

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Reference No.</b>
1	Jetspark	WATTON	3PL/2009/0681/F
2	Lakeside Country Club	LYNG	3PL/2009/0715/F
3	Mr N Medler	TITTLESHALL	3PL/2009/0887/F
4	Mr G Foulger	SOUTH LOPHAM	3PL/2009/0926/F

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 23-11-2009**

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>REPORT TO COMMITTEE</b>
<b>REF NO:</b>	3PL/2009/0681/F	
<b>LOCATION:</b>	WATTON Beechwood House 43 High Street	<b>APPN TYPE:</b> Full <b>POLICY:</b> In Settlemnt Bndry <b>ALLOCATION:</b> Commercial Area <b>CONS AREA:</b> Y <b>TPO:</b> Y <b>LB GRADE:</b> N
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Jetspark c/o agent	
<b>AGENT:</b>	Pelorus Planning & Property Lt 1 Collins Way Rash's Green	
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Residential care home (C2) with assoc. parking/access, retention of Beechwood House, demo. of side wing & outbdgs	

**CONSULTATIONS**

**RECOMMENDATION**

No recommendation made

3920 REPORT ITEM

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 23-11-2009**

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>REPORT TO COMMITTEE</b>
<b>REF NO:</b>	3PL/2009/0715/F	
<b>LOCATION:</b>	LYNG Lakeside Country Club Quarry Lane	<b>APPN TYPE:</b> Full <b>POLICY:</b> Out Settlemnt Bndry <b>ALLOCATION:</b> No Allocation <b>CONS AREA:</b> N <b>TPO:</b> N <b>LB GRADE:</b> N
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Lakeside Country Club C/o Agent	
<b>AGENT:</b>	Pelorus Planning & Property Lt 1 Collins Way Rash's Green	
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Erection of additional holiday accommodation in 2 blocks	

**CONSULTATIONS**

**RECOMMENDATION**

No recommendation made

3920 REPORT ITEM

## **BRECKLAND COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 23-11-2009**

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION : REFUSAL</b>
<b>REF NO:</b>	3PL/2009/0887/F	
<b>LOCATION:</b>	TITTLESHALL 13 High Street	<b>APPN TYPE:</b> Full
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Mr N Medler 10 Lynn Hill Dereham	<b>POLICY:</b> In Settlemnt Bndry
<b>AGENT:</b>	Roy Payne Chartered Architect Russell House Litcham	<b>ALLOCATION:</b> No Allocation
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Domestic extension & wall & pedestrian entrance	<b>CONS AREA:</b> Y
		<b>TPO:</b> Y
		<b>LB GRADE:</b> N

### **KEY ISSUES**

1. Impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area
2. Impact upon the existing TPO tree
3. Impact upon neighbour amenity

### **DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT**

The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a single storey pitched roof side and rear extension to an existing two storey end of terrace dwelling. The application also proposes the erection of a wall to enclose the extension and the dwelling so as to create a private amenity area to the side and rear of the property.

### **SITE AND LOCATION**

The application site consists of a two storey end of terrace property with large side garden. The site is accessed via the High Street which lies to the north of the site, beyond which are single storey dwellings. To the east of the site is a two storey semi-detached dwelling, to the west is the adjoining dwellings and to the south are the gardens belonging to the terraced properties. Within the south-eastern corner of the plot is a large Ash tree. The site lies within the Tittleshall Conservation Area.

### **RELEVANT SITE HISTORY**

- 3PL/2009/0814/F - Extension and wall and pedestrian entrance - Withdrawn - 24.09.09  
3PL/2009/0365/F - Erection of new house - Withdrawn - 15.06.09  
3PL/2007/1737/F - Erection of side extension to dwelling - Dismissed on Appeal - 04.06.08  
3PL/2007/1333/F - Extension to cottage and new garage - Refused - 12.10.07

## **BRECKLAND COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 23-11-2009**

### **POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

The following National Planning Guidance and/or Saved Policies of the Breckland Local Plan and those of the Submission Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document have been taken into consideration in the determination of this application:

PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development

PPG15: Planning and the Historic Environment

DC1: Amenity

DC16: Design

TRA.5: Highway safety

### **CONSULTATIONS**

TITTLESHALL P.C.

NO REPLY AS AT 6TH NOVEMBER, 2009

TREE & COUNTRYSIDE OFFICER - The proposal would result in the loss of the remaining tree, which is protected by a TPO and its loss should be resisted.

HISTORIC BUILDINGS OFFICER - No objection in principle, however, the extension should be of a lesser footprint. Ideally, this would be no more than an outward extension of the existing outbuilding on an east-west alignment. If this is not acceptable, then I urge that we accept no more of an extension on a north-south axis than what is achievable via the relocation of the garden walling to the rear corner of the existing dwelling.

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

None received.

**ASSESSMENT NOTES**

- \* The application is referred to Development Control Committee at the request of the Ward Representative.
- \* The application site lies within the Tittleshall Conservation Area and, as such, a proposal should seek to preserve and enhance the Conservation Area.
- \* A previous application for a two storey extension was refused (3PL/2007/1737/F) and subsequently dismissed on appeal on the basis of it failing to appear visually subservient to the existing dwelling and its failure to safeguard the symmetry and fenestration of the existing dwelling. These shortcomings in turn would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- \* It is considered that the single storey nature of the extension, coupled with its position to the rear and side of the dwelling, set back from the principle elevation of the dwelling allow the extension to appear visually subservient to the exiting dwelling. Furthermore, the use of traditional materials and the contemporary fenestration is appropriate to the Conservation Area. The Historic Buildings Officer has no objection, in principle, but considers that the size could be reduced. Whilst this is acknowledged, on balance, it is considered that the size of the extension is not disproportionate to the existing dwelling given its single storey composition.
- \* In terms of neighbour amenity, the single storey nature of the works coupled with their position in relation to the neighbours is such that no significant loss of light or outlook would occur. The windows are positioned so as to face inward, thus avoiding any unacceptable overlooking.
- \* The proposal would lead to the inevitable loss of a mature Ash tree which is protected by a TPO and forms a prominent feature within the Conservation Area. The Tree & Countryside Officer has expressed concern at this and as such it is considered that this is unacceptable in planning terms.
- \* In conclusion, it is considered that the proposal would result in the loss of a prominent TPO tree within the Conservation Area and as such is recommended for refusal.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Refusal of Planning Permission**

**REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL**

**9900** Loss of TPO tree/detrimental conservation area

## **BRECKLAND COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 23-11-2009**

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION : APPROVAL</b>
<b>REF NO:</b>	3PL/2009/0926/F	
<b>LOCATION:</b>	SOUTH LOPHAM The Lilacs Low Common	<b>APPN TYPE:</b> Full <b>POLICY:</b> Out Settlemnt Bndry <b>ALLOCATION:</b> No Allocation <b>CONS AREA:</b> N <b>TPO:</b> N <b>LB GRADE:</b> N
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Mr G Foulger The Lilacs Low Common	
<b>AGENT:</b>	Durrants 19 St Nicholas Street Diss	
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Amendments to extg dormers & amendments to dormer, front door and porch prev. appr. 2006/0680 (retrospective)	

### **KEY ISSUES**

Design appropriate to a dwelling in a rural location

### **DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT**

The application is to regularise work carried out which is not in accordance with an earlier approval, 3PL/2006/0680. The changes relate to two existing dormers and a new dormer in the approved extension which have been raised in the roofline and incorporate higher eaves. The dormers are .1m wider than shown on the original plans and are set .9m higher, to the ridge, in the roof. Minor changes to the front porch include an exposed spandrel detail to the front elevation and a different door design. A new chimney has been added.

### **SITE AND LOCATION**

The Lilacs is a semi detached one and a half storey dwelling set in a rural location. A single storey outbuilding stands to the side. The adjacent semi has a similar form with dormers, albeit set lower in the roof.

### **RELEVANT SITE HISTORY**

3PL/2006/0680 - Extension and alterations - Approved - 12/07/06

**POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

The following National Planning Guidance and/or Saved Policies of the Breckland Local Plan and those of the Submission Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document have been taken into consideration in the determination of this application:

PPS1: Sustainable Development

PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

DC16: Design

DC3: Replacement Dwellings and Extensions in the Countryside

**CONSULTATIONS**

S LOPHAM P C

The council would strongly reject this application as in its opinion it makes a mockery of the planning process if retrospective permission can be gained simply because the work has been carried out. The dormers and porch clearly differ from the original and do not harmonise with the neighbouring property. There is little point in having a planning procedure if it is not adhered to.

**REPRESENTATIONS**

A letter of objection has been received from the owner of the neighbouring, linked dwelling raising concerns in respect of unauthorised work, not in accordance with the original permission; impact on the adjacent nature conservation areas; impact on balance of pair of cottages, detrimental to the appearance of the building as a whole; inappropriate design detail to gable of porch; changes to roof pitch; inaccuracies in the plans in respect of the size of original, new and neighbouring dormers; chimney not shown on plan; staircase not shown emerging at first floor level.



**ASSESSMENT NOTES**

- \* The application is referred to Development Control Committee at the request of the Ward Representative who raises concern that the scheme is not in keeping with the linked cottage and that work has been carried out before an appropriate application has been considered.
- \* The principle of extensions and alterations to this rural cottage have been agreed through the 2006 application. This application relates to regularisation of works which have already been carried out but are not in accordance with the approved plans.
- \* Planning permission was granted on 12th July, 2006 subject to conditions requiring work to be carried out in accordance with amended plans, details of external materials to be submitted before works commence and the window in the north east elevation to be fitted with obscure glass. These details were agreed on 17th July 2007 and work commenced on site on 10th February, 2007. An officer visited the site on 8th July 2008 and the applicants were requested to submit an amended plan in relation to work carried out which was not in accordance with the approved plans. The applicants were made aware that any further works carried out on site would be at their own risk. An amended plan was received on 6th August, 2009 and an officer confirmed that a further application would be required by letter dated 11th August, 2009.
- \* Whilst it is acknowledged that the new dormer arrangement is different to the adjacent linked semi cottage, the form and scale of the dormers and windows is very similar, maintaining the character of this pair of cottages in a rural location. The changes to the porch element are minor in nature and do not compromise the overall design of the extension or original building. There would not appear to be any changes to the roof pitch and the new chimney reflects that of the adjacent dwelling.
- \* The residential use of the site has been established for many years and the extension and alterations to the dwelling will not impact on the nature conservation areas or the street scene generally.
- \* Whilst the relationship between The Lilacs and Lilac Cottage is clear, differences between the two properties identify them as separate units - style, size and materials of windows, style of porch. The hedge between the two also emphasises the division and each property is seen within in its own context.
- \* When assessing such retrospective proposals, the fact that work has been carried out before any consent has been issued is not a material consideration. The application is considered as if the work had not been started. If the current scheme had been submitted as the original application, it is unlikely that a recommendation of refusal could have been justified.
- \* The changes to the existing dormers, new chimney and erection of new extension with dormer and front porch are considered acceptable in terms of their design, scale and materials. The design, whilst not replicating the adjacent cottage, does reflect that form and is appropriate to this rural cottage.
- \* The application is recommended for approval.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Planning Permission**

**CONDITIONS**

- 3007** Full Permission Time Limit (3 years)
- 3046** In accordance with submitted plans
- 3998** NOTE: Reasons for Approval
- 4000** Variation of approved plans