

## AGENDA ITEM NO: 8/2(f)

<b>Parish:</b>	Hunstanton	
<b>Proposal:</b>	Proposed dwelling following demolition of existing garage / workshop	
<b>Location:</b>	Workshop Store 1C Seagate Road Hunstanton Norfolk	
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr D Lloyd	
<b>Case No:</b>	17/02398/F (Full Application)	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Mr C Fry	<b>Date for Determination:</b> 1 March 2018

**Reason for Referral to Planning Committee** – The views of the Town Council are contrary to the Officer recommendation.

**Neighbourhood Plan:** No

### Case Summary

The site lies within the development plan boundary for Hunstanton. Hunstanton is classified as a main town according to the Policy CS02 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

The site contains an existing flat roof, concrete block single garage with concrete apron on the front.

The proposal seeks consent to demolish the garage and erected a split level dwelling with undercroft parking.

### Key Issues

Planning History and Principle of Development  
Form and Character  
Impact upon Neighbour amenity  
Other Material Considerations

### Recommendation

**REFUSE**

### THE APPLICATION

The site lies on the northern side of Seagate Road, Hunstanton and contains a flat roof concrete block garage with concrete apron to the front.

The garage is not used in association with any of the adjacent buildings.

The site scales 59.31m<sup>2</sup> and is adjacent to residential dwellings on the northern side of Seagate Road and looks over scrubland to the south.

The form and character of development in the locality comprises of semi-detached two storey Victorian houses, infill 2 ½ storey terraced dwellings and single storey bungalows.

The proposal seeks consent to demolish the existing garage and erect a detached 3 storey dwelling. The building scales 10.3m (d) x 4.6m (w) x 8.5 (h) and has a render and timber clad finish with balconies to the front. The windows will be grey aluminium.

## **SUPPORTING CASE**

The application has been accompanied with a:-

- Design and Access Statement
- Planning Statement

## **PLANNING HISTORY**

17/01506/O- Outline Application – Proposed new dwelling refused 28.09.17

## **RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION**

**Town Council: NO OBJECTION** the HTC supports this application. It would remove an incongruous and potential eyesore and a small house would make good use of the site. The neighbours have no objection either. It is recognised that there is a need to have a variety of types of dwelling and having no yard or garden suits some people very well.

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

**Environmental Health & Housing – Environmental Quality:** an asbestos informative required

**Environment Agency:** We have no comment to make on this application. The site is located above a principle aquifer however will not be providing special advice or comments in regards to land contamination issues for this site. The developer should address risk to controlled waters from contamination at the site, following the requirements of the NPPF.

**Emergency Planner:** suggested that the occupiers should sign up to the EA flood warning system and a flood evacuation plan be prepared.

**Natural England:** have not assessed the application in terms of protected species, however they raise observations about foul water drainage being unknown at this stage.

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

None received

## **LDF CORE STRATEGY POLICIES**

**CS01** - Spatial Strategy

**CS05** - Hunstanton

**CS08** - Sustainable Development

**CS09** - Housing Distribution

**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

**DM17** - Parking Provision in New Development

## **NATIONAL GUIDANCE**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- Planning History and Principle of Development
- Form and Character
- Impact upon Neighbour amenity
- Other Material Considerations

### **Planning History and Principle of Development**

The principle of residential development in Hunstanton is acceptable, given its placement in the settlement hierarchy; this is subject to other material considerations.

The site has planning history for demolishing the existing garage and erecting a dwelling that was refused under delegated powers, 17/01506/O. The refusal of the application was on the following grounds:-

1. Albeit all matters of the application are reserved for determination at a later date, the principle of a dwelling on this site would result in a cramped form of development which would be incongruous in the street scene and would result in the future occupiers of the dwelling experiencing a poor standard of amenity by virtue the site size, the need to provide off-road parking, a lack of private amenity area and storage of bins. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the provisions of Policy DM15 of the Site Allocation and Development Management Policies Plan 2016, Policy CS05 and 08 of the Local

Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 and paragraphs 56, 58 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

This application has been submitted to try and address this reason for refusal.

### **Form and Character**

The outline application was all matters reserved, although the plan was accompanied by an indicative layout. Notwithstanding that, the LPA considered that a dwelling on this site would be a cramped form of development which would appear incongruous in the street scene and its future occupiers would experience a poor standard of amenity.

The street scene comprises of Victorian semi-detached two storey dwellings on the southern side of Seagate Road and infill development with the exception of a few two storey dwellings and single storey dwellings on the northern side of the road. The properties on the northern side of the road benefit from communal parking court or individual off-road parking provision where as those on the south side, do not have off-road parking from Seagate Road. The majority of the properties have pitched roofs constructed from tile or slate. The properties are rendered, painted or left natural in brick. Each property on Seagate Road has a private amenity space to the rear. The dwellings on both sides of the road are set back from the roadside.

Following the demolition of the existing garage, a new dwelling will be erected that scales 8.53m (h) x 10.3m (d) x 4.6m (w). The building will have a flat roof and use timber cladding on all elevations. Windows will be constructed from aluminium and finished in a grey colour. In terms of accommodation at ground floor, there is undercroft parking with the ability to store bins, utility room and shower room. First floor accommodation comprises of an open plan living and kitchen area with balcony and at second floor there are two bedrooms with shower room.

The National Planning Policy Framework requires development to be of a good standard of design, that functions well and adds to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development and that it should respond to the local character and history and reflect the identity of its surroundings, whilst not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation. Permission should be refused where poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Design is covered generally in policies CS05 - Hunstanton and CS08 - Sustainable Development of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy, but Policy DM15 of the Site Specific Allocation and Development Management Policies Plan 2016 provides more detail:-

- The scale, height, massing, materials and layout of a development should respond sensitively and sympathetically to the local setting and pattern of adjacent streets including spaces between buildings through high quality design and use of materials. Development which is of a poor design will be refused.

In regards to policy DM15 and the proposal, the scale and layout of the proposed dwelling would not respond sympathetically to the form of development on Seagate Road. The property would be hard onto the road, contrary to the set-back position of the development on the northern side of Seagate Road and over 3 floors it would be unduly prominent in the street scene. The property, by virtue of its narrow width would also appear to be a truncated terraced or semi-detached property.

There is little to break the visual massing of the building. This would be particularly noticeable from the south given that the existing built form on the northern side of the road is set back from the roadside, exposing the majority of the properties south elevation.

The use of timber cladding to this degree and the flat roof form would also be incongruous in the street scene.

### **Impact upon Neighbour Amenity**

The proposed property is 10m south of flat 1b Seagate Road and 5 Seagate. These neighbours have in total 4 windows in their southern elevation at this distance from the proposed property. At first and second floors these windows serve en-suites, bathrooms or voided areas. The one window at ground floor in 5 Seagate Road, which is undergoing renovation in-line with 16/001179/F, is to serve a bedroom. However views will not be achieved from the landing window at first floor in the proposed property into the bedroom at 5 Seagate because the flat 1b's garage will act to screen the views into this bedroom. With the proposed property being set to the west of flat 1b's garage and to the south east of this bedroom at 11m away from this neighbour's elevation, the bedroom will not suffer overshadowing or overbearing issues that would warrant a refusal of this application.

The proposed property is 11m to the north of 1 Seagate Road. No.1 has no windows in its northern elevation facing the proposed property and is separated from the site by an access road that serves a carpark. It is therefore considered that given the siting of the property and the lack of windows in the gable end of no.1, that the proposed property will not cause overshadowing or overbearing issues upon this neighbour. Glimpses of the private amenity space of no.1 could be achieved from the window in bedroom 2 at second floor in the southern elevation of the proposed property. However the window is 13m away from the private amenity space of this neighbour's property at an acute angle, which is adequate.

Beyond the rear of the application site is a car parking area belonging to 5 Seagate. 5 Seagate accesses this area by an existing vehicular access sited between 1b Seagate Road and the proposed property. It is considered that albeit at 8.53m tall, and to the south west of this car parking area, the presence of the proposed property would not cause a detrimental impact upon the neighbour who enjoys this area for parking purposes only.

There are no neighbours directly opposite the site. No. 2 Seagate Road would be the closest neighbour to the proposed property on the opposite side of the road. No.2 is a 2 storey terraced dwelling, set on slightly lower land than the application site. This neighbour's front elevation is separated from the proposed property by 15m, which is an adequate separation in this town centre location. In order to reduce overlooking from the balcony area and bedrooms on the west elevation, a condition could be imposed to ensure that the glazing panels are obscurely glazed in order to avoid looking down into 2 Seagate Road. The 15m separation distance helps to limit any overbearing presence experienced by this neighbour. The neighbour will experience little overshadowing from the building as it is sited to the north east of their property.

### **Other Material Considerations**

The site is located within flood zone 1.

There are no redeeming features on the site that would warrant a protected species report. A £50 contribution would be secured in terms of Habitat Mitigation Payments. Natural England required further information in respect to foul water drainage, if foul water drainage was not to go to mains drains. The agent has since confirmed that the proposed property will connect the foul water mains drain that is immediately in front of the site on Seagate Road.

The planning statement places emphasis on paragraph 14 of the NPPF in its planning balance of the scheme, but this paragraph is not relevant as the Borough has a 5 year supply of deliverable sites.

## **CONCLUSION**

Members will need to consider whether the design proposed on this site is acceptable. It is noted that the Town Council support the proposal and there are no objections from neighbours, but your officer's view is by virtue of its scale, layout, massing and materials, the proposed property is not considered to advocate good design principles and would be unduly incongruous in the street scene, contrary to both national and local planning policy in this regard.

Furthermore the 2 bedroom property has no private amenity space associated with it, which is felt to be another problem with this proposal. It is therefore your officer's recommendation that the proposal be refused for the following reason.

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

**REFUSE** for the following reason(s):

- 1 The proposed dwelling by virtue of its scale and layout results in a cramped form of development contrary to the prevalent form of development on Seagate Road and would result in the future occupiers of the dwelling experiencing a poor standard of amenity by a lack of private amenity space. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the provisions of Policy DM15 of the Site Allocation and Development Management Policies Plan 2016, Policy CS05 and 08 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 and paragraphs 56, 58 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The proposed dwelling on this narrow site, by virtue of its massing over 3 storeys, fenestration style and extent of timber materials used in its construction, results in an incongruous development which fails to adhere to the building characteristics of the locality and would be unduly prominent in the street scene. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the provisions of Policy DM15 of the Site Allocation and Development Management Policies Plan 2016, Policy CS05 and 08 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 and paragraphs 56, 58 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework.