

Committee Report

Item No: 7D

Reference: DC/23/02385

Case Officer: Nikita Mossman

Ward: Haughley, Stowupland & Wetherden.

Ward Member/s: Cllr Janet Pearson. Cllr Rachel Eburne.

RECOMMENDATION – GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION WITH CONDITIONS

Description of Development

Householder Application - Erection of single storey side extension and new entrance porch

Location

10 Silver Street, Old Newton, Stowmarket, Suffolk IP14 4HG

Expiry Date: 18/07/2023

Application Type: HSE - Householder Planning Application

Development Type: Householder

Applicant: Ms N Hayward

Agent: Mr Matthew Stearn

Parish: Old Newton with Dagworth

Site Area: 0.05 hectares.

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 application site is owned by Mid Suffolk District Council.

PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Summary of Policies

The Adopted Development Plan for Mid Suffolk District Council comprises the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Focused Review (2012), the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (2008) and the Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998), specifically the live list of 'saved policies' (2007). The following are considered the most relevant to the determination of this proposal.

CLASSIFICATION: Official

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG - National Planning Policy Guidance

Adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (2008)
CS05 - Mid Suffolk's Environment

Adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Focused Review (2012)
FC01 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
FC01_1 - Mid Suffolk Approach to Delivering Sustainable Development

Adopted Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998)
GP01 - Design and layout of development
H15 - Development to reflect local characteristics
H16 - Protecting existing residential amenity
H17 - Keeping residential development away from pollution
H18 - Extensions to existing dwellings
T09 - Parking Standards
T10 - Highway Considerations in Development

Emerging Joint Local Plan Modifications (2023)
LP03 - Residential Extensions and Conversions
LP24 - Design and Residential Amenity
LP29 - Safe, Sustainable and Active Transport

Neighbourhood Plan Status

This application site is within the Neighbourhood Plan Area of Old Newton and Dagworth with Gipping. Whilst the Neighbourhood Development Plan has not yet been released, the Parish Council have begun preparation of it.

Consultations and Representations

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

[Click here to view consultee comments online](#)

A: Summary of Consultations

Town/Parish Council (Appendix 3)

Old Newton with Dagworth and Gipping Parish Clerk Comments Received - 13/06/2023

Cllrs believe this property can only be accessed by a footpath. There is no vehicular access to this property. It is believed that the choice of a flat roof has been opted for so as to not impact on the neighbours. It was agreed that the fence hides most of the proposed build. The only side that can see the property would be on Falconer Avenue and they are bungalows and Cllrs therefore believe there will be very little detrimental impact to any of the neighbours.

Cllrs have concerns due to the lack of access to the property. There is council owned land that the owner currently uses for personal parking which they have been asked not to do. Cllrs believe this land could be

used and abused for the delivery of building materials and or parking of contractor's vehicles. Cllrs would like to see the construction management plan ' for logistics of access for delivery and use of building materials due to lack of access and parking spaces.

Cllrs do not have an issue with the potential build and have no concerns regarding the size or shape of the extension being requested. It was proposed and seconded to approve the application with the condition of Cllrs seeing a construction management plan. All Cllrs were unanimously in favour provided the construction management plan is provided.

Officer comment: *It is accepted that the site has limited access and parking provision. A construction management plan will help control and manage the construction period (as recommended by the Highways Authority).*

County Council Responses (Appendix 5)

SCC Highways Received - 03/08/2023

No objection, subject to a condition for a construction management plan.

B: Representations

At the time of writing this report no letters/emails/online comments have been received. A verbal update shall be provided, as necessary.

PLANNING HISTORY

No relevant planning history.

PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1. The Site and Surroundings

- 1.1. The site consists of a semi-detached dwelling within the village of Old Newton. The site is accessed via a footpath from Silver Street which runs along the west of the site. The site benefits from a nearby shared parking bay accessed from Silver Street.
- 1.2. The dwelling is not listed nor are there any listed buildings nearby. The site is not within a Conservation Area or a Special Landscape Area.
- 1.3. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 and is at a low risk of surface water flooding.
- 1.4. The closest neighbouring property is to the north of the site and forms part of the semi-detached pair.

2. The Proposal

- 2.1. The proposal seeks planning permission for a single storey side extension to be used as a family room and a front porch. This is to allow for additional living space for the applicant.
- 2.2. The proposed dimensions of the side extension are 5.065m in width, c.5.7m in length and a maximum height of 2.85m. The extension would be set 1.2m away from the southern boundary.

- 2.3. The proposed dimensions of the porch are 2.94m in width and 2m in length with a maximum height of 2.85m.
- 2.4. The proposed side extension has a window on the front and rear elevation with no windows proposed on the side elevation.

3. The Principle Of Development

- 3.1. As a householder application for the erection of a single storey side extension and a front porch, the application is assessed under Local Plan policies GP1, H15, H16, H17, H18, T9, T10 and Core Strategy Policies CS5, FC1, FC1.1 and the NPPF.
- 3.2. Key considerations will be the design of the proposed extension and porch, and the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties.
- 3.3. Policies GP1 and H18 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan 1998 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 2021 in terms of achieving sustainable development.
- 3.4. The Councils have completed consultation on their Joint Local Plan (JLP) modifications. The policies had limited weight; however, the modification policies are now afforded added weight having regard to their progress through examination and consultation.
- 3.5. Relevant policies of the JLP include Policy LP03 which relates the design of residential extensions and ensures that there is a reasonable amount of amenity space remaining after the proposal. Also, Policy LP24 which requires all new development to be of a high standard, protecting the character and amenity of the existing area. Whilst the weight is limited, there is no conflict with these policies in principle.
- 3.6. The principle of development in terms of the erection of extensions, at 10 Silver Street, is acceptable, subject to compliance with the detailed requirements of policies H18 and LP03, in particular, which are considered below.

4. Site Access, Parking and Highway Safety Considerations

- 4.1. The site is accessed via a footpath from Silver Street which runs along the west of the site. There are no off-street parking spaces on the site but there is a shared parking bay situated to the north-west of the site which allows for 3no. vehicles.
- 4.2. SCC Highways were consulted on the application and raised no objection subject to a construction management plan condition being added to the decision.
- 4.3. It is recognised that the parking provision for the current dwelling does not accord with the adopted SCC Parking Guidance. However, as the proposal doesn't seek the addition of any bedrooms, the parking requirement is not increased as a result. It is considered unreasonable to seek for an improvement of the parking arrangement on this basis.

5. Design And Layout

- 5.1. Section 12 of the NPPF requires inter alia that local planning authorities seek to promote and reinforce local distinctiveness as well as design. Paragraph 130 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.

- 5.2. Policy GP1 calls for proposals to, amongst other matters, maintain and enhance the character and appearance of their surroundings, materials and finishes should be traditional, or compatible with traditional materials and finishes and should respect local architectural styles where appropriate.
- 5.3. Policy LP24 states that 'all new development must be of high-quality design, with a clear vision as to the positive contribution the development will make to its context'.
- 5.4. The materials proposed for the development are fibre cement boarding, a brick plinth, single ply membrane and UPVC windows. With regards to the boarding, the application states that hardi plank cladding might be used. Given the ambiguity, a condition is recommended to secure full details of the materials.
- 5.5. Both the side extension and porch are to be of a flat roof construction. The agent states that the flat roof design was chosen to reduce the visual impact of the proposed development. Officers agree that the flat roof design limits the height of the extensions and therefore the visual impact. Flat roof designs are not typically regarded as good design and are resisted in most circumstances. In this case, the proposed extension is to the side of the dwelling, behind mature boundary vegetation which extends along the western boundary. Views would be screened, in part, from the public vantage points on Silver Street. The extension is not unacceptable in its form and scale.
- 5.6. The proposed materials would not match the existing (which are brick and concrete tiles). However, there are examples of hardi plank cladding in the close vicinity of the site. The proposed materials are therefore not considered to negatively impact the character of the dwelling or the surrounding area.
- 5.7. To conclude, the proposal would not erode the character of the area, nor reduce the amenity of the area by means of appearance, traffic generation, nuisance or safety and accords with policies GP1 and H18 of the Local Plan, LP03 and LP24 of the emerging JLP, and the NPPF.

6. Impact On Residential Amenity

- 6.1. With regard to Mid-Suffolk Local Plan Policy H16, H18 and emerging JLP Policy LP24, it is crucial that development does not detrimentally affect residential amenity.
- 6.2. It is considered that this proposal does not give rise to any concerns of loss of neighbouring amenity (overlooking, loss of light, loss of privacy or overshadowing) by reason of the single storey nature of the proposed extension and porch as well as the flat roof elements of the proposal. The lack of a first-floor element removes the potential for overlooking onto the neighbouring properties and adds to the subservience of the extension and porch.
- 6.3. The potential for additional impacts on neighbouring amenity is therefore minimal and are not significant enough to warrant refusal.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

7. Planning Balance and Conclusion

- 7.1. The proposed development is subservient to the host dwelling and does not constitute over development of the plot. The proposal would have no detrimental impact on the privacy and amenity of nearby neighbouring properties. The existing parking requirement remains the same, and therefore there is not a detrimental risk to highway safety. The proposal is in keeping with the character, form and materials of development in the area.
- 7.2. The proposal accords with the NPPF and policies of the Development Plan and is therefore considered acceptable. This application is recommended for approval pursuant to its compliance with Local Plan Policy, emerging JLP Policy and the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION

That authority be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer to GRANT planning permission, including the imposition of relevant conditions and informative as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Chief Planning Officer:

- Standard time limit (3yrs for implementation of scheme)
- Approved Plans (Plans submitted that form this application)
- Materials Schedule (prior to commencement of works above slab level)
- Construction Management Plan (prior to commencement)

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

- Proactive working statement