

Application for Determination

Parish Coltishall

Reference: BA/2013/0096/FUL & BA/2013/0109/LBC **Target Date:** 28/05/2013

Location: Norfolk Mead Hotel, Coltishall, Norwich

Proposal: Erection of a function room and service block within walled garden with formation of new openings with east wall of garden to provide access to car park

Applicant: Mr James Holliday

Reason for referral: Objection from neighbouring properties and a consultee

Recommendation: Approve with conditions

1 Description of Site and proposals

- 1.1 The application site is situated between the River Bure to the south and the village of Coltishall to the north. The Norfolk Mead site comprises the Norfolk Mead Hotel, a Grade II Listed building originally constructed in 1740, a building subdivided to provide a manager's cottage and a holiday cottage, and the grounds to the hotel which extend to approximately eight acres.
- 1.2 The hotel grounds include an area of riverside scrub and woodland to the far south of the building, a lawn area to the immediate south, a walled garden to the north-west and a thin strip of woodland running alongside the private access drive to the far north. Within the walled garden area there was until recent works to infill it, an outdoor swimming pool.
- 1.3 The application site lies both within and immediately to the west of the walled garden area. A former agricultural barn, now converted to four residential units (three of which are let as holiday units) is located adjacent to the east of the application site, with the external wall of the converted barn forming the majority of the eastern side of the walled garden area (and so the eastern extent of the application site). The wall surrounding the garden is approximately 3m high along the majority of its length.
- 1.4 Access to the site is from the north, via a shared private drive which leads on to Church Loke, a private road which, in turn, access onto the B1354, the

principal road running through the village of Coltishall.

- 1.5 This application seeks consent for the erection of a new function room, the erection of a new service block and the retention of kitchen extraction ducting mounted on the roof of the hotel kitchens. The new function room would be used to host weddings and other functions and is intended to complement the accommodation, restaurant and bar services already offered at the Norfolk Mead site.
- 1.6 The new function room would be a pavilion style structure, with a square footprint of 16.5m x 16.5m. The room would be situated at the northern end of the walled garden, with the garden wall forming the rear wall of the building and the original brickwork left exposed. The remaining walls would be glazed, with glazed doors in the south facing elevation providing access to the gardens. The only exception to this glazed exterior would be a 5m length of wall on the eastern elevation of the pavilion, this being the edge which faces the neighbouring converted barn. This length would be clad in vertical timber boarding finished timber cover beads.
- 1.7 The pavilion would sit beneath a flat roof constructed from a roofing membrane and finished with an aluminium edge detail. The roof would stand at 3m high and would be punctuated by two roof lights situated in the centre of the roof plan, with each roof light extending to approximately 3.3m in height. The roof would be cantilevered beyond the end of the pavilion walls and provide a 1.1m overhang on all elevations, excluding the northern elevation which abuts the garden wall.
- 1.8 The pavilion would accommodate approximately 132 covers and would incorporate a reception area, a function area and washroom facilities.
- 1.9 The pavilion would be linked to the western edge of the garden wall via a glazed entrance lobby. This lobby would be set back from the front (southern elevation) of the pavilion and would have a footprint of 7m x 11m. The lobby would stand at the same height as the pavilion and would be constructed in the same form and of the same materials.
- 1.10 The lobby would serve as the principal entrance to the pavilion and would also accommodate the bar and bar stores.
- 1.11 The proposed new service block would sit outside of the walled garden area, utilising the rear face of the western garden wall as the western wall of the block. The block would be rectangular in plan and measure 7.1m wide by 22.5m long.
- 1.12 The service block would follow the simple form of the proposed pavilion, with a low, flat roof extending to 3.1m high and finished with the same aluminium edging detail as specified on the pavilion. The walls of the service block would be clad with vertical timber boarding finished with timber cover beads and sitting on a 700mm high brick plinth. It is proposed that there would be five windows and a door and side light punctuating the west

facing elevation.

- 1.13 It is proposed to access the service block via the existing shared private drive which runs in front of the converted barn. Land immediately south of the proposed service block would be used as a staff car park with space to accommodate up to five cars.
- 1.14 The service block would provide an office space, staff room, stores and kitchen. To facilitate access between the service block and the pavilion it is proposed to create a new break in the garden wall which would give access from the service block to the pavilion entrance lobby.
- 1.15 The final element of works for which consent is sought is the retention of ventilation ducting on the roof of the existing hotel kitchens. This ducting replaced a previous kitchen ventilation system and comprises approximately 8m of tubular ducting terminating in an upraised air intake filter. At present the ducting is finished in a bright, galvanised metal and the proposal here is to paint the ducting and filter a recessive colour (RAL 7042, 'Traffic Grey').

2 Site History

In 1989 consent was refused for the erection of four holiday cottages (BA/1989/4973/HISTAP).

In 1990 consent was granted for the erection of a conservatory and six self-catering units. (BA/1990/4861/HISTAP). This consent appears not have been implemented.

In 1995 consent was granted for a change of use from hotel to a private residential dwelling (BA/1995/4543/HISTAP). This consent appears not have been implemented.

In 2002 consent was granted for a change of use from hotel to a private residential dwelling (BA/2002/3994/HISTAP). This consent appears not have been implemented.

3 Consultation

Coltishall Parish Council – Whilst Coltishall Parish Council has no objection to further development at the Mead Hotel we would like the following concerns addressed before approval is granted. The delivery vehicles to access via the Hotel and not over Barn Mead cottages property. This not suitable for ongoing deliveries with permission granted we believe for occasional service access. It would be more appropriate for the deliveries to go straight down to the Mead. Concerns regarding noise have been expressed by nearby residents and have been assured by the applicants that this will be kept to a minimum. We would like to see some kind of improvement to the access from the Loke onto Church Street, with perhaps a mirror as visibility is poor and there have been several near misses at this junction. However we support businesses in our village and hope that with

these issues addressed the Mead can be successful in their new venture and wish them well.

District Councillor – No response received

Broad Society – We support the proposal to expand and strengthen the Norfolk Mead Hotel business and to create more local employment. Considering that the existing Hotel is a Grade II Listed Building, we would have preferred the form of the extensions architecturally to have matched that of the main building rather than the flat roofed, modernistic structure that is proposed. As an alternative solution, we would have preferred to see the main function room in the form of a conservatory or similar. Although this would require a pitched roof higher than the existing garden wall, we think this would be more in keeping with the house. We question the need to break another opening through the garden wall which, according to the Heritage Statement, might date back to 1740. However we do not believe these observations to be sufficient reason to object to this application.

If the Authority is minded to approve this application we recommend that a condition should be attached that no further changes should be made to the existing garden wall.

Highways – Whilst the proposed development will be accessed via a private road, it will lead to an intensification of use of the existing access with the public highway, the visibility from which is slightly below current standards. However, it is unlikely that any improvements could be made to the visibility at this junction due to existing constraints.

Therefore, having regard to the nature of this development, the surrounding highway environment and the fact that vehicle movements to and from the site are likely to be, in the majority, of short term intensity I consider that I could not sustain an objection on the grounds of a marginal shortfall in visibility.

Accordingly, in highways terms only I have no objection to the proposals outlined, but I would recommend a condition regarding retention of proposed parking area be attached to any grant of permission your Authority is minded to make.

Environment Agency – No objection, subject to the imposition of a condition requiring the submission of a scheme of foul water drainage prior to the commencement of any works.

Broadland District Council Environmental Health Officer – No objection. I would recommend that the following conditions are added to protect the amenity of adjacent dwellings:

1. Windows and doors must be kept closed during the playing of music except for ingress and egress.
2. Music shall not be played between the hours of 00:00 and 09:00.

3. The function room building, including windows and doors, shall be designed to achieve a minimum sound reduction index (Rw) of 35dB.
4. Music noise and noise from public address systems shall not exceed 88dBA (5-min) Leq when measured internally at least 1 meter from any wall within the function room.

In order to achieve these criteria I would advise the applicant to apply the operational recommendations for noise control detailed in the acoustic report. This will help to comply with the prevention of public nuisance requirements when operating a premises licence at a later date. They may also need to consider air conditioning where windows and doors must remain closed.

The acoustician appears confident that the design criteria mentioned above in condition 3 above can be achieved according to his comments in section 6.2 of his report.

Ancient Monuments Society - The AMS has no objection in principle to the erection of a new function room in the walled garden. Nor does it object to the demolition of the existing outdoor swimming pool.

Concerns were raised, however, about the quality of the proposed design and in particular of the materials to be used. In order to minimise the harm to the setting of the walled garden and the Grade II listed house, we feel strongly that only the best materials should be selected. For instance, we would expect to see hand-made bricks and very high-quality aluminium-framed glazing in this context. The use of a stretcher bond in the construction of the plinth to the annex would not be appropriate. It should be a condition of the application that samples are approved by your Conservation Officer.

Additionally, we recommend that sound construction methods are used, with special attention paid to detailing. The Committee was especially concerned about the appearance of the function room, which could be visible from elevated sites.

The Georgian Group - The Mead Hotel is a GII listed classical former country house of c1740 with good quality late c19th or early c20th classical additions, its site also falls within a conservation area. The 'Design and Access and Heritage Statement' provided very briefly discusses the architectural development of the main house, but fails to provide information on the age and significance of the walled garden (which is the historic asset most directly affected by the proposed development) and also the former stable block which adjoins it. The information provided on the impact of the proposed development upon the setting and significance of the historic complex as a whole is also inadequate; the Group wishes to stress that the historic designed landscape at the Norfolk Mead Hotel plays an important part in the site's overall significance, and therefore of that of the conservation area. The absence of an adequate heritage assessment is a matter of some considerable concern, particularly as there does not appear

to be an approved appraisal for the conservation area as a whole. The Group would strongly advise that this situation is addressed before the application is determined.

The proposed development must be regarded as a considerable intensification of activity on what is a relatively confined, and a highly sensitive site. The Group would question whether this hotel could expand significantly without causing damage to the setting of the heritage assets on the site. Piecemeal/ad-hoc development proposals must therefore be avoided. The complex would benefit from a brief conservation management plan which could potentially identify both its capacity for absorbing sensitive development and (if such development is found to be possible), those sites where it could be most appropriately located.

The present car parking arrangements detract from the listed building's setting and any further intensification of them is likely to cause further harm. Your authority will need to be clear therefore that the proposed new development will be viable in the medium to long-term with the car parking arrangements suggested within the applicant's documentation, and that a more sensitive alternative cannot be found. A separate refuse storage area for the function room is not identified on the proposed drawings and we therefore assume that the existing storage area immediately by the listed building will prove adequate.

New openings within the walls of the walled garden should only be permitted upon the provision of the strongest of justifications. Permanent external lighting should also be kept to a minimum within its confines, and gravel rather than sets used where possible for paving.

4 Representations

Two letters of objection from neighbouring properties objecting on grounds of impact on amenity in terms of overlooking, noise and traffic generation and, in the case of one of the two letters, the design of the proposal.

Two further letters from neighbouring properties raising concerns regarding impact on amenity.

5 Policy

- 5.1 The following policies have been assessed for consistency with the NPPF and have found to be fully consistent with the direction of the NPPF.

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

CS5 – Historic and Cultural Environments
CS9 – Supporting, Widening and Protecting the Tourism Base

- 5.2 The following policies have been assessed for consistency with the NPPF

and have found to be broadly but not fully consistent with the direction of the NPPF, therefore aspects of the NPPF may need to be given some weight in the consideration and determination of this application.

Adopted Broads Development Management DPD (2011)
[DMP DPD - Adoption version.pdf](#)

DP5 – Historic Environment
DP14 – Tourism and Recreational Development
DP28 - Amenity

5.3 **Material consideration**
National Planning Policy Framework
[NPPF](#)

A Strategy and Action Plan for Sustainable Tourism in the Broads

6 Assessment

6.1 This report considers two applications; the first is an application for planning consent, the second is for Listed Building Consent for the same works.

6.2 It is the case that both applications are assessed against the same adopted development plan policies, having regards to any material considerations and, as such, it is proposed to consider the applications as one for the purposes of this report.

6.3 The development proposed in these applications raise a number of issues, each of which is considered in turn below:

6.4 Principle of the development

6.4.1 Policies within both the Core Strategy and the DM DPD recognise the important role tourism plays in the economy of the Broads and seek to protect and promote appropriately located tourism development. Specifically, Policy CS9 states that *'the tourism base within the Broads will be supported, widened and strengthened'*, whilst policy DP14 refines this general aspiration and provides guidance on the location of new tourism development, detailing that *'new tourism and recreational development will be permitted where it is closely associated with an existing tourism site'*.

6.4.2 Having regards to the existing hotel, bar and restaurant facilities available at the Norfolk Mead site it is considered that the site is, in principle, an appropriate location for the development proposed.

6.5 Design and Impact on the Listed Building

6.5.1 The application site lies within a curtilage of Grade II Listed Building and, consequently, in addition to meeting the high standard of design required of all applications within Conservation Areas in the Broads, the proposal must

have regards to the potential impacts (either positive or negative) on the setting of the Listed Building.

- 6.5.2 Planning policies and guidance at both a national and local level recognise the importance of protecting designated heritage assets such as Listed Buildings, with the NPPF noting that the significance of a heritage asset can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or through development within its setting (paragraph 132) and policy DP5 of the Broads DM DPD requiring all new development to '*protect, preserve or enhance the fabric and setting of historic, cultural and architectural assets*'. In addition, it must also be recognised that the application site lies within the Coltishall Conservation Area and, as such, any new development proposed must preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area.
- 6.5.3 Considering first the issue of siting, there are no objections to locating the proposed new pavilion within the walled garden area. It is noted that this area makes a contribution to the character and setting of the Listed Building, however it must also be recognised that this character and setting has been diminished in the past with the introduction of a large, outdoor swimming pool surrounded by picket fencing and located at the centre of the walled garden. Removal of this poor quality development and reinstatement of the area of the pool to lawns is considered to enhance the setting of the Listed Building.
- 6.5.4 Furthermore, whilst the garden area does make a positive contribution to the setting of the Listed Building it is a large space and it is considered that the introduction of an appropriately designed and scaled building need not have a detrimental impact on the setting of the Listed hotel building.
- 6.5.5 Siting the proposed service block behind the garden wall is considered appropriate and whilst it is regrettable that this position results in a requirement to create a new opening in the wall to facilitate access between the service block and the entrance link, the proposed new opening is modest in scale and any minor detriment to the setting of the Listed Building resulting from the new opening is considered to be outweighed by the benefits of reducing the amount of built form within the walled garden area by placing the service building outside the garden.
- 6.5.6 The concerns expressed by the Georgian Group regarding the introduction of a new opening are noted. However, it is considered that there is significant merit in siting the service block outside of the walled garden area, thereby preserving the sense of space within the garden and the relationship between the garden and the Listed building.
- 6.5.7 In terms of assessing the impact this new opening and the proposed new buildings would have on the Listed building, guidance within the NPPF states that where a 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 optimal viable use.

- 6.5.8 In this instance it is considered that the proposal would not harm any designated heritage asset – either the Listed building or the Coltishall Conservation Area: In terms of the Listed building the walled garden is not cited in the statement of Listing and whilst it is recognised that the garden is important to the setting of the Listed building it is considered that the siting, scale and design (which are discussed in more detail below) of the buildings proposed are such that the development would not be detrimental to the setting of the Listed building.
- 6.5.9 Again, the concerns of the Georgian Group regarding intensification of use of the site are noted. However, this is an existing hotel site and it is considered that the use of the building as a hotel has merit both in terms of securing a viable use for the building in which the owners have a direct financial interest in maintaining the appearance and character of the property, and in that hotel use permits a wide range of people to visit and enjoy the property. The proposed development is considered to complement the existing 12 bed hotel, bar and restaurant business which operates from the site and it is not considered that the proposal does, in practice, amount to a considerable intensification of the site.
- 6.5.10 With regards to the character of the Conservation Area, the application site is not visible from any public highway or right of way and, due to the scale and design of the buildings proposed, the development would not be visible from outside the Norfolk Mead site. This, combined with the high standard of design proposed (discussed in more detail below) result in a proposal which is considered to preserve the character of the Conservation Area.
- 6.5.11 Having regards to the above, there are no objections to the proposal in terms of siting and it is not considered that the proposal conflicts with guidance within the NPPF.
- 6.5.12 Considering the issues of scale and design, in designing the proposed pavilion and entrance link the applicant has attempted to minimise the impact on the setting of the Listed Building by siting the proposed new building away from the host building, and has acknowledged the importance of the wall as a means of enclosing the space and creating a setting for the Listed Building by keeping the proposed pavilion low, visually lightweight and by utilising the wall within the structure of the pavilion, leaving the garden wall exposed within the pavilion so that it reads as an addition to the wall rather than an interruption of it.
- 6.5.13 In terms of detailed design, the appearance of the proposed new pavilion is avowedly contemporary, with the largely glazed, flat roofed structure intended to contrast with the more ornate, red brick Listed Building. The large areas of floor to ceiling glazing would allow those within the garden and the hotel (the principle areas from which the pavilion would be visible) to look through the structure and see the continuous line of the wall running along the back of the pavilion, maintaining the feeling of enclosure which contributes to the special character of the Listed Building.

- 6.5.14 The low roof height, which is set just below the height of the garden wall, would further contribute to maintaining this sense of enclosure and reinforce the lightweight, subservient nature of the proposed pavilion and link building.
- 6.5.15 Having regards to the separation between the proposed pavilion and the Listed building, the care taken to preserve the sense of enclosure created by the garden wall and the preservation of the integrity of the wall (bar a single new opening, considered below), it is considered that the proposed pavilion and link are of a high standard of design and that the proposal would preserve the character of the Conservation area and would have no detrimental impact on the setting of the Listed Building.
- 6.5.16 It is noted that the simple, contemporary appearance of the proposed pavilion does contrast in both materials and style to the main building. Whilst this is considered to be a valid approach in terms of design it is recognised that the quality of materials and final design detail (in terms of eaves detail, exterior lighting, brick bond etc) will be crucial to the acceptability of the proposal. Consequently, conditions requiring the submission of further information regarding these details are proposed.
- 6.5.17 Considering the proposed retention of the kitchen extraction equipment, the extraction equipment replaces a similar, industrial extraction system, and its retention is considered acceptable. The proposal to paint the system a recessive grey is welcomed as it will help to minimise the visual impact of the equipment and, consequently, help to preserve the character of the Conservation Area and the visual integrity of the Listed Building.

6.6 Amenity

- 6.6.1 Both letters of objection received raise concerns regarding the impact of the proposed new development on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The concerns regarding amenity break down into three categories: concern regarding overlooking; concerns regarding noise emanating from the function room; and concerns regarding noise and disturbance associated with deliveries and staff movements to and from the proposed new service block. Each of these matters are considered in turn below.
- 6.6.2 Considering first the concern expressed regarding overlooking, due to the single storey nature of the proposed pavilion and the fact that it is contained within a walled garden area, the building has only a limited potential to overlook the neighbouring residential properties. However, it is the case that the property immediately adjacent to the application site, Barn 4, has four ground floor windows which face into the application site. Two of these windows are located on the gable end of the barn and lie approximately 5.8m from the edge of the proposed new pavilion. The remaining are set further back, at a distance of 6.5m.
- 6.6.3 To address concerns regarding overlooking the applicant has specified a

length of timber wall cladding on the elevation which is closest to the neighbouring property; this eliminates views from within the pavilion to Barn 4 at the location which is most vulnerable to loss of amenity thorough overlooking. Along the remainder of the elevation the wall facing the barn would be glazed, however the distance between the two buildings is greater (around 5.8m) and there is the opportunity to utilise the planting bed between the two properties (which is to be retained as part of the landscaping proposals accompanying the application) to provide a degree of screening, with precise details of planting to be secured by condition attached to any consent granted.

- 6.6.4 When considering impact on amenity in this instance it is important to recognise the existing situation. The windows in the neighbouring property look directly into the walled garden area of the Norfolk Mead Hotel. This is an area which is open to guests of the hotel to walk around and enjoy and, additionally, an areas which can and has been used to host functions for the hotel in the past. Given that these existing uses of the space also raise the potential for a degree of overlooking, having regards to the distance between the glazed elements of the building and the potential for planting between the two buildings to filter views, it is not considered that the proposed new pavilion would have any unacceptable impact on the amenity of the residents of Barn 4, having regards to overlooking, and noting the existing situation which provide a high degree of intervisibility between the properties.
- 6.6.5 Concerns regarding the impact of noise emitted from the proposed function room have been expressed by residents/owners of all four of the properties within the converted barn building which adjoins the application site.
- 6.6.6 In response to these concerns, and recognising the close relationship between the application site and the neighbouring properties and the potential for conflict between the use of the pavilion as a function venue and the neighbouring residential/holiday home use the applicants have submitted an Acoustician's Report to accompany the application. This report considers the location of the proposed building, the nearest noise receptors, the design and build specification of the building and uses acknowledged benchmarks (such as the World Health Organisation Guidelines). The report concludes that '*calculated external noise levels are not likely to give rise to complaints*' and that '*internal noise levels will not disturb resting and sleeping within the nearest noise sensitive dwelling*'.
- 6.6.7 Having considered this report, the Environmental Health Officer (EHO) has raised no objections to the proposal but has recommended a number of conditions to control noise emitted from the building. These conditions include no music being played between the hours of 00.00 and 09.00, an upper limit on the volume of music and audio equipment within the function room and the specification of additional insulation to achieve specific sound reduction figure. These conditions are considered reasonable and necessary and the applicant has indicated that the development could operate within these restrictions.

- 6.6.8 The EHO further recommended that no music be played without all doors and windows being closed (except for access and egress). Whilst it is recognised that this would offer a high level of protection to the amenity of the neighbouring properties it is not considered that such a condition could be defended as being reasonable and necessary for the purposes of planning. Instead, it is considered that a revised condition which permits the playing of acoustic music with no amplification inside or outside (doors and windows opened or closed) until 19.00 would prevent any unacceptable impact on the neighbouring occupier's amenity and, at the same time, offer a degree of flexibility to the operators of the site.
- 6.6.9 Considering the above, there are no objections to the proposal on the grounds of noise generated from the proposed development.
- 6.6.10 The final area of concern regarding amenity relates to noise and disturbance associated with deliveries to and from the application site and staff entering and leaving the site.
- 6.6.11 It is proposed that deliveries would be made to the service block via the shared private drive which, at approximately half way down its length, divides in two with one half continuing down to the front of the Norfolk Mead Hotel and the second half turning to the west and running in front of the converted barn before turning to give vehicular access to the area in which the proposed service block would sit. Not all of this second route lies within the ownership of the applicant, but it is understood that there is an access agreement between the properties which permits the hotel access to the rear of the site via this route.
- 6.6.12 In terms of noise and disturbance from operations at, deliveries to and car movements from the proposed service block, the applicant has submitted a noise management policy in which they undertake not to use this access for deliveries between 23.00 – 09.00 and not to empty or fill any outdoor glass bottle bins between 23.00 – 09.00. It is also noted that any staff traffic to and from the site will be restricted to a maximum of five cars and that traffic movements will be infrequent and clustered – being mostly limited to the beginning and end of shifts.
- 6.6.13 It is considered that these measures, secured by appropriately worded conditions (concerning glass bins and delivery times) would protect the amenity of the neighbouring properties and, consequently, there are no objections to the application regarding impact on amenity (subject to conditions as detailed at section 8 of this report).

6.7 Highways

- 6.7.1 Both the Parish Council and neighbouring properties have expressed concerned regarding the potential for the proposed development to have a detrimental impact on the safe functioning of the highways.

- 6.7.2 In response to consultation the Highways Authority have acknowledged that the junction of the private access road and the public highway falls '*slightly below current standards*' in terms of visibility splays but, taking account of the nature of the development, the surrounding highway environment and the fact vehicle movements to and from the site are likely to be, in the majority, of short term intensity, raise no objection to the application.
- 6.7.3 Considering the issue of parking, the hotel currently provides 34 parking spaces and offers 12 rooms of accommodation. As recognised by the Georgian Group, this is a constrained site and the potential for additional parking is limited both by the size of the site and the impact any new parking area would have on the setting of the Listed building. Similarly, the opportunities for relocating the parking area are limited by both consideration of the Listed Building and the neighbouring residential properties.
- 6.7.4 Given the number of parking spaces currently available at the site and having regards to the distance of the site from the public highway, it is not considered that the proposal would have any detrimental impact on the safe functioning of the highway.
- 6.7.5 Having regards to the above, it is considered that a refusal of the application on the grounds of highways impacts could not be justified.

6.8 Material Considerations

- 6.8.1 The NPPF requires that local planning authorities support sustainable tourism and leisure developments which benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitor and which respect the character of the countryside.
- 6.8.2 In addition, the Broads Authority's own Strategy and Action Plan for Sustainable Tourism in the Broads identifies a need to raise the quality of the serviced accommodation sector within the Broads area and it is considered that the proposed substantial investment in facilities to complement the offer at the Norfolk Mead hotel is in accordance with this aspiration.
- 6.8.3 It is anticipated that the proposed new function space created by the pavilion would generate 8 additional part time jobs and help to support the viability of the Norfolk Mead Hotel, a business which has in the relatively recently past been granted planning consent on two separate occasions for change of use to a private dwelling, with the principal justification for those consents being the lack of viability of the hotel operation at this site.
- 6.8.4 Having regards to the guidance within the NPPF, the aspirations of the Authority's own Sustainable Tourism guidance and the anticipated material impacts the development would have on the local economy of the area and the viability of the Norfolk Mead site, it is considered that there are a number of significant material considerations which weigh in favour of approving the application.

7 Conclusion

- 7.1 This application seeks consent for the erection of a pavilion, access link and service building together with the retention of kitchen ducting at The Norfolk Mead Hotel, Coltishall.
- 7.2 The application offers benefits to the local economy, would improve the quality of the accommodation within the Broads and would help to improve the viability of a hotel which has in the recent past struggled to remain open as a business.
- 7.3 However it is also the case that the site is sensitive both in terms of historic environment (sitting within the Coltishall Conservation Area and containing a Listed Building) and in respect of its proximity to neighbouring properties.
- 7.4 The applicant has submitted a bold scheme which proposes a contemporary design approach. It is considered that this approach is valid in design terms, that the proposal would preserve and enhance the setting of the Coltishall Conservation Area and would have no detrimental impact on the setting of the Listed building.
- 7.5 In terms of amenity, the Environmental Health Officer has raised no objections to the proposed development and, subject to conditions to control noise and disturbance emanating from and associated with the new building, it is not considered that the proposal would have any unacceptable impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties.
- 7.6 Having regards to the above, it is considered that the development is in accordance with Policies DP4 (Design), DP5 (Historic Environment), DP14 (Tourism and Recreational Development) and DP28 (Amenity), in accordance with guidance contained within the NPPF, and that there are no material considerations which could justify the refusal of consent in this instance.

8 Recommendation

BA/2013/0096/FUL - Approve subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Time limit.
- (ii) In accordance with approved plans.
- (iii) Material details – external walls and roof including brick bond.
- (iv) Material details – windows and doors.
- (v) Landscaping details – hard and soft landscaping.
- (vi) Details of foul water drainage scheme.
- (vii) Highways condition re staff parking area.
- (viii) No music between 12.00 – 09.00.
- (ix) The function room building, including windows and doors, shall be designed to achieve a minimum sound reduction index (Rw) of 35dB.
- (x) Music noise and noise from public address systems shall not exceed

88dBA (5-min) Leq when measured internally at least 1 meter from any wall within the function room.

- (xi) No electric or amplified music shall be played within the building hereby approved without all windows and doors being closed (except for access/egress) to reduce noise emanating from the property. Non-amplified, acoustic music may be played within the building with doors and/or windows open between the hours of 09.00 and 19.00, after which time the doors and windows shall be closed whilst music is playing, except for as a means of access and egress from the building.
- (xii) No emptying of glass bins into outdoor containers shall take place between the hours of 23.00 – 09.00.
- (xiii) No deliveries by motor vehicle accessing the site via the route which runs to the immediate north of Barn Mead Cottages (as depicted on the approved Location Plan (PL03 Rev A) shall be made to the service unit, function room or entrance lobby between the hours of 23.00 – 09.00.
- (xiv) The personnel door located on the east facing elevation of the function room hereby permitted (as detailed on approved plan PL02 Rev B) shall be used as a fire door in emergencies only and shall, at all other times, remain closed.
- (xv) The five parking spaces accessed via the route which runs to the immediate north of Barn Mead Cottages (as depicted on the approved Location Plan (PL03 Rev A) shall be used only for staff parking and not for guest or overflow parking.

BA/20123/0109/LBC - Approve subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Time limit
- (ii) In accordance with approved plans.
- (iii) Material details – external walls and roof including brick bond.
- (iv) Material details – windows and doors.
- (v) Landscaping details – hard and soft landscaping.
- (vi) Details of foul water drainage scheme.

Background Papers: Application File BA/2013/0096/FUL & BA/2013/0109/LBC

Author: Fergus Bootman
Date of Report: 5 July 2013

Appendices: APPENDIX 1 - Location Map

APPENDIX 1

BA/2013/0096/FUL - Proposed New Function Room & Service Block within walled garden and new openings to provide access from existing car park

The Norfolk Mead Hotel, Church Loke, Coltishall

