

AGENDA ITEM NO: 8/2(e)

Parish:	Holme next the Sea	
Proposal:	Demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings and erection of replacement dwelling and garages with revised highway access	
Location:	Homefields Peddars Way Holme next The Sea Norfolk	
Applicant:	A. R. & V. Investments	
Case No:	17/02359/F (Full Application)	
Case Officer:	Mrs K Lawty	Date for Determination: 15 February 2018 Extension of Time Expiry Date: 9 August 2018

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

Neighbourhood Plan: No

Case Summary

The site comprises a single storey detached property and associated garden land. The property is surrounded by open countryside.

In planning policy terms the site is within the countryside and within the AONB.

This application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the bungalow and outbuildings on site and their replacement with a large, two storey contemporary dwelling, garages and revised highways access.

Key Issues

The principle of development;
Form and character / impact on the countryside and AONB;
Neighbour amenity;
Access and highways impact; and
Other considerations.

Recommendation

APPROVE

THE APPLICATION

The application proposes the demolition of the existing bungalow and outbuildings at Homefields, Peddars Way, Holme next The Sea and their replacement with a two storey, four bedroom property and a detached garage/store building.

The site is within the countryside as depicted on the Local Plan Proposals Maps and within the North Norfolk AONB. The site is immediately surrounded by open countryside in agricultural use on three sides and there are brick built agricultural barns adjacent to the south. There is residential and agricultural development along Peddars Way both to the north and south of the site.

When the application was originally submitted the site consisted of the bungalow, outbuildings and garden land, a grassed access running immediately to the north of the bungalow, an area immediately to east of the bungalow and a large parcel of land to the north, which is currently part of a larger field. Following discussions the application site boundary has been reduced in size, omitting the whole of the section of field to the north, which is now shown as blue land i.e. within the same ownership as the applicant.

Amended plans have also been submitted reducing the scale of the proposed replacement dwelling in terms of its footprint. The design has also been amended so that the barn-like qualities, (albeit a contemporary take on this), are more apparent.

SUPPORTING CASE

The application has been supported by a Design and Access Statement and Contaminated Land Assessment. The applicant has also supported the application by this summary:

Design:

The original scheme submitted in late December last year has been comprehensively revised in consultation with your officers resulting in a reduction in size of some 50% of the residential element. In addition, the appearance has been amended to better reflect the character of agricultural buildings in the locality, and we feel that the scheme to be considered by your Committee now presents an appropriate and recessive building which will harmonise with its immediate surroundings and with the AONB as a whole.

Precedent:

Council planning departments are required by central government to be consistent in their decision making. I call your attention to a large replacement dwelling immediately to the south of Homefields in a much more prominent location which was granted consent some nine years ago. Although your Council now has a replacement dwelling policy in place this has no limitation on size and we are of the opinion that the current proposal conforms to this policy.

Parish and Neighbour Comments:

The original proposal has been comprehensively revised and the amendments have thoroughly addressed the concerns of the Parish Council despite their continued objection to the much reduced scheme. The proposal is indeed sustainable and the existing bungalow never was "affordable" being marketed at over £400,000. The house is set well below the sightline of the top of the hill above Holme and being grouped with a farm building complex will not be excessively prominent in the AONB or create any appreciable extra traffic movements.

PLANNING HISTORY

11/01564/F: Application Refused: 29/11/11 - Siting of caravan – Homefields Peddars Way Holme next the Sea Norfolk PE36 6LD

2/98/1477/F: Application Permitted: 23/11/98 - Extension to dwelling – Homefields Peddars Way Holme next the Sea

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

Parish Council: OBJECT - The amended drawings do not address The Parish Council's concerns regarding the proposal for a replacement dwelling on this site and the extension of the residential curtilage into the countryside. The changes to the design will do nothing to mitigate the damaging impact of the proposed development on the AONB countryside at this location.

The Parish Council's remaining concerns are set out in our previously submitted comments on the original application (dated 19 January 2018) and these are maintained.

1. The Parish Council objects to this proposal to replace the existing, modest Homefields bungalow by a very large house with four bedrooms, numerous reception rooms, balconies and loggia. The proposed replacement is several times the size of the existing dwelling. It is completely out of context with its countryside setting, located as it is between the developed areas of the Smaller Villages and Hamlets of Holme and Ringstead and sited adjacent to a
1. group of farm buildings. These include a substantial agricultural barn immediately to the rear with a 4ft way-leave on the north side for maintenance purposes.
2. Despite the claims of the Applicants, the proposal is not sustainable in terms of its impact on the community or the environment, it will do nothing to support the local economy and the location is inaccessible to sustainable modes of transport.
3. The development of the existing, small bungalow on this site in open countryside was originally justified as tied accommodation for a local agricultural worker and his family. A previous application (11/01564/F) to site a small caravan, out of public view, to accommodate the locally employed son of the family was refused for reasons related to highways and possible landscape impacts.
4. The proposed replacement would represent the loss of yet a further affordable market home in the village and will do nothing to contribute to local housing need. Permitting this application would hence conflict with the social role of the planning system in achieving sustainable development (NPPF 7) through “.....supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations ...”
5. This is a particularly sensitive location on the coastal slopes of the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The site is highly visible to passers-by, occupying a prominent position on relatively high ground, close to the Peddars Way in an area that is rich in biodiversity and supports a wide variety of Priority Species. Given the location, the proposals are contrary to NPPF 115 which states that “Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas“
6. The proposed development would result in overdevelopment of the site. It would require a change of use over a significant area, extending the existing residential curtilage northwards and resulting in a loss of agricultural land to garden. Given the location, the scale and visibility of the overall development threatens to extend the margins of the developed area of the village and to close the gap that separates

Holme and Ringstead, impacting negatively on the countryside in this Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

7. The attempt to present the site as brown field is totally misleading. It is however characteristic of the approach followed by this developer, based on targeting small family homes for replacement by homes of a size, design and price tag that is of little interest and beyond the reach of the local community. Until its acquisition by the developer, the bungalow served as a good family home. It may benefit from modernisation and refurbishment but
8. its age and modest proportions do not justify the brown field label, nor the proposed replacement.
9. The existing single storey dwelling blends well with the immediate setting. It also sits well within the wider landscape. In complete contrast:

I. The scale, mass and modern design of the proposed replacement is out of context – it is dominated by uncharacteristically large gables and windows and incorporates equally uncharacteristic black stained boarding to the elevations.

II. In design terms the replacement bears no relationship to the adjacent large barn and it would appear as an incongruous and intrusive feature on the skyline, dominating the landscape and interrupting open views across the AONB.

III. The sheer scale of the fenestration incorporated into the design will inevitably introduce an element of light pollution on the site impacting negatively on the naturally dark skies which are so characteristic of this rural location in the AONB.

Given the above, the proposed development runs counter to national and local planning policy as follows:

I. NPPF 64 which states that “Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions” and to Core Strategy CS06 which states that “Development in Smaller Villages and Hamlets will be limited to specific identified needs only”. In all cases , development should seek to avoid conflict with the environmental protection and nature conservation policies of the Local Development Framework “.

II. SADMP Policy DM 5 which states that “proposals for replacement dwellings or extensions to existing dwellings will be approved where the design is of a high quality and will preserve the character or appearance of the street scene or area in which it sits. Schemes which fail to reflect the scale and character of their surroundings or which would be oppressive or adversely affect the amenity of the area or neighbouring properties will be refused”.

III. SADMP Policy DM15 on Environment, Design and Amenity which states that “proposals will be assessed against a number of factors including light pollution” , and that “the scale, height, massing, materials and layout of a development should respond sensitively and sympathetically to the local setting”

10. The area is rich in archaeology and very popular with walkers - notably those following the Peddars Way / National Trail across the coastal slopes. Currently these afford magnificent, long-reaching views across The Wash to Lincolnshire. By virtue of its design, scale and visibility the proposed development would impact negatively on the amenity of all those who come to enjoy this open landscape and the associated peace, tranquillity and views that this affords. In this respect the proposed development conflicts with the purpose of SADMP Policy DM15 which states variously that “Development must protect and enhance the amenity of the wider

environment including its heritage and cultural value” “Proposals will be assessed against a number of factors includingheritage impact and visual impact...” and also that “development that has a significant adverse impact on the amenity of others or which is of a poor design will be refused”.

11. The increase in activity implied by the scale of the development will add to the visual distraction of the building itself. In particular, the increased car parking spaces (5 in total) will encourage additional vehicle movements both on the site and on Peddars Way which is a narrow lane where traffic conflict is a growing issue and there are limited passing places.

Highways Authority: NO OBJECTION - conditionally

Environment Agency: NO COMMENT

Natural England: NO OBJECTION but made comments

Environmental Health & Housing – Environmental Quality: NO OBJECTION – subject to informative re: asbestos

Norfolk Coast Partnership: – OBJECT - The Norfolk Coast Partnership have not changed our previous stance for this development. The amended drawings do not address our concerns as to scale and design.

The applicant states that the proposal is not out of context for the locality, however it is completely out of context being a substantial, very modern, largely glazed property in the middle of the countryside next to a vernacular farm building.

The views over this part of the AONB from the Peddars Way are very extensive and of high quality. Primarily due to the fact that there is no development in the immediate vicinity other than farm buildings. This would be a major visual detractor.

The existing building, although not considered to be attractive in architectural terms, does not detract from the views as it is small and compact, it is single story and unobtrusive.

This proposal goes against our Management Plan policies for the AONB in the current Management Plan:

'PB3 Ensure that new development, including changes to existing buildings and infrastructure, within their ownership or powers of regulation are consistent with the special qualities of the area and relevant conservation objectives.' This proposal is not consistent with the special qualities of the area.

'PB5 Support new development and conversion that is consistent with local and national planning policy and the principles above, in order to retain and develop residential and employment opportunities that support natural beauty' The proposal could act as a visual detractor to the AONB and will impact on Peddars Way viewpoints.

'PC7 Manage traffic and transport issues, including car parking and provision and promotion of effective public transport and other non-car means of travel, to reduce traffic congestion at peak times, conserve tranquillity and manage pressures on sensitive sites in the area' The proposal is not in a sustainable location and is well outside of the village boundary and its facilities.

From our Integrated Landscape Character Assessment the area is classified as 'Coastal Slopes'. Perhaps one of the key messages of this character type is the conservation of

critical strategic gaps between villages and to avoid new development that adds a prominent skyline. Views from the Peddars Way which runs straight up the slope are particularly important and sensitive to change. This development will add a large and confusing modern visual mass to the locality which will be detrimental to the enjoyment of the Peddars Way route.

REPRESENTATIONS

2 representations received to the original scheme referring to the following:

- this applicant/ developer has a track record of acquiring small bungalows previously occupied by individuals who live and work in Holme, demolishing them and building or applying to build million pound plus houses for the holiday home sector.
- This application however seems to have exceeded all expectations or credibility.
- The property to be demolished was a very small tied house for a farm worker associated with the adjacent farm buildings. It was bought by the occupant when given the legal right to purchase some years ago.
- Its function as a home for a farm worker was its justification for being built on the edge of Holme village in countryside.
- Now acquired by a London based property development company from its long term occupant, it is scheduled for development as yet another inappropriately massive residence, beyond the ability of any local to afford and yet another affordable residence is to be lost.
- Described in the application as a point of interest, on the road from Holme-next-the-Sea to Ringstead, it threatens to be yet another monstrosity in the locality, in seriously bad taste as an ostentatious display of wealth. Anyone wealthy and genuinely wanting a rural life-style would seek a larger plot and seclusion from passers-by.
- Holme does not need points of interest, it needs houses which local people can afford to buy and occupy. Holme risks becoming a theme park for wealthy investors who enjoy occasional holidays themselves or acquire assets to rent out. Their clients will enjoy a short break in the locality whilst making no contribution either financially or practically to the village.
- Although without near neighbours to affect adversely, it will be in clear view of the many people driving from Holme to Ringstead or walking the Peddars Way. The property is many times too large for its site along a country road where it will have an intrusive presence. It is no way in keeping (other than possibly by size comparison) with the adjacent farm buildings. Never could this be taken to be a farm house.
- Who is expected to live in it?
- The proposed property is five or six times the size of the existing small house.
- Suggesting that demolishing sheds, summerhouse, a greenhouse and mobile home will go some way to minimising the size increase is dishonest representation. If the application were (disastrously) approved, any new occupants could replace those buildings without planning consent problems. The only reasonable before and after comparison is existing house to new house. The proposed garage is itself considerably larger than the existing house.
- Hopefully this outrageous application will get the short shrift it deserves.
- As the previous owner of this bungalow we would like to point out that when we sold the bungalow it was not in need of modernisation or refurbishment. You could have moved in that day, apart from redecorating to your choice.
- My husband and I spent many hours keeping the garden neat and tidy. Being a large garden my husband was finding keeping it tidy was taking its toll.
- This bungalow has been neglected and left unkempt with the sole intention of getting planning on a supposed eye sore which it was not.

- The planned size is too big

2 representations received to the amended scheme referring to the following:

- I agree totally and support all the points and comments made by the previous objectors. The same "developers" plan to despoil our wonderful village with another of their vile monstrosities. A totally unattractive and tasteless building of titanic proportions no doubt intended for the type of individual that wishes to park their surplus cash in a property to be used once a year maybe?
- They may not get permission for this application as it stands but by playing the game of constantly altering their plans eventually they will get something akin to their original ideas.
- I have lived here 18 years and I am deeply saddened by the amount of unnecessary development and filling in which has occurred here during that time.
- Ruining Holme will not solve the so called "housing crisis" which in fact it is not, it is an immigration crisis our England is facing and until something concrete is done about that there is no hope that villages like ours will not be totally raped and ruined.
- This "development" is completely out of keeping for this area of outstanding natural beauty, the size is monstrous.
- Yet another blot on our beleaguered landscape.
- No doubt to be inhabited for a couple weeks a year while ruining the landscape for ever.
- This should be rejected out of hand as any planning dept. of probity would do.

LDF CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

CS01 - Spatial Strategy

CS02 - The Settlement Hierarchy

CS06 - Development in Rural Areas

CS08 - Sustainable Development

CS09 - Housing Distribution

CS12 - Environmental Assets

SITE ALLOCATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES PLAN 2016

DM1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

DM2 – Development Boundaries

DM5 – Enlargement or Replacement of Dwellings in the Countryside

DM15 – Environment, Design and Amenity

DM17 - Parking Provision in New Development

NATIONAL GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

17/02359/F

Planning Committee
30 July 2018

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The key issues identified in the consideration of this application are as follows:

- The principle of development;
- Impact on the countryside and AONB;
- Form and character;
- Neighbour amenity;
- Highway safety; and
- Other considerations.

The Principle of Development

The application seeks full planning permission for a replacement dwelling on the same site as the existing bungalow.

The application site is situated within the countryside as defined on the King's Lynn & West Norfolk Local Plan (1998) Proposals Map. The countryside is defined as any area outside of the settlements listed in Core Strategy Policy CS02 the Settlement Hierarchy.

One of the core principles of the NPPF is to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the Countryside. Beyond the villages and in the countryside, Policy CS06 refers that the strategy will be to protect the countryside for its intrinsic character and beauty, the diversity of its landscapes, heritage and wildlife, and its natural resources to be enjoyed by all. Issues relating to the AONB are covered in later sections.

The NPPF promotes sustainable rural development, however, there is no national guidance regarding replacement dwellings and residential extensions.

At a local level Policy DM5 of the SADMP sets out the approach for the enlargement or replacement of dwellings in the countryside. This states that 'proposals for replacement dwellings or extensions to existing dwellings will be approved where the design is of a high quality and will preserve the character or appearance of the street scene or area in which it sits. Schemes which fail to reflect the scale and character of their surroundings or which would be oppressive or adversely affect the amenity of the area or neighbouring properties will be refused.'

Impact on the countryside and AONB

The whole site is within the AONB. The NPPF states, nationally designated areas such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), have been confirmed by the Government as having the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of the natural beauty of the landscape and countryside should therefore be given great weight in planning policies and development control decisions in these areas. Any development on this site would need to comply with these provisions.

Peddars Way runs between Holme next the Sea in the north and Ringstead in the south. The site is on rising ground and sits on the northern side of some existing brick built farm buildings. Within the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Landscape Character Assessment March 2007 the site falls within the landscape character area defined as 'Coastal Slopes - C2 Holme next the Sea to Brancaster'. The characteristics within this area are its gently sloping landform (from higher plateau to the south towards the coast).

Reference is made to Peddars Way, which connects to a wider network of public footpaths, both within and outside the character area. The character summary also refers to the mixture of traditional buildings that dominate the built character within the villages, which are occasionally interspersed with more modern development. The summary makes reference to the higher landscape to the south which facilitates extensive, uninterrupted and often panoramic views towards the coast (with an intricate network of saltmarshes and creeks visible in the distant foreground). Views northwards towards the coast are also often channelled along rural lanes, such as Peddars Way.

Within this C2 area the most pertinent key Landscape Planning Guidelines are to

- Seek to conserve characteristic panoramic, open views northwards across the slopes towards the coast.
- Seek to conserve and enhance strongly recognisable sense of place within the area.
- Seek to ensure that any new development avoids prominent skyline locations upon the slopes.

Officers were initially concerned about the scale of the original proposed replacement for this site in terms of its setting in the AONB. The amended scheme has reduced the footprint, depth and position of the proposed replacement dwelling. The amended plans show a dwelling which is now set further back in the site, in a similar position to the original bungalow behind the barns to the south.

The dwelling has been reduced in floor area from an 'L' shaped block to a 'T' shaped layout. The longest elevation of the two storey element is 24m long but is only 6m wide. The link to the garage/store building is of single storey height. The overall mass of the building would appear less from some viewpoints than the original proposal.

The Parish Council has objected to the proposal which they state is of too great a scale, out of context, not sustainable, will not support the local economy, will be overdevelopment of the site, and will harm the general amenity of the area. They raise concerns about the impact of light pollution from the windows of the proposed new property on the dark skies of the AONB.

The Norfolk Coast Partnership has also objected to the application stating that it is out of context, being a substantial, very modern, largely glazed property in the middle of the countryside next to a vernacular farm building. They note that the views over this part of the AONB from the Peddars Way are very extensive and of high quality, primarily due to the fact that there is no development in the immediate vicinity other than farm buildings. They consider this would be a major visual detractor in the landscape. They note that the existing bungalow does not detract from views as it is small and compact, single storey and unobtrusive.

The NCP consider this proposal goes against Management Plan policies for the AONB in their current Management Plan. Within their Integrated Landscape Character Assessment the area is classified as 'Coastal Slopes' and one of the key messages of this character type is the conservation of critical strategic gaps between villages and to avoid new development that adds a prominent skyline.

Although the proposed dwelling would be considerably taller than the building it seeks to replace it is not on the ridgeline of the coastal slope, it is set back in the site adjacent to existing buildings and incorporates traditional building characteristics.

There are examples of other buildings which already breach the skyline in the form of the former Windmill (now a residential property) and The Crows Nest (a replacement dwelling) to

the south. This application site is, however, on rising ground of the slope and not on the ridge like these more prominent buildings.

Given that the site is not wholly isolated and is not on the highest and most visible part of the landscape it is not considered the proposed replacement dwelling will significantly detract from the character and appearance of the AONB. On balance although it would be more visible than the existing bungalow, it is considered that the proposal would not be so prominent to conflict with the general planning guidelines for this landscape character type.

It is however recommended that should planning permission be granted permitted development rights should be removed for development within the curtilage of a dwelling house (Classes A to E) to allow the local planning authority to retain control over development which may be detrimental to the character of the area and the amenities of the locality if not otherwise controlled.

The Parish Council and NCP concerns about dark skies and lighting is noted. The proposed dwelling would result in a larger number of window openings.

It is recognised that light spillage can have a harmful effect upon the character of the area and wildlife and it is considered that a condition to limit the type of outdoor lighting to be used would go some way to alleviating unnecessary light spillage.

Form & Character

Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that the government “attaches great importance to the design of the built environment, good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning and should contribute positively to making places better for people” Additionally paragraph 58 requires development to function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development... responds to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation.

Policy DM 15 – Environment, Design and Amenity states that 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.

The existing bungalow is a very modest building with no specific architectural features to reflect its position in the north Norfolk countryside. The site is on rising ground, on the eastern side of Peddars Way and is located adjacent to existing farm buildings.

Despite its position in the countryside, the site is not completely isolated given the farm buildings immediately to the south of the site. The nearest residential property to the north is a detached property on the opposite side of the road, approximately 270m away. Other residential properties in the village of Holme next the Sea are approximately 440m to the north.

The nearest property to the south, The Crows Nest, is on the same side of the road, approximately 560m away. This itself was a much larger replacement dwelling for a modest bungalow (lpa ref: 11/00713/F). At the time it was considered that the principle of replacing the existing dwelling was acceptable and the high quality design of the replacement dwelling would not have any significantly detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the AONB or cause any significant harm to residential amenity or highway safety. Conditionally the proposal was considered to comply with policy in place at that time.

The properties within the village of Holme -next -the Sea, are a mixture of single and two storey buildings and to the south the properties of Ringstead are predominantly two storey. This proposed dwelling is two storeys in height and proposes barn-like qualities, using traditional, external building materials. In context therefore a two storey dwelling of this design in this location is not considered to be out of keeping with development which already exists in the vicinity.

As referred to above, the layout has also been amended from a 2 storey 'L' shaped block to a mostly 2 storey but part single storey 'T' shape. The longest elevation of the two storey element is 24m long but is 6m wide. The link to the garage/store building is of single storey height.

The existing property contains a series of outbuildings including a garage, three sheds, a caravan, detached summer house and a greenhouse. These are all single storey outbuildings but are spread over a proportion of the site. In comparison the proposed single storey garage/store is of similar floor area but consolidated in one part of the site.

The proposed dwelling is shown to be approximately 5.5m to eaves and 8m to the ridge. It is proposed to be constructed of red brick with a charcoal coloured clay pantile roof. The west elevation facing the road is shown to have chalk rubble panels. A short timber clad, flat roofed link is proposed between the main house and the garage building.

The closest brick barn to the south of the site is approximately 4m in height to the eaves and 6m in height to the ridge. These barns are on slightly higher ground than the current bungalow as the ground levels rise from north to south at this point along Peddars Way.

Both of the barns are wider than the proposed dwelling and sit closer to the road. When viewed from the south the only element of the house visible will be the roof slope. When travelling from the north the proposed house will be set back in the site with a low brick wall to the street frontage.

Despite the amendments the proposed replacement dwelling is still much larger than the existing property in terms of the overall floorspace to be created. However, in context the footprint of the dwelling is much less than the barns to the south and the outbuildings are of a comparable dimension to those already on site, albeit consolidated in one part of the site.

Although Policy DM5 makes no reference to the need for replacement dwellings to be of a similar size to the building it seeks to replace, it does require that proposals for replacement are of a high quality design that will preserve the character or appearance of the street scene or area in which it sits. Members will need to decide if they consider that the character of Peddars Way is adequately preserved.

Policy DM5 also refers that schemes which fail to reflect the scale and character of their surroundings or which would be oppressive or adversely affect the amenity of the area ... will be refused. Again, Members will need to decide whether the size, scale and design of the proposed dwelling is appropriate for the site and would not have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the streetscene.

Although the site is within the AONB where permitted development rights are already restricted it is recommended that certain classes of permitted development are removed to ensure that the scale of the property remains appropriate to the character of the area.

Neighbour Amenity

The closest neighbouring property to the proposed replacement dwelling is 'Field Barn' on Peddars Way which is a detached property situated approximately 270 metres away to the north.

Given the distance between the properties and the planting which exists between the two properties it is not considered that the proposed replacement dwelling would result in any harm to residential amenity in terms of either loss of light or overlooking.

Access & Highways Impact

The proposed development includes provision of satisfactory access, turning and parking areas that comply with adopted standards. As a result the Local Highways Authority has raised no objection to the proposal subject to specified conditions, relating to the provision of the access and parking facilities, being attached to any planning permission.

Other Considerations

Initial comments referred to the large area to the north of the site. However, this has been removed from the application site and shown as 'blue' land or land within the applicant's ownership. It does not form part of the curtilage of the dwellinghouse and as this field does not form part of the application site its use is not for consideration as part of the determination of this application.

Third party and Parish Council concerns have been raised regarding the use of the property as an agricultural tied dwelling. Planning permission was approved in 1954 for the dwelling currently on site, but there were no restrictions imposed linking the occupation of the occupants to agriculture.

The Parish Council has also referred to a planning application in 2011 (Ipa ref: 11/01546/F) which refused planning permission for the siting of two residential caravans to provide a single residential unit for family accommodation. This application was refused for several reasons including the fact that it would have resulted in a new dwelling in the countryside, contrary to policy.

Parish council and third party comments refers to the loss of an 'affordable dwelling' but this is not 'affordable' under the definitions of planning policy as set out in the glossary of the NPPF. For clarity the bungalow was sold on the open market and not a dwelling provided at a cost lower than market housing.

Following further investigation the applicant has amended the nature of the foul drainage to link to the existing mains drainage system. This then overcomes the comments of the Environment Agency and Natural England.

Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 requires Local Authorities to consider the implications for crime and disorder in the carrying out of their duties. The application before the Planning Committee will not have a material impact upon crime and disorder.

CONCLUSION

Members will need to consider whether a significantly larger two storey dwelling in place of a modest single storey dwelling is suitable in this locality. Both the Parish Council and Coastal Partnership raise concerns about this proposal, as they feel it's scale, mass and design mean it is harmful to the character of the AONB.

The principle of replacing the dwelling needs to adhere to policy DM 5 of the Development Management Policy which states “replacement dwellings will be approved where the design is of a high quality and will preserve the character or appearance of the street scene or area in which it sits. Schemes which fail to reflect the scale and character of their surrounding or which would be oppressive or adversely affect the amenity of the area or neighbouring properties will be refused.”

It's your officer's opinion that whilst the proposed replacement dwelling is much larger than the existing bungalow on site, it is of high quality, bespoke design which takes reference from the agricultural style buildings adjacent to it and in the surrounding area. It is considered that the amended plans show a dwelling that is now suitable for the site in context. The site is not entirely isolated as it is adjacent to existing farm buildings and although it is taller and much longer than the dwelling it seeks to replace, it sits in context with the neighbouring brick built farm buildings

The principle of a replacing the existing dwelling is considered to be acceptable and although undoubtedly more visible in the landscape than the existing bungalow it is not considered it would have a significantly detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the AONB.

On balance, the scale and design of the property is considered to cause some impact upon the character of the AONB in its wider setting but not to a degree that would warrant a refusal of the application.

The proposal would not cause any significant harm to residential amenity or highway safety.

As a result the proposal complies with the provisions of the NPPF and local policy, in particular Policies CS06, DM5 and DM15. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be approved subject to 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. 1889.1 – Site Location (version received 22 May 2018)
 - Drawing No. 2049.2a – Block Plan
 - Drawing No. 2049.3 – Elevation (West and South)
 - Drawing No. 2049.4 – Elevation (East and North)
 - Drawing No. 2049.5 – Layout (Ground floor)
 - Drawing No. 2049.6 – Layout (First floor)
 - Drawing No. 2049.7 – Layout (Ground floor)
- 2 Reason For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 3 Condition No development shall commence on any external surface of the development until a sample panel of the materials to be used for the external surfaces of the building(s) and/or extension(s) hereby permitted has been erected on the site for the inspection and written approval of the Local Planning Authority. The sample panel shall measure at least 1 metre x 1 metre using the proposed materials, mortar type, bond and pointing technique. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.
- 3 Reason To ensure a satisfactory external appearance and grouping of materials in accordance with the principles of the NPPF.
- 4 Condition Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the vehicular access shall be provided and thereafter retained at the position shown on the approved plan (drawing number 2049.2a) in accordance with the highway specification (Dwg. No. TRAD4) attached. 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.
- 4 Reason To ensure satisfactory access into the site and avoid carriage of extraneous material or surface water from or onto the highway.
- 5 Condition Vehicular access to and egress from the adjoining highway shall be limited to the access shown on drawing No 2049-2a only. Any other access or egress shall be permanently closed, and the highway verge shall be reinstated in accordance with a detailed scheme to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority, concurrently with the bringing into use of the new access.
- 5 Reason To ensure the permanent availability of the parking manoeuvring area, in the interests of highway safety.
- 6 Condition Notwithstanding the provision of Class A of Schedule 2, Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, (or any Order revoking, amending or re-enacting that Order) no gates, bollard, chain or other means of obstruction shall be erected across the approved access unless details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 6 Reason In the interests of highway safety.
- 7 Condition Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted a visibility splay measuring 2.4 x 120 metres shall be provided to each side of the access where it meets the highway and such splays shall thereafter be maintained at all times free from any obstruction exceeding 1.05 metres above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway.
- 7 Reason In the interests of highway safety.
- 8 Condition Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the proposed access / on-site car parking / turning area shall be laid out, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter available for that specific use.
- 8 Reason To ensure the permanent availability of the parking / manoeuvring area, in the interests of highway safety.

- 9 Condition Prior to the first use or occupation of the development hereby approved, full details of both hard and soft landscape works shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include finished levels or contours, hard surface materials, refuse or other storage units, street furniture, structures and other minor artefacts. Soft landscape works shall include planting plans, written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment) schedules of plants noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers and densities where appropriate.
- 9 Reason To ensure that the development is properly landscaped in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with the NPPF.
- 10 Condition All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation or use of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or plants that within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species as those originally planted, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written approval to any variation.
- 10 Reason To ensure that the work is carried out within a reasonable period in accordance with the NPPF.
- 11 Condition Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A - E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no extensions, roof alterations, porches or incidental buildings shall be allowed without the granting of specific planning permission.
- 11 Reason In order that the Local Planning Authority may retain control of development which might be detrimental to the amenities of the locality if otherwise allowed by the mentioned Order.
- 12 Condition Prior to the installation of any external lighting to the site, details shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and only lighting so agreed shall be installed on the site. Such lighting shall be kept to a minimum for the purposes of security and site safety, and shall prevent upward and outward light radiation. The lighting shall be fully shielded (enclosed in full cut-off flat glass fittings), directed downwards (mounted horizontally to the ground and not tilted upwards), switched on only when needed (no dusk to dawn lamps) and use white light low-energy lamps (LED, metal halide or fluorescent) and not orange or pink sodium sources.
- 12 Reason In the interests of minimising light pollution and to safeguard the amenities of the locality in accordance with the NPPF.