

## **Application for Determination**

<b>Parish</b>	Thorpe St Andrew		
<b>Reference</b>	BA/2008/0403/FUL	<b>Target date</b>	04/03/2009
<b>Location</b>	2a Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew		
<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of white Upvc conservatory and replacement of north facing front fence		
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr C Coulson		
<b>Recommendation</b>	Approve subject to conditions		

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

- 1.1 The application site comprises a single residential dwelling sited on a rectangular plot which lies parallel with and adjacent to Yarmouth Road opposite Broadland District Council offices. The ground slopes, initially sharply, downwards away from Yarmouth Road through the site gradually levelling off across open marshland countryside to the rear of the site. Residential dwellings abut the site to the east with a pumping station to the west. The site lies within Thorpe St Andrew Conservation Area.
- 1.2 The proposal is for the replacement of the conservatory to the rear elevation and replacement of the boundary fence which runs parallel to Yarmouth Road.

### **2 Site History**

BA/2008/0287/FUL Erection of conservatory and replacement of north facing front fence - Refused November 2008.

### **3 Consultation**

Broads Society – We had no comment on the original submission and our response to the resubmission is therefore unchanged.

Thorpe St Andrew Town Council – Recommend Approval. No objection to the conservatory but the new front fence should be no higher than existing fence.

Thorpe Conservation Group – The conservatory would not be visible from the road, nor due to the slope of the land would it have significant visual impact when seen from Cary's Meadow. Approval would seem reasonable in this

instance. UPVC may not normally be regarded as a suitable material for a 'National Park', but it could not be distinguished from white-painted wood at a distance from the nearest point of public access. The increased height of the boundary fence would create a 'canyon' effect on Yarmouth Road. However, nearby walls of long standing are of greater height, and increasing the height of the front wall of the neighbouring property would be of general benefit.

Ward Member – No response.

## **4 Policies**

### **4.1 National Planning Policy**

Planning Policy Guidance 15: Planning and the Historic Environment  
<http://www.communities.gov.uk/planningandbuilding/planning/planningpolicyguidance/planningpolicystatements/planningpolicyguidance/>

### **4.2 Broads Local Plan (Saved Policies)**

#### **B11 – Design**

Development will only be permitted if its scale, form, design, external materials and colour would be appropriate to its setting. New development in the built environment should respect the character and townscape of the area. New development in the countryside should be appropriately located so as to minimise its visual intrusion in the landscape.

#### **B9 – Alterations in Conservation Areas**

Planning permission will be granted for alterations to buildings in Conservation Areas if they would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area; this would include the need for a high standard of design and materials.

### **4.3 Broads Core Strategy adopted September 2007**

#### **CS1 – Protection of Environmental and Cultural Assets**

Development and changes in land use / management must ensure that all aspects of the environmental and cultural assets of the Broads distinctive landscape are protected, enhanced and restored.

Proposals should ensure opportunities for positive impacts on the following core assets have been addressed and adverse impacts avoided:

- (i) the defining and distinctive qualities of the varied landscape character areas formed by the built and natural environment
- (ii) tranquillity and wildness as part of the Broads experience
- (iii) the value and integrity of nature conservation interest and
- (iv) the character, appearance and integrity of the historic and cultural environment

Opportunities to mitigate the visual impact of currently intrusive features should be sought

## **5 Assessment**

- 5.1 The main issues in the determination of this application relate to design and the visual impact of the proposal on the Conservation Area.
- 5.2 The proposed conservatory (length 5m, width 4.2m and maximum height 3m) is sited adjacent the eastern boundary wall on the southern elevation of the property and is proposed to be constructed from uPVC material with brick plinth to either side.
- 5.3 While this form of development in these materials would often be considered unacceptable within a Conservation Area within the Broads, given that it is proposed to replace an existing structure of similar proportions of identical material it would be unreasonable to consider that the development would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the building or Conservation Area. A recent Planning Inspectorate appeal decision allowing a similar styled new conservatory building in Stalham Staithe Conservation Area supports this position. This conclusion notwithstanding, it is disappointing that the opportunity has not been taken to improve the quality of the built environment here.
- 5.4 An existing timber fence with a height of approximately 1.2m runs along most of the northern boundary of the site parallel with Yarmouth Road and the associated footpath. It then diverts at an angle to the south, providing a vehicular entrance for the property before continuing along its original trajectory towards the site's eastern boundary.
- 5.5 The second aspect of the proposal seeks to replace the majority of the length of this fence with a new raised fence of approximately 1.8m in height in order to provide increased privacy to the property's rear garden as well as reduce noise from passing traffic. The vehicular entrance gate and adjoining fence panels are to remain at a height of approximately 1.2m.
- 5.6 A previous similar application (BA/2008/0287/FUL) was recently refused under delegated powers on the grounds that the combination of the increased height of the fence and materials (concrete posts and gravel board) would result in a form of development which would have an adverse impact on the character of the Conservation Area. The applicant has addressed these concerns through the removal of the concrete gravel board which had a height of around 0.3m and ran the length of the boundary, as well as through the use of close boarded timber panelling which visually removes the concrete posts from views from Yarmouth Road, although these remain to provide support and are visible from the garden.
- 5.7 Yarmouth Road is characterized by boundary walls of varying materials and heights located both within and outside of the Conservation Area. While the changes proposed are relatively minor, the revised plans are considered to

sufficiently address the concerns in relation to visual impact on the Conservation Area. The raising in height of the fence addresses the privacy and noise concerns of the applicant while preserving the character of the Conservation Area. A condition requiring a sample of the timber stain prior to commencement of development is necessary to ensure this.

- 5.8 Thorpe St Andrew Town Council, while recommending approval, express concerns over the increased height of the fence. Following a discussion to clarify their position they wish to oppose the development citing concerns over loss of views over the open marshland from Yarmouth Road. While it is acknowledged that this is the case, the maintenance of a view is not a material planning consideration and cannot be taken into account in the determination of the application. Were it to be considered that the obstruction of the view would have an adverse effect on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area this would be material, however this is not considered to be the case here.
- 5.9 The vehicular entrance to the property is set back from the road by a minimum distance of 10m and is to remain unchanged as is the height of both adjacent panels. This thereby results in no loss of visibility for vehicles egressing from the site and the safety of passing vehicular traffic is therefore unaffected.

## **6 Conclusion**

- 6.1 This application is a resubmission of a previously refused scheme and the applicant has sought to address the concerns of the Local Planning Authority. This is a prominent site within the Conservation Area, however, the development is not of sufficient impact to justify the refusal of planning permission.

## **7 Recommendation**

Approve subject to conditions

- standard time limit;
- in accordance with plans submitted; and
- details of stain on fence

## **8 Reason for Recommendation**

The application is considered to be in accordance with saved Broads Local Plan policies B11 and B9 and adopted Core Strategy Policy CS1.

Background papers: Application File BA/2008/0403/FUL

Author: Andrew Fillmore  
Date of Report: 16 February 2008  
List of Appendices: APPENDIX 1: Site Location Plan

BA/2008/0403/FUL – 2a Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew  
Erection of White UPVC Conservatory and replacement of north facing front fence - resubmission of BA/2008/0287/FUL

