

Committee Report

Item No: 7B

Reference: DC/22/00357

Case Officer: Alex Breadman

Ward: Haughley, Stowupland & Wetherden.

Ward Member/s: Cllr Keith Welham. Cllr Rachel Eburne.

RECOMMENDATION –PLANNING PERMISSION WITH CONDITIONS

Description of Development

Householder Application - Erection of single storey front and rear extensions.

Location

5 Trinity Walk, Stowupland, Suffolk, IP14 4AS

Expiry Date: 19/03/2022

Application Type: HSE - Householder Planning Application

Development Type: Householder

Applicant: Mr Philip Rake

Agent: N/A

Parish: Stowupland

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: Yes (DC/21/06220).

PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

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

The applicant is married to a Council employee.

PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Summary of Policies

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

NPPG-National Planning Policy Guidance

FC01 - Presumption In Favour Of Sustainable Development

FC01_1 - Mid Suffolk Approach To Delivering Sustainable Development

CS05 - Mid Suffolk's Environment

H15 - Development to reflect local characteristics

CLASSIFICATION: Official

H16 - Protecting existing residential amenity
H18 - Extensions to existing dwellings
T09 - Parking Standards
GP01 - Design and layout of development

Neighbourhood Plan Status

This application site is within the Stowupland Neighbourhood Plan Area.

The Neighbourhood Plan is currently at Stage 7: Adoption by the Local Planning Authority.

Accordingly, the Neighbourhood Plan has significant weight; relevant policies include:

- SNP14: Quality of Development, Resource Efficiency and Design Considerations

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)

Stowupland Parish Council – Comments Received 07.02.2022

Stowupland Parish Council SUPPORTS the application.

B: Representations

At the time of writing this report, no letters/emails/online comments have been received.

PLANNING HISTORY

No relevant planning history.

PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1.0 The Site and Surroundings

- 1.1. The application site hosts No. 5 Trinity Walk, a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling sited northeast of the highway, in an established residential area in the village of Stowupland. Given its setting, the dwelling has various near neighbours, notably No. 7 Trinity Walk of which is paired to the southeast, and No. 3 Trinity Walk which stands to the northwest.
- 1.2. The dwelling is of a rectangular form and includes an existing flat roof side extension and an enclosed, lean-to entrance porch. The dwelling is finished with red external facing brickwork. Nearby surrounding dwellings share similarities with regards to their size, scale and appearance.
- 1.3. The site is not a listed building, there are no nearby listed buildings or landscape designations. There are no major constraints on the site.

CLASSIFICATION: Official

2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1. The proposal seeks the erection of a single-storey front and rear extensions.
- 2.2. The proposed rear extension would be located beyond the existing side extension. The proposal would measure at 3.5 metres (length) x 3.9 metres (width), extending 2.8 metres beyond the rear elevation. The extension would have a flat roof, measuring at approximately 2.8 metres. It should be noted that the provided plans denote the raising of the existing side extension's flat roof by 0.4 metres to create one continuous roof.
- 2.3. The proposed front extension, similarly, would extend beyond the existing side extension. This extension would measure at 3.25 metres in length (extending beyond the forward elevation), with a width of 6.2 metres and in, turn, would create a new entrance porch. This element of the proposal would have a part dual-pitched roof/part lean-to, with an eaves height of approximately 2.5 metres and a maximum height of approximately 3.35 metres.
- 2.4. Proposed fenestration would include a new front entrance door, two front elevation windows, one side elevation window, one rear elevation window and one rear patio door located on the southeast side elevation; all of which are to be white UPVC, to match the dwellings existing fenestration. No rooflights or first floor fenestration are proposed.
- 2.5. Proposed external materials include HardiePlank wall cladding (or similar) with the final colour to be confirmed. A new flat roofing system to the rear extension/existing side extension and roof tiles to match the existing main roof on the front extension are also proposed.

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 H15, H16, H18, T09 and GP01 of the Mid-Suffolk Local Plan 1998; policies FC01 and CS05 of the Mid-Suffolk Core Strategy 2008 and policy SNP14 of the Stowupland Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019 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 National Planning Policy Framework 2019 in terms of achieving sustainable development.

- 3.5. The principle of development in terms of the erection of single-storey front and rear extensions to No. 5 Trinity Walk is considered acceptable, subject to compliance with the detailed requirements of the relevant policies outlined above.

4.0 Site Access, Parking And Highway Safety Considerations

- 4.1. Mid-Suffolk Local Plan Policy T09 ensures that all development proposals shall be required to provide for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles, on the application site, in accordance with the parking standards adopted by the district planning authority.
- 4.2. The application site's existing access and driveway/on-site parking areas would not be significantly altered as a result of the proposed development.
- 4.3. The proposed extensions would not include any additional bedrooms and, therefore, the proposal does not engage with the requirement for additional on-site parking in line with the Council's adopted parking standards (SCC Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2019).
- 4.4. It is, therefore, considered the proposed development would have no adverse impact on highway safety at this location.

5.0 Design And Layout [Impact On Street Scene]

- 5.1. The proposal seeks the erection of single-storey front and rear extensions.
- 5.2. 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, are sympathetic to local character, and function well and add to the overall quality of the area.
- 5.3. Mid-Suffolk Local Plan Policy GP01 states that proposals should maintain or enhance the character and appearance of their surroundings and respect the scale and density of surrounding development. Furthermore, materials and finishes should be traditional, or compatible with traditional materials and finishes and should respect local architectural styles where appropriate.
- 5.4. Mid-Suffolk Local Plan Policy H18 ensures that applications for extensions to existing dwellings will be approved, so long as they are in keeping with the size, design and materials of the existing dwelling; will not detrimentally affect the character and appearance of the area and will not result in over-development of the plot.
- 5.5. The proposed front and rear extensions would both extend beyond the existing side extension. The extensions would be of a modest size and scale, ensuring that the proposal appears subservient to the dwelling, and that the character of the dwelling and nearby surrounding is not adversely impacted as a result of the works.
- 5.6. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF. The proposal is of an appropriate form and detailed design having regards to the host dwelling and surrounding area. The materials proposed, whilst not entirely matching, are considered appropriate and clearly signify that the extensions are a modern addition to the dwelling. The proposal is considered not to constitute over-development of the plot and would not harm local distinctiveness. As such, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Local Plan Policies GP01 and H18.

6.0 Impact On Residential Amenity

- 6.1. Mid-Suffolk Local Plan Policy H16 aims to protect the existing amenity and character of residential areas. This policy states that development that materially reduces the amenity and privacy of adjacent dwellings, or erodes the character of the surrounding area, will be refused.
- 6.2. The application site lies within an established residential area, with neighbouring properties either side of the dwelling, both of which are two-storey. The proposed extensions are both single-storey and are considered modest in size and would be subservient to the host dwelling.
- 6.3. With regards to the private amenity space of neighbouring dwellings, the proposal would only include ground floor windows. The development, therefore, would not give rise to any potential overlooking or loss of privacy to the residents at any neighbouring dwellings.
- 6.4. The proposed extensions, by virtue of their design, scale and form, are not considered to affect the privacy of the nearby properties nor their visual amenity. It is, therefore, considered that the proposed extensions would not detrimentally affect the residential amenity of any nearby properties.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

7.0 Planning Balance and Conclusion

- 7.1. The application proposal is in keeping with the existing form and character of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The development is modest in size and scale and does not constitute over-development of the plot. The proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the privacy and amenity of neighbouring dwellings and would not result in any demonstratable harm to any matter of planning substance.
- 7.2. The proposal accords with the NPPF and policies within the Development Plan and is, therefore, considered to be acceptable. This application is recommended for approval, given its compliance with the relevant Local Plan Policies and NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION

That PLANNING PERMISSION be granted, with the following conditions:

- Standard time limit (3yrs for implementation of scheme)
- Approved Plans (Plans submitted that form this application)
- Agreement of cladding colour

(2) And the following informative notes as summarised and those as may be deemed necessary:

- Proactive working statement