

ITEM:		RECOMMENDATION:	REFUSAL
REF NO:	3PL/2018/0038/HOU	CASE OFFICER	Tom Donnelly
LOCATION:	OXBOROUGH 3-4 Oxborough Road Oxborough	APPNTYPE:	Householder
APPLICANT:	Mr & Mrs S Sorrell 3-4, Oxborough Road Oxborough	POLICY:	Out Settlemnt Bndry
AGENT:	Mike Hastings Building Design 58 Sluice Road Denver	ALLOCATION:	N
PROPOSAL:	Construction of garage/store (amended proposal)	CONS AREA:	N
		LB GRADE:	N
		TPO:	N

REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

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

KEY ISSUES

Design and appearance
Impact on amenities of adjoining neighbours
Size & scale of development outside settlement boundary
Impact on parking provision and highway safety

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The proposal seeks the erection of a detached garage/storage building in the rear garden of the existing property. The building measures 13m in length, 7.1m in width, 2.65m in height to the eaves and 6.15m in height to the ridge. The building would be constructed using materials to match the existing dwelling. The building would provide two garage spaces and a garden store room at ground floor level with attic storage space in the roof space.

SITE AND LOCATION

The application site is at 3-4 Oxborough Road in Oxborough. It is a residential property situated outside any defined settlement boundary. The site is isolated from other development.

EIA REQUIRED

No

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

3PL/2017/1485/HOU

Withdrawn

15-01-18

Erection of garage/store

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

DC.01	Protection of Amenity
DC.03	Replacement Dwellings and Extensions in the Countryside
DC.16	Design
DC.19	Parking Provision
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance

OBLIGATIONS/CIL

Not Applicable

CONSULTATIONS

OXBOROUGH P C

While agreeing a garage/store may be needed , there is concern regarding the size of it as shown on the plans. Just under 1000 sq ft on ground floor and 550 sq ft on 1st floor. This is as large as a medium sized house. Excessive for a garage and store. Why does a 1st floor store need eight roof lights and a window each end?

NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS

No objection

REPRESENTATIONS

3 neighbours were consulted on the application with the 21 days expiring on 28-02-18.

No responses were received.

ASSESSMENT NOTES

The key issues of consideration are the design and appearance of the proposal, the impact on the amenities

of adjoining properties, the size & scale of development outside of the settlement boundary and the impact on highway safety and parking provision having regards to Policies DC16, DC1, DC3 and DC19 respectively.

1.0 Design and appearance

1.1 The proposal seeks the erection of a large detached garage/storage building in the rear garden of the existing property. The proposed building measures 13m in length, 7.1m in width, 2.65m in height to the eaves and 6.15m in height to the ridge and the proposed building would be constructed using materials to match the existing dwelling. The building would be provide two garage spaces and a garden store room at ground floor level with attic storage space in the roof space.

1.2 Whilst the siting of the building is set back to the rear of the site behind the existing property, there is not a substantial amount of boundary screening on the eastern boundary of the site. It is therefore considered that the proposed building would be visible in street scene terms when approaching the site from this direction given the overall size and height of the building.

1.3 The size of the proposed building is considered to exceed what would be considered proportionate and subservient to the host dwelling. The ridge height of 6.15m is considered to be more akin to that of a small dwelling rather than an ancillary outbuilding. When the ridge height is added to the overall footprint of the building, it is considered that the proposal would result in a significantly large structure.

1.4 On the basis of the size and scale of the building, it is considered that the proposal would not satisfy the requirements of Policy DC16 in terms of design and appearance.

2.0 Impact on amenities of adjoining neighbours

2.1 The application site is isolated from any other residential properties, and therefore given its location would not have any adverse impact on amenity having regard to Policy DC1.

3.0 Size & Scale of Outbuilding

3.1 As the site falls outside any defined settlement boundary, the overall size and scale of the proposal must be considered with regards to Policies DC3. It is considered that the overall size, scale and height of the building results in an excessively large and disproportionate sized outbuilding out of keeping and character having regard to Policy DC3.

3.2 Whilst, justification has been provided by the agent in support of the application which states that the size of the building is required to accommodate long vehicles in the garage area, space to renovate a boat in the garden store to the rear and the overall height to provide suitable storage space in the loft of the building. Notwithstanding this it is nevertheless considered that the scale, size and height would be out of keeping and would not have appropriate regard to Policy DC3.

4.0 Impact on highway safety and parking provision

4.1 In terms of highway safety and parking provision, no objection to the proposal is raised subject to the proposed building remaining ancillary to the main dwelling. It is not considered that the proposal would result in an increase in traffic movement at the property and would therefore not compromise the safety of the access.

4.2 The proposal provides 2 parking spaces. In addition to this, there would be ample space remaining on

site for parking outside of the proposed building having regards to Policy DC19.

4.3 The proposal is therefore considered to satisfy the requirements of Policy DC19 as it is not considered to compromise highway safety or parking provision on site.

5.0 Conclusion

5.1 In terms of the overall planning balance of the scheme it is considered that the overall size, scale and height of the building would result in a disproportionate size of outbuilding out of keeping and character.

5.2 The proposal is therefore not considered to comply with Policies DC16 and DC3 and is accordingly recommended for refusal on these grounds.

RECOMMENDATION

Refusal of Planning Permission

REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL

- 9370** **Incompatible design of extension**
The proposed overall size, scale and height of the building would result in a disproportionate size of outbuilding out of keeping and character contrary to Policies DC3 and DC16 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Document (Adopted 2009).
- 2003** **Application Refused with Discussion -With Way Forward**
The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application in as timely a manner as possible, (having engaged with the Applicant at the pre-application stage) and by identifying matters of concern with the application and discussing those with the Applicant. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to resolve those matters within a reasonable timescale. However, the Local Planning Authority has clearly set out, within its Planning Committee report, the steps necessary to remedy the harm identified within the reasons for refusal - which may lead to the submission of a more acceptable proposal in the future. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide (further) pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.
- Copies of all documentation submitted in connection with this application can be viewed online at <http://www.breckland.gov.uk/content/planning-search-0>
- 2006** **Criterion B - Householder - 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.
- As this is a decision to refuse planning permission for a householder application, if you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision then you must do so within 12 weeks 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.