

Parish:	Flitcham with Appleton	
Proposal:	Demolition of existing flat roof rear extension and side 2 storey pitched roof element and construction of new 2 storey pitched roof side and rear extension with detached garage	
Location:	33 Church Road Flitcham Norfolk PE31 6BU	
Applicant:	Client of Holt Architectural Ltd	
Case No:	17/00825/F (Full Application)	
Case Officer:	Mr C Fry	Date for Determination: 22 June 2017

Reason for Referral to Planning Committee – The site has been the subject of a recently dismissed appeal (appeal decision attached)

Case Summary

The application site lies within the Conservation Area of Flitcham. Flitcham is classified as a Rural Village according to Policy CS02 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011.

The application site contains one of a pair of semi-detached two storey properties that are constructed solely from red brick.

The application has been the subject of a recently refused application for two storey, single storey extensions and detached garage, 16/01482/F and subsequently dismissed appeal APP/V2635/D/16/316385.

The proposal seeks consent for single, two storey extensions and a detached garage trying to address the reasons for dismissing the appeal.

Key Issues

- Principle of Development and Planning History
- Impact upon the Conservation Area and general form and character issues
- Highway Safety
- Impact upon Neighbour Amenity
- Other Material Considerations

Recommendation

APPROVE

THE APPLICATION

The application site lies within the village of Flitcham. Flitcham is classified as rural village according to Policy CS02 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

The site also lies within Flitcham's Conservation Area.

Church Road has two storey dwellings dating back to the mid c19th. The northern side is more open to public view with properties on the south side of Church Lane on lower ground and partly screened behind walls. The properties demonstrate the use of carrstone and have header and cill treatment details.

The site is on a corner and contains one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings which is constructed solely from red brick. The property has been the subject of a two storey side extension. The property can be seen from public view in an elevated position above the road level. Other features to note include a 1m high red brick wall that wraps around the site frontage.

The site has been the subject of a recently dismissed appeal for two storey extensions and single storey rear extensions (APP/v2635/3163185). The Inspector considered that the proposals imbalanced the pair of semi-detached properties and when viewed alongside the proposed garage the extensions caused a significant impact upon the street scene and Conservation Area, with no public benefit arising from the proposal that would outweigh the harm.

The proposal has sought to overcome the reasons for the dismissing the appeal, namely by reducing the width of the two storey side extension at the front and significantly stepping in the two storey rear extension from the west elevation.

SUPPORTING CASE

The application has been supported with a Design and Access Statement:-

- The proposal has been amended to reflect comments advised by the Planning Officer and further amendments
- Demolition of a pitched roof 2 storey side projection and single storey flat roof extension allowing the construction of a new two storey extension with a rear projecting two storey extension all of which mirrors that of the adjoining dwelling.
- The proposal will create an additional floor area of 28.6sqm (internally) at first floor level.
- The layout of the proposal will project no further at the rear than that of the adjoining semi-detached house and will replicate the original double pitch that was constructed onto number 32 Church Road.
- The scale of the proposal mirrors that of the adjoining property and reflects the lowered rear single storey eaves height to the side extension with the rear extension being of identical size and form of the existing two storey rear extension of no.32 Church Road
- The existing landscape has becoming wild and past tree works have killed off the TPO tree that was on the site. The proposal will provide improved hard and soft landscape environment.
- In the Conservation Area any proposal will be subject to materials approved by the local planning authority with matching materials and finishes proposed.
- The site topography does not allow for good vehicular access, with the removal of a raised area of soil the existing main vehicular access can be relocated away from the junction of Church Road and allow the construction of the new driveway and garage block to the rear of the site with improved vehicular access and visibility whilst also

providing a segregated garden area directly adjacent to the dwelling and away from vehicle movements.

- The site lies within the least restrictive flood zone.

PLANNING HISTORY

Adjoining property 32:-

92/2618 Extension to dwelling permitted 16.11.1992

Application property:-

16/01482/F - Demolition of existing flat roof rear extension and side storey pitched roof element and construction of new 2 storey pitched roof side and rear extension with flat roof infill to rear with detached garage. Refused, 19.10.16. Appeal dismissed, 01.03.17.

92/0975/F – Extension to dwelling refused 28.07.1992

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

Parish Council: **NO COMMENT**

Highways Authority: **NO OBJECTION** subject to conditions

Conservation Officer: **NO OBJECTION** subject to conditions

Environmental Health & Housing – Environmental Quality: **NO OBJECTION**

REPRESENTATIONS

1 letter received **objecting** to the proposals on the following grounds:-

- The properties remain important unlisted buildings constructed in 1856, which are in a prominent position in the centre of the village
- Alter the symmetry of these two properties
- The decision would adhere to the planning permission guidelines for conservation areas and to the Flitcham Conservation Area Character Statement.
- The size of the side extension affects the proportion of the 2 semi-detached house by being wider and more forward than the original 2 storey construction
- The proposed garage design negates the surrounding nineteenth century building styles.
- The council granted planning permission in 1992 for extensions on both 32 and 33 Church Road emanating from the rear which maintained the symmetry of the two properties.
- The design and access statement is of litcham and not Flitcham

NATIONAL GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework – sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

National Planning Practice Guidance - Provides National Planning Practice Guidance, in support of and in addition to the NPPF

LDF CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

CS01 - Spatial Strategy

CS02 - The Settlement Hierarchy

CS06 - Development in Rural Areas

CS08 - Sustainable Development

CS11 – Transport

CS12 - Environmental Assets

SITE ALLOCATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES PLAN 2016

DM1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

DM2 – Development Boundaries

DM15 – Environment, Design and Amenity

OTHER GUIDANCE

Conservation Area Character Statement.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations in regards to the application are:-

- Principle of Development and Planning History
- Impact upon the Conservation Area and general form and character issues
- Highway Safety
- Impact upon Neighbour Amenity
- Other Material Considerations

Principle of Development and Planning History

The site is contained within the development boundary and Conservation Area of Fritcham.

The nature of the proposal, being a householder application could be acceptable in principle subject to other material considerations.

The site has recently had an application for side extensions and a detached garage which was refused under delegated powers, 16/01482/F and dismissed on appeal (APP/v2635/D/16/3163185)

The application was refused under delegated powers for the following reasons:-

17/00825/F

1. The proposed side extension by virtue of its scale, specifically its width and the main entrance being to the front rather than be retained to the side, results in an extension which imbalances the pair of dwellings and fundamentally changes the inherent character of the pair of dwellings to their detriment. The proposal is therefore contrary to the principles of good design in accordance with paragraphs 56, 58 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework; National Planning Policy Guidance and Policy CS06 and CS08 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011; Policy DM 15 of the Site Specific Allocation Document and Development Management Plan Document.
2. The property is one dwelling of a pair of semi-detached dwellings that are referred to as being an important unlisted building within Flitcham's Conservation Area. The proposed extension by virtue of its scale specifically its width imbalances the pair of semi-detached dwellings which causes harm to the setting of the Conservation Area. The harm caused to the designated heritage asset is not considered to be outweighed by any form of public benefit. The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraphs 131 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance, Policy CS12 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy

The application was dismissed on appeal, APP/V2635/D/16/3163185. This application therefore seeks to resolve the inspector's comments in dismissing the appeal.

The 1992 permission 2/92/2618/F, referred to by the third party, did detail an extension on no. 33, but the application site, block plan and decision notice refers solely to no.32 and was described as "extension to dwelling". It is therefore considered that no.33 did not benefit from that extant consent.

Impact upon the Conservation Area and general form and character issues

Third party representations refer to the need for the design to adhere to Flitcham's Conservation Area Character Statement; the design of the proposal unbalancing the pair of semi-detached properties and the garage design not adhering to the surrounding C19th building styles.

S.72 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that in the exercising of planning functions "special attention will be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area". Policy CS12 of the Local Development Framework states that the Council will "preserve and where appropriate enhance the qualities and characteristics (in relation to the historic environment)" Further design principles in regards to scale, height and massing is provided in Policy DM15 of the Site Allocation and Development Management Policies Plan.

Flitcham's Conservation Area Character Statement (CACS) refers to Church Road, as Church Lane, and states in regards to the general character of Church Road "the most interesting mixture of buildings is on the north side."; there is no particular mention of the site, and reference is only made to individual properties or groups of terraces beyond the application site. The CACS refers to traditional materials being carrstone, chalk blocks, brick (blood red and orange), greensand, flint and orange pantiles. Detractors can include unsuitable replacement windows and doors, inappropriate materials or unsympathetic paintwork, removal of walls, railings, trees and hedges... the character of several cottages is spoilt by the installation of unsuitable wooden or upvc wooden windows.

The original proposal was for a 4.8m wide two storey side extension with rear two storey projection. A single storey flat roof extension from the rear was also proposed. Whilst the two

storey side extension was stepped in and stepped down, which are good design principles when it comes to designing extensions, on a pair of distinct semi-detached properties such as these, the width of the two storey side extension imbalanced the pair of semi-detached properties.

Furthermore the main entrance doors to the pair of semi-detached dwellings are on the side elevation of the properties and the proposal was to move the entrance to the property so that it was on the front elevation. This was also considered to be an example of unbalancing the pair of semi-detached properties.

The semi-detached properties are referred to as important unlisted buildings within Flitcham's Conservation Area and it was by virtue of the width of the two storey extension that harm was caused to the setting of the Conservation Area, without any public benefit to offset the harm.

The Appeal Inspector concluded that "the proposed extension would significantly alter the appearance of the front of the dwellings because it would be much wider than the original side projection... it would be out of character with the original design and would result in the pair of dwellings having an imbalanced appearance from the front. This would clearly affect the architectural integrity of the building and the street scene. The extension would have a significant impact on the latter because of its prominent siting on the corner and its visibility in views along Church Road."

Whilst the Inspector had no issue with the garage in terms of its design, it was considered in combination with the proposed extension, that it added to "the bulk and extent of development and to its impact on the character and appearance of the area."

The Inspector concluded his reasoning by stating "the proposal would harm the significance of the building which is non-designated heritage asset and would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, however there would be less than substantial harm in that the general design of the extension would match the architectural features and form in the dwelling". The Inspector in line with paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework then stated that "whilst there was less than substantial harm, the enlargement of the existing residential accommodation may be of benefit to the local community, however there is no specific evidence before me in this regard and I give limited weight to any public benefit in this respect."

On other matters, the Inspector considered "An existing small rear flat roof extension would be removed but this is not particularly harmful because of its limited size."

The proposal has tried to address the Inspectors comments by; reducing the width of the two storey side extension by 1.5m and keeping the main entrance door on the side elevation of the property albeit infilling the existing opening with a dummy door. The two storey extension to the rear is significantly stepped in from the west elevation and tied in with the pitched roof extension on the rear of the adjoin property. The proposed side extension is still 0.4m wider than the adjacent two storey side extension, however it is not considered that this additional width, imbalances the pair to such a degree that the proposal will appear unduly unbalanced. Moving the two storey element in significantly from the west elevation and the breaking up of west elevation by stepping in the dining room area, is considered to reduce the impact on the proposal on the street scene and views along Church Road.

When viewed in combination with the proposed garage, the massing and bulk and extent of development and its impact upon the area has been reduced.

The new retaining wall and extend garden wall would not harm the character of the Conservation Area.

The Conservation Officer has no objection to the proposal subject to conditions in regards to materials and window details.

It is therefore considered that the proposal sustains the character of the Conservation Area.

The revised design is considered to overcome the reasons in dismissing the previous appeal.

Highway Safety

The existing access drive would be moved a short distance further north, away from the road junction. The Highways Officer has no objection to this proposal subject to conditions.

Impact upon Neighbour Amenity

The proposed side extension would not cause any detrimental impact upon the adjoining neighbour's amenity and would be separated from the neighbours to the west and south by Church Road itself.

The rear extension will not project beyond the plane of the neighbours two storey rear extension. The bedroom window at first floor will primarily look north and not directly into the neighbours private amenity area. It is worth noting that the adjoining neighbour already has a bedroom window in their rear elevation at first floor adjacent to the boundary of the application property. By virtue of the two storey extension not projecting beyond the plane of the neighbour's two storey rear extension, it is considered that this neighbour will not experience any detrimental overshadowing or overbearing issues as a result of the proposal.

Other Material Considerations

It is noted that the Design and Access Statement shows a plan of Litcham and not Flitcham.

CONCLUSION

Members will need to consider whether the proposal overcomes the reasons the Inspector dismissed the appeal. The Inspector dismissed the previous appeal as the proposal would imbalance the pair of the semi-detached properties and the massing of the two storey extension when viewed with the proposed garage would have a significant impact upon the character of Church Road. The Inspector considered that the proposal caused harm which was not outweighed by Public benefit in accordance with paragraph 134 of the NPPF and also concluded that the proposal did not comply with the provisions of Policy DM15 of the Site Allocation and Development Management Policies Plan.

It is your officer's opinion that by virtue of the width of the two storey element being reduced by 1.5m, only 0.4m wider than the two storey side extension to the adjoining neighbours property with the bulk of the two storey rear extension being stepped in significantly from the west elevation, the proposal no longer imbalances the pair of dwellings to a degree that would warrant a refusal of the application. The proposal has also satisfactorily addressed the bulk issues raised by the Inspector.

The Conservation Officer and Highways Officer have no objection to the proposal subject to condition.

The proposal is therefore recommended to be approved subject to the following conditions.

RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE subject to the imposition of the following condition(s):

- 1 Condition: The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
- 1 Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004.
- 2 Condition: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:-
 - Drawing no. 16-IB-210 Rev B received 13th June 2017
 - Drawing no. 16-IB-03 Rev D received 27th April 2017
- 2 Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
- 3 Condition: The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension, garden wall and new retaining wall hereby permitted shall match, as closely as possible, the type, colour and texture those used for the construction of the existing building.
- 3 Reason: To ensure a satisfactory external appearance and grouping of materials in accordance with the principles of the NPPF.
- 4 Condition: No development over or above foundations shall take place on site until full details of the window style, reveal, cill and header treatment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 4 Reason: To ensure that the design and appearance of the development is appropriate in accordance with the principles of the NPPF.
- 5 Condition: Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted the vehicular access shall be provided and thereafter retained at the position shown on the approved plan 16-IB-210 Rev B in accordance with the highway specification drawing No:TRAD 1. Arrangement shall be made for surface water drainage to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway carriageway.
- 5 Reason: To ensure satisfactory access into the site and avoid carriage of extraneous material or surface water from or onto the highway.
- 6 Condition: Vehicular and cyclist access to and egress from the adjoining highway shall be limited to the access shown on drawing No 16-IB-210 Rev B only. Any other access or egresses shall be permanently closed, and the footway verge shall be reinstated in accordance with a detailed scheme to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority concurrently with the bringing into use of the new access.
- 6 Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

- 7 Condition: The gradient of the vehicular access shall not exceed 1:12 for the first 5 metres into the site as measured from the near channel edge of the adjacent carriageway.
- 7 Reason: In the interests of the safety of persons using the access and users of the highway.
- 8 Condition: Prior to commencement of the use of the revised access hereby permitted any access gate(s), bollard, chain or other means of obstruction shall be hung to open inwards, set back and thereafter retained a minimum distance of 5 metres from the near channel edge of the adjacent carriageway.
- 8 Reason: To enable vehicles to safely draw off the highway before the gate(s) or obstruction is opened.
- 9 Condition: Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the proposed access / on-site car parking turning area shall be laid out, and surfaced in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter available for that specific use.
- 9 Reason: To ensure the permanent availability of the parking / manoeuvring area, in the interests of highway safety.