

Planning meeting 27th April 2020- 7.30pm

2 Norburton Planning Application WD/D/20/000193

Comments from Councillor **Graham Moody**

While there is not a traditional building line in Norburton, the location and block plan shows that there is a careful arrangement of the dwelling footprints facing the road, which form a “staggered building line”.

This dwelling arrangement together with the modest size of the dwellings and the open plan requirement on the front gardens results in a very pleasing aspect to the road and complements the Conservation Area, in which the development sits.

With the exception of Number 1, alterations have maintained this staggered building line, and the pleasant overall appearance of the development as seen from the road.

The proposed extension to the front of the property would intrude into this setting by some 3 metres and result in the dwelling looking significantly different from those nearby. This would harm the appearance of Norburton’s built environment as described above and detract significantly from the overall attractiveness of this quiet road.

Paragraph 2.6.3 of the (west Dorset Weymouth and Portland) Local Plan states:

“The scale and design of extensions can have a negative impact on the individual character of a building and how it relates to its surroundings. This is particularly noticeable in the roof form, as this reflects the shape and symmetry of the entire building. In general, the extension should be visually subsidiary to the original building if it is to avoid overwhelming the original character of the building and the pitch of any extension should reflect the pitch of the original building. In some cases proposals that are not subservient to the host building may be acceptable if they achieve visual enhancement to both the building and surrounding area.”

I note that the elevations indicate that the pitch of the proposed extension is greater than the existing one and of nearby dwellings, a further lack of sympathy with the local built environment. In this particular application the proposed extension does not achieve any visual enhancement, rather it detracts from the current largely harmonious development fronting the road.

Policy Env 12 of the Local Plan (see annex) states that:

“It [Development] will only be permitted where it complies with national technical standards and where the siting, alignment, design, scale, mass, and materials used complements and respects the character of the surrounding area or would actively improve legibility or reinforce the sense of place.”

The siting, design, scale and mass of this proposal is at odds with and disrespects the character of the surrounding area in Norburton, and the development would harm the existing legibility and sense of place.

For the reasons stated above, I believe that the siting, design, scale and mass of the proposed extension would have a considerable negative impact not only on the individual character of the dwelling, but also on the “Norburton neighbourhood”. It would be out of character with the overall built environment of this part of Norburton and would detract significantly from it. As such it would be contrary to Policy Env 12 of the Local Plan (attached).

21 April 2020

Dave D: Can you remind Councillors of the comments we made about the re development of Number 1 Norburton - The application under consideration makes a case for approval based on the precedent set by the adjacent development. I recall we objected to the planning application for number 1 Norburton based on the scale of the extension. It is unusual to get extensions into the front garden of properties and this is a significant one (28m²) - Given that one bad development often leads to another one we might want to consider the implications for the rest of the bungalows on Norburton if this was approved.

Elena: I agree that we need to be consistent in regards to all planning applications. The parish council objected to the application at number 1 Norburton in 2015 which is of similar design to the one proposed at number 2, so I agree that we need to object on the same grounds (3m length/ 28sq m area extension to the front of the property damaging the open appearance of the area and so the distinctiveness of this part of the Conservation Area)

Rebecca: I have looked at the application. I have no objection to this application. I think our original objections are rather outdated.

We can surely have no objections to the property making better use of the space available. Bungalows have been frowned upon as using too larger footprint for living space for many years. The objection to using the front garden for development I would support much more than the back garden. The frontages are all useless lawn that people only mow and do not use for any purpose. They also serve no environmental benefit being just manicured lawn. The property is well set back from the road with a wide pavement adding to the separation.

We did say we ought to review our attitudes to planning applications with climate change in mind and I think this is a case in point.

Mike: I have also walked past 2 Norburton and reviewed the plans. I totally agree with Rebecca's comments and I have no objections to the planning request.

Darren: I too have looked at this application, and as number 2 is set back slightly from no's 1 & 3, the 3m extension on the front is not past the current building line. I have no objections to this application.

Steve: Despite Graham's very thorough assessment and the position the PC took five years ago on a neighbouring property, I don't feel the visual impact of this extension on this street scene justifies us opposing it.

Grant: No objections except the privacy of neighbours with gable end window