

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 1st OCTOBER 2012

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF COMMISSIONING

Author: Viv Bebbington - Senior Planner

THOMPSON: Construction of two bedroom bungalow including landscaping and parking

Applicant: Breckland District Council

Reference: 3PL/2012/0547

DEFERRED ITEM REPORT

This report concerns the erection of a two bedroom bungalow on land within the settlement of Thompson

Members will recall that at the Planning Committee of 6th August concerns were raised about the appearance of the proposed dwelling. The application was deferred to improve the design.

Amended plans have been submitted which indicate the introduction of a brick plinth, eave and verge detailing, brick soldier courses and the introduction of a brick porch to add interest to the front elevation. The plans are an improvement to the original scheme.

Conclusion

The amended plans are considered acceptable and overcome the concerns of members

Recommendation

Approval subject to the conditions as set out in the original committee report

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 06-08-2012

ITEM	5	RECOMMENDATION : APPROVAL
REF NO:	3PL/2012/0547/F	CASE OFFICER: Viv Bebbington
LOCATION:	THOMPSON Land adjacent Tom Haven Tottington Road	APPN TYPE: Full POLICY: In Settlemnt Bndry ALLOCATION: CONS AREA: N TPO: N LB GRADE: N
APPLICANT:	Breckland District Council Elizabeth House Walpole Loke	
AGENT:	Daniel Connal Partnership The Glasshouse Kings Lane	
PROPOSAL:	Construction of two bedroom bungalow including landscaping and parking	

KEY ISSUES

Principle of development
Size, scale, siting and external appearance
Impact on street scene
Impact on amenity of neighbouring properties
Impact on Special Interest Feature of SPA

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The proposal seeks full planning permission for the erection of a two bedroom bungalow. The proposal includes a new vehicular access off the existing cul de sac to provide 2 spaces to the rear of the proposed property.

SITE AND LOCATION

The site is located on an area of open space adjacent existing housing. It is bounded by an estate road to the side and rear and faces on to Tottington Road. The land immediately to the south has permission for a house. The site is within the Settlement Boundary and the buffer zone for the SPA.

EIA REQUIRED

No

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 06-08-2012

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

Land adjoining - 3PL/2011/1229/F - erection of two storey detached dwelling and formation of vehicular access.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The following policies of the adopted Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies and the adopted Site Specific Policies and Proposals Document, including the Proposals Maps, have been taken into consideration in the determination of this application. The provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework have also been taken into account, where appropriate

CP.10	Natural Environment
DC.01	Protection of Amenity
DC.02	Principles of New Housing
DC.11	Open Space
DC.16	Design

CONSULTATIONS

THOMPSON P C -

This application was discussed at a meeting of Thompson Parish Council held on 09 July 2012. The Council voted that whilst they had no particular objection in principle to building an affordable property on this site they could not support the project as presented and directed the Clerk to inform you of their decision

There are a number of reasons not supporting the project as presented and these are set out below.

1. It was felt that the property boundaries extending to and being fenced at the roadway are not in keeping with nearby properties. The plot is quite large and it was felt that plans should incorporate a verge around the property similar to that around Toms Haven. This would still allow a good sized garden but retain some green space and be more in keeping with its rural setting.
2. There is an issue with the lack of parking for residents and visitors to the Airey Houses, Tottington Road and additionally access to Nos 7 - 10 Airey Houses is poor. The road in front of the houses is too narrow to allow on-road parking and access for delivery vehicles to Nos 9 & 10 is greatly restricted. Building on this plot will badly affect parking as currently visitors and residents can and do park on this area of land. It was felt that the full width of the plot at its rear, i.e. the area directly in front of Nos 7 and 8 Airey Houses, should be retained for communal parking. This would also contribute to easier access for deliveries to the properties and make up to some extent for the loss of this amenity land.
3. Thompson Parish Council assumes that the property will be affordable housing for rental and would like to see it offered initially to a local long term resident of Thompson in need of a smaller, more modern unit but wanting to continue to reside in the village.
4. Comment also needs to be made regarding the information submitted in your application.
 - a. Firstly under Section 15 Trees and Hedges. You have answered no to the question are there trees and hedges on the development site. There are clearly two trees on the site, both of which will need to be felled to allow the development to go ahead.
 - b. Under Section 11 Foul Sewage. You indicate that disposal is via mains drainage. Thompson has no mains drainage and the Airey houses are served by what we assume is a Packaged Treatment Plant. Does the PTP have the capacity to handle the extra waste from both this

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 06-08-2012

development the new house to be built on the adjacent plot at 11 Airey House and for which planning consent has already been given?

c. Similarly under Section 12 Assessment of Flood Risk Assessment. You indicate that surface water will be disposed of to main sewer. We re-iterate that there is no main sewer just a PTP and ask how will surface water really be disposed of as sending it to a PTP does not seem to be a satisfactory solution?

We trust that you find these comments of use in your deliberations regarding this application.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICERS

No objection

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

No objections

TREE & COUNTRYSIDE CONSULTANT

The proposal is approximately 1000m from the Breckland Special Protection Area but is screened out of the need for further Habitats Regulations Assessment by virtue of having existing buildings in all direction towards the SPA.

The Ecological Report by Wild Frontier Ecology is noted and accepted.

The proposal will result in the loss of green space and two medium trees at the entrance to the close. While some loss would not unduly impact on the street scene and the trees could be replaced were there space to do so, it is noted that a close boarded fence would abut the highway with no footpath and the creation of a canyon entrance to the other existing houses behind.

NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS

No objection subject to conditions

PRINCIPAL PLANNER MINERAL & WASTE POLICY - No Comments Received

REPRESENTATIONS

The following is a summary of representations received:

Existing turning area insufficient; the existing estate road should be widened; no visitor parking provision; no space around dwelling like Tom Haven property

ASSESSMENT NOTES

* The application is referred to Planning Committee as it is a Breckland Council Application.

Principle of Development

* The proposal is located within the Settlement Boundary and therefore there is no objection in principle to the development of the site providing it can be developed in a satisfactory manner which would be of a density and layout appropriate to the character of the area and would not be

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 06-08-2012

detrimental to the amenities of adjoining residents.

* The property is of modest size and simple design which is satisfactory in this location.

Size, scale, siting and external appearance

* The applicant has satisfactorily demonstrated that the site is of sufficient size to accommodate the proposed dwelling with sufficient amenity and parking provision. The proposal is similar to the existing development immediately to the north where a similar single storey dwelling has been erected adjacent to and in front of existing Airey houses.

Impact on Street Scene

* The site to the north is larger and therefore afforded a generous strip of grass verge between the highway and the boundary fence. There is insufficient space to provide a similar width strip of land between the boundary of the site and the highway. The agent was requested to set the fence back and provide grass verge of at least 1m between the fence and the highway. However, due to issues regarding maintenance, the proposal has been amended to replace the proposed 2m close boarded fence with a post and rail fence and beech hedge to soften the development. The boundary fence remains against the carriageway.

* It is considered a post and rail fence with hedge would achieve the same objective and provides a soft edge to the development. Conditions have been imposed to ensure the hedge is planted and retained and permitted development rights for walls and fences have been removed.

Impact on amenity

* The dwelling is positioned in line with the existing properties along Tottington Road. There is a sufficient degree of separation between the proposed dwelling and the existing dwellings to the rear to ensure the proposal does not have an overbearing impact on residential amenity. The proposal is single storey and therefore is unlikely to adversely impact on the properties to the rear in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy.

* A condition has been imposed to prevent any additional windows above ground floor level to protect residential amenity. A further condition has been imposed to remove Permitted Development rights for garages, to protect the outlook from the properties to the rear.

Impact on Special Interest Feature of the SPA

* The proposal has been assessed in accordance with the Habitat Regulations and it has been concluded that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on the Stone Curlew special interest feature of the SPA. A condition has been imposed requiring a replacement tree to be provided within the site.

Other Issues

* The applicant has confirmed that a clause is to be added into the contract of sale requiring the purchaser to enter into a unilateral agreement with the Council to provide a financial contribution towards outdoor recreation. The proposal satisfies policy DC 11.

* Conditions regarding foul and surface water drainage have been imposed as, contrary to the application form, there is no mains drainage available in the village.

* The views of the Parish Council have been taken into account by the amended plans in respect of the boundary treatment and by the imposition of conditions in respect of drainage, boundary treatment and tree replacement. However it should be noted that the applicant has indicated that the land would be sold for open market housing and not developed for affordable housing as assumed by the Parish Council.

* The Highway Engineer has raised no objection to the proposal in respect of the access and parking issues.

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 06-08-2012

Conclusion

* In conclusion, the proposal is considered acceptable in principle and is of a size, scale and appearance in keeping with the character of the area. The proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the area and adjacent occupiers. The proposal is considered to accord with policy and is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

Planning Permission

CONDITIONS

- 3007** Full Permission Time Limit (3 years)
- 3046** In accordance with submitted plans
- PD01** No additional windows at first floor
- PD04** No PD for fences, walls etc
- PD06** No PD for extensions, garages, ancillary buildings
- MT03** External wall and roof materials to be agreed
- LS10** Implementation of submitted boundary treatment
- LS17** Replacement tree
- LS08** Hedge planting
- HA17** New access gates, doors - inward opening
- HA20** Provision of visibility splays - conditioned
- HA24** Provision of parking and servicing - when shown on plan
- 3990** NOTE: non standard highway note
- 3990** NOTE: non standard highway note
- 3998** NOTE: Reasons for Approval
- 4000** Variation of approved plans
- 3996** Note - Discharge of Conditions