Countryside' and 'Undeveloped Coast' designations, the scheme has been assessed by the Landscape Team who raised no objections in respect of the impact of the proposals upon the surrounding landscape subject to the imposition of a previously requested condition from the 2019 permission prohibiting the installation of any additional external lighting.

Furthermore, no objections were raised in respect of ecology or biodiversity on the basis that the 2019 condition being re-imposed ensuring works carried out in accordance with the Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment.

As such, it is considered that the scheme would accord with policies SS 4, EN 2, EN 3, EN 9 and Section 15 of the NPPF.

### **4. Residential amenity and environmental considerations (Policies EN 4 and EN 13)**

Policies EN 4 and EN 13 supports development proposals where they would not result in a significantly detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of nearby occupiers.

It is noted that residential properties lie directly to the east of the site. As was the case with the 2019 scheme which also included a two-storey extension (albeit of a hipped roof design), the two-storey side extension remains modest in scale (with its height reduced by virtue of its flat roof design), with no additional first floor windows included on the east-facing elevation. As such, it remains the view that the extensions, along with the introduction of 2 no. dormers to the rear wing of the hotel, would not result in any significant loss of privacy to, nor be visually overbearing for, neighbouring properties.

Furthermore, whilst the Councils Environmental Health Team raised a holding objection initially to the scheme based on concerns relating to noise and disturbance, following the receipt of additional information provided by the Agent, this objection has been removed with no conditions requested.

As such, it is considered that subject to proposed conditions, the proposed development would comply with the requirements of Policies EN 4 and EN 13 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy in respect of protecting residential amenity.

### **5. Highway safety (Policies SS6, CT5 and CT6)**

Access to the site would remain off Cromer Road. It is noted that an element of parking which was previously located to the front of the hotel has been lost due to the use of this area as a seating area/eating area with associated structures and buildings, and concerns have been raised to the impact of this area and loss of parking on highway safety.

Notwithstanding this, NCC Highways have assessed the proposals and raised no objections, with no conditions requested.

As such, it is considered that the scheme would safeguard highway safety in accordance with Policies CT5 and CT6 of the Core Strategy.

## **Conclusion**

Whilst officers recognise there are numerous elements of the proposal that are broadly acceptable in planning terms, there are also elements of the proposal which conflict with aims and objectives of the development plan. The Local Planning Authority is unable to issue a 'Split' decision (i.e. approve those elements that are acceptable and refuse those elements which are not)

As such, the scheme as a whole is considered to be unacceptable in design terms, due to the design, form, height (protruding above the eaves), materials and colour finish of the two-storey side (east elevation) extension, resulting in an incongruous form of development which would be detrimental to the character of the host property and visual amenities of the area, contrary to the requirements of Policy EN 4 of the Core Strategy and Section 12 of the NPPF.

The proposals would fail to comply with relevant Development Plan policies and the guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

As a departure from the Development Plan, the Development Committee would be able to consider whether any material considerations advanced in favour of the proposal outweigh the departure. In this case, the applicant has put forward supporting information to justify the proposal related to the impact of Covid 19. However, Officers consider that the justification for a flat-roof extension rather than a pitched roof extension and the choice of cladding in themselves do not provide material considerations of sufficient weight to outweigh the identified conflict with Core Strategy Policy EN 4 nor the aims and objectives of Section 12 of the NPPF.

In making a recommendation of refusal, if the Development Committee were minded to support the recommendation, further consideration would need to be given to the next steps (i.e. consideration of enforcement action or further negotiation outside of this application to seek to secure an acceptable scheme).

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

### **REFUSAL for the following reasons:**

The District Council adopted the North Norfolk Core Strategy on 24 September 2008, and subsequently adopted Policy HO9 on 23 February 2011, for all planning purposes. The following policy statements are considered relevant to the proposed development:

EN 4 - Design  
Section 12 NPPF

North Norfolk Design Guide SPD (2008)

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the scheme, in particular the inclusion of a two-

storey flat roof side extension protruding above the existing eaves line constructed in a dark clad colour finish, results in an incongruous form of development which is considered unacceptable in design terms and detrimental to both the visual amenities of the area and character of the host building. The development is therefore considered contrary to the requirements of Policy EN 4 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy, Section 12 of the NPPF and the design principles set out in the North Norfolk Design Guide (Adopted SPD).

**Final wording of reasons for refusal to be delegated to the Assistant Director for Planning.**