

## **Committee Report**

**Item No:** 6

**Ward:** Ringshall.

**Ward Member/s:** Cllr David Whybrow.

**Reference:** DC/17/05561

**Case Officer:** Jamie Edwards

---

### **Description of Development**

Householder Application-Erection single storey side and rear extensions and front canopied porch.

### **Location**

Old Rectory, Stowmarket Road, Ringshall, Stowmarket Suffolk IP14 2HZ

**Parish:** Ringshall

**Site Area:**

**Conservation Area:**

**Listed Building:**

**Received:** 06/11/2017

**Expiry Date:** 09/01/2018

---

**Application Type:** HSE - Householder Planning Application

**Development Type:** Householder

**Environmental Impact Assessment:**

**Applicant:** Mr & Mrs D Whybrow

**Agent:** Mr Steven Ryles

---

## **DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR CONSIDERATION**

This decision refers to drawing number 1:1250 LOCATION PLAN received 06/11/2017 as the defined red line plan with the site shown edged red. Any other drawing showing land edged red whether as part of another document or as a separate plan/drawing has not been accepted or treated as the defined application site for the purposes of this decision.

The plans and documents recorded below are those upon which this decision has been reached:

Defined Red Line Plan 1:1250 LOCATION PLAN - Received 06/11/2017

Elevations - Existing 01 - Received 06/11/2017

Elevations - Existing 02 - Received 06/11/2017

Plans - Existing - Received 06/11/2017

Site Plan - Received 06/11/2017

Elevations - Proposed 01 - Received 14/11/2017

Elevations - Proposed 02 - Received 14/11/2017

Plans - Proposed - Received 30/11/2017

Floor Plan - Proposed 17-0140 A - Received 30/11/2017

The application, plans and documents submitted by the Applicant can be viewed online at [www.midsuffolk.gov.uk](http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk). Alternatively, a copy is available to view at the Mid Suffolk and Babergh District Council Offices.

## **PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE**

The application is referred to committee for the following reason/s:

The applicant is a member of Mid Suffolk District Council.

## **PART TWO – APPLICATION BACKGROUND**

### **History**

The planning history relevant to the application site is listed below. A detailed assessment of the planning history including any material Planning Appeals will be carried out as needed in Part Three:

2024/14 - Refused 22/09/2014

To construct a 2 bedroom detached annex with open plan kitchen, diner, lounge accommodation with wetroom, 2nd en-suite bedroom for carer all on one level for ease of movement, and wheelchair access.

### **All Policies Identified As Relevant**

The proposal has been assessed with regard to adopted development plan policies, the National Planning Policy Framework and all other material considerations. Highlighted local and national policies are listed below. Detailed assessment of policies in relation to the recommendation and issues highlighted in this case will be carried out within the assessment:

### **Summary of Policies**

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework  
FC01 - Presumption In Favour Of Sustainable Development  
FC01\_1 - Mid Suffolk Approach To Delivering Sustainable Development  
CS01 - Settlement Hierarchy  
CS05 - Mid Suffolk's Environment  
GP1 – Design and Layout of Development  
H18 - Extensions to existing dwellings  
H16 - Protecting existing residential amenity  
H15 - Development to reflect local characteristics

### **Consultations and Representations**

During the course of the application Consultation and Representations from third parties have been received. These are summarised below.

### **A: Summary of Consultations**

**Ringshall Parish Clerk**

No comments received

## Heritage Team

No comments provided

## B: Representations

None

## **PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION**

From an assessment of relevant planning policy and guidance, representations received, the planning designations and other material issues the main planning considerations considered relevant to this case are set out including the reason/s for the decisions, any alternative options considered and rejected. Where a decision is taken under a specific express authorisation, the names of any Member of the Council or local government body who has declared a conflict of interest are recorded.

### 1. Details of Amended Plans and Negotiations

- 1.1. New ground plans and elevations were submitted to include measurements for the proposal.

### 2. Site and Surroundings

- 2.1. The site is located outside of the settlement boundary of Ringshall, which is designated as a secondary village in the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Plan (2008). The site has a detached property located within a modest garden. The east facing elevation has views across open countryside. To the west is Stowmarket Road, with a small property on the opposite side of the road known as Hall Cottage. Along the north side of the boundary line is a public footpath. The south boundary line has two tree lines that sandwich a thin strip of field that separates Old Rectory and Glebe Farm.

### 3. Principle of Development

- 3.1. The proposal is comprised of a number of elements:
- 3.2. The proposed development will remove the existing west facing extension and erect a new extension. This extension will cover the west facing wall of the drawing room with a width of 5.3m and depth of 3.9m.
- 3.3. The east facing elevation has a proposed single storey extension that projects by 3.4m from the main dwelling and extends 11.7m across the full length of the east facing side of the property and wrapping around the south facing elevation. It will be 7.8m in length along the south elevation.
- 3.4. The proposed extension to the porch on the north elevation will be approximately 3m x 2.9m.

### 4. Development Plan

- 4.1. The principle of erection single storey side and rear extensions and front canopied porch is supported, subject to detailed compliance with Policies H15, H16 and H18 of the saved Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998), Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy (2008) and Policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the Core Strategy Focused Review (2012) and other material considerations.

### 5. The National Planning Policy Framework

- 5.1. The National Planning Policy Framework came into full effect on 27th March 2013. Under paragraph 215 the NPPF provides that "due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the

weight that may be given)". The relevant Local Plan policies set out above are considered to be consistent with paragraphs 14, 17, 57, 58, 61 and 64 of the NPPF.

6. Design and Layout

6.1. The proposal will increase the floorspace substantially. However, within the setting and curtilage of the property it is not considered to result in over-development. The design and materials are considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the main dwelling. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this respect, in compliance with policy H18 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998).

7. Highway Safety (Parking, Access, Layout)

7.1. The existing property has a driveway, turning circle and garage which will not be impacted by the proposed development.

8. Residential Amenity

8.1. The NPPF (paragraphs 17 and 56) and policies within the adopted development plan require, inter alia, that development does not materially or detrimentally affect the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

8.2. The property is set within modest grounds and there is substantial distance between the neighbouring property. Glebe Farm is to the south of the proposed development, approximately over 60 metres away from Old Rectory. There is no impact to Glebe Farm due to it being an agricultural building that is separated with two dense tree lines and therefore not within view of Old Rectory. Glebe Farm also has a grade II listed which is situated to the south east of the proposed development and east of the agricultural building mentioned above. This cannot be seen from Old Rectory due to hedgerow and tree line that separate the properties and the substantial separation distance.

8.3. This proposal would therefore not have a negative impact on any neighbour amenity, as the proposal would not have an impact on neighbouring private amenity space. The proposal will not have an impact on levels of light or overlooking received by neighbours as the proposal is of a scale and will not be extending the footprint near the boundary. As such the proposal is considered acceptable and in accordance to policy H18 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan.

9. Heritage

9.1. The Heritage team provided no comments or objections on the proposed development. However, it is considered that there is no impact on a Grade II listed building to the south east of the proposed development due to the distance between the two properties, the lack of inter-visibility and nature of the works proposed to an existing building.

## **PART FOUR**

10. Conclusion

10.1. Although the proposal substantially increases the ground floor it is considered to be in keeping with the scale and design of the main dwelling. The proposed development is not considered to result in any significant adverse impact on highways safety, residential amenity, heritage assets, the environment or biodiversity interests to warrant refusal. Recommendation is to grant permission.

#### 11. Recommendation

That authority be delegated to Corporate Manager – Growth & Sustainable Planning to grant permission and that such permission be subject to the conditions as set out below:

- Standard time limit
- To be in accordance with submitted documents and drawings.