

AGENDA ITEM NO: 8/3 (g)

Parish:	Sedgeford	
Proposal:	Outline Application: Construction of a dwelling	
Location:	High House Docking Road Sedgeford Hunstanton	
Applicant:	Mr H Head	
Case No:	16/00977/O (Outline Application)	
Case Officer:	Mr C Fry	Date for Determination: 2 August 2016

Reason for Referral to Planning Committee – Called in by Councillor Wright and Councillor Devereux.

Case Summary

The application site lies within an area designated as Countryside within the local plan proposals maps for Sedgeford.

The application site is on the southern side of Docking Road, Sedgeford in an elevated position above road level. The site contains laurel and conifer hedging and 2 horse chestnut trees.

The application seeks consent for outline planning permission with all matters reserved for the erection of a detached dwelling.

Key Issues

Principle of Development
Impact upon Visual Amenity
Impact upon designated heritage assets
Impact upon Neighbour Amenity
Highway Safety
Other Material Considerations

Recommendation

REFUSE

THE APPLICATION

The application site lies within an area designated as Countryside according to Local Plan Proposals Maps for Sedgeford.

The site is on the southern side of Docking Road, Sedgeford.

The site is in an elevated position above road level and is accessed via a shared drive that serves the donor property – “High House”.

The site contains a laurel and conifer hedging and a Horse chestnut trees

The surrounding development comprises of terraced and detached 2 storey properties constructed prior to the C20th century. The properties are constructed from brick and are painted. The donor property, “High House” is grade II listed and is located to the east. It is constructed from flint with red brick coin detailing with parapet roof. The donor property is two storey in scale and has a number of linked outbuildings.

The proposal seeks outline consent with all matters reserved the construction of a detached dwelling.

An indicative plan has accompanied the application showing a new property sharing the existing access drive to the donor property. The new property is sited slightly back from Docking Road. The indicative scale of the new property is unknown.

Parking is to be provided to the rear of the site.

Albeit all matters are reserved it is highly likely that at least the laurel hedge that runs across the site on a west-east axis will be removed.

SUPPORTING CASE

A design and access statement is not required.

PLANNING HISTORY

16/00834/F: - Conversion of outbuilding to annexe

16/00840/LB - Conversion of outbuilding to annexe

13/01218/LB: Application not required: 16/10/13 - Listed Building Application: installation of an additional 24 photovoltaic solar panels

13/01217/F: Application Permitted: 16/10/13 - Installation of an additional 24 photovoltaic solar panels

13/00645/LB: Application Permitted: 08/07/13 - Conversion of outbuilding to annexe

13/00644/F: Application Permitted: 08/07/13 - Conversion of outbuilding to annexe

11/00258/F: Application Permitted: 10/05/11 - Installation of 18No photovoltaic solar panels to an A frame to the south of the property

11/00259/LB: Application not required: 28/02/11 - Listed building application: Installation of 18No photovoltaic solar panels to an A frame to the south of the property

10/01816/LB: Application Withdrawn: 22/12/10 - Installation of 18No photovoltaic solar panels & removal of 4No solar panels replaced with 2No thermal solar panels

10/01815/F: Permitted Development _App not req'd: 03/11/10 - Installation of 18No photovoltaic solar panels & removal of 4No solar panels replaced with 2No thermal solar panels

2/01/0552/LB: Application Permitted: 25/05/01 - Demolition of internal wall and construction of new internal wall to extend lounge into garage area. Insertion of new timber framed window

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

Parish Council: OBJECTION this proposal is outside the village envelope. Main objections are the access onto the B1454 at this dangerous bend. The current access is dangerous with very poor visibility.

Highways Authority: OBJECTION The access onto the B1454 Docking Road is classified as a Main Distributor route with the NCC route hierarchy and is narrow with limited visibility.

At this location, the B1454 Docking Road is subject to a 40mph local speed restriction, however my assessment is that speeds are marginally in excess of the posted speed limit. At this speed a minimum of 120m needs to be provided in both directions at a 2.4m setback.

Visibility is restricted by the roadside frontage hedgerows to only 8m in the trafficked direction to the east and approximately 5m to the west, from the required 2.4m setback. This equates to only 6% and 4.2% of the required provision available.

The access width is also below the required standard of 4.5m for the first 5m back into the site to allow two way movements to/from the adopted highway, in this case the B1454 Docking Road (classified as a Main Distributor route within the NCC Route Hierarchy), but could be widened to address this concern.

TRICS database indicates that a residential dwelling will typically generate 6 vehicular trips per weekday. This proposal, in addition to the existing movements from the existing property already served via this access track, would if permitted, equate to an increase of 100% vehicular trips per weekday from 6 to 12 via the existing sub-standard access.

Any increase in usage must be prevented.

Even if the hedgerow to the east of the site's access in the applicant's ownership was to be removed and access provided adjacent to littleport cottages, visibility is still restricted. Visibility in the trafficked direction would only be 85m, a shortfall of 35m. A reduction in the standard visibility requirements should be resisted.

Historic Environment Service: NO OBJECTION subject to conditions

Environmental Health & Housing - Environmental Quality: NO OBJECTION

Arboricultural Officer: NO OBJECTION subject to conditions

Conservation officer: NO OBJECTION Although the site is within the curtilage of the listed building the site reads as being separate from its garden because it is physically separated from the grounds of the listed building by virtue of the conifer hedging along the eastern boundary. It would preferable if the property would be single storey or 1 ½ storey so as not to compete with the listed building.

REPRESENTATIONS

None received

NATIONAL GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework – sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

National Planning Practice Guidance - Provides National Planning Practice Guidance, in support of and in addition to the NPPF

PLANNING POLICIES

The King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan (1998) contains the following saved policies that are relevant to the proposal:

8/1 - indicates that individual and small groups of dwellings will be permitted in settled or built-up areas of villages defined as Built Environment Types C and D.

LDF CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

CS01 - Spatial Strategy

CS02 - The Settlement Hierarchy

CS06 - Development in Rural Areas

CS08 - Sustainable Development

CS09 - Housing Distribution

CS11 - Transport

CS12 - Environmental Assets

SITE ALLOCATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES PRE-SUBMISSION DOCUMENT

DM1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

DM2 – Development Boundaries

DM15 – Environment, Design and Amenity

DM17 - Parking Provision in New Development

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations in regards to the pre-application are:-

- Principle of Development
- Impact upon Visual Amenity
- Impact upon designated heritage assets
- Impact upon Neighbour Amenity
- Highway Safety

- Other Material Considerations

Principle of Development

The application seeks consent for 1 dwelling with all matters reserved.

Sedgeford is classified as a “Rural Village” according to Policy CS02 – The Settlement Hierarchy. The application site lies within an area designated as Countryside according to the 1998 Local Plan Proposals Maps for Sedgeford.

Being a “rural village” as opposed to a smaller village and hamlet Sedgeford does not benefit from Policy DM 3 of the Draft Development Management Plan Policy – “development in smaller village and hamlets” and the allowance for sensitive infill development.

Accordingly, paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework applies in this instance, and with no special circumstances being put forward in this application and the Council announcing in April that it has a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites; the development is not supported in principle.

Impact upon Visual Amenity

The site is on the southern side of Docking Road, Sedgeford. This part of Docking Road, has funnelled views leading out of the village. There is a strong sense of enclosure by virtue of the elevated land and the tall trees and high hedges either side of Docking Road. The road sweeps away from the site.

The donor property is grade II listed and is to the east of the site. The donor property is constructed from flint and red brick. The property has a number of outbuildings physically linked to it. The properties to the west of the site, leading up the hill and out of Sedgeford, are mainly two storey in scale and constructed 19th century. These properties generally have a painted finish. A row of two storey cottages to the south west of the site are also constructed circa 19th century.

The site shares its access with the donor property. The access is flanked on either side by significant hedging. The site is already physically separated from the donor property by virtue of the conifer hedge on the eastern side of the site. A laurel hedge runs across the site on a west-east access and two horse chestnut trees are located on the site. Further tree planting has taken place on land to the south of the site.

The indicative site plan shows a roughly square parcel of land with a detached dwelling house towards the front of the site with parking and turning area to the rear.

No information has been provided in regards to the scale of the property or its appearance.

The indicative site plan states that the access to the donor property will also serve the proposed dwelling. However, access is a matter reserved for consideration at a later stage.

The National Planning Policy Framework requires development to be of good design, function well and add to the overall quality of the area for the lifetime of the development. Permission should be refused that is of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

In this particular proposal, the plots size is considered to be acceptable. Whilst siting is a matter reserved for consideration at a later stage, the indicative siting of a dwelling in this location would not cause detrimental form and character issues.

Impact upon designated heritage assets

S.66 of the Town and Country Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act 1990 requires Local Planning Authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting. No heritage statement has been submitted with the application in order to aid in the determination of whether there is any harm caused to the setting of the listed building and if that harm is substantial in accordance with paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The application site is on lower land than the donor property “High House” listed building and separated from it by virtue of conifer hedging along the eastern boundary. In its indicative position the proposed property would be 47m away from the façade of the donor property. Given the landscaping and change in land heights, it is considered that there is little material impact upon the setting of the listed building as a result of the erection of a dwelling on this site. The site physically reads as a separate parcel of land to the grounds of the listed building and from a public view point it is not obvious that the site is in the same grounds as High House.

The Conservation Officer’s doesn’t have a principle objection to developing the site. The Conservation Officer considers that the site reads separately from the grounds of High House by virtue of the conifer hedging along the eastern boundary. The Officer considers that the scale of the property ought to be single or 1 ½ storey in order not to compete with the setting of the listed building.

The Historic Environment Service requests that archaeological conditions are imposed on the decision notice.

In accordance with Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework states, where the development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

Impact upon Neighbour Amenity

The siting of the property is not being determined at this stage. It is considered that from the indicative layout there is adequate separation (14m) from Plough Cottage, which is on lower land than the application site, to overcome overshadowing, overbearing and overlooking issues.

The nearest neighbour to the south east is some 20m away from the rear elevation of the indicative siting of the dwelling, an adequate separation. 47m separates the donor property from the northernmost part of the plot.

In all it is considered that there would not be detrimental neighbour amenity issues.

Highway Safety

Access is a matter which is reserved for consideration at a later stage. Indicatively it is detailed that the new property will share the existing access with the donor property.

The Highways Officer comments that sharing the access with donor property or indeed providing a new independent access across the site’s frontage would not be suitable.

The existing access does not benefit from the required visibility splay distance according to the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. At a 2.4m setback on this road, at 40mph, 120m visibility splay distance is required in either direction.

At present the visibility is severely restricted by the roadside hedges to only 8m in the easterly direction and 5m in the westerly direction from the existing access point. This equates to only 6% and 4.2% respectively of the required standard.

Even if the roadside hedging to the east of the site is removed, secured by way of condition, the required visibility in the trafficked direction still cannot be achieved. From the shared access point, only 70m in the trafficked direction can be achieved and from a new access point, adjacent to Plough Cottage, only 85m in the trafficked direction could be achieved if the hedge were to be removed.

The Highways Officer still retains his objection, even if all the hedges in the applicant's control were to be removed as the resultant visibility splay distances are significantly short of the required standard.

Whilst the access can be widened in order to 4.5m wide to allow two way traffic movements to and from the highway, by removing hedges, the proposal would fail the required visibility standards in accordance with the manual for roads and bridges

Therefore the proposal doesn't demonstrate a safe access in accordance with policy CS11 – Transport of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy, and is also contrary to the NPPF given the impacts of this proposal are severe.

Other Material Considerations

The Environmental Health and Housing – Environmental Quality team have no objection to the application. There is no requirement to consult the Environment Agency contrary to the Environmental Health Officer's comments as the site lies within flood zone 1 and the previous uses of the existing site not potentially polluting and nor is the proposed use.

The Arboricultural Officer has no objection in principle to the proposal but would need to see a full tree survey which can be conditioned.

Foul and surface water drainage details can be conditioned.

CONCLUSION

In this case there is a clear in principle objection to this proposal, as the application site lies outside of the defined settlement of Sedgeford. The site is over 370m away from the settlement boundary and little under 1km from the village centre.

With no special circumstances being put forward as justification for the dwelling in accordance with paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the proposal would be contrary to the provisions of the framework, as well as policy CS08 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM 2 of the draft Site Allocation and Development Management Plan Document.

Whilst the proposal is an outline application with all matters reserved, the principle of serving the site with an access that is in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges cannot be achieved. The requirement for 120m in either direction at a 2.4m setback cannot be achieved from the shared access or the provision of a new access on the site's frontage

even when taking into account the possibility of removing the hedging along the roadside frontage of High House. Any access falls well short of this requirement.

Whilst there is little impact on the listed building and a house would not impact on neighbours, for the fundamental objections set out above, the proposal is therefore recommended to be refused for the following reasons.

RECOMMENDATION:

REFUSE for the following reason(s):

- 1 The site lies outside the settlement boundary for Sedgeford as identified by the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan 1998 and the emerging Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Submission Document 2015. The applicant has not provided any special justification why countryside protection should be relaxed. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the provisions of Paragraphs 17 and 55 of the NPPF, Policy CS06 of the Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM 2 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Submission Document 2015.
- 2 Whilst access is a matter reserved for later consideration, the proposal cannot be served with adequate visibility splays in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, from the access to the county highway and this would cause danger and inconvenience to users of the adjoining public highway to the detriment to highway safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy Cs11 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011.