

<b>Parish:</b>	Ingoldisthorpe	
<b>Proposal:</b>	The subdivision of a bungalow into two dwellings by utilising an existing annexe extension as a separate dwelling house .	
<b>Location:</b>	Morzine Ingoldsby Avenue Ingoldisthorpe King's Lynn PE31 6NH	
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr S Hipkin	
<b>Case No:</b>	22/01813/F (Full Application)	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Connor Smalls	<b>Date for Determination:</b> 15 December 2022 <b>Extension of Time Expiry Date:</b> 9 January 2023

**Reason for Referral to Planning Committee** – Called in by Councillor Bubb

**Neighbourhood Plan:** No

### Case Summary

The application seeks full planning permission for the subdivision of an existing dwelling and attached annexe into two individual dwellings. The site is located within the Ingoldisthorpe area, outside of the development boundary within an existing residential estate/area.

### Key Issues

Principle of Development  
 Form and Character  
 Impact on Neighbour Amenity  
 Impact on Highways Safety  
 Any other material considerations

### Recommendation

**REFUSE**

## THE APPLICATION

The application site is situated on the south side of Ingoldsby Avenue within wider Ingoldisthorpe, and currently consists of a single storey dwelling with an attached annexe. The site is set outside of the development boundary for Ingoldisthorpe within an existing residential area.

The application seeks full planning permission for the subdivision of the existing dwelling and annexe into two individual dwellings and associated works within the site.

**SUPPORTING CASE**

None submitted to date.

**PLANNING HISTORY**

No recent planning history available.

**RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION**

**Parish Council: NO OBJECTION (SUPPORT)**

**Highways Authority:**

Original scheme

An access measuring 4.5m wide was requested, amended plans were requested.

Amended scheme

Thank you for the revised consultation received recently relating to the above development proposal, which detailed a wider access, but indicates that visibility is restricted by a 2.4m high frontage hedge setback less than 2m from the carriageway.

Within the site, parking for Dwelling 1 to the front of the site would preclude turning for Dwelling 2, which does not benefit from any ability to turn within its curtilage, this could be resolved with the addition of turning space alongside the parking spaces removing more of the front garden.

To address the shortfall in emerging visibility would require some works to the frontage hedgerow.

These improvements could be achieved, however, it remains unclear whether the unit is ancillary or whether it is an independent unit already, stated to have paid its own council tax, although our own Mapping layer (AddressBase) does not indicate any separation of the site.

Regardless of the above, I would not be able to justify any objection on highway safety grounds subject to access widening, visibility splays and parking provision which can be conditioned, conditions and an informative are requested to be attached to any consent given.

**Environmental Quality: NO OBJECTION.**

**REPRESENTATIONS: TWO** public **SUPPORT** comments regarding:

- No objections to changes.
- Suitable street scene impact.

**LDF CORE STRATEGY POLICIES**

**CS01** - Spatial Strategy

**CS02** - The Settlement Hierarchy

**CS06** - Development in Rural Areas

**CS08** - Sustainable Development

**CS09** - Housing Distribution

**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

**NATIONAL GUIDANCE**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

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

National Design Guide 2019

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

The main considerations are:

Principle of Development

Form and Character

Impact on Neighbour Amenity

Impact on Highway Safety

Any other material considerations

**Principle of Development**

The application site is outside of the Development Boundary for Ingoldisthorpe as defined within the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016. As such the provision of Policy DM2 of the above plan are relevant. DM2 states:

“Development will be permitted within the development boundaries of settlements shown on the Policies Map provided it is in accordance with the other policies in the Local Plan.

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 to that identified as suitable in rural areas by other policies of the local plan, including

- farm diversification (under Core Strategy Policy CS06);

- small scale employment (under Core Strategy Policy CS10);
- tourism facilities (under Core Strategy Policy CS10);
- community facilities, development in support (under Core Strategy Policy CS13);
- renewable energy generation (under Policy DM20 of the rural economy or to this Plan);
- rural workers' housing (under Policy DM6 of this Plan); and
- affordable housing (under Core Strategy Policy CS09)."

This application proposes none of the above so the principle of development cannot therefore be supported by this policy.

Paragraph 79 of NPPF does however state that:

"To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby."

In this instance, despite the location of the application site within an existing built up area, the development is not considered to be sustainable for reasons outlined below.

### **Form and Character**

This application proposes the subdivision of the existing single storey dwelling and attached annexe. There would be limited external changes to the building with only the loss of the conservatory to the southern elevation. The remainder of the works to the building itself are internal, dividing the dwelling from the annexe.

Externally, works proposed to subdivide the site include a new boundary between the proposed dwellings alongside the provision of new parking areas to provide two spaces to both dwellings.

For dwelling 1, all parking and amenity space would be provided to the north of the dwelling in what was previously the front garden space. Whilst providing appropriate parking, this space to the north would be the only amenity space available for future occupiers. This is already limited and by providing parking to the required standards, the amenity space is eroded further. This is not considered high quality or acceptable development.

For dwelling 2, access would be the same as to dwelling 1 and the driveway would run along the front of both dwellings leading to the parking and garage to the south. Dwelling 2 has a greater level of amenity space, disproportionate compared to dwelling 1. The access to Dwelling 2 is considered to be constrained and fosters a poor relationship between the proposed properties by virtue of always having to pass Dwelling 1. If for any reasons the access serving Dwelling 1 was blocked or otherwise constrained, then you would not be able to exit the parking area for Dwelling 2.

Alongside the above, Norfolk CC Highways comments on the amended scheme require the creation of a turning area for Dwelling 2, eroding further amenity space for the future occupiers of Dwelling 1. Works to the front boundary providing visibility splays would also see the front hedge reduced rendering the front amenity space less than private to the detriment of the occupiers of the proposed property.

Whilst the Parish Council's comments are noted, it is considered that the level of amenity space and relationship between the two proposed dwellings would be poor quality and the

development of two separate dwellings on site would be overly cramped and constrained. The subdivision and small dwellings/plots would also be out of character with the established form of the locality and would further present a poor quality of development. The development is therefore considered to be unsustainable and contrary to Policy CS08 of the Core Strategy 2011, DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016 as well as Paragraph 79 and 134 of the NPPF 2021 and the National Design Guide 2021.

**Impact on Neighbour Amenity**

The use of the site as proposed, whilst intensified, would remain residential. There are no physical works to the building other than the removal of the southern conservatory and internal subdivision. The addition of parking areas would have no impact and any boundary treatment could have details conditioned if the proposal were to be approved. As such, it is not considered that there would be any significant or adverse impact on neighbour amenity.

The proposal would therefore comply with Policy CS08 of the Core Strategy 2011, DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016 and the NPPF in this regard.

**Impact on Highway Safety**

Amended plans have been submitted which demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Highways Officer that there would not be any unacceptable highways impacts. Suggested conditions would be attached to a decision if the proposal were to be approved. As such, there are not considered to be any unacceptable highways impacts and as a result, the proposal complies with CS11 of the Core Strategy 2011 and DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016.

**Any other material considerations**

*Parish Council and Third-Party Support Comments*

Reasons for support are addressed and countered in the above report.

**CONCLUSION**

The application site is outside of the development boundary but is within an established residential area and the principle of development could be acceptable. However, the proposal is not considered to be high quality or sustainable. The development would be of a poor quality, representing small dwellings and a cramped layout, at odds with the character of the locality. The relationship between the two dwellings would also be poor and in order to meet highways requirements, the small provision of amenity space for Dwelling 1 would have a distinct lack of privacy. Therefore, the development is considered to be unacceptable and contrary to Policy CS08 of the Core Strategy 2011, DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016 as well as Paragraphs 79, 134 and the wider provisions of the NPPF 2021 and the National Design Guide 2021.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**REFUSE** for the following reason(s):

## AGENDA ITEM NO

- 1 The application site is outside of the Development Boundary for Ingoldisthorpe as defined within the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016. The development does not accord with any of the provisions within Policy DM2 of the above plan and it is not considered to represent a sustainable form of development. Therefore, the principle of development is unacceptable contrary to Policy DM2 of Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016 as well as Paragraph 79 of the NPPF 2021.
- 2 The proposed development, by reasons of the poor level of amenity space to Dwelling 1, relationship between Dwelling 1 and 2, the subdivision of the plot and the resultant small dwellings and plots, represents a poor quality and cramped form of development at odds with the predominant form and character of the area to the detriment of the amenity of future residents and the locality as a whole. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Paragraph 134 of the NPPF 2021, the National Design Guide 2021 as well as Policy CS08 of the Core Strategy 2011 and DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016.