Reference:

BA/2017/0010/HOUSEH

Location

Deerfoot, 76 Lower Street, Horning

BA/2017/0010/HOUSEH - Deerfoot, Lower Street, Horning



Broads Authority Planning Committee 3 March 2017

Application for Determination

Parish	Horning		
Reference	BA/2017/0010/HOUSEH	Target date	29 March 2017
Location	Deerfoot, 76 Lower Street, Horning		
Proposal	Garage and extension		
Applicant	Mr Len Funnell		
Recommendation	Approve subject to conditions		
Reason for referral to Committee	Applicant related to a member of the Navigation Committee		

1 Description of Site and Proposals

- 1.1 The application site is a two storey, detached riverfront dwelling in the village of Horning. The substantial render and timber clad dwelling has an integral boathouse and balconies on the riverfront (west) and north elevations. Mooring cuts to neighbouring properties exist either side and to the north there is a roadside dwelling with a curtilage extending to the river while to the south the neighbouring dwelling is also at the riverfront. A dwelling exists to the immediate rear of the application side, on higher ground at the roadside and these two dwellings and that to the south share an access from the road. They are also all in the same ownership and are currently all let as holiday accommodation. The site is in the Horning Conservation Area.
- 1.2 The application proposes a garage and extension to the dwelling.
- 1.3 The garage would be attached to the northern side of the rear elevation, adjoining a single storey utility room and in an area which is currently grass. This garage would measure approximately 6 metres by 6 metres in footprint and be single storey with a dual pitched roof at approximately 4.5 metres above ground level. It would be rendered to match the lower parts of the dwelling and have a window in the end elevation and large roller shutter door on the south elevation to the existing drive and parking area.
- 1.4 The extension would be on the north elevation where there is an existing ground floor window with first floor Juliet balcony above. It is proposed to add a 2 metre by 4 metre ground floor extension with first floor balcony above.

This would be glazed on the ground floor with double doors opening to a step on the north elevation and the first floor balcony would have a stainless steel and glass balustrade to match existing balconies on the north and west elevations. On the ground floor this extension would be to the existing living room and above it would provide a larger balcony to a bedroom in place of the existing Juliet opening.

2 Site History

BA/2005/1309/HISTAP Erection of two-storey replacement dwelling – Approved subject to conditions

3 Consultation

Parish Council – The Parish Council has reviewed the plans and supports the application. Deerfoot is an excellent example of modern design that empathizes with its riverside location and enhances the appearance of the village. The proposed extension and garage are sympathetically integrated into the building and will not adversely affect other properties or detract from their appearance.

District Member – the application can be determined by the Head of Planning.

Representations

None received at time of writing report, consultation period ongoing.

4 Policies

4.1 The following Policies have been assessed for consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and have been found to be consistent and can therefore be afforded full weight in the consideration and determination of this application.

DEVELOPMENTPLANDOCUMENT

DP4 - Design

4.2 The following Policies have been assessed for consistency with the NPPF and have found to lack full consistency with the NPPF and therefore those aspects of the NPPF may need to be given some weight in the consideration and determination of this application.

DP5 – Historic Environment DP28 – Amenity

4.3 Neighbourhood plans

There is no neighbourhood plan in force for this area.

5 Assessment

- 5.1 The application proposes extensions to a dwelling and these are acceptable in principle. The main considerations are the design, impact on the Conservation Area and impact on amenity.
- 5.2 The existing dwelling is large and by virtue of its position right on the riverfront it has a significant presence in the riverscene and Conservation Area. The two extensions would increase the scale and mass further: however it is considered that the siting and scale of the garage is such that it would be subservient to the dwelling. The north elevation extension is relatively modest and would also be subservient in scale and extend from an existing large window and Juliet balcony feature in this position. It is therefore considered that extensions, by virtue of their scale and siting, would not unacceptably increase the scale and mass of the dwelling and are also appropriate in design and materials. The proposal can therefore be considered acceptable in terms of design in accordance with Policy DP4. It is, however, considered that any further extension of the dwelling may begin to result in overdevelopment of the site and it is considered appropriate to remove permitted development rights for extensions in the interests of managing this.
- 5.3 The garage would be sited to the rear of the dwelling but due to the open western boundary to a dyke it would be visible from the river as you travel downstream and the north elevation extension would also face directly upstream. Neither elevation would be directly visible from the road. As these extensions are considered to be appropriate in design, it is not considered there would be any harm to the Conservation Area and the proposal is considered acceptable in accordance with Policy DP5 and the NPPF with regards heritage assets.
- 5.4 With regards amenity, it is noted that when this dwelling was first proposed (BA/2005/1309/HISTAP) an attached garage of a similar scale and in the same position was included. This design was amended to site the garage further to the south in order to mitigate any adverse impact on the outlook and amenity of the neighbouring dwelling Reedlings immediately to the rear (east). This garage was never built.
- 5.5 Reedlings has been extended and altered since consideration of the original proposal but these changes have not significantly changed its outlook or relationship with the application site. Glimpsed views of the river either side of Deerfoot from the first floor accommodation and terrace would not be affected by the lower garage and it is considered a sufficient distance to the boundary (approximately 5 metres) would mitigate any impact on the enjoyment of the garden. It is not therefore considered the proposed garage would result in any unacceptable impacts on the amenity of the occupiers of this dwelling.

5.6 The first floor balcony to the extension would be large enough to provide seating space whereas the existing Juliet balcony only gives views out in an upstream direction. The proposal would result in views between this balcony and those on the river facing elevations of the dwellings immediately to the rear and that to the north. Given the existing relationship between these dwellings, the existing Juliet balcony and the openness to views from the river, it is not considered this extension and its balcony would result in any additional overlooking or loss of privacy that would be unacceptable. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of amenity in accordance with Policy DP28.

6 Conclusion

6.1 The application proposes extensions to an existing dwelling. It is considered these have been designed to integrate with the existing dwelling and as a result they are considered acceptable in design terms and not to harm the Conservation Area. Whilst there would be some additional opportunity for overlooking of neighbouring dwellings, it is not considered any impact on residential amenity would be unacceptable. Overall, the proposal is considered acceptable.

7 Recommendation

Approve subject to conditions

- (i) Standard time limit
- (ii) In accordance with approved plans
- (iii) Materials to match existing
- (iv) Removed permitted development rights for extensions

8 Reason for recommendation

The proposal is considered acceptable in accordance with Policies DP4, DP5 and DP28 of the adopted Development Management Policies DPD (2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) which is a material consideration in the determination of this application.

List of Appendices: Location Map

Background papers: Application File BA/2017/0010/HOUSEH

Author: Maria Hammond Date of Report: 15 February 2017



