

# Brandon Parva, Coston, Runhall & Welborne Parish Council – Planning Meeting Minutes

Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2018 at 7:30pm, Welborne Village Hall

---

Parish Councillors present: Simon Guest (chairman), Clare Kay, Jaqui Russell, Andrew Egerton-Smith, Peter Wood. Also in attendance: Bev Long (clerk)

## **1 Apologies for absence**

Apologies were received and accepted from Cllr Carolyn Bailey (unwell) and Cllr Mike Webb (prior meeting commitment)

## **2 Members declarations of interest in items on the agenda and requests for dispensation**

None received

## **3 Planning matters**

### **3.1 Application 2018/2159 – Claypit Farm, Pound Lane, Welborne, NR20 3LG. Demolition of conservatory and replacement with two storey extension and attached double garage.**

Councillors viewed the plans and discussed fully. The councillors had several queries and although supportive of a development on the site voted to reject the application and submit details of the issues it had identified. Therefore, the clerk submitted the following comments to South Norfolk Planning Dept.

The council object to this particular application. The council are supportive of a development on the site and recognise that a large extension can be accommodated, however this particular application raises a number of concerns that need to be addressed.

1. This proposal fails to take opportunities to make the evolution of the dwelling clear and includes inappropriate and out of character design features which in total lead to the impression of a dominant new structure grafted onto the existing house which does not represent good design. For example,

a. The application shows a long unrelieved single roof line, and this is dominant and lacking visual interest in character when seen from the front / public space. There will also be a visually obvious and awkward transition between old and new roof materials. It would be usual to [a] break the ridge line so that the roof line varies and provides visual interest and [b] to set the new work back from the front wall of the original

dwelling to create a "shadow break" and break the overall scale of the whole build into smaller more legible parts.

b. Typically window details in extensions provide some visual continuity between original and new work. The new full height glazing in the extension is the only substantive window detail on the front and is not in character with the window detailing of the original dwelling. Whilst not stated on the application it looks from the proposed elevation document that some of the current windows may be changing – if this is the case it should be made clear.

c. The new open Porch is a large and out of character feature dominating the transition between the original dwelling and the new work.

d. To the rear the design is modern in detailing with a clear change in wall materials in contrast to the front. The large flat roofed canopy is consistent with this but the corner pillars look out of character with the size of canopy. For such a large canopy the eye would expect to see a larger supporting pillar. The pillar features should be given greater bulk to enhance their appearance of strength as should the pillar in the car port.

2. The proposal is for “The demolition of the existing conservatory on the east side of the house and addition of a new two story extension to the east side with the house with an attached double garage.” The plans submitted show additional work on the west side of the house – addition of new porch, removal of a window. Why is this work not included in the application?

3. The application states that the site cannot be seen from a public road. It can be seen from both Burnthouse Lane and Pound Lane.

The council would be supportive of a development on this site if the issues identified were resolved and accurate improved plans re-submitted.

The chairman closed the meeting at 7:55pm