

## **Committee Report**

**Item No:**

**Reference:** DC/19/05417

**Case Officer:** Averil Goudy

**Ward:** Box Vale.

**Ward Member/s:** Cllr Bryn Hurren.

---

## **RECOMMENDATION – REFUSE HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING PERMISSION**

---

### **Description of Development**

Householder Planning Application - Erection of a single storey rear and side extension.

### **Location**

Manna Wood Farm, Stackyard Green, Monks Eleigh, Ipswich Suffolk IP7 7BD

**Expiry Date:** 14/02/2020

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

**Development Type:** Householder

**Applicant:** Mr John Olley

**Agent:** N/A

**Parish:** Monks Eleigh

**Details of Previous Committee / Resolutions and any member site visit:** None

**Has a Committee Call In request been received from a Council Member (Appendix 1):** No

**Has the application been subject to Pre-Application Advice:** No

---

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

---

The application is referred to committee for the following reason:

The applicant is employed by Babergh District Council.

---

## **PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY**

---

### **Summary of Policies**

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

CS01 - Applying the presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development in Babergh

CN01 - Design Standards

CN06 - Listed Buildings - Alteration/Ext/COU

HS33 - Extensions to Existing Dwellings

## **Neighbourhood Plan Status**

This application site is not within a Neighbourhood Plan Area.

## **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**

#### **Town/Parish Council**

##### **Monks Eleigh Parish Council**

It was agreed unanimously to have no objections to this planning application.

### **Internal Consultee Responses**

#### **Heritage Team**

I consider that the proposal would cause a medium level of less than substantial harm to a non-designated heritage asset because the proposed extensions would result in an overly complicated and disjointed arrangement that would detract from the simple form and relative status of the historic core of the building.

The application proposes the erection of a single storey rear and side extension on Manna Wood Farm, an unlisted timber-framed and thatched dwelling. The heritage concern relates to the potential impact of the proposal on the significance of Manna Wood Farm, which I consider to be a non-designated heritage asset.

Manna Wood Farm can likely accommodate some increase in footprint without harming its significance. However, the proposed extensions are not considered appropriate, due to their design and articulation.

The historic core of the building is characterised by its traditional, simple rectilinear planform. The proposed extensions would result in a concentration of varying architectural forms within a relatively small area, in combination with the existing C20 extension, that would give the rear section of the building a convoluted and overly complicated form, out-of-keeping with the simple planform characteristic of the historic core. The articulation of the side extension is considered particularly inappropriate. It would appear disjointed and disconnected from the historic core and read more as an outbuilding awkwardly abutting the existing dwelling, rather than an organic expansion to the building.

Additionally, the style of the proposed porch is not considered appropriate. The design of the porch would give it a status out-of-keeping with the building as a whole, but especially on an ancillary extension. The historic core of the building has traditionally been, and should therefore remain, the principal architectural element of the building, even if the main entrance is now in an extension. A large porch on a modern extension, as proposed, would appear at odds with this and relegate the perceived importance of the historic core.

The harm would be cumulative in combination with the existing C20 rear lean-to extension, which already detracts from the significance of the building due to its inappropriate form.

Due to the design of the existing rear C20 extension, I consider that it would be difficult to achieve a suitably designed extension(s) in this area without first significantly altering or removing all/part of the existing extension.

In conclusion, the application does not meet the policies within the NPPF, or the Local Plan. Therefore, I do not support the proposal. As per para.197 of the NPPF, the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application.

## **B: Representations**

No local or third party representations have been received for this proposal.

## **PLANNING HISTORY**

<b>REF:</b> B/0275/75/FUL	Erection of double garage and construction of a vehicular access, as amended by plans received with letter dated the 28th April 1975	<b>DECISION:</b> GRA 16.05.1975
---------------------------	--	------------------------------------

---

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

---

### **1.0 The Site and Surroundings**

- 1.1. Manna Wood Farm is a two-storey detached dwelling situated on a modest plot. The dwelling is set back from the highway of Stackyard Green and benefits from a moderately sized access/parking area to the south. The dwelling is situated in a small cluster of dwellings along Stackyard Green, located outside of the defined settlement boundary of Monks Eleigh. The wider surrounding area is agricultural fields.
- 1.2. The dwelling is thatched, and Heritage note that it is timber framed. The dwelling is part rendered and part brickwork and has an existing 20<sup>th</sup> century rear and side lean-to extension. The dwelling is not a listed building but has been classified by the Heritage Team as a non-designated heritage asset.
- 1.3. The nearest neighbours are Manna Wood House to the northeast, Olivers to the southwest and Stackwood Cottage, a Grade II listed building, to the south, which is also thatched.

### **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1. The proposal seeks the erection of both a single storey rear and a single storey side extension to Manna Wood Farm.
- 2.2. The proposed side extension would have a ridge height of approximately 4.47m, with an eaves height of 2.48m. It would extend 3m from the side (northern) elevation of the dwelling and 2m from the rear (eastern) elevation, with a total width of 5.26m. In addition, the side extension will have a porch which would measure a further 1.2m x 1.83m. The extension will create additional living space, in the form of a shower room and utility room. The materials to be used are timber weatherboard cladding for the walls and plain tiles for the pitched roof.
- 2.3. The proposed rear extension would have a ridge height of approximately 3.7m, with an eaves height of 2.3m. This element would extend from the rear (eastern) elevation of the host dwelling by 1.2m and be approximately 3.63m in width. The proposal will create an extension to the existing garden room. The materials to be used are glazing panels for the walls and slate for the pitched roof.

### **3.0 The Principle Of Development**

- 3.1. The starting point for any planning decision is the development plan, as identified in Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Determination of any application must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. A key material consideration regarding the principle of development is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019, which requires proposals which accord with an up to date development to be approved without delay. However, various factors affect whether a development plan can be considered 'out-of-date'.
- 3.2. The age of policies itself does not cause them to cease to be part of the development plan or become "out of date" as identified in paragraph 213 of the NPPF. Significant weight should be given to the general public interest in having plan-led decisions even if the particular policies in a development plan may be old. Policies should be given weight according to their consistency with the NPPF.
- 3.3. Even if policies are considered to be out of date, that does not make them irrelevant; their weight is not fixed, and the weight to be attributed to them is within the remit of the decision taker. There will be many cases where restrictive policies are given sufficient weight to justify refusal despite their not being up to date.
- 3.4. Policies CN01, CN06 and HS33 of the Babergh Local Plan 2006 and policy CS01 of the Babergh Core Strategy 2014 are the most relevant policies for assessing this application. Full weight is given to these policies as they are consistent with the aims of the of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 in terms of achieving sustainable development.
- 3.5. The principle of development in terms of an extension(s) to Manna Wood Farm is acceptable, subject to compliance with the detailed requirements of policies CN01, CN06 and HS33 which are considered below.

#### **4.0 Nearby Services and Connections Assessment Of Proposal**

- 4.1. Not Applicable – The proposal relates to an extension to an existing dwelling, therefore an assessment regarding this is not applicable.

#### **5.0 Site Access, Parking And Highway Safety Considerations**

- 5.1. The existing site access and parking arrangements will not be changed by this proposal. There are no works planned to take place within the highway, so it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in this regard.

#### **6.0 Design And Layout**

- 6.1. The proposal seeks the erection of both a single storey rear and a single storey side extension to Manna Wood Farm.
- 6.2. Section 12 of the NPPF requires inter alia that local planning authorities seek to promote and reinforce local distinctiveness as well as design. Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that decisions should ensure that developments, amongst other things, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, and are sympathetic to local character.

- 6.3. Babergh Local Plan Policy HS33 states that planning permission to extend a dwelling will be granted if, inter alia, the scale, mass, external materials and architectural details of the proposed extension blend in with those of the dwelling and its wider setting.
- 6.4. Manna Wood Farm has a simple form, characterised by its traditional, narrow form, only one room in width, with traditional thatched roof extending down over the porch on the northern elevation. To the rear of the dwelling is an existing single storey side and rear lean-to extension with a tiled roof. The existing extension is considered inappropriate in its form and layout.
- 6.5. The proposed side extension would protrude from the north eastern corner of the existing rear extension. It would appear disjointed and disconnected from the building; viewed as an outbuilding awkwardly abutting the existing dwelling. The modern materials proposed are not considered to compliment the traditional host dwelling, which instead would detract from the attractive thatched and rendered element.
- 6.6. The proposed porch on the side extension is out of keeping with the building. The addition of a pitched porch on an extension to the dwelling would become a significant architectural element and would not be viewed as subservient to the existing main entrance to the dwelling. It would add an additional pitched element juxtaposed with the existing traditional thatched roof.
- 6.7. The proposed rear extension is more modest in design and scale. However, the rear extension would introduce an additional roof pitch, different to the existing thatched house, its existing extension and proposed side extension. The rear elevation when viewed as a whole from the rear garden would appear convoluted and incongruous.
- 6.8. The proposed extensions do not represent a natural extension to the property. Instead they appear disjointed and as 'awkward add-ons', lacking any harmony or relation to the existing dwelling. The extensions would result in several varying architectural forms, in particular the roof styles. The rear section would appear convoluted and overly complicated, out-of-keeping with the simple characteristics of the dwelling.
- 6.9. The proposals are not considered to be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and neither are they sympathetic to the local character, contrary to the requirements of the NPPF. Furthermore, the proposals fail to be of appropriate form and detailed design having regards to the host dwelling. The materials proposed are also out of keeping with the host dwelling. As such the proposal is also contrary to Local Plan Policy CN01.

## **7.0 Landscape Impact, Trees, Ecology, Biodiversity And Protected Species**

- 7.1. n/a

## **8.0 Land Contamination, Flood Risk, Drainage and Waste**

- 8.1. n/a

## **9.0 Heritage Issues**

- 9.1. Manna Wood Farm has been identified by the Councils Heritage Team as a non-designated heritage asset. Non-designated heritage assets have a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, but which are not formally designated heritage assets.

- 9.2. Paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) states that: “The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset”.
- 9.4. The Councils Heritage Officers have assessed the application proposal and consider that it would result in a medium level of less than substantial harm to a non-designated heritage asset because the proposed extensions would result in an overly complicated and disjointed arrangement that would detract from the simple form and relative status of the historic core of the building.
- 9.5. The Heritage Team considered that the proposed extensions would result in a concentration of varying architectural forms within a relatively small area, in combination with the existing 20<sup>th</sup> century extension, that would give the rear section of the building a convoluted and overly complicated form, out-of-keeping with the simple planform characteristic of the historic core.
- 9.6. As such, given that the proposal would result in medium level of less than substantial harm to a non-designated heritage a balanced judgement has to be made as required by paragraph 197, which will be considered in the planning balance section below.
- 9.6. Local Plan Policy CN06 repeats the aims and objectives of the NPPF, stating: “proposals for the alteration (including part demolition), extension or change of use of buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest (including curtilage structures), or for the sub-division of, or new work within the curtilage or setting of a listed building should in this case (amongst other things):
- preserve the historic fabric of the building, and ensure that all proposals to remove by demolition, or alter any part of the building are justified in terms of preserving the special character of the building and will cause the minimum possible impact;
  - retain all elements, components, and features which form part of the building’s special interest and respect the original scale, form, design and purpose of the architectural unit;
  - be of an appropriate scale, form, siting and detailed design to harmonise with the existing building and its setting;
  - use materials and components which are natural or handmade, and which complement or harmonise with those on the building and the area. This will include lime plasters and lime mortars; natural clay or slate roofs; bricks; handmade timber windows and doors.”
- 9.7. This building as a non-designated heritage asset is considered to have historic interest so as to require assessment under this policy.
- 9.8. The proposed extensions are considered to be out-of-keeping with the existing design and form of the dwelling. The awkward articulation of the side extension fails to respect and harmonise with the existing built form, introducing a disconnected and disjointed addition. In failing to respect the character of the non-designated heritage asset the proposal reduces the significance and perceived importance of the historic core. The materials proposed do not reflect those of the existing dwelling or the local area. Thus, the proposed extensions are considered contrary to Local Plan Policy CN06.

## **10.0 Impact On Residential Amenity**

10.1. The site has no immediate neighbouring properties. The site boundaries are formed by dense mature vegetation, screening any potential views. Due to this it is considered that the proposal will not detrimentally affect any neighbouring amenity.

#### **11.0 Planning Obligations / CIL**

11.1. n/a

---

## **PART FOUR – CONCLUSION**

---

#### **12.0 Planning Balance and Conclusion**

12.1. The application proposals lack any harmony or relation to the existing dwelling and fail to respect its simple and traditional form. The extensions result in several varying architectural forms when viewed from the rear, appearing overly complicated and out-of-keeping with the simple characteristics of the dwelling. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Local Plan Policy CN01 which seeks to ensure that extensions to dwelling are of an appropriate scale, mass, external materials and that the architectural details blend in with those of the dwelling and its wider setting.

12.2. Manna Wood Farm, having been identified as a non-designated heritage asset, is considered to have historic interest and therefore has been assessed against Local Plan Policy CN06. The proposals would result in an overly complicated and disjointed arrangement which fails to respect the original scale and form of the dwelling. The modern materials proposed would detract from the traditional attractive thatched and rendered element. As such, the proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Local Plan policy.

12.3. The National Planning Policy Framework (2019) requires for non-designated heritage assets that a balanced judgement is made having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. In identifying a medium level of less than substantial harm, it is considered that the proposal reduces the significance and perceived importance of the historic core. The harm is not insignificant and adds to the balance of judgement in refusing the application, having regards to local plan policies and the NPPF.

12.4. The proposal is not compliant with the NPPF and policies within the Development Plan and is therefore not considered acceptable. This planning application is recommended for refusal pursuant to the failure to comply with Local Plan Policy CN01 and CN06 and paragraph 197 of the NPPF.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the application is REFUSED planning permission for the following reasons: -

1. The proposed development would result in a convoluted and contrived form of development which would be out of character with the existing dwelling. The proposed design is contemporary in materials and design and fails to be of an appropriate scale and form. The design fails to respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surroundings. As such the proposal is contrary to the requirements of Local Plan Policy CN01, and Section 12 of the NPPF, having particular regards to the requirements that development should respond to local character and history and reflect the identity of local surroundings, along with seeking to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

2. The application proposals are considered to affect the character and significance of the non-designated heritage asset. The proposed extensions would result in varying architectural forms which would give the rear section of the building a convoluted and overly complicated form, out-of-keeping with the simple planform characteristic of the historic core. The application proposal would therefore result in a medium level of less than substantial harm to a non-designated heritage asset because the proposed extensions would appear incongruous and disjointed, distracting from the simple form and relative status of the historic core of the building. The proposal would therefore be considered contrary to the provisions of the NPPF and development plan Policy CN06, which seeks to conserve, and where possible enhance, the historic environment and protect the character, setting and significance of heritage assets. Furthermore in balancing the level of harm and the significance of the heritage asset, as required by paragraph 197 of the NPPF, the balance of the proposal is unacceptable.