

Application for Determination

Parish	Coltishall		
Reference	BA/2014/0336/HOUSEH	Target date	2 December 2014
Location	Landfall, 8 Anchor Street, Coltishall		
Proposal	Resubmission of BA/2013/0313/FUL to remove existing conservatory and provide first floor extension / side extension		
Applicant	Mr P Cobb		
Recommendation	Approve subject to conditions		
Reason for referral to Committee	Deferred from 7 November 2014 meeting pending re-consultation and a site visit		

1 Introduction

- 1.1 In September 2014, an application for the removal of an existing conservatory and erection of a first floor/side extension was submitted. A report was presented to the Planning Committee meeting on 7 November 2014 recommending approval subject to conditions. A copy of that report is attached at Appendix 1.
- 1.2 At that meeting it was queried whether the Parish Council and District Member had been correctly consulted. Officers confirmed that all consultations had been sent out correctly and responses had been received from various parties but not from the Parish Council or District Member.
- 1.3 Members considered it necessary to re-consult the Parish Council and District Member prior to determining the application and resolved to defer the application to allow time to do so. They also resolved to visit the site to assess the proposed development and likely impacts on amenity and heritage assets.

2 Site Visit

- 2.1 Members will undertake a site visit on Friday 28 November to assess the proposed development in the context of the existing dwellinghouse and neighbouring property. Notes of the site visit will be circulated prior to the meeting to determine the application.

3 Consultation

- 3.1 New consultations have been sent out by both post and email to the Parish Council and District Member. Responses are requested by Friday 28 November and Members will be updated verbally at the meeting.

4 Assessment

- 4.1 The main issues to consider in the determination of this application are the design, impact on Conservation Area and listed building, amenity and trees. A full assessment is set out in the report at Appendix 1.

5 Recommendation

Approve subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Standard time limit
- (ii) In accordance with submitted plans
- (iii) Obscure glazing to ground floor window (also non-opening) on southeast elevation and first floor bathroom on northeast elevation
- (iv) Tree work to be completed in accordance with Arboricultural Implications Assessment
- (v) Tree protection plan to be submitted

8 Reason for Recommendation

The proposal is considered acceptable in accordance with Policies DP2, DP4, DP5 and DP28 of the adopted Development Management Policies (2011), Policy CS1 of the adopted Core Strategy (2007) and the National Planning Policy Framework which is a material consideration in the determination of this application.

Background papers: Planning File BA/2014/0336/HOUSEH

Author: Maria Hammond
Date of Report: 17 November 2014

List of Appendices: APPENDIX 1 – Report to 7 November 2014 Planning Committee
APPENDIX 2 – Notes of site visit held on 28 November 2014

APPENDIX 1

**Broads Authority
Planning Committee**
7 November 2014

Application for Determination

Parish	Coltishall		
Reference	BA/2014/0336/HOUSEH	Target date	2 December 2014
Location	Landfall, 8 Anchor Street, Coltishall		
Proposal	Resubmission of BA/2013/0313/FUL to remove existing conservatory and provide first floor extension / side extension		
Applicant	Mr P Cobb		
Recommendation	Approve subject to conditions		
Reason for referral to Committee	Third party objections		

1 Description of Site and Proposals

- 1.1 The application site is a dwelling, Landfall, on the western side of Anchor Street, Coltishall. The site lies within the Coltishall Conservation Area and extends between Anchor Street and the river. A mid-twentieth century single storey dwelling with attached double garage extends 24.5 metres across the width of the plot and a mature copper beech tree stands to the immediate east of the dwelling. The dwelling has buff brickwork walls, a concrete tile roof and timber windows. A lean to conservatory stands at the southern end of the southwest elevation, opening onto a raised patio which then steps down to a lawn that extends to the river.
- 1.2 A two storey dwelling of more recent construction lies to the northwest and immediately south of the site is the former maltings site which is Grade II listed, consisting of two dwellings fronting the road with a larger detached dwelling, The Old Maltings, behind. A single storey section of The Old Maltings abuts the boundary of the application site at the eastern end.
- 1.3 The application proposes an extension to the existing dwelling. This would include the removal of the existing conservatory and extending over two floors at the southern end of the dwelling. The footprint would be extended out 4.3 metres to the southwest, 2 metres further than the existing conservatory, and 7.85 metres across. This would form a cross-wing arrangement with the roof

at 90 degrees to the existing dwelling over this extended southern end of the dwelling.

- 1.4 Ground levels drop gently across the site towards the river and at the lowest ground level, the eaves would be at 4.6 metres and the ridge at 7.25 metres. This is 1.8 metres higher than the existing ridge and the eaves would be 0.8 metres below that height.
- 1.5 On the ground floor, the southwest and northwest elevations would be largely glazed and on the southeast elevation there would be one high level window which is proposed to be non-opening and obscure glazed. At first floor level, there would be a balcony across the southwest elevation, covered by the roof and with solid side walls. The southwest elevation would have a balustrade across and the window and door openings to the internal accommodation would be set 1.5 metres back from this. There would be no first floor openings on the southeast elevation and only three rooflights on the northwest elevation. The northeast elevation, facing the road, would have two first floor windows.
- 1.6 The new section of roof is proposed to be covered in concrete tiles to match the existing and the ground floor would have matching brickwork. Above this, the first floor would have timber cladding and all windows would be timber to match the existing. The existing patio would be extended across the river elevation of the extension.

2 Site History

- 2.1 In 1997 planning permission was granted to replace a flat roof over the garage with a pitched roof (BA/1997/4361/HISTAP).
- 2.2 A porch was granted permission on the northwest elevation in 2011 (BA/2011/0013/FUL) and subsequently amended (BA/2011/0268/NONMAT).
- 2.3 A first floor extension was proposed in 2013 (BA/2013/0313/FUL) and this application was subsequently withdrawn to allow further consideration of the design, impact of amenity and tree. The current application is a resubmission of this.

3 Consultation

Broads Society – To be reported orally.

Parish Council – To be reported orally.

District Member – To be reported orally.

Representations

Seven letters of objection received: advising Landfall is not the only bungalow on Anchor Street and that there is a gap of approximately four metres to The

Old Maltings (not 7.4 metres as stated in the application); concerned about adverse impacts on landscape, Conservation Area and listed buildings; consider the development is too close to existing dwellings; inappropriate scale and design; and, amenity of adjoining occupiers, including in respect of overlooking and loss of privacy from the extension and extended patio and loss of daylight to windows of the adjacent dwelling.

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.

Adopted Core Strategy (2007) [Core Strategy Adopted September 2007 pdf](#)
CS1 – Landscape Protection and Enhancement

Adopted Development Management Policies (2011)
[DEVELOPMENTPLANDOCUMENT](#)
DP2 – Landscape and Trees
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. [NPPF](#)

Adopted Development Management Policies (2011)
DP5 – Historic Environment
DP28 – Amenity

- 4.3 Adopted Site Specific Policies (2014)
No policies relevant to this site or proposal.

5 Assessment

- 5.1 In terms of assessment, an extension to the dwelling is acceptable in principle and it is necessary to consider the design, impact on the Conservation Area and listed building, amenity and trees.
- 5.2 With regard to scale, the introduction of first floor accommodation is considered acceptable in principle and the existing single storey dwelling is somewhat out of character with the surrounding development that is predominantly two storeys. The increase in height would not be out of scale with neighbouring dwellings and the majority of the dwelling would remain at the existing height with the cross wing form reducing the mass of the extension when viewed from the road and river. The extended footprint would occupy the area of the existing conservatory and part of the raised patio and the scale is considered acceptable.

- 5.3 The detailed design of the extension is contemporary and considered appropriate to the host building and the matching materials are acceptable. The fenestration is concentrated on the southwest and northwest elevations, maintaining views within the site, and the covered balcony design is considered appropriate with similar features existing in the local area. In terms of design, the proposal is therefore considered acceptable in accordance with Development Management Policy DP4.
- 5.4 As noted above, the scale and form of the existing dwelling is not typical of other dwellings on Anchor Street or the wider Conservation Area and the introduction of a gable feature to the road and river would improve the relationship with the established form of development here. The cross wing form would also direct the mass of the extension away from the listed buildings and would not compete visually with these. The existing gap to the listed buildings would be maintained and while some parts of The Old Maltings would be obscured in public views by the higher and extended roof, it is not considered the proposal would be unacceptably detrimental to the appearance or setting of the listed buildings and would result in an enhancement of the Conservation Area. The local concerns about the impact on the Conservation Area and listed buildings are appreciated. However, it is not considered that the proposal would result in any loss of or harm to these heritage assets, and the proposal is considered acceptable in accordance with Policy DP5 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 5.5 With regard to amenity, the extension is proposed within 4 metres of the boundary to the adjacent dwelling to the south (The Old Maltings). A single storey section of this dwelling abuts the boundary at the eastern end and it is understood there is an extant planning permission to continue that extension along the side in the form of a conservatory. On the existing two storey section of the adjacent dwelling (approximately 7.4 metres from the southeast elevation of the proposed extension) there are three ground floor windows, one landing window and two first floor windows on the northwest elevation facing towards the site. This dwelling is also set on slightly lower ground, so any views from the application site are downwards and it is noted the gardens of these dwellings are open to views from the river, reducing the level of privacy, however, any views from passing boats are transient, rather than the more fixed views from windows and balconies.
- 5.6 It is not considered that the proposed extension would result in any direct overlooking of the adjacent dwelling to the south. The only window in the southeast elevation would be non-opening and obscure glazed and this could be secured by condition. The first floor balcony would give views towards the river and oblique views across the adjacent curtilage nearest the river. Standing at the edge of the balcony it may be possible to look sideways towards the adjacent dwelling, but there would be no direct window-to-window view by virtue of the enclosed sides and roof covering over the balcony. The modest extensions to the patio would not significantly increase the available seating area or opportunities for overlooking from here. It is not therefore considered the proposal would

result in any overlooking or loss of privacy that would unacceptably reduce the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

5.7 The outlook from the northwest elevations of the adjacent dwelling would change and rather than the gable end and side of the conservatory, the dwelling would face a 13.2 metre long wall and roof slope. The eaves would be lower than the existing gable and the ridge would be 1.8 metres higher, but set a further 3.9 metres into the site. It is appreciated that the outlook would change significantly and a greater mass of building would be visible, however, the view would largely be of the roof which would be angled away from the dwelling. The rooms which would have this view are a kitchen and dining area on the ground floor, landing and a first floor bathroom; not primary living accommodation. It is not therefore considered that the proposal would result in an overbearing impact on the neighbouring dwelling or, due to the orientation, any overshadowing or loss of direct sunlight which would unacceptably impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers. Whilst it is appreciated that the proposal would change the outlook from the adjacent dwelling to the south, on balance, it is not considered that any unacceptable impacts on amenity would result and the proposal is considered acceptable in accordance with Policy DP28.

5.8 The canopy of the copper beech tree on the roadside of the dwelling extends over the existing roof. Crown reduction prior to commencement and regular maintenance of the tree are proposed and it is considered that, subject to an appropriate condition securing this, the proposal would not significantly adversely affect the tree and an appropriate relationship between the tree and dwelling would be maintained.

6 Conclusion

6.1 The proposed extension would provide first floor accommodation and replace an existing lean to conservatory. The design, scale and materials are considered acceptable and the existing copper beech tree would not be detrimentally affected. It is appreciated that the relationship with the dwelling to the southeast would change, however, it is not considered that the listed building or amenity of the occupiers would be detrimentally affected so as to justify a refusal of planning permission. The extension would relate far better to the predominant scale and form of dwellings along Anchor Street and within the Coltishall Conservation Area and whilst the concerns raised in the objections received are appreciated, on balance and with reference to the Development Plan, the proposal is considered acceptable.

7 Recommendation

Approve subject to conditions:

- (i) Standard time limit
- (ii) In accordance with submitted plans

- (iii) Obscure glazing to ground floor window (also non-opening) on southeast elevation and first floor bathroom on northeast elevation
- (iv) Tree work to be completed in accordance with Arboricultural Implications Assessment

8 Reason for recommendation

The proposal is considered acceptable in accordance with Policies DP2, DP4, DP5 and DP28 of the adopted Development Management Policies (2011), Policy CS1 of the adopted Core Strategy (2007) and the National Planning Policy Framework which is a material consideration in the determination of this application.

List of Appendices: APPENDIX 1 – Location Plan

Background papers: Application File BA/2014/0336/HOUSEH

Author: Maria Hammond
Date of Report: 27 October 2014

APPENDIX 1

• BA/2014/0336/HOUSEH Landfall, 8 Anchor Street, Coltishall



PLANNING COMMITTEE

5 December 2014

Note of site visit held on Friday 28 November 2014

BA/2014/0336/HOUSEH Landfall, 8 Anchor Street, Coltishall

Resubmission of BA/2013/0313/FUL to remove existing conservatory and provide first floor extension/side extension

Applicant: Mr P Cobb

Present:

Dr J M Gray – in the Chair

Mr M Barnard

Mrs L Hemsall

Miss S Blane

Dr J S Johnson

Mr N Dixon

Mr P Ollier

Mr C Gould

Mr P Warner

In attendance:

Mrs Sandra A Beckett – Administrative Officer (BA)

Mr Ben Hogg – Historic Environment Manager (BA)

Ms Andrea Long – Director of Planning and Resources (BA)

Ms Maria Hammond – Planning Assistant (BA)

Mr Peter Cobb – Owner/ Applicant (for site visit on his property)

Mr Jonathan Burton – Agent for Applicant

Mrs Jayne Smith – Objector and resident of Old Maltings (for site visit on her property)

Mr Alan Mallett – District Council Member

Mr Paul Savage – Broads Society

Mrs Doreen Snelling – Coltishall Parish Council

Mr Robert Watson – Coltishall Parish Council Chairman

Apologies for absence were received from: Prof J Burgess, Mr G W Jermany, Mr R Stevens and Mr J Timewell.

Introduction

The Chairman welcomed everyone and invited them to introduce themselves.

No decision would be made at this visit but the matter would be considered in detail at the next meeting of the Planning Committee on 5 December 2014. The Chairman emphasised the procedures for the meeting explaining that there would be no debate. Members were on the visit to examine the context of the application, the impact on the neighbour and the surrounding area and to make sure that all the relevant factors of the site had been pointed out by all interested parties.

Following an explanation of the application, members were given the opportunity to view the site from various vantage points and ask questions.

The Proposal

The Plans

The Planning Assistant introduced and gave a description of the application for the removal of an existing conservatory and an extension to the bungalow to provide a first floor and side extension at the southern end of the dwelling in order to provide first floor accommodation. The Chimney would remain although it would be increased in height. The materials for the extension would match the existing, with matching brickwork and timber cladding for the first floor. All windows would be timber to match the existing.

Members noted the significant copper beech tree within the curtilage on the roadside of Landfall. The extension would be upwards towards the canopy but on the line of the existing front wall and therefore if approval was given, this would be conditioned to ensure appropriate tree works were completed and protection measures were in place.

Site context

Members noted the context of the property. It was within the Coltishall Conservation Area. The red brick property fronting the road to the east of the application property, was red brick Grade II Listed and contained two dwellings. It was part of the old Maltings. The objector's dwelling was to the rear of this and benefited from curtilage listing. Members had views of the pantiled roof of the Objector's "Old Maltings" from the road. It was clarified that the Coltishall Conservation Area Draft Appraisal had not been adopted as yet and therefore at this stage could not be given great weight. Members noted the scale and form of the other dwellings within the vicinity

Views on Site from Riverside and Patio

Members walked round Landfall to the riverside and examined the actual site of the proposed extension, noting the conservatory to be removed and the new footprint from the patio and from the river. Ranging poles were used to point out the corners of the proposed extension and the ridge and eaves heights as well as the level of the first floor balustrade. The proposed new ground floor would be largely glazed and on the south east elevation there would be one high level window which was proposed to be non-opening and obscure glazed. The first floor level would include a balcony covered by the roof with solid walls either side. The balcony floor level, 2.8 metres above the patio level was indicated and eye level height 1.7 metres above that, was also marked.

Members noted the ridge height of the proposal in relation to the ridge height of the neighbouring property, which were similar. The neighbour's property ridge height was 7.88 metres whereas the applicant's property's proposed ridge height was intended to be 7.25 metres.

There were no proposals to change the trees within the area. Given that the site was within a Conservation Area any tree work would require conservation area consent.

Members then viewed the boundary of the properties, noting the blue tarpaulin on the neighbour's side with wire mesh on the applicant's side. A Lleylandii hedge/boundary had recently been removed and the temporary tarpaulin represented a solid wall or 2 metre high fence as required by the extant planning permission of the Old Maltings. This had been erected by Mr and Mrs Smith.

Members noted the windows of the two storey neighbouring property: there was one landing window and two first floor bathroom windows facing towards the application site. There were also three ground floor windows, although not visible due to the tarpaulin. These were viewed when visiting the neighbour's property.

Members noted the baton on the neighbouring property to illustrate the approximate slope of the roof from the plans approved in 1989. The Planning Assistant explained that there appeared to be a discrepancy between the floor plan and elevations of the extant permission as to how far it would extend along the boundary and this would need to be resolved prior to any building taking place.

Members stood on the existing patio area, noting that its total extent towards the river would remain the same but it would extend sideways across the width of the extension. Members noted the temporary fencing erected along the side of the patio not only to give the residents of Landfall some privacy but also illustrate the extent of the new conservatory. The length of this fence would become a solid wall.

Members returned to the roadside and looked down on the boundary between the two properties noting the ranging poles depicting the height of the extension. It was also noted that the overhang of the existing roof on the east side of Landfall would be removed but the chimney would remain in situ.

Members were then able to visit the neighbouring property to view the concerns expressed by the objector.

Views from within the curtilage of Old Maltings.

Members viewed the proposal site from within the riverside curtilage of the Old Maltings. They noted the marks on the ranging poles within the Landfall site, depicting the proposal's ridge height, the eaves height, the level of the first floor and the eye height of someone standing on the balcony looking obliquely towards the river and the Old Maltings curtilage.

Members noted the boundary between the two properties and the layout of batons on the southeast side adjacent to the Old Maltings to give an impression of the layout of the extant conservatory due to be constructed.

Members noted the distances and relationship of the property and its garden from the river. The privacy was already compromised by those using the river although it

was noted that this was only transient as opposed to more fixed views from windows and balconies.

Members were then given the opportunity to enter Old Maltings in two groups to view the site of the proposal from its first floor in order to assess light factors and the impact of the proposals.

Conclusion and Procedures

The Chairman explained that the application would be considered by the Committee at the next meeting on 5 December 2014. Those present were able to attend the meeting when the usual Public Speaking procedures would be in place and operated. Any additional comments would be required in writing.

The Chairman thanked everyone for attending the site inspection.

The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 11.50 am