

ITEM:		RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL
REF NO:	3PL/2018/0051/F	CASE OFFICER Tom Donnelly
LOCATION:	GRISTON Land adjacent no 5 Manor Road Griston	APPNTYPE: Full POLICY: In Settlemnt Bndry ALLOCATION: N CONS AREA: N LB GRADE: N TPO: N
APPLICANT:	T R Scott Properties Village Farm Little Cressingham	
AGENT:	Adrian Morley Architectural Design Kingsfold Watton Road	
PROPOSAL:	Erection of detached 2 storey dwelling	

REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

The application is brought to Committee at the request of a Ward Representative

KEY ISSUES

Principle of development
Impact on character and appearance of area
Neighbour amenity impact
Highway impact
Trees

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The application proposes the erection of a detached two storey dwelling, accommodating two bedrooms. It is proposed to construct the dwelling using concrete pantiles and a facing brickwork, precise details to be agreed. Two parking spaces are proposed on the front curtilage.

SITE AND LOCATION

The site is located within the settlement boundary of Griston. It is an area of amenity space separating two rows of terraced houses. Vehicular access to the existing properties is to the rear in the form of a communal parking area. There is a footpath linking the front of the site with the car parking area to the rear. The footpath immediately abuts the property to the south of the site. Immediately to the west of the site is a block of garages which is served off the communal parking area. The land immediately to the north of the site is an area of land similar in size to the application site which forms part of the garden area to the adjoining house. There are several ornamental trees within the garden area close to the boundary of the site.

EIA REQUIRED

No

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

3PL/2017/0306/F- Erection of a detached two storey dwelling- Application withdrawn

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 and National Planning Policy Guidance have also been taken into account, where appropriate

CP.01	Housing
DC.01	Protection of Amenity
DC.02	Principles of New Housing
DC.12	Trees and Landscape
DC.16	Design
DC.19	Parking Provision
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance

OBLIGATIONS/CIL

Not Applicable

CONSULTATIONS

GRISTON P C

Car parking off road would be detrimental to the gardens in the street. Previous permission has not been complied with as fence across front gardens has not be erected. The access road is of poor quality. Other proposals within Griston that will serve the needs of the current housing shortage. Green spaces are essential to the quality of life in rural villages.

NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS

No objection subject to conditions.

TREE AND COUNTRYSIDE CONSULTANT

Having looked at the plans and supplied AIA I would not be supportive of the application. Although the trees have been categorised as being low value C trees, they are within 3rd party ownership and are likely to be damaged during construction and cause future problems to occupants (shading, leaf litter etc). Unless there is overriding justification to build within the RPA of retained trees it should be avoided, and in this instance it would appear that there is not.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER

No objection subject to conditions

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICERS

No objection. Recommend applicant views leaflet 'Construction and demolition works - Guidance for contractors and developers' .

REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbour consultations were carried out which expired on 12-02-18.
A site notice was erected that expired on 15-02-18.

2 letters of objection were received with the main points raised being a cramped form of development, concerns over parking provision for the development, a loss of privacy due to overlooking and impact on adjoining trees.

ASSESSMENT NOTES

Principle of development

The site lies within the Griston Settlement Boundary as designated by the adopted Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2009). The principle of residential development is therefore supported by Policy DC 2 which encourages new housing in these areas.

Impact on the character and amenity of the area

The main issue is whether the siting of a dwelling on the plot given its small size would result in a cramped form of over development of the site in general out of keeping and character. The proposed dwelling would be sited on a plot which is significantly smaller in width and depth than the adjacent properties. It is considered that the erection of a dwelling on the site appears cramped and out of keeping with the primarily more wider and spacious character of the area. In terms of the external appearance and design of the property the proposal is also considered at odds with the wide fronting, uniform dwellings that form the majority of Manor Road, particularly those to the north and south of the site. The dwelling proposed measures 5.2m wide with those immediately adjacent measuring 8.9m. In light of these factors, the proposal fails to preserve or enhance the existing character or the established pattern of development, contrary to Policies DC1 or DC16 and paragraph 17 of the NPPF.

Impact on amenity

The proposal is unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on the level of amenity currently enjoyed by the adjacent residents due to its modest proportions, plot orientation and sensitive window placement. The proposed dwelling would not directly overlook adjoining properties and the applicant has retained the existing footpath which is in his ownership which retains a good separation distance between the proposed dwelling and No.5. Notwithstanding the above, whilst the proposal would provide some amenity space and necessary circulation space around the proposed dwelling, it is considered limited and result in a poor quality of provision for future occupiers. This, alongside the cramped relationship, means the application is considered contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC1 and paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Impact on highway safety

The impact of the proposal on highway safety was considered with regards to Policy DC19 and in consultation with the highway authority. The highway authority have raised no objections to the proposal subject to the imposition of conditions relating to the surfacing of the access road, access width and visibility splays. It is considered that sufficient parking provision can be provided on site and that the proposal would not be detrimental to highway safety. The proposal is accordingly considered to be acceptable with regards to Policy DC19 in terms of parking provision and highway safety.

Impact on trees and landscaping

The impact of the proposal on trees and landscaping was considered with regards to Policy DC12. Given the proximity of trees to the eastern boundary of the site and the proposed siting of the dwelling, works will be required to the roots of the trees as well as the implementation of tree protection measures. In spite of these protective measures, it is still considered likely that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the trees adjacent to the site and is likely to prejudice their long term survival. The proposal is therefore not considered to satisfy the requirements of Policy DC12 in terms of the impact on trees and landscape.

Conclusion

In terms of the overall planning balance of the scheme, whilst it is acknowledged that the site falls within the settlement boundary and notwithstanding the fact that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing supply, it is still considered that the harm caused in terms of the cramped form of over development of the site in general, together with the close proximity of the dwelling to adjoining trees likely to prejudice their long term survival, outweighs this. Refusal of the application is accordingly recommended.

RECOMMENDATION

Refusal of Planning Permission

REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL

- 9240 Cramped development**
The proposed dwelling given the size and shape of the site would result in a narrow and cramped form of development overall, out of keeping and character with the primary form of development as well as providing poor quality size of amenity space provision for future occupiers contrary to Policies DC01 and DC16 of the Core Strategy as well as having regard to paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 9900 Non-std reason for refusal**
The siting of the proposed dwelling within close proximity to adjacent trees adjoining the boundary are likely to prejudice their long term survival and result in increased pressure for their removal and works to be undertaken to them contrary to Policy DC12.
- 2002 Application Refused Following Discussion - No Way Forward**
The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application in as timely a manner as possible and by identifying matters of concern with the application and discussing those with the Applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory solution and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

Copies of all documentation submitted in connection with this application can be viewed online at <http://www.breckland.gov.uk/content/planning-search-0>

2009

Criterion E - Planning Apps Where Refused

Appeals against planning decisions

If you are aggrieved by the decision of your local planning authority to refuse permission for the proposed development or to grant it subject to conditions, then you can appeal to the Secretary of State under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

If an enforcement notice is served relating to the same or substantially the same land and development as in your application and if you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision on your application, then you must do so within: 28 days of the date of service of the enforcement notice, or within 6 months (12 weeks in the case of a householder appeal) of the date of this notice, whichever period expires earlier.

If you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision then you must do so within 6 months of the date of this notice.

Appeals must be made using a form which you can get from the Secretary of State at Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN or online at www.planningportal.co.uk

The Secretary of State can allow a longer period for giving notice of an appeal but will not normally be prepared to use this power unless there are special circumstances which excuse the delay in giving notice of appeal.

The Secretary of State need not consider an appeal if it seems to the Secretary of State that the local planning authority could not have granted planning permission for the proposed development or could not have granted it without the conditions they imposed, having regard to the statutory requirements, to the provisions of any development order and to any directions given under a development order.