

Committee Report

Item 8F

Reference: DC/20/00331
Case Officer: Harry Bailey

Ward: Bacton.

Ward Member/s: Cllr Andrew Mellen.

RECOMMENDATION – GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION WITH CONDITIONS

Description of Development

Householder application - Erection of front porch and 2no single storey rear extensions. Erection of garage (following demolition of existing) and formation of extended driveway.

Location

Woodfield, 4 Mill Hill, Cotton, Stowmarket Suffolk IP14 4RT

Expiry Date: 24/03/2020

Application Type: HSE - Householder Planning Application

Development Type: Householder

Applicant: Mr And Mrs Fuller

Agent: Mr Fraser Hall

Parish: Cotton

Site Area: approximately 0.074ha

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/s:

- The applicant is an employee of Babergh Mid Suffolk District Councils.

PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Summary of Policies

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework
FC01 - Presumption In Favour Of Sustainable Development
FC01_1 - Mid Suffolk Approach To Delivering Sustainable Development
CS05 - Mid Suffolk's Environment
GP01 - Design and layout of development
H15 - Development to reflect local characteristics
H16 - Protecting existing residential amenity
H18 - Extensions to existing dwellings
T09 - Parking Standards
T10 - Highway Considerations in Development

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 (Appendix 3)

Cotton Parish Council – no objections.

County Council Responses (Appendix 5)

Suffolk County Council Highways - the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the highway network at this location. Therefore, SCC Highways does not wish to restrict the grant of any permission.

B: Representations

At the time of writing this report at least 2 letters/emails/online comments have been received. It is the officer opinion that this represents 1 objections, 0 support and 1 general comment. A verbal update shall be provided as necessary.

Views are summarised below:-

2 comments were made with concerns over:

- Loss of south facing light within the property (Tanglewood) due to the roof height of the bedroom extension
- Over development of site
- Overlooking from 'bedroom three window', unless obscured, will result in overlooking on to the neighbouring dwelling of Tanglewood.

(Note: All individual representations are counted and considered. Repeated and/or additional communication from a single individual will be counted as one representation.)

PLANNING HISTORY

REF: DC/20/00331

Householder application - Erection of front porch and 2no single storey rear extensions. Erection of garage (following demolition of existing) and formation of extended driveway.

DECISION: PCO

PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1. The Site and Surroundings

1.1 The dwelling is located in the heart of the village of Cotton, fronting north-eastwards on to the north-west to south-east running Mill Hill road. Woodfield is a detached bungalow that sits in a row of other similar detached dwellings. Although the applicant's property fronts on to Mill Hill, it is situated relatively setback from Mill Hill, with a private driveway siting between the two and trees acting as a screen from the public view. The site currently hosts a small, detached flat-roof cart lodge sited from the north elevation.

1.2. Similar residential form is situated both to the north and south of the site, meanwhile to the east lies arable land. Furthermore, to the west lies a small area of privately owned grassland, with further residential houses situated on further.

1.3. The site is not constrained by either a Conservation Area or Special Landscape Area, nor are there any nearby listed buildings.

2. The Proposal

2.1 The proposal seeks the demolition of aspects of the original dwelling and the subsequent development of two single storey rear extensions, a front porch and a detached garage.

2.2. The overall internal floorspace will amount to approximately 170 metre squared, an additional 70 metre squared from what is existing.

2.3. The site requires provision for 2 parking spaces, a sufficient parking and turning area is made available in the proposed scheme.

2.4. Surrounding dwellings are positioned in the local area that is considered to be of medium density. Neighbouring properties are located either side of the applicant dwelling, however there is no immediate neighbour to the rear. The back to back distance to the nearest dwelling is approximately 45 metres.

2.5. The siting of the applicant dwelling between two similar detached residential dwellings leads to consideration to the degree of overlooking onto the neighbours as a material planning consideration. The ground floor nature of the proposal reduces the resultant overlooking onto neighbouring property; however, the officer does give further consideration based on the representations made by the resident to the north of the dwelling (Tanglewood).

2.6. The proposed development would adopt a grey render for the elevations of the that sit on the blueprint of the existing dwelling. Additionally, the development forward of the principal elevation of the existing dwelling (the porch and single-bay garage) would endorse vertical, grey-green timber board cladding. Moreover, the two single-storey rear extensions would adopt red-brick elevations.

Lastly, the proposed roof would use either dark grey pantiles or slate, from the existing concrete pantiles.

3. The Principle Of Development

3.1. As identified in Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchases Act (2004), predominant reference should be given to the local development plan of the District Authority. The determination of applications made that District Authority must made in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations otherwise indicate. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) sets the precedent for the principle of development for applications and is a material consideration.

3.2. Development plan policy H18 provides the local planning policy basis for the principle of the erection of extensions to existing dwellings. The policy states that the acceptability of such proposals would be subject to ensuring extensions are in keeping with the scale of the existing dwelling, of good design, and do not significantly affect the amenities of neighbours or local character.

3.3. Policy H16 of the Mid Suffolk development plan ensures that new development protects the existing amenity and character of primarily residential areas. Such develops that materially reduce the amenity and privacy of adjacent dwellings or erode the character of the surrounding area should be refused by the District Authority.

3.4. When considering the design and layout of development, Policy GP01 provides the local policy basis for new development to endorse good design and effective layout of both built form and the altered surrounding environment.

3.6. Furthermore, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides the foundation for the local planning policies, as stated above. Paragraph 127 reinforces the principle to ensure that new development is of good design, sympathetic to the local character, and does not impact the amenities of the neighbours. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF provides the basis for the application for presumption in favour of sustainable development.

4. Nearby Services and Connections Assessment Of Proposal

4.1. The nature of this householder development is not considered significant enough to alter the impacts on nearby services and connections.

5. Site Access, Parking And Highway Safety Considerations

5.1. The proposed access to the dwelling would use what is existing, onto Mill Hill. In consultation with SCC Highways, no impacts have been identified and is therefore considered to be acceptable. The proposal is not considered to raise any significant impacts on Highways and Parking that could warrant refusal. The proposed arrangements are not dissimilar from what is existing, with the re-location of the

detached garage the only significant change. Furthermore, the proposal increases the overall surface area of the driveway, enhancing the provision for parking and turning provision.

6. Design And Layout [Impact On Street Scene]

6.1. As highlighted in paragraph 2.7, the proposal uses a mix of materials on the external elevations. In its entirety the materials are considered to be appropriate, although are not considered to enhance the environment. The officer does note that the mix of materials used portrays the transition and evolution of the dwelling, as each aspect of development endorses materials that define the built form.

6.2. The proposed size and scale of the development is considered appropriate and sympathetic to the host dwelling. The nature of two ground floor extensions that protrude from the southern elevation would need to remain incidental to the host dwelling in order to adhere to policies H18 and GP01. With the northerly protrusion approximately 45% greater the length of the southerly extension, the officer considers if the nature of the proposal is sympathetic and harmonious with the host dwelling.

The adoption of the roofing for both extensions located below the roof of the existing dwelling clearly defines the extensions, giving the visual impression that the proposed built form is incidental to the host dwelling. Furthermore, this aspect of the development is not considered to have an impact when viewing the property from the Public Highway, therefore the visual harm is minimal.

Furthermore, the officer considers that both the porch and the garage are appropriate to the dwelling and local character.

6.3. Neighbouring dwellings to the south of the applicant property are relatively larger in size to the existing dwelling of Woodfield. Additionally, the dwellings to the north of the applicant site uphold a similar blueprint to that of Woodfield. Furthermore, it is notable that extended built form to the rear of dwellings, and outbuildings in the form of garages, including those forward of the principal elevation, are not uncommon.

6.4. The screening generated by the existing trees and vegetation along the principal boundary of the property with the road, blocks the main line of sight from the public view.

6.5. In its entirety on design and layout, the proposed scheme would conform to the local character.

7. Landscape Impact, Trees, Ecology, Biodiversity And Protected Species

7.1. The proposal would not further impact the visual landscape from the disused dwelling that is existing. The officer considers that the proposal to re-generate the dwelling with new materials would, in all, increase the attractiveness of the property and therefore the visual landscape.

7.2. The environment surrounding the applicant dwelling is does not host any Tree Protection Orders (TPOs), nor does the area present any obvious habitats for protected species.

8. Land Contamination, Flood Risk, Drainage and Waste

8.1. The proposal does not give rise to any significant concerns in regard to Land Contamination or Waste.

8.2. The officer does not consider there to be any Flood Risk or Drainage concerns.

9. Heritage Issues [Including The Impact On The Character And Appearance Of The Conservation Area And On The Setting Of Neighbouring Listed Buildings]

9.1. There are no designated heritage assets in the vicinity of the site considered to be harmed

9.2. The applicant site is not located in a Conservation Area.

10. Impact On Residential Amenity

10.1. In accordance with development plan policies H16 and H18, the acceptability of any development should seek to ensure the protection of any existing amenity. When considering this aspect of development, the officer notes particular attention to the impacts of overshadowing and overlooking that may arise from the development.

10.2. The single-storey nature of development would not result in any significant impact on overshadowing in officer opinion that would warrant refusal. The positioning of the dwelling to the sun, would not result in any significant overshadowing on the neighbours to the south. There would be no further impact or very little overshadowing from what is existing. The proposed scheme does not seek enlargement of the roof and would not result in any further overshadowing by the development.

10.3. As indicated in the representations section of this report, alongside paragraph 2.7, the neighbours situated immediately north to the applicant have objected on the grounds that the 'Bedroom 3' window would overlook onto the property. The window in question is proposed on the ground floor of the north elevation for bedroom 3, as indicated on the proposed floor plan. The neighbour states that the onlooking through the proposed window would enable the applicants to see onto the neighbouring property and through the house. However, the existing siting of a 1.8-metre-high timber fence between the properties would considerably mitigate the overlooking on to the neighbouring property and permitted development would allow this to be increased to 2 metres. The highest point of the window is 2 metres and beyond average head height. The degree of harm on overlooking is considered to be minimal and entirely preventable should the neighbour wish to explore the full provision of permitted development. Therefore, the officer does not consider that there would be any significant degree of overlooking through the window on to the neighbouring property that would be sufficient to warrant refusal.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

12. Planning Balance and Conclusion

12.1. In its entirety, the proposal does conform to development plan policies H18 and GP01 by means of good design, sympathetic size and scale, and development that is sympathetic to the local character. Furthermore, the representations by the neighbours has been considered by the officer, however the highlighted harm is not sufficient to warrant a refusal. As explored in section 10 of the report, the proposed scheme would adhere to policy H16 and H18 on grounds of residential amenity. In accordance with the principles of planning set out in the NPPF, the proposed scheme is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

That the application is GRANTED planning permission and includes the following conditions:-

- Standard Time Condition
- Approved Plans