

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**5<sup>th</sup> March 2018**

**SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED SINCE THE  
PUBLICATION OF THE AGENDA AND ERRATA**

**Item Number 8/1(a) Page Number 2 of Late Pages**

**Norfolk Coast Partnership: SUPPORTS** the application on the following grounds (summarised):

- Supports the application in general especially the provision of affordable homes;
- The site looks a little dense but the new configuration is better and we agree with the Conservation Officer's recommendation to retain the views of the church;
- There will be pressure from increased usage [of coast road and minor rural roads] however NCC Highways have suggested recommendations;
- Timber cladding is not vernacular and can look quite harsh until it is weathered. Prefer to see more cobble infill;
- Provision of affordable homes needed and supported;
- Would like to see hedges and field boundaries maintained around the site and ensure that materials are locally distinctive;
- There seems to be less trees. Would support retaining trees and planting new trees/hedges especially on the south boundary. This will soften the edge of the boundary where there are extensive views back towards the village;
- Ensure ecological mitigation is carried out in accordance with the ecology report;
- In order to minimise light pollution, recommend that any outdoor lights associated with the proposed development should be:
  1. fully shielded(enclosed in full cut-off flat glass fittings);
  2. directed downwards (mounted horizontally to the ground and not tilted upwards);
  3. switched on only when needed (no dusk to dawn lamps);
  4. white light low-energy lamps (LED, metal halide or fluorescent) and not orange or pink sources).

**CSNN: NO OBJECTION** to revised Surface Water Drainage Strategy. Suggests that the development should be implemented in accordance with the drainage strategy.

**Third Party: OBJECT** and make the following observations:

- cannot understand why the planners have allowed the main access road to the above mentioned site to veer northwards bringing properties 1-5 nearer to the existing single storey properties of Saw Mill Road. If this main road were straightened/moved southwards it would afford more space to the north of properties 1-5 thereby distancing them from the existing bungalows of Saw Mill Road.
- Properties 2 and 3 are the only semi-detached properties on the site. As pointed out in our previous correspondence about this proposed development, the two storey properties 2 and 3 are on significantly higher ground than the existing single storey bungalows of Saw Mill Road. They are also less than 10 metres from Saw Mill Road, and approx 20 metres from the front building line of 2 Saw Mill Road. This will result in an overbearing appearance, an overpowering obstruction of light and the likelihood of overlooking no 2 Saw Mill Road. It is suggested a single dwelling in place of the two semi-detached properties is proposed giving more space and light

and reducing the possibility of overlooking property No 2 Saw Mill Road, as well as being more in keeping with the overall appearance of the proposed development. Reducing the number of houses on the development by 1 dwelling reduces the risk of overdevelopment if the site which many feel is the case.

- suggest that for the benefit of all current occupants of Saw Mill Road that dwellings 1-5 are placed on the south side of the development, and properties 10 and 11 built on the north side of the development nearest Saw Mill Road. This would give all occupants more light, more space and less possibility of overbearing, overpowering and overlooking issues.
- It is an issue raised in the village plan that all occupants of Brancaster have an unobstructed view of the church as they travel northwards down the B1153, Mill Road. It is fundamental and incumbent upon the planners to ensure this present facility is not compromised and that property no 12 does not prevent this.
- It is of concern that the newly proposed property no 1 is sufficiently set back off the B1153 [so] that the splay currently enjoyed by cars entering and leaving Saw Mill Road is not compromised and that this traffic is assured of future safe entry and exit from Saw Mill Road once the development has been built.

**Assistant Director's comments:** In response to comments outlined above and to ensure sufficient control over the development, surface water drainage is covered by suggested Condition 13 and full details of lighting are requested by Condition 14. A sample panel is requested by Condition 4 along with samples of the tile and timber boarding in Condition 5.

**Item Number 8/2(c) Page Number 27**

**Agent:** Submitted an amended plan removing one parking space in favour of additional planting to the front of the site.

**Assistant Director's comments:** The amended plan retains the required amount of parking spaces in accordance with NCC Parking Standards.

**Item Number 8/2(d) Page Number 36**

**Parish Council: OBJECTS** and wishes to reiterate its previous objections to the application on the following grounds:

- There is a lack of turning space on Sunnyside Road and a lack of parking space for existing properties.

**Item Number 8/2(e) Page Number 45**

**Agent:** Submitted photos and states that the immediately adjacent caravan sites are upgrading and increasing capacity, apparently outside planning control (replacing single caravans with larger double ones). The Client will be addressing Planning Committee but considers withholding planning permission for touring caravans is disproportionate given expansion on adjacent sites.

**Hunstanton Town Council:** Continue to **SUPPORT** development in South Beach Road for reasons explained in full in the 2008 Master Plan and subsequent reports. In this case it is for seasonal use so we have no objection.

**Local Highway Authority:** Notes the point of access has been amended as a result of the amended plans and therefore the site will need to be revisited to assess its acceptability.

**CSNN: NO COMMENT**

**Item Number 8/2(i) Page Number 22 of Late Pages**

**Third Party:** Neighbour has instructed that a Daylight and Sunlight study (in accordance with BRE "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: a good practice guide 2011) be undertaken by a Consultant. The main findings of the report are as follows (in summary):

- BRE 25 degree test in relation to the main sitting room window.
  - Proposal likely to breach the BRE 25 degree test – the proposal extends to approx. 47 degrees from the midway point of the window and is likely to breach the test by approx. 22 degrees;
- BRE Vertical Sky Component (VSC) test for daylight in respect of the main sitting room window.
  - Likely to reduce the level of VSC to the main sitting room window to below the BRE recommendations of 27% and 0.8 times its former value. Therefore likely to breach the BRE test for VSC;
- Likely to breach the BRE Annual Probably Sunlight hours test for summer and winter in respect of the main sitting room window;
  - Proposal is likely to reduce the existing level of sunlight enjoyed by the window down to less than 25% annually, 5 % during the winter months, be less than 0.8 times its former value and with the reduction greater than 4% over the whole year;
- As a result, requests that no decision is made in favour of the application by Committee Members until the applicant undertakes a daylight and sunlight study and produces a proposal which evidences compliance with BRE guidelines. Requests a copy of such a study and willing to liaise with Agent;
- Welcomes a visit from the Committee to view the reduction in light from the Client's perspective;
- Note that the Committee report suggests that the distance between No's 7 and 9 is 4m however it does not mention that the main sitting room bay window is 2m from the flank wall at No. 7;
- States that the main sitting room window does not enjoy "a relatively unobscured eastern view across the rear garden" as the report suggests. The window looks out onto the roof of no. 7 and any increase in height of roofline will cause an oppressive and detrimental impact on the way the client enjoys her sitting room;
- Proposed chimney only causes concern over reduction in daylight and sunlight to the room but also fears fumes would enter the property if the window is open;
- Requests that no decision is made in favour of the application until we are satisfied that the proposal complies with both the BRE guidelines and the civil legal rights of light criteria.

**Assistant Director's comments:** It must be noted that the BRE Guidelines and civil legal rights of light are covered under separation legislation. The Officer has thoroughly detailed the difference in roof heights between the existing dwelling and proposed development within the report. The Officer has visited the site and given the difference in levels, proposed hipped roof and favourable orientation, it is considered that the proposed development is not so detrimental on the adjacent neighbour as to warrant a refusal.

With regard to the location of the chimney and any perceived fumes, CSNN raise no objection.

**Item Number 8/2(k) Page Number 83**

**Agent:** Extension of time agreed until 5<sup>th</sup> July 2018.