

Application for Determination

Parish	Horning		
Reference	BA/2013/0371/FUL	Target date	16 January 2014
Location	Roseberry, Ropes Hill, Horning		
Proposal	Adaptations, 2-storey side extension, and additional floor to existing chalet bungalow.		
Applicant	Mr Alan Smith		
Recommendation	Approve subject to conditions		
Reason for referral to Committee	Objections received		

1 Description of Site and Proposals

- 1.1 The application site is a dwelling Roseberry on Ropes Hill, Horning. Ropes Hill is the A1062 road running between Hoveton and Ludham and provides the main approach to Horning from Hoveton. The dwelling lies on the southern side of the road within a ribbon of residential development that varies in scale, age and style but these are largely substantial detached dwellings within large curtilages, many of which extend down to Ropes Hill Dyke to the south. The site is within the development boundary and not in a Conservation Area.
- 1.2 The existing dwelling is a chalet bungalow that extends across almost the entire width of the plot, set back approximately 20 metres from the road within the 130 metre deep plot. The dwelling, which dates from the mid-twentieth century, has an integrated double garage on the eastern side and has been the subject of various alterations and additions. At the centre of the hipped roof there is a flat roof section over first floor accommodation which has two window openings on the southwest elevation. The ridge height is approximately 5 metres above the adjacent ground level which drops considerably to the dyke to the south. The dwelling is constructed of red brick under a plain tile roof with a variety of window materials. Within the curtilage there is a boathouse in a cut off the dyke and a number of small ancillary buildings. Mature landscaping exists to the front and rear of the dwelling and along the boundaries.
- 1.3 To the west, the neighbouring dwelling is a substantial two storey dwelling with detached double garage on the eastern boundary. Further to the west the

dwellings are a storey and a half and two storey in scale and have curtilages extending to Ropes Hill Dyke. To the east, the neighbouring dwelling is a chalet bungalow with limited first floor accommodation and beyond this there are further bungalows. The curtilages of these dwellings, whilst large, do not extend to the dyke, where there is a further line of residential development, predominantly two storey in scale.

- 1.4 The application proposes extensions and alterations to the existing dwelling to provide first floor accommodation across the whole dwelling. The existing footprint would be adjusted to remove additions on the front, rear and western side elevation and the dwelling would be set in approximately 2 metres further from the eastern boundary. On the eastern side, an integral double garage would be retained, over which a full two storey height extension would be constructed with gables to the front and rear and a ridge height of approximately 8.5 metres above ground level. This ridge height would continue at right angles across the remainder of the dwelling with a lower eaves height to provide accommodation within the roof space with dormer windows on the front and rear elevations. An open sided porch is proposed on the front elevation under a projecting gable and a chimney is proposed on the northwest elevation.
- 1.5 First floor windows are proposed in each side elevation and these would be obscure glazed. The walls would be rendered over a brick plinth and the roof would have clay tiles, all windows and doors would be painted timber. No existing trees are to be removed.

2 Site History

- 2.1 No known planning history.

3 Consultation

Broads Society – Response awaited.

Parish Council – Noted that objections had been received from parishioners. Agreed that refusal should be recommended on the grounds that the proposed plan is out of proportion with the existing property and adjoining properties and would have a detrimental visual impact on the approach to the village.

District Member – No response.

Anglian Water – No response.

4 Representations

- 4.1 One letter received in support and three objections on the basis of scale being inappropriate to the area and adverse impacts on amenity of adjoining occupiers.

5 Policies

- 5.1 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.

Adopted Core Strategy (2007)

[Core Strategy \(Adopted Sept 2007\).pdf](#)

CS1 – Landscape Protection and Enhancement

Adopted Development Management Policies (2011)

[DMP DPD - Adoption version.pdf](#)

DP1 – Natural Environment
DP2 – Landscape and Trees
DP3 – Water Quality and Resources
DP4 – Design

- 5.2 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.

Adopted Development Management Policies (2011)

DP28 – Amenity

6 Assessment

- 6.1 In terms of assessment, the principle of extensions and alterations to an existing dwelling is acceptable and it is therefore necessary to consider the scale, form, design and materials proposed, the impact on the character of the area, amenity, ecology and trees.
- 6.2 In terms of scale, the proposal represents a significant increase, creating a first floor across the whole dwelling. The footprint would be marginally decreased by rationalising some additions to the original dwelling but the extension upwards would result in a significantly larger dwelling in terms of mass. There is no consistent scale or style to the dwellings along Ropes Hill and given this mixed pattern of development and the position within a development boundary, it is considered that a substantial increase in scale is not inappropriate. The scale would relate more to the storey and a half and two storey dwellings to the west, than the bungalows to the east, but given the size of the curtilage and visual context this is considered acceptable. Concerns have been raised that the scale of the proposal is not appropriate to the area, however this is not considered to be the case

when looking at the development along Ropes Hill and on Ropes Hill Dyke as a whole and the scale is certainly not unprecedented.

- 6.3 The proposed design rationalises and harmonises the existing openings to the dwelling and the adaptations and extensions would appear as one cohesive dwelling. The detailed design is therefore considered acceptable as are the materials which are considered appropriate to the character of the area. In accordance with Development Management Policy DP4, the design is considered acceptable.
- 6.4 The site is not in the Horning Conservation Area, which is located over 15 metres to the southeast along the River Bure. Whilst the elevated position of the dwelling relative to the adjacent dyke network and river makes it more prominent in the local landscape, due to the siting of neighbouring dwellings and tree cover, there would be no direct views from the Conservation Area and thus no adverse impacts on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 6.5 In terms of amenity, the objections received are concerned that the proposal would result in overlooking and overshadowing. First floor openings are proposed on all elevations, with obscure glazing proposed to the two southeast side elevation windows (one to a bedroom and one to a bathroom) and one northwest side elevation bedroom window. Whilst this would mitigate any overlooking when closed, the objections note that these are casement windows which could be opened. Nevertheless, these windows are not to primary living accommodation and, with the exception of the bathroom, are not the only openings to these rooms. The front and rear elevation windows would give views to the less private areas of curtilage – those to the roadside and furthest from the dwelling – and first floor windows exist on the rear elevation of the current dwelling. Due to the drop in levels, two dwellings fronting Ropes Hill Dyke to the southeast are visible from the site, but it is considered that there is sufficient distance (over 40 metres) to mitigate any overlooking of these properties. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposal would increase the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy to the neighbouring dwellings each side, it is considered that the nature of the use of these rooms and proposed obscure glazing would satisfactorily mitigate any unacceptable impacts on amenity.
- 6.6 There would be a distance of approximately 7 metres to the neighbouring dwelling to the west with the neighbouring dwellings detached double garage on approximately the same alignment to the north as the dwelling which is subject of the application. There are no side elevation windows to the neighbouring dwelling and any overshadowing of the nearest front elevation windows and a small area of the front curtilage would be for a relatively short period of the day when the sun is due east. It is not therefore considered that the proposal would result in any unacceptable overshadowing or overbearing impact and the proposal is not unacceptable in respect of amenity, in accordance with Development Management Policy DP28 which is considered sufficiently consistent with

the National Planning Policy Framework to be given weight in the determination of this application.

- 6.7 In order to maintain control over the addition of new openings or further alterations and extensions, it is considered necessary to remove permitted development rights.
- 6.8 A Protected Species Survey has been submitted which identifies the roofspace of the dwelling has been used by bats, but not for roosting. Appropriate mitigation measures are proposed and subject to securing these and enhancements by condition, it is not considered the proposal would adversely affect protected species in accordance with Development Management Policy DP1.
- 6.9 In order to ensure the retained trees are not adversely affected and continue to screen the neighbouring dwellings, it is considered necessary to secure appropriate protection measures by condition and subject to this the proposal is considered acceptable in accordance with Development Management Policy DP2.
- 6.10 The proposal would reduce the number of bedrooms from five to four and maintain the same number of bathrooms, thus not creating any additional demands on the sewerage system, in accordance with Development Management Policy DP3.

7 Conclusion

- 7.1 The application proposes a significant reordering of an existing dwelling to substantially increase its scale. Whilst it is appreciated that there is local concern that this is not appropriate to the character of the area, given the mixed pattern of development and size of the plot, the proposed scale is considered acceptable. The detailed design and materials are also considered appropriate to the area and, subject to conditions, no adverse impacts on ecology or trees are considered to result. Opportunities for overlooking and overshadowing could potentially increase, however, due to the siting of neighbouring dwellings, disposition and use of openings and proposed obscure glazing, it is not, on balance, considered that any unacceptable impacts would result to justify a refusal on the basis of amenity.

8 Recommendation

- 8.1 Approve subject to conditions:
- (i) Standard time limit
 - (ii) In accordance with submitted plans
 - (iii) Samples of materials to be submitted
 - (iv) Obscure glazing to first floor side elevation windows and bathroom and en suite
 - (v) Tree protection measures
 - (vi) Ecological mitigation measures

- (vii) Ecological enhancements
- (viii) Remove permitted development rights

9 Reason for Recommendation

- 9.1 The proposal is considered to be acceptable in accordance with Policies DP1, DP2, DP3, DP4 and DP28 of the adopted Development Management Policies DPD (2011) and Policy CS1 of the adopted Core Strategy (2007) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) which is a material consideration in the determination of this application.

Background papers: Application File BA/2013/0371/FUL

Author: Maria Hammond
Date of report: 12 December 2013

List of Appendices: APPENDIX 1 – Location Plan

APPENDIX 1

