

## **Application for Determination**

<b>Parish</b>	Brundall
<b>Reference</b>	BA/2014/0127/HOUSEH
<b>Target date</b>	23 May 2014
<b>Location</b>	21 Riverside Estate, Brundall
<b>Proposal</b>	Alterations, extension and pitched roof to dwelling
<b>Applicant</b>	Miss L Dent
<b>Recommendation</b>	Approve subject to conditions
<b>Reason for referral to Committee</b>	Objection received

## **1 Description of Site and Proposals**

- 1.1 The application site is a chalet at 21 Riverside Estate, Brundall. The Riverside Estate lies to the east of the River Yare at Brundall, south of the rail line. On the riverfront, the development consists of approximately 70 modest, detached single storey chalets which vary in age and appearance, but are generally of lightweight construction and maximise the river fronting aspect.
- 1.2 The application site is a larger than average plot, measuring approximately 15 metres wide and 13 metres deep. The chalet is sited to the rear of the plot, off centre to the northern side, and is rectangular in footprint with a low monopitch felted roof. The timber cladding and windows are painted blue and a raised veranda extends across most of the river (west) elevation. South of the chalet, there is space to park one or two cars and this area and the frontage between the veranda and riverside boardwalk have a gravel surface.
- 1.3 The application proposes extensions and alterations to the existing chalet. The footprint would be extended 1.5 metres to the west, closer to the river, resulting in total footprint of 7 metres by 8.8 metres. A 1 metre wide veranda would extend across the whole river elevation and return on the south elevation to give access to a door. The existing monopitch roof would be replaced with a gabled roof at a ridge height of 4.8 metres with the ridge running across the plot, north-south.
- 1.4 The existing window openings are also proposed to be rearranged to correspond with an internal reordering of the accommodation. This would remove two existing windows on the north elevation and provide larger openings on the rear (east) elevation. Fibre cement slates are proposed to the

new roof with colour stained weatherboarding to the walls and powder coated aluminium windows and doors.

- 1.5 In front of the veranda, dredged material is proposed to be used to raise eroded and sunken areas, over which decking is proposed.

## **2 Site History**

- 2.1 No known planning history.

## **3 Consultation**

Broads Society – No objections

Parish Council – This application is for general improvements to an existing riverside chalet at 21 Riverside Estate comprising alterations plus an extension and pitched roof to the chalet. We recommend that the PC should support this application.

District Member – I support this application and would expect it to be determined by officers favourably.

## **4 Representations**

- 4.1 One representation from the owner of the chalet to the immediate north, objecting on the basis that the scale and siting of the extension would block sun light to a window on the south elevation.

## **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 September 2007 pdf](#)

CS1 – Landscape Protection and Enhancement

Adopted Development Management Policies (2011)

[DevelopmentManagementPoliciesDPD2011](#)

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

- 5.3 Proposed Site Specific Policy BRU1 is also a material consideration in the determination of this policy and, on adoption, will supersede saved Policy BRU1 of the Broads Local Plan (1997). Given the advanced stage of the Proposed Site Specific Policies, it is considered the Proposed Policy can be given the greater weight in the determination of this application.

## **6 Assessment**

- 6.1 The proposed extensions and alterations to an existing dwelling are considered acceptable in principle and the key considerations are the design and impact on amenity.
- 6.2 In terms of scale, the extension would increase the footprint by approximately 27 per cent. This is a larger than average plot for this area and it is considered the increased footprint would retain an appropriate distance from the river and would not result in an overdevelopment of the plot, in accordance with criteria (c) (i), (ii) and (iii) of Proposed Site Specific Policy BRU1. The scale would also be increased by the addition of the dual-pitched roof and whilst the height would increase by approximately 1.8 metres, this would be only 0.7 metres higher than the chalet to the north and this roof form is considered to be an improvement in the appearance of the chalet in accordance with criteria (b) (i) and (c) (iv) of Proposed Policy BRU1. The scale and form of the extended and altered chalet are also considered appropriate to the site in accordance with Development Management Policy DP4.
- 6.3 The area of the veranda would be reduced by approximately half, although a new deck would be added to the area between the veranda and boardwalk. This deck is proposed be broken up with areas of planting and the remainder of the plot would remain as existing with a gravel surface and the proposed hard surfacing is considered acceptable in accordance with criteria (b) (iii) and (iv) of Proposed Policy BRU1.
- 6.4 Coloured stained weatherboarding and colour coated aluminium windows and doors are considered appropriate for this area in principle, subject to the precise colours used, and the retention of colour will contribute to the holiday character of the area, in accordance with criterion (b) (i) of Proposed Policy BRU1 and Policy DP4.
- 6.5 The floor level of the extension would match the existing and appropriate flood resilience measures are proposed in accordance with criterion (a) of Proposed Policy BRU1.
- 6.6 With regard to amenity, it should be noted that this series of chalets are relatively densely grouped and this combined with the largely open river frontages means they do not generally enjoy a high degree of privacy. The

proposed extension is to the west of the chalet, directly south of a window opening in the side (south) elevation of the chalet to the north. As a result, the chalet would extend to a position approximately halfway across this window and approximately 2 metres from it and the veranda would extend 1 metre closer than the existing. This window is to the living room of that chalet which also has double doors opening to a veranda on the west (river) elevation.

- 6.7 In terms of overlooking, this may be reduced as a result of the proposal as the veranda would provide less space for seating than at present. However, the orientation of the extension would result in some overshadowing to the living room window. It would not block all the light to this window and this room does benefit from sunlight, albeit less direct, through double doors on the west elevation. The neighbour has objected and made suggestions as to how his objection could be overcome. Having considered this, the applicant has chosen to proceed with the original proposal and, on balance, taking into account the benefit of the reduced impacts from the veranda and the remaining sources of sunlight to the neighbour's living room, it is not considered that the impacts on amenity would be unacceptable or justify a refusal with reference to Development Management Policy DP28 or criterion (b) (ii) of Proposed Policy BRU1. It is noted the neighbouring chalet is used as a holiday let (and the periods of occupation are limited by planning condition), however the reduction in the view of the river and any associated impact on lettings are not material considerations in the determination of this application.

## **7 Conclusion**

- 7.1 The proposed extensions and alterations are considered to result in an improvement in the appearance of this chalet that would retain the lightweight holiday character that is characteristic of this area and would not result in overdevelopment of the plot. It is acknowledged that there would be some loss of direct sunlight to the neighbouring chalet to the north, however, on balance this is not considered to be of such a degree that it would unacceptably impact on the amenity of the occupiers to justify a refusal of planning permission.

## **8 Recommendation**

- 8.1 Approve subject to conditions:
- (i) Standard time limit
  - (ii) In accordance with submitted plans
  - (iii) Details of the colour of the weatherboarding, balustrade, windows and doors

## **9 Reason for recommendation**

- 9.1 The proposal is considered acceptable in accordance with Policies DP4 and DP28 of the adopted Development Management Policies (2011) and Policy CS1 of the adopted Core Strategy (2007). It is also considered acceptable in accordance with Proposed Policy BRU1 of the Site Specific Policies (2014) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) which are material considerations in the determination of this application.

Background papers: Application File BA/2014/0127HOUSEH

Author: Maria Hammond  
Date of Report: 8 May 2014

List of Appendices: APPENDIX 1 – Location Plan

## APPENDIX 1

**BA/2014/0127/HOUSEH – 21 Riverside Estate, Brundall**  
**Alterations, extension and pitched roof to dwelling**

