

AGENDA ITEM NO 9/2(a)

| | | |
|----------------------|--|--|
| Parish: | Brancaster | |
| Proposal: | Proposed extension, an increase of ridge height for loft conversion and renovation of the existing dwelling | |
| Location: | Quexcroft Cross Lane Brancaster King's Lynn PE31 8AE | |
| Applicant: | Mr And Mrs Insch | |
| Case No: | 23/00384/F (Full Application) | |
| Case Officer: | Connor Smalls | Date for Determination: 17 April 2023 Extension of Time Expiry Date: 10 November 2023 |

Reason for Referral to Planning Committee – Called in by Councillor Lawton and subsequently by Councillor de-Winton.

Neighbourhood Plan: Yes

Case Summary

The application site consists of a detached bungalow dwelling and associated parking area to the front of the dwelling.

The application proposes an extension to the existing side projection between the main house and garage with a new pitched roof as well as an extension to the rear in place of the current conservatory, an increase of ridge height of the main dwelling for a loft conversion and renovation of the existing dwelling.

The application has been amended over time to seek to address concerns regarding the design and materials of the dwelling. The site is not located within the Conservation Area, but it is adjacent.

Key Issues

Principle of development
Form and character
Impact on neighbour amenity
Parking
Any other matters requiring consideration prior to determination of the application

Recommendation

APPROVE

THE APPLICATION

The application site consists of an existing detached bungalow set within a moderate plot with parking to the front. This is located on the corner of Branodunum and Cross Lane within Brancaster. The site is residential in character with neighbouring dwellings to the east, west and south of the site as well as across the road to the north. This location lies outside of but adjacent to the Conservation Area.

The application proposes an extension to the existing side projection between the main house and garage with a new raised pitched roof and one rear roof light. To the rear, a single storey, shallow hipped roof extension is proposed in place of the current conservatory. To the main dwelling, an increase of ridge height is proposed for a loft conversion alongside two sets of roof lights on the front and one to the rear. Alterations are also proposed to the fenestration across the dwelling. Materials include bricks and pantiles to match existing as well as natural cladding to the rear extension.

The proposed development has been amended over time to seek to address concerns regarding the design and materials of the dwelling and a balanced recommendation is now for approval.

SUPPORTING CASE

No specific submission at time of writing, should a statement be submitted, this will be included within late correspondence.

PLANNING HISTORY No recent history available.

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

Parish Council: No objection:

After objecting to the original scheme, the Parish Council have subsequently raised no objection.

Conservation Officer: OBJECT (Summarised for clarity):

Original Comment:

The Branodunum Estate was designed between 1974 and 1979 by Marshman, Warren and Taylor Architects of Northamptonshire for Fourth Avenue Estates of Northamptonshire. Arthur A.J Marshman, a senior partner and founding member in the firm designed and built a house for himself at Horton, Northamptonshire in 1966 which, in Sept 2012 became a grade II listed building. One of the reasons for listing was the clearly influenced works of Frank Lloyd Wright and, the involvement of AAJ Marshman himself. He also designed an extension to the Chapter House at Truro Cathedral in 1974, around the same time that the first application for Branodunum was submitted.

While the designs for the houses within this development can be considered to be “of their time” they have been remarkably little altered and examples of each of the house types identified at present can be easily found within the estate. There have been remarkably few losses of these building and while alterations have clearly taken place over time, the architectural integrity of the estate as a whole remains intact.

The proposal would radically alter the scale and form of the buildings designed by a nationally known architectural firm. This would erode the architectural integrity of the estate.

We would also argue that the Branodunum Estate could be considered as a non designated heritage asset. The definition of a non-designated heritage asset is;

locally-identified 'buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified by plan making bodies as having a degree of heritage significance meriting consideration in planning decisions but which do not meet the criteria for designated heritage assets' (PPG)

The Branodunum estate has been designed by a nationally important architect firm with certain evidence of his involvement, to an interesting design which survives remarkably intact. This gives the estate architectural, historical and evidential significance. Further research is required to see whether it meets the criteria for inclusion as a conservation area.

Latest comment to final submission:

The plans have now altered to increase the ridge height of the existing building, alter the fenestration and add roof lights. While this represents a welcome change to the plans previously submitted and retains much of the original form, the proportions have been altered and the wall to roof ratio no longer represents the same proportions as the original.

Given the originality of the existing building and its 1970's design intent, the raising of the ridge still represents a significant change to the design and therefore, while we appreciate the architect's efforts to minimise the visual change, we consider that the scheme would still represent harm to the significance of an estate which retains much of the Marshman, Warren and Taylor characteristics. We are therefore unable to support this application.

We appreciate there is a planning balance to be undertaken and therefore suggest that the application is determined in accordance with national and local planning guidance and policy.

REPRESENTATIONS (summarised for clarity)

To final Submission: **TWELVE** public **SUPPORT** comments regarding:

- Development would be sympathetic enhance the property within out disadvantage to others.
- Alterations are minimal.
- Improvement compared to current dwelling.
- The edge of the estate location would not impact or change the immediate area.
- Design appears to be in keeping with the local area and character and would improve the area and estate rather than cause harm.
- Many houses on the estate have had substantial changes and the changes proposed to this property are minimal in comparison.
- Many of the properties have been improved with additions whether by adding a storey to a bungalow, adding balconies, porches, additional rooms at first floor level, and at ground level.
- The variety that is now being seen on Branodunum rather than a uniform design is a positive.
- The Estate was only built during the 70's 80's and 90's, and although it is a very pleasant estate both to look at and to live in, we wouldn't have thought it warranted Listed status.

To original submission: **NINE** public **SUPPORT** comments regarding:

- Development would improve the aesthetics of the house and not impact the feel of the area.
- The design is attractive and an improvement compared to the current property.
- The development would improve the house, nearby properties and the wider estate and locality.
- The development is sympathetically designed with neighbouring dwellings in mind.
- What is proposed is minor compared to what other properties have done in the area.
- *Family needs.
- *The property had a major leak which flooded and made it uninhabitable. It makes sense to make the alterations at the same time as restoring the property.

LDF CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

CS01 - Spatial Strategy

CS02 - The Settlement Hierarchy

CS06 - Development in Rural Areas

CS08 - Sustainable Development

SITE ALLOCATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES PLAN 2016

DM1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

DM15 – Environment, Design and Amenity

DM17 - Parking Provision in New Development

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN POLICIES

Policy 1 - Appropriate Housing

Policy 2 - Design, Style and Materials

Policy 3 - Footprint for New and Redeveloped Dwellings

Policy 4 - Parking Provision

Policy 5 - Replacement and Extended Dwellings

Policy 8 - Protection of Heritage Assets and Views

Policy 10: Protection and Enhancement of the Natural Environment and Landscape

NATIONAL GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
National Design Guide 2021

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main considerations are:

- *Principle of development
- *Form and Character
- *Impact on neighbour amenity
- *Parking
- *Any other matters requiring consideration prior to determination of the application

Principle of Development:

This application proposes alterations and additions to an existing dwelling, all within the plot of an existing residential unit. As such, the principle of development is acceptable subject to compliance with neighbourhood, local and national policy.

Form and Character:

The application originally proposed the rendering of the main dwelling, use of cladding, an increase in roof height to the main part of the dwelling to approx. 6.5m from approx. 5m, two flat roof front dormers and a roof light, three rear rooflights, a rear single storey extension, increased side projection with a hipped roof alongside an enlarged pitched roof porch to the front.

In association with the consultation response from the Conservation Officer, it was considered that this was unacceptable based on the clear house types and architectural integrity across the estate and the remaining legibility of these despite many types of alterations.

It is also stated by the Conservation Officer that “it is also argued that the Branodunum Estate could be considered as a non-designated heritage asset.”

At this time is not considered that the estate as a whole is a non-designated heritage asset in of itself based on the criteria set out within the PPG, it is recognised that the estate is of a cohesive and planned design and, there is a clear character and set of design styles throughout. This is an important consideration within the determination of this application. It is however also noted that there have been many alterations across the estate which have fundamentally altered the form and character of individual dwellings and by virtue, the wider estate. Dwellings within the estate also benefit from various permitted development rights and based on the current situation, change to the original dwellings is not exclusively unacceptable and cannot be wholesale resisted. It is also important to note that each application is determined on its own merits given the factors of the individual case.

Amendments have explored different design options and the final proposal consists of an extension to the existing single storey side projection between the main house and garage with a new raised pitched roof and one rear roof light. To the rear, a single storey, shallow hipped roof extension is proposed in place of the current conservatory. To the main dwelling, an increase of ridge height is proposed for a loft conversion (now from approx. 5m to approx.

6.1m for an increase of approx. 1.1m) which would result in an asymmetric roof with the rear eaves higher than the front alongside two roof lights on the front and one to the rear. Brick detailing under the eaves is retained as is a chimney to the west of the main element of the dwelling.

Alterations and additions are also proposed to the fenestration across the dwelling which would see a central front door with two side lights within the porch, deeper front windows, one window and one door to the extended side projection all to the front. To the western side, a door would be replaced by a window and the rear extension would have a side window. To the east, there would be one window and one door with a large, glazed area to the rear extension. To the south, the existing garage would have a door in place of a window, the side projection would have glazed bifold doors, the rear extension would have a large, glazed section/doors and there are two large windows to the rear of the main dwelling in place of existing. The changes in window proportions and windows to doors (and vice versa) to the main dwelling would likely be permitted development not requiring permission in their own right. Materials include bricks and pantiles to match existing as well as cladding to the rear extension.

The application would be within the 50% plot coverage requirement of the Brancaster Neighbourhood Plan (Policy 3 and 5) and the height increase is considered visually acceptable as explored above as well as having an acceptable amenity impact as explained below (Policy 5). Alongside this, it is not considered that the level of rooflights proposed, within the existing residential estate/ area of the village, would have a significantly adverse impact on dark skies that could warrant refusal. The Parish Council do not object on this matter.

The Conservation Officer maintains that they do not support the application as set out above. It is not noted within this response that the proposal would harm the adjacent Conservation Area.

However, taking into the account the amendments made it is considered that the use of materials, form and the reduced alterations to the front elevation as well as the pitched side projection all work towards a more in keeping design within the design ethos and character of the estate. Elements such as the existing porch, brick detailing under the eaves, chimney and asymmetric roof design as noted above all relate to the wider estate.

With this taken into account, whilst the ridge would be raised and the dwelling altered, it is considered that the design is acceptable. The design takes design inspiration from the established character of the estate and the planned development types whilst adapting the dwelling for future use. Paragraph 130 (c) of the NPPF states that decisions should ensure that developments “are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change”. In this instance, it is considered taking a balanced view, that the development would now be in accordance with this decision-making requirement.

It is therefore considered that the application would be visually acceptable and be in accordance with Policies CS08 and CS12 of the Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016 as well as Policy 1,2,3,5,8 and 10 of the Brancaster Neighbourhood Plan, the National Design Guide and NPPF.

Impact on Neighbour Amenity:

The proposed works are either over the existing footprint of the dwelling or small-scale increases. The proposed extension to the side would be between the existing garage and

main dwelling, set back from the front elevation of the main part of the dwelling. The ridge of this side projection would increase by approx. 0.8m. This projection would remain set away from the boundary at approx. 4.8m from the mid-point to the boundary over the existing garage and approx. 5.4m to the neighbouring dwelling. At the closest point to the shared boundary, the neighbouring dwelling consists of a garage with one side window serving this space. It is therefore not considered that an unacceptable impact would arise in this regard.

To the rear, the single storey extension in place of the existing conservatory is not a significant increase in size and scale and remains set away from all boundaries. This separation and single storey height would have an acceptable impact in regard to amenity.

To the main element of the dwelling, the height would be increased from approx. 5m to approx. 6.1m (an approx. 1.1m increase) creating the new first floor in what would be a 1.5m storey building. To the east, there is a separation from the main element of the dwelling being raised to the neighbour's garage (the closest part of the neighbouring built form) of approx. 8m with further separation to the dwelling and garden. There is a separation of approx. 9.7m to the southern boundary and approx. 8.5m to the western boundary. At first floor, the new roof space would be served by two sets of rooflights to the front for the bedrooms and one set to the rear serving a bathroom. The front facing rooflights would have no overlooking impact as they would face the front of the plot and the road beyond. The rooflight set to the rear serving the bathroom would be conditioned on any approval to be fitted with obscured glazing to prevent any overlooking or amenity impact.

All new ground floor windows and doors would be screened by existing boundary treatment (generally approx. 1.8m close board fence with various vegetation) and/or not face towards any private amenity space creating no adverse impacts.

Overall, the development is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy CS08 of the Core Strategy 2011 and DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016.

Parking:

The proposed dwelling would result in a total of four bedrooms. Norfolk County Council Parking Standards require 3 spaces for a 4 or more bedroom unit and the plans demonstrate three parking spaces to the front of the dwelling alongside the existing retained garage. Whilst parking would be to the front of the dwelling in the front garden area facing the road, this would be similar to existing and neighbouring properties across the estate and street scene. This would be in accordance with NCC Parking Standards, Policy DM17 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016 and Policy 4 of the Brancaster Neighbourhood Plan.

Other matters requiring consideration prior to the determination of this application:

Third Party Comments

It is considered that the majority of support comments are addressed within the above report. It is important to note that it is not proposed to apply or otherwise grant Listed status to the estate. The Conservation Officer suggested in their original response that the estate could be considered a non-designated heritage asset however, this is explored above. The justification regarding family needs and the flooding of the property are noted however are not directly relevant to the determination of the application on its planning merits.

CONCLUSION:

Overall, it is not considered that the amended design would create an incongruous or overly out of keeping development. Whilst the Conservation Teams comments are well founded, given the changes made and details retained within the final design, the dwelling would be seen within the context of the estate and it is considered that , taking a balanced view, the proposal is acceptable and the application would be in accordance with Policies CS08 and CS12 of the Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016 as well as Policy 1,2,3,5,8 and 10 of the Brancaster Neighbourhood Plan, the National Design Guide and NPPF. It is also considered that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on neighbour amenity and parking would accord with both Norfolk County Council parking requirements and Neighbourhood Plan requirements. The development is therefore also in accordance with Policy CS08 of the Core Strategy 2011 and DM15 and DM17 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016 as well as NCC Parking Standards and Policy 4 of the Brancaster Neighbourhood Plan.

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: PROPOSED AND EXISTING PLANS, Drawing Number: INS01.01.04.
- 2 Reason For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
- 3 Condition The brick and pantiles to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match, as closely as possible, the type, colour and texture those used for the construction of the existing building.
- 3 Reason To ensure a satisfactory external appearance and grouping of materials in accordance with Policy CS08 of the Core Strategy 2011, DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Polices Plan 2016, Policy 2 of the Brancaster Neighbourhood Plan and the principles of the NPPF.
- 4 Condition Before the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the set of roof lights to the rear (south) of the main part of the dwelling serving the bathroom shall be fitted with obscured glazing and any part of the set for roof lights that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be non-opening. The set of roof lights shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.
- 4 Reason To protect the residential amenities of the occupiers of nearby property in accordance with Policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Polices Plan 2016 and the NPPF.