

AGENDA ITEM NO.8/1(b)

Parish:	Holme next the Sea	
Proposal:	Demolition of existing bungalow, construction of detached two-storey dwelling with garage and garden room.	
Location:	Westfield, 27 Peddars Way, Holme next The Sea, PE36 6LE	
Applicant:	Mr _ Mrs Thorogood	
Case No:	21/00457/F (Full Application)	
Case Officer:	Mrs K Lawty	Date for Determination: 4 May 2021 Extension of Time Expiry Date: 17 September 2021

Reason for Referral to Planning Committee – The comments of the Parish Council and Norfolk Coast Partnership are contrary to the recommendation, referred to Planning Committee by Sifting Panel and was later deferred from 13th September 2021 Planning Committee.

Neighbourhood Plan: No

Members will recall that the application was deferred in the September 2021 Committee. The reason given was to clarify the GIA calculations and seek a reduced scheme.

Amended plans were provided on 17th September 2021 showing the proposed dwelling reduced by 7sqm by increasing the thickness of the wall construction and the repositioning of the first floor glazed screens inward. These changes have resulted in a GIA of 199.92sqm (40% increase from the original bungalow GIA of 142.80sqm).

The amendments were considered to overcome the original issues and a reconsultation was issued.

For ease, new text is outlined in bold.

Case Summary

The site comprises a single storey detached property and associated garden land. The property is one of a row of residential properties along Peddars Way, Holme next the Sea.

In planning policy terms the village of Holme next the Sea is identified as a Smaller Village and Hamlet in the Core Strategy and SADMP and it does not have a settlement boundary. In this respect the site is within the countryside.

Holme next the Sea now has an adopted Neighbourhood Plan and in this respect the site frontage is within the NP settlement boundary, whilst the rear part of the site is outside.

The whole village is within the AONB.

This application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing bungalow and construction of a detached two-storey dwelling with garage and garden room.

Key Issues

- The key issues to be determined in this case are:-
- Principle of development;
- Form and character;
- Impact upon the AONB;
- Relationship with adjoining occupiers;
- Highways; and
- Other material considerations.

Recommendation

APPROVE

THE APPLICATION

The site comprises a single storey detached property and associated garden land. The property is one of a row of residential properties along the eastern side of Peddars Way, Holme next the Sea.

This application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing bungalow and construction of a detached two-storey dwelling with garage and garden room.

The existing bungalow is a modest, hipped roof dwelling constructed of buff/brown brick and concrete roof tiles.

The proposed replacement dwelling has two storeys and is of contemporary design with a flat roof. It is proposed to be constructed of locally found external materials including flint, brick, timber and glass with some grass/sedum roofs.

The design takes reference from the extension to the property on the southern side, immediately adjacent to the site, which has a flat roof and contemporary appearance.

SUPPORTING CASE

Introduction

There is a danger that confusion will get in the way of many of the facts, so we are grateful for the opportunity to respond to the Parish Council's latest submission. Whilst many of these points have already been addressed, for the purpose of clarification we feel it is important to lay out the specifics. In each instance we have a direct quote from the Parish Council in italics, with our response following up.

SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT

- **“Uncertainty surrounding the Agent's Gross Internal Floor Area.” To be clear, there is absolutely no uncertainty - the net increase of Gross Internal Area is to 40% of the original dwelling (Existing GIA 142.80 sqm Vs Proposed 199.91 sqm). The Parish Council's calculations incorrectly include the external terraces, access deck to the**

external stairs, external covered entrances, outbuildings as well as external covered walkways - these are not internal and therefore should not play any part in calculating the Gross Internal Area.

- The floor area of the proposed dwelling was further reduced by adjusting the external wall thicknesses to suit the proposed methods of construction. The previous drawings showed a generic external wall thickness. For instance, the introduction of flint on the ground floor requires the use of backing blockwork to support it. The timber walls with rainscreen cladding are proposed to be thermally insulated to a very high level to minimise the use of energy to heat the dwelling. This can only be achieved with a wall construction of at least 400 mm. Examples of these forms of construction (from other projects) are included in appendix A of this document.
- “Revised drawings in the new application are not consistent with the claimed reduction in GIA” - the provided drawings are accurate and have been approved by the Planning Officer as such. A scale bar has been provided on the drawings so that there can be no doubt about the accuracy of the drawings provided.
- “The actual GIA for the proposed development is almost 370 sq.m. (house plus garage plus garden building)” - as stated above, it is incorrect to include the garage or garden building as part of this calculation
- “The very large garden outbuilding is forced to the eastern extreme of the plot. This breaches the village development boundary which guides the location of development in the village and protects the central open space which defines the historic form of Holme” - the rear part of the garden, where the proposed garden room is to be sited, is outside of the Neighbourhood Plan settlement boundary. Even so, the Planning Officer made their view very clear on this topic in their original response - “the outbuilding located at the very end of the garden rather than closer to the dwelling house can be supported in terms of layout and would not be at odds with surrounding development or have implications for the wider visual characteristics of the AONB. The proposal therefore complies with NP Policy HNTS 16.”

IMPACT ON THE STREET SCENE

- “It is simply inappropriate at this location and will damage the street scene” - As the Planning Officer has stated: “having two dwellings of a similar, contemporary design approach is not seen as diluting the rural character of the area, but creating a high quality contrast. Two dwellings following a more contemporary design will help to form an element of cohesion in the street scene”

In reality, there is an eclectic mix of property styles that presently influence the character of Peddars Way. They range in size, form, detailing and material, but only one property on the whole street could lay a claim to be considered of traditional Norfolk style.

ADDITIONAL AONB IMPACTS

“Furthermore, light spillage would be considerably greater” - We have made a significant effort to minimise light spillage including:

- Entirely avoided the use of any skylights

- The timber wrap-arounds on the balconies have been chosen to reduce any light pollution. Open baton cladding has been made less perforate by reducing the gaps between the slats - contrary to the Parish Council comments - these would not “remain very visible from the street” as they wrap the sides of the building and not the front or the back
- The glass is set deep within the canopies with integrated blinds to reduce light emission
- Removed the shower room window on the ground floor
- In addition we will be using smart glass to further reduce light pollution

Conclusion

In conclusion, we fully support and respect the Neighbourhood Plan and as such have made numerous changes to comply with the policies. The Planning Officer’s report is thorough and explicit in the support of the proposal in terms of compliance with policies, scale of the dwelling, materials used, position on the site, light pollution and fitting in with the street scene.

PLANNING HISTORY

20/01622/F: Application Withdrawn: 22/01/21 - Demolition of existing bungalow, construction of detached two-storey dwelling with garage and garden room – Westfield, 27 Peddars Way, Holme next The Sea

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

Parish Council : OBJECT - This application is a resubmission of Application Ref 20/01622/F which was withdrawn following a number of objections including comments from the Borough Council, the Norfolk Coast Partnership, the Parish Council and the immediate neighbour to the north of Westfield. Although some changes have been made to the design with specific reference to Policies HNTS11, 14,16 and 18 the Parish Council maintains its objection and supports the position of the Norfolk Coast Partnership (objection dated 16 March 2021) on the grounds that the proposals remain contrary to policy.

The Parish Council’s previous comments noted that the striking modern design, topped by a flat roof, will be an incongruous addition to the street scene and hence contrary to SADMP Policy DM15 and NDP Policy HNTS11. Although the Applicant claims the precedent of the neighbouring property (which was approved prior to the consultations on community preferences carried out in connection with the NDP), the cumulative impact of two such properties would create a cramped (despite the c0.25 acre plot) and urbanised appearance. This would overwhelm and distract from the essentially rural character of the street which is currently dominated by a pleasant mix of modest and traditional properties which blend well into their surroundings. Furthermore the choice of building materials and external finishes does nothing to complement and enhance locally distinctive character. Reference to the NDP Style Guide (drawn up by an established RIBA Architect) shows that the proposed house has little in common with either local style or materials. There is some token use of flint panels but the flat roof, extensive use of dark timber and metal plus extensive fenestration are most definitely not characteristic of Holme and in this respect run counter to Core Strategy Policy CS12 as well as HNTS11. The introduction of the proposed house at this location would seriously harm the character of the neighbourhood.

The huge area of fenestration proposed will increase light pollution notably on the west elevation overlooking Peddars Way and the fields beyond and on the east elevation overlooking the paddocks which form the central open space in the village and provide a valuable habitat for sensitive local wildlife. This is contrary to HNTS20 and NPPF 180(c). As noted in PC's previous comments, Holme's Dark Night Skies are amongst the least polluted in England but are threatened by increasing levels of development and use of intrusive lighting which impacts negatively on the tranquillity associated with the AONB setting. The Parish Council is not opposed to modern design as the Applicant suggests, but this is not the place for this striking house - the proposals not only show little sympathy for the neighbour (overlooking balcony) or for neighbourhood character but show equally little sympathy for the the AONB environment.

With respect to HNTS 16 the revised design claims a significant reduction in Gross Internal Floor Area. However the distinction between internal and external spaces is blurred and this claim relies on the exclusion of first floor balconies and terraces which, for the purposes of measuring GIFA, include integral components of the living area of the house **. The original bungalow (excluding the later conservatory and porch extensions) is c135sqm. The overall area under the roof / above the foundations of the proposed replacement dwelling is c 225sqm (excluding c40sqm garage / workshop). Much of the first floor terraced / balcony areas are covered and / or have end walls - which means that the increase in GIFA remains very large in relation to the criteria set out in Policy

HNTS 16. The PC's comments on the withdrawn application noted that a significant factor leading to imbalance in Holme's housing stock has been replacement of small houses relevant to young families, downsizers or retirees by excessively large houses which are beyond their financial reach or of no relevance to their needs. Holme is traditionally a village where people choose to retire and / or downsize and the reduction in suitable housing is impacting negatively on the vitality of the community. This is the major consideration underlying NDP Policy HNTS16 (and is consistent with Local Plan policy CS13) and explains the limit of 40% increase of GIFA on Replacement Dwellings.

Again as noted previously the proposed development will result in the loss of a good deal of mature vegetation on the site and it is difficult to see how the proposals for re-planting would make a contribution to the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity which is proportionate to their size and likely impact (NPPF15, Core Strategy Policy CS12, HNTS 22). Moreover, the proposals do nothing to conserve and enhance the landscape at this location contrary to NPPF para 172 which states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing 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 these issues'.

In view of the above the Borough Council is urged to refuse this application.

** the treatment of balconies has been tested through CIL Appeals leading to the view of the VOA that if a balcony does not protrude from the external wall of a building and is surrounded by the main structure of the building with an open front then it is included in the GIA – see RICS Code of Measuring practice, 2017

The Parish Council submitted comments after the publishing of the 13th September Committee agenda and was therefore included within the late representations document. The comments reiterated their original response and further queried the GIA and provided a technical statement.

Following the receipt of amended drawings submitted 17th September 2021, comments including the following have been made:

There have been a number of iterations of the proposals for the redevelopment of Westfield, none of which the Parish Council feel addresses their fundamental objections to the scheme.

The suggestion that the GIA of the proposed replacement dwelling is less than 40% larger than the existing bungalow has been shown to be without foundation and it is clear that the proposed development is not Policy compliant on the basis of size alone.

The PC maintains that the proposed development should be rejected for all of the reasons set out above and those explained in previous objections. The Borough Council is respectfully urged to refuse it.

Highways Authority: NO OBJECTION - conditionally

Natural England: NO COMMENTS

Environmental Health & Housing - Environmental Quality: NO OBJECTION – conditionally.

Having reviewed the information in the application and our files, we have no comments with regard to contaminated land.

In the case that the proposed development includes the refurbishment/replacement of any existing building which could contain asbestos materials, the Control of Asbestos Regulations 2012 (CAR 2012) require that suitable and sufficient assessment is carried out as to whether asbestos is or is liable to be present before demolition or other work is carried out. CAR 2012 requires that a suitable written plan of work must be prepared before any work is carried out and the work must be carried out in accordance with that plan. If asbestos is not managed appropriately then the site may require a detailed site investigation and could become contaminated land as defined in Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

Norfolk Coastal Partnership: OBJECTION - The development falls in the Drained Coastal Marshes area identified in the AONB Integrated Landscape Character Assessment. This area has a strong sense of remoteness, panoramic views and an isolated rural character. The existing development is not isolated however much of the development to the east are fairly modest 1 to 2 storey bungalows/chalet bungalows apart from the somewhat incongruous neighbouring development.

That potentially has set a precedent for this development which would also be at odds with the majority of the other dwellings in the road thereby creating some visual disturbance in terms of its design more so than scale.

Two relevant issues that would have an impact on the landscape character and by result the special features of the AONB (which was mentioned briefly in the Design and Access Statement despite being a nationally designated landscape) are: 'New small-scale development, which may impact upon the characteristic sense of remoteness, openness and exposure'. and ' Extension of 'urban fringe' character and this includes lighting, pony paddocks and domestic garden fences and hedges as well as design.

Because of the adjacent dwelling there is already a precedent set, however by adding more of these types of very modern and visually striking houses the special qualities of the AONB will be cumulatively eroded.

Our current Management Plan which is endorsed by King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council seeks to protect and enhance the AONB special features. Two are pertinent in this case:

Diversity and integrity of landscape, seascape and settlement character (currently amber – cause for concern, and Sense of remoteness, tranquillity and wildness'. (also amber cause for concern).

Nothing in the design is reflective of local character, dark timber is not vernacular to Norfolk, the flint is used sparingly and looks at odds with the modern design and the vast amount of glazing and metal will increase light pollution and glare particularly on the east and west elevations impacting views from Peddars Way. This will impact dark skies, another special feature of the AONB designation. The glazing has been recessed more in this design however there will be still be light spill and large areas of reflective material in the landscape.

This development therefore does not fulfil the requirements of NPPF para 172 'Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing 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 these issues'.

PB3 from our Management Plan states to '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'. Again this demonstrates the need for new development to enhance what is there. That doesn't necessarily mean that there should be no contemporary buildings in the AONB, but the context in which they sit should be right and not at odds with the landscape and settlement.

This is similar to policy CS12 of the Local Plan 'The design of new development should be sensitive to the surrounding area, and not detract from the inherent quality of the environment'.

For these reasons we believe the proposal is contrary to policy and object to the application

REPRESENTATIONS

TEN OBJECTIONS and **THREE SUPPORTING** responses received from 9 different people referring to the following:-

- Design inappropriate and out of keeping
- Will spoil lovely village
- Urban design in rural area
- contrary to the village development plan as too big
- do not want small dwellings replaced with huge buildings out of reach financially for most local people
- Shortage of affordable housing properties that fall into this category need to be preserved for the common good.
- Oppose the planning this application on the grounds it exceeds the 40% increase in internal floor space as stated in the local neighbourhood plan.
- Holme next the Sea will become a "ghost" town full of second homes
- Impact on neighbours - overlooking
- Contrary to policy HNTS 11; the volume within the external walls and "timber slats" (which will look like walls from the outside) is nearly 2 1/2 times that of the current building.

- The living area is on a new second storey which looms over our garden given how close the development is to its north boundary (around 3 feet).
- More than a third of this first floor comprises open balconies which are not included in Gross Internal Area but, given that they are enclosed behind timber slats, contribute to the inappropriate massing effect of the total structure.
- the Application- does not provide "appropriate separation from boundaries"
- it does not "avoid a cramped or urbanised appearance"
- it is not "sympathetic to its setting in terms of height massing or roof form"
- it does not "have regard to the relationship between building size and plot size" (in terms of height and closeness to its boundaries)
- it is "overbearing or detrimental to the amenity of its neighbours by virtue of overlooking resulting in loss of privacy"
- Increases the GIA by some 70m².
- The official definition of GIA (as per the Valuation Office Agency and RICS) includes covered balconies (as opposed to external balconies). The application includes proposals for some 24m² of covered balconies (not including the covered breakfast terrace ((20m²) which may or may not be included in the definition). This means that the actual GIA of the proposed building is some 304m² (excluding the covered breakfast terrace).
- The definition of the GIA of the original building for houses built after 1948 should be the GIA of the structure as originally built excluding outbuildings (an established measure included in the Neighbourhood Plan and approved by the Council Examiner). The front porch and the conservatory and porch to the rear of the property have been built onto the external wall of the bungalow, presumably subsequent to the original building, and should therefore be removed from the GIA of the original building. The garage was therefore originally an outbuilding and should also be removed from the baseline GIA. The proper GIA of the original building should therefore be some 120m².
- The corrected GIA of some 304m² is therefore an increase over the GIA of the original building of some 150%.
- Policy LP28 of the Local Plan Review states that schemes which "would be oppressive or adversely affect the amenity of the area or neighbouring properties will be refused" and HNTS 11 states that schemes should not be "overbearing or detrimental to the amenity of neighbours by virtue of overlooking resulting in loss of privacy".
- The proposed structure focuses all the living accommodation of the new structure on the new first storey and which would directly overlook our property:
 - the full-length rear balcony on the first floor will overlook the rest of our garden
 - the current tree screening is not high enough to protect us from being constantly overseen from
 - The timber slats along the first floor elevation on the north side will presumably let out light glow over our property from the full length glazing screen in the living area behind it - the glazed screen and balcony across the entire rear of the first floor will also emit a significant amount of light onto our property.
- The only reason this proposal is even being considered is because of the property on the south boundary which was (somehow) approved under previous planning legislation.
- The Neighbourhood Plan was presumably intended to prevent a repeat of this aberration and was public well before 27 Peddars Way was sold to the existing owner so its impact on any possible development would have been clear.
- Approval of this scheme would open the way for the entire Peddars Way to be filled with similar sized properties which would transform the nature of the village.
- To override this statement of local preferences would seem to be totally against the Borough Council's policies of encouraging local communities to express their requirements around local development.
- This application should be treated on its own merits and not by comparison with a previous application

- The proposed development at number 27 is replacing a rather tired, dilapidated building.
- The plot is narrow but long - and the new property will be set back from Peddars Way.
- The roof height is inferior to other neighbouring properties.
- The style of the proposed plans happens to suit our personal tastes, but we are aware that everyone is entitled to their own views which may differ from ours.
- We have also had the privilege to meet the new owners (a family of four) who want to create a home which will become their primary residence. We would certainly not wish to deny them such an opportunity.

Following the receipt of amended plans on 17th September 2021 a total of 7 representations were received, expressing the following reasons of objection:

- **Against the demolition of smaller owners with larger replacements**
- **The proposed dwelling would appear discordant to the surrounding area and would be of an inappropriate scale and design.**
- **Original objections have not been addressed through the revisions**
- **The proposed dwelling resembles more of an officer/warehouse on an urban industrial estate**
- **Too large to replace modest bungalow**
- **Negative impact on the character and charm of the traditional village**
- **Unnecessary demolition**
- **Detrimental impact on climate change as brick making creates vast amounts of CO2**
- **Change the nature of the housing stock for retirees and families.**
- **Gia incorrectly calculated**
- **Proposed windows are too big and would have an impact on the AONB.**
- **Does not comply with the neighbourhood plan.**
- **Unacceptable scale, design and excessive glazing**

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

DM15 – Environment, Design and Amenity

DM17 - Parking Provision in New Development

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN POLICIES

HNTS 1: Principle of Sustainable Development

Policy HNTS2: Holme Village Zone

Policy HNTS11: Street Scene, Character and Residential Environment

Policy HNTS14: New Homes

Policy HNTS16: Replacement Dwellings

Policy HNTS20: AONB Landscape Quality

Policy HNTS22: Biodiversity

NATIONAL GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
National Design Guide 2019

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The key issues to be determined in this case are: -

- The principle of development;
- Amended Plans
- Form and character;
- Impact upon the AONB;
- Relationship with adjoining occupiers;
- Highways; and
- Other material considerations.

The principle of development

In planning policy terms the village of Holme next the Sea is identified as a Smaller Village and Hamlet in the Core Strategy and SADMP and it does not have a settlement boundary. As set out in Policy DM2, the areas outside development boundaries (excepting specific allocations for development) will be treated as countryside where new development will be more restricted and will be limited.

Policy DM5 allows for replacement dwellings in the countryside, which will be approved where the design is of 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 will be oppressive or adversely affect the amenity of the area or neighbouring properties will be refused.

However, Holme next the Sea now has an adopted Neighbourhood Plan which contains a village settlement boundary. This shows that most of the site (western end) is within the NP settlement boundary, whilst part of the rear garden is outside.

Within the NP settlement boundary development Policy HNTS2 refers that 'where large gardens extend beyond the Development Envelope, development will be restricted to that allowed under permitted development rights'.

The whole of the village lies within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Nationally, the NPPF seeks the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities (para 126).

Para 130 refers that 'planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments: a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development; b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities); d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit.'

Para 134 also seeks high quality design, stating that 'development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes. Conversely, significant weight should be given to: a) development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes; and/or b) outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.'

The NPPF refers to development within the AONB, and states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in these areas which have the highest status of (para 176). The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited, while development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas.

Policies CS06, CS08 and DM15 are also relevant in terms of development in rural areas, sustainable development and design. Neighbourhood Plan Policies HNTS1, HNTS11, HNTS16, HNTS17 and HNTS18 also apply.

It is of note that the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) has given the ability to add additional storeys in the airspace to many homes by one or two additional storeys. Class AA now permits the enlargement of a dwellinghouse by construction of additional storeys, although there are a list of restrictions including the fact that this permitted development does not apply to properties within an AONB. Nonetheless this sets out the government's encouragement of building into air space above buildings and that this is generally acceptable development in most scenarios.

Form and character

The bungalow which presently occupies the site is of little historical or architectural merit and the loss of this building is not contested.

The main part of Holme-next-the-Sea village, much of which is designated a Conservation Area, is characterised by traditional cottage style properties constructed of local material (chalk/flint infill with pantile roof and white painted timber windows) where replacement/new dwellings in keeping with the locality would be encouraged.

However, the site lies outside the Conservation Area where form and character of existing development is more varied. This part of Peddars Way is characterised by detached dwellings, which are a mixture of design styles of varied heights; single, one and a half storey and two storey properties. Whilst the design of each property is different, and the character of the street scene is therefore mixed, the common design element is that they are detached and generally sited in a row, set back in their plots, along Peddars Way.

Importantly, the dwellinghouse immediately to the south has been redeveloped within recent years. Planning permission was approved for a contemporary designed first floor extension with a flat/mono pitch roof and chalk, render and timber materials (ref:15/01174/F). This extension is of a larger scale than the existing bungalow on this application site and the difference between dwelling styles and scale is quite apparent when viewed from the application site.

The plans for this current application seek the demolition and rebuild of a dwellinghouse that takes reference from the design elements of this part of the borough as well as the nearest neighbouring property. Submitted plans received 17th September 2021 show a detached, two storey replacement property of contemporary design with flat roof and external materials to include knapped flint, timber boarding and a green roof.

The application has been supported by a Design and Access Statement which sets out the way that the design of the replacement dwelling has evolved and how it relates to the area in general as well as the neighbouring property. Indeed, a previous application to replace the dwelling on this site was withdrawn to allow for improvements and amendments to accommodate responses received to this application and a design that better relates to the site.

The proposed dwelling remains unashamedly contemporary in appearance with its strong box form. The proposal shows the use of knapped flint to all of the ground floor elevations of the dwelling. This forms a solid base in contrast with the lighter materials of timber to the first floor. This timber cladding is specified as untreated and will naturally weather to a light silver grey. **The recent reduction in floor area has not changed the appearance of the proposed dwelling.**

The proposed dwelling is also formed by several elements and components so that the visible side elevations are not flat, but varied to add relief and interest. Similarly, the upper floor is not aligned with the ground floor so this breaks up mass and creates light and shade.

This bespoke design approach, within this context, is considered to add interest to the built form and to be of high quality which would make a positive contribution to the built environment.

The Parish Council objects to the proposal, stating that it will be an incongruous addition to the street scene and hence contrary to SADMP Policy DM15 and NDP Policy HNTS11. They comment that the contemporary design of the property next door was approved prior to works on the NP and that two dwellings of a similar design would overwhelm and distract from the essentially rural character of the street which is dominated by modest properties.

Norfolk Coastal Partnership considers the dwelling to the south of the proposal is incongruous, although recognises this has set a precedent. NCP claims that this proposal

would be at odds with the majority of other dwellings in the road and would cause some visual disturbance in terms of design more so than scale.

However, the contemporary dwelling to the south already exists and this is a material consideration. Contrary to the opinions of the Parish Council, it is considered that the relationship between this and the contemporary neighbouring property will be improved through a more uniformed scale of development that respects and relates to this existing dwelling in terms of scale, design and layout. Having two dwellings of a similar, contemporary design approach is not seen as diluting the rural character of the area, but creating a high-quality contrast. Two dwellings following a more contemporary design will help to form an element of cohesion in the street scene.

The Parish Council raised concern about the cramped nature of the proposal. However, the applicant has retained spacing between this and the nearest property to the south by moving the first floor element away from the boundary to retain the rhythm of the detached nature of dwellings along this side of Peddars Way. The property to the north is set much further back in the streetscene and is not visible in the same view point. The proposal is not considered to result in a cramped form of development.

The Parish Council objects to the external finishes, which they consider would seriously harm the character of the neighbourhood. However, the use of knapped flint to the whole of the ground floor and contrasting timber to the upper is not considered out of keeping when viewed in context with other properties in the area.

Third party objection has also been made to the design of the proposed property being out of keeping with the existing surrounding development. However, this is a bespoke design that has responded to the particular in terms of scale and design the scheme as amended preserves the character of this part of the village and accords with the provisions of the NPPF, local plan and neighbourhood plan policy with regard to good quality design.

Whilst the comments of the Parish Council and North Coast Partnership are noted, the applicant has come some way to responding to the adopted Neighbourhood Plan Policies. It is considered the replacement dwelling makes a statement about modern design, yet successfully responds to its location and local context and, through the incorporation of traditional materials, reinforces local distinctiveness in accordance with NP Policy HNTS11. However, design is subjective and Members will need to decide, given the particular circumstances of the case, whether the proposal responds to the form and character of the locality.

Impact upon the AONB

AONB's have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. In this case the application site is already a dwelling with associated garden land. The existing site is surrounded by other development to the north and south.

The dwelling will be visible within the streetscene amongst neighbouring properties, and seen from certain vantage points to the east and west across more open views.

The applicant has provided a plan showing how the scale and mass of the proposed replacement dwelling would fit amongst the other existing properties in a street view. This shows that the proposed dwelling is of comparable height to the property to the south and lower than some of the other redeveloped sites along Peddars Way.

The Parish Council states that the proposals do nothing to conserve and enhance the landscape at this location contrary to NPPF guidance on development in the AONB.

The Norfolk Coast Partnership refer to their current Management Plan policies which seek to protect and enhance the AONB special features. They claim that two are pertinent in this case: Diversity and integrity of landscape, seascape and settlement character (currently amber - cause for concern), and Sense of remoteness, tranquillity and wildness', (also amber cause for concern). They consider that by adding more of these types of very modern and visually striking houses the special qualities of the AONB will be cumulatively eroded.

They are also concerned about the impact upon dark skies, which is another special feature of the AONB designation. They acknowledge that the glazing has been recessed more in this design, however they consider there will still be light spill and large areas of reflective material in the landscape. They consider that smart glass would help to alleviate internal light spill.

They state that Policy PB3 from their Management Plan states to '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'. They claim that this demonstrates the need for new development to enhance what is there. That doesn't necessarily mean that there should be no contemporary buildings in the AONB, but the context in which they sit should be right and not at odds with the landscape and settlement.

For the reasons above, it is not considered that, by supporting a more contemporary designed dwelling in a row of houses, this would erode the special qualities of the AONB. The scale of the dwelling will sit comfortably within its plot and have very limited impact beyond the site boundary in terms of scale or built form.

In response to concerns of the Parish Council and NCP, it should be noted that this application is for a replacement dwelling and there is already a degree of artificial light emanating from this site. The existing bungalow has large windows and a conservatory from which light spillage already occurs.

That said, the applicant has taken steps to reduce the amount of light spillage from fenestration. They confirm that there will be very little external lighting and no floodlights. No rooflights are proposed to any part of the dwelling. Any external lighting that is proposed utilises shrouded downward facing light fittings, and this light will to a great extent, be absorbed by the close proximity of the proposed dense tree border planting.

They also confirm that the extent of glazing proposed is no more than the adjacent house to the south and the large areas of glass are set deep within the recess of the upper terraces which will keep the glass in shadow and reduce the reflection of direct sunlight.

The batten cladding to the north facing upper terrace has been modified to close the gaps to help contain the light from this dining terrace. The areas of glazing to east and west elevations are shrouded on all sides deep within recesses.

The proposed dwelling, as amended, is considered to be of appropriate, good quality design and form so that it will not appear unduly prominent or incongruous in the landscape. The scale and height of the proposed dwelling, flanked by a row of other, existing dwellings, would prevent any adverse impact on the AONB landscape.

In this case it is considered the detailed plans are of suitable scale, design and mass such that the proposed dwelling will not significantly detract from the wider landscape character and appearance of the AONB in accordance with NP Policy HNTS 16.

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.

Relationship with adjoining occupiers

Both the NPPF and Local Plan (including the Neighbourhood Plan) seek to protect the amenity of occupiers of existing dwellings.

The nearest property lies immediately to the south of the application site. This neighbouring property has a modern, contemporary design and has windows facing towards the application site, although these are high level windows. It is also taller and of a greater scale than the bungalow currently on the application site.

There is already a degree of overshadowing from this neighbouring property, albeit that the degree of overshadowing and the relationship between the two dwellings was deemed to be of an acceptable level in terms of neighbour amenity when permission was granted for the works to this property in 2015.

The design of this proposed replacement dwelling has taken into account the position of the existing windows along with the scale of the neighbouring property. Amended plans have moved the position of the outside spaces to improve the relationship with the immediate adjoining neighbour in terms of general noise and activity. The window arrangement is such that there should be no direct overlooking. Additionally, it is considered that there is sufficient distance between this and neighbouring properties so that the dwelling would not be unduly overbearing.

The nearest dwelling to the north is some distance away and set back in the site. Given the distances there are no neighbour amenity concern in terms of the proposed replacement dwelling being overbearing, causing overshadowing, loss of light or overlooking.

Third party objection has been made that the building will loom over the neighbouring property in the same way that its neighbour looms over the existing bungalow. Objection has also been made to overlooking from the proposed rear balcony, however, this is some 27m away from the eastern boundary. The rear balcony is shielded to the north and south by full height timber boarding so that the balcony area is contained within a frame. Views north and south will be restricted by the design of the dwelling.

Objection has been made to the transfer of the dining terrace to northern side of the house through the amended plans, which will now expose other neighbours to noise pollution. However, the distance between properties is great enough (in excess of 27m) so that any amenity issues will be mitigated. The domestic use is replacing an existing domestic use and is considered to be compatible with surrounding uses.

In summary the relationship between the proposed replacement dwelling and existing neighbouring properties has been examined. There will be no significantly detrimental impact upon the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking, being overshadowed or the dwelling being over bearing sufficient to warrant the refusal of planning permission, as a result of this proposal. The development raises no conflict with paragraph 130 of the NPPF, Development Plan Policy DM15.

Highways issues

The Design and Access Statement confirms that access to the site for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles will remain unchanged. Visibility for cars using the original entrance will be

improved with more careful siting of new planting and the replacement of the original boundary wall.

Vehicle parking capacity on site is provided to the minimum standards for a new dwelling of this size.

The Highways Authority raises no objection to the proposal given that the application results in no increases in vehicular traffic.

Other material considerations

Policy HNTS 16

Neighbourhood Plan Policy HNTS 16 refers specifically to replacement dwellings. It states that 'Proposals for replacement dwellings will be permitted provided that they conserve and enhance landscape and scenic beauty and are appropriate to their location in the Norfolk Coast AONB and provided that they do not result in a net increase of more than 40% of the Gross Internal Floor Area of the original dwelling excluding any outbuildings.'

Previously, the GIA of original dwelling has been calculated by including the conservatory, however, this was incorrect as the structure was a later addition to the property. Only the original dwelling can be included within calculations. The error was highlighted and it was confirmed that the proposal exceeded the 40% limit for the GIA of the dwelling by 7smq (area comprising the conservatory) and therefore, the development was not considered to comply with the requirements of policy HNTS 16 therefore. The application was deferred from Committee.

Since the deferral from Committee, the applicants have recalculated the GIA and revised the proposal. Amended Plans were provided showing the overall GIA of the new dwelling reduced by 7sqm. The reduction is achieved through increasing the thickness of the wall construction by 50mm and repositioning the first-floor glazed screens inwards. The amendments result in a GIA of 199.92sqm which is an exact 40% increase on the original bungalow's GIA of 142.8sqm (without the conservatory). Therefore, it is considered that the amended drawings overcome the issues originally raised regarding the GIA measurements. As the proposed dwelling now does not exceed more than 40% of the original dwellings GIA, it is considered that the development complies with Policy HNTS16.

Following the receipt of amended plans, the Parish Council has reassessed the GIA calculations and provided comments concluding that the proposed dwellings GIA is still above the 40% limit even with the 7sqm reduction. The comments state that the addition of the utility/boot room which adjoins the garage and the covered walkway takes the GIA of the proposed dwelling to 245sqm which creates an overall increase of 75% over the original dwelling and therefore, in their opinion, does not comply with policy HNTS16.

The PC's comments note that a significant factor leading to imbalance in Holme's housing stock has been replacement of small houses relevant to young families, downsizers or retirees by excessively large houses which are beyond their financial reach or of no relevance to their needs. Holme is traditionally a village where people choose to retire and / or downsize and the reduction in suitable housing is impacting negatively on the vitality of the community. This is the major consideration underlying NDP Policy HNTS16 (and is consistent with Local Plan Policy CS13) and explains the limit of 40% increase of GIFA on Replacement Dwellings

However, the applicant claims that the footprint figure provided is the extent of ground floor walls, which is the footprint of the building that actually touches the ground. The first floor balconies project out beyond the ground floor walls but these cantilevered elements include the external dining terrace to the north and the access decks to the external stair on the first floor. These are considered to be outside spaces that should not form part of the GIA calculation.

Third party comment has been made regarding the various definitions of GIA and how they should be calculated. In the glossary, however, the NP defines the Gross Internal Floor Area (GIFA) as equating to the total area enclosed by the external walls measured to the internal face of those walls and taking into account every floor in the building.

For the sake of this calculation, given that the GIFA definition refers to 'areas enclosed by external walls' it is accepted that the areas designed to be used for outside space should not be included in the calculations (because they are open spaces which are not fully enclosed by external walls) and that the 40% restriction on GIFA increase has not been exceeded.

Whilst it is appreciated that simply increasing the wall thickness within the dwelling in order to achieve the required 7sqm reduction may not be in the spirit of the policy HNTS16, the proposed GIA of the dwelling is not considered to exceed the 40% limit and is therefore policy compliant.

In this case, the design and layout of the proposed replacement dwelling is considered to be of high quality and, in the planning balance, must be weighed against any numerical floorspace figures that do not necessarily provide a measurement of good design.

Third party objection also raised to the fundamental issue that the proposal would result in the replacement of a smaller home with a larger one, contrary to the aims of the NP, are noted. However, for the reasons given above, it is considered that the new dwelling meets the criteria of Policy HNTS 16 in terms of the incremental size increase.

Outbuilding to rear garden

Policy HNTS 2 refers to the Holme Village Zone and development within the Development Envelope. This policy states that 'where large gardens extend beyond the Development Envelope, development will be restricted to that allowed under permitted development rights.'

In this case the proposal includes a garden room to the rear garden. The proposed building has a floor area of approximately 50 sqm, is 11 m long by 4.5m wide and 2.5m tall. It is located approximately 22m from the nearest wall of the proposed replacement dwellinghouse.

This part of the garden falls outside the development envelope and so Policy HNTS 2 applies. As the site is within the AONB, national permitted development rights are restricted. Class E of Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (GPDO) (as amended) relates to outbuildings in gardens where the maximum area to be covered by buildings, enclosures, containers and pools sited more than 20 metres from any wall of the dwellinghouse is limited to 10 square metres only.

Whilst this proposed outbuilding does not fully comply with the provisions of Class E of the GPDO, if it were moved closer to the house to be within 20m of the nearest wall of the dwellinghouse it would comply. However, by keeping it close to the rear boundary of the site it is better screened by the boundary planting that exists which means it will be less visible in

the wider landscape. The proposed location of this single storey, flat roof outbuilding at the end of the garden also results in a better layout and use of this rear garden space.

It is also of note that planning permission was approved in 2018 for a detached, mono-pitch garden room to the rear of the garden of the nearest neighbouring property to the south of the application site (ref: 18/00852/F). The location of a garden room at the end of the garden would therefore be in keeping with surrounding development.

Accordingly, in terms of the planning balance it is considered that, in this case, the outbuilding located at the very end of the garden rather than closer to the dwellinghouse can be supported in terms of layout and would not be odds with surrounding development or have implications for the wider visual characteristics of the AONB. The proposal therefore complies with NP Policy HNTS 16.

Nature Conservation

The site lies within 2km of a SSSI. The site is currently in residential use and will not likely have an impact on protected species or habitats.

Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites.

Landscaping

The PC has raised objection to the impact of the proposed development which will result in the loss of mature vegetation on the site and that it is difficult to see how the proposals for re-planting would make a contribution to the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity which is proportionate to their size and likely impact (NPPF15, Core Strategy Policy CS12, HNTS 22).

The existing site contains lawn and garden planting of boundary hedging, shrubs and small trees. The proposed plan shows areas of planting and lawns with opportunity to improve and enhance the quality of planting on the site. The design also incorporates some areas of sedum/green roofs.

The applicant states that the paddock to the east is used for horse grazing and the large arable field to the west is used for a single crop. Both areas have a low biodiversity and do not provide valuable habitat for sensitive local wildlife.

The site contains typical garden planting. The proposals will not result in long term harm to the biodiversity of the site or surroundings. Further, the new tree planting and areas of green roofs proposed will compensate for any short term loss of biodiversity.

It is recommended that appropriate conditions are imposed to ensure the planting scheme is undertaken as proposed to ensure that the landscaping is enhanced and helps the proposed built form integrate successfully into the landscape.

For this reason there is no policy conflict identified.

Crime and Disorder Act 1998

Section 17 of the above act requires Local Authorities to consider the implications for crime and disorder in the carrying out of their duties. The application will not likely have a material impact upon crime and disorder.

Third party comments

Most of the third party comments, including those relating to the design, scale of the development and privacy, have already been addressed earlier in this report.

Objections to the house not being affordable are noted, but the proposal is not in conflict with any national or local policies in this regard.

Comments about the proposed dwelling being used for holiday purposes and not being used as a permanent family home are noted. However, the restriction on the type of occupant introduced through the NP only applies to new homes within the NP area and does not apply to replacement dwellings.

Supporting comments that the proposed development would replace a rather tired, dilapidated building are noted. So too are comments that the new property will be set back from Peddars Way and the roof height is inferior to other neighbouring properties. It is noted that comment is made that the style of the proposed plans suits some personal tastes, but views of third parties differ.

CONCLUSION

Members will need to consider whether this two storey dwelling of contemporary design 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 as well as the recently adopted Policy HNTS16. This NP policy states "Proposals for replacement dwellings will be permitted provided that they conserve and enhance landscape and scenic beauty and are appropriate to their location in the Norfolk Coast AONB and provided that they do not result in a net increase of more than 40% of the Gross Internal Floor Area of the original dwelling excluding any outbuildings."

The proposed replacement dwelling is larger than the existing bungalow on site, but in terms of floorspace increase it falls within the parameters set within Policy HNTS16 **following the submission of amended plans (17th September 2021)**. The scale and design of the property is similar to the neighbouring property and will be seen in context to this existing dwelling. The proposal will have some impact upon the character of the AONB in its wider setting as it will be visible in the street scene, but not to a degree that would warrant a refusal of the application.

The position of the outbuilding does not accord with the wording of Policy HNTS16 but, in terms of the planning balance it is considered that, in this case, the outbuilding located at the very end of the garden rather than closer to the dwellinghouse can be supported in terms of layout and would not be odds with surrounding development or have implications for the wider visual characteristics of the AONB. The proposal therefore complies with the aims and objectives of retaining the character of the area.

It is your officer's opinion that the proposal is of high quality, bespoke design that takes reference from a recent contemporary development on the adjacent site. It proposes the use of a mixture of traditional and more modern materials that, along with the cantilevered design, will add interest to the streetscene. In context it is, therefore, considered acceptable in terms of design, scale and use of materials and it sufficiently relates to the neighbouring property and contrasts with the existing surrounding development on Peddars Way.

The plans show that any loss of garden planting can be replaced and enhanced and the implementation of this can be controlled by planning condition.

The applicant has demonstrated that the development will not have a significantly detrimental impact upon the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking, overshadowing or the dwelling being overbearing.

The proposal raises no highway safety issues.

On balance it is considered that the proposal complies with the provisions of the NPPF and local and neighbourhood plan policy, in particular Policies CS06, DM5, DM15 and HNTS1, HNTS11, HNTS16, HNTS17 and HNTS18. 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 plan:
 - Drawing No. 2016-001 Rev P1, Location Plan
 - **Drawing No. 2016-100 Rev P4, Proposed Plans**
 - Drawing No. 2016-110 Rev P3, Proposed Elevations
 - Drawing No. 2016-111 Rev P3, Proposed Roof Plan & Site Sections
 - Drawing No. 2016-112 Rev P2, Proposed Street View
- 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: Any access gates/bollard/chain/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. Any sidewalls/fences/hedges adjacent to the access shall be splayed at an angle of 45 degrees from each of the outside gateposts to the front boundary of the site.
- 4 Reason: In the interests of highway safety enabling vehicles to safely draw off the highway before the gates/obstruction is opened.

- 5 Condition: Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the proposed 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.
- 5 Reason: To ensure the permanent availability of the parking/manoeuvring areas, in the interests of satisfactory development and highway safety.
- 6 Condition: The use of the outbuildings hereby approved shall be limited to purposes incidental to the needs and personal enjoyment of the occupants of the dwelling and shall at no time be used as an independent unit of residential accommodation or for business or commercial purposes.
- 6 Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the building is not used for unrelated purposes that would be incompatible with the provisions of the NPPF.
- 7 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.
- 7 Reason: To ensure that the work is carried out within a reasonable period in accordance with the NPPF.
- 8 Condition: Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, details of the method of external lighting and extent of illumination shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting scheme shall be implemented as approved prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter maintained and retained as agreed.
- 8 Reason: In the interests of minimising light pollution and to safeguard the amenities of the locality in accordance with the NPPF.