

Committee Report

Item No:

Reference: 0552/17

Case Officer: Sian Bunbury

Ward: Hoxne.

Ward Member/s: Cllr Elizabeth Gibson-Harries.

Description of Development

Erection of rear extension, loft conversion with dormer roof extension, front porch and new 3 bay cart lodge with room over.

Location

Old Rectory, Horham Road, Athelington IP21 5EJ,

Parish: Athelington

Listed Building: Affects Setting of Grade II*

Received: 08/02/2017

Expiry Date: 11/04/2017

Application Type: FUL - Full Planning Application

Development Type: Householder

Environmental Impact Assessment: Environmental Assessment Not Required

Applicant: Mr & Mr Cook & Hicks

Agent: Beech Architects

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR CONSIDERATION

This decision refers to drawing number 01Nov 2015 received 08/02/2017 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 01 Nov 2015 - Received 08/02/2017

Proposed Plans and Elevations 13 Dec 2015. Rev C - Received 08/02/2017

Cross Section 15 Dec 2015. Rev B - Received 08/02/2017

Proposed Site Plan 09 Dec 2015. Rev F - Received 21/04/2017

Floor Plan - Proposed 10 Dec 2015. Rev F - Received 21/04/2017

Floor Plan - Proposed 11 Dec 2015. Rev F - Received 21/04/2017

Block Plan - Proposed 17 Dec 2015. Rev A - Received 14/07/2017

Floor Plan - Proposed 12 Dec 2015. Rev G - Received 14/07/2017
Elevations - Proposed 14 Dec 2015. Rev F - Received 14/07/2017
Roof Plan - Proposed 16 Dec 2015. Rev C - Received 14/07/2017

The application, plans and documents submitted by the Applicant can be viewed online at www.midsuffolk.gov.uk.

PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

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

The applicant is a member of MSDC

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:

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
GP01 - Design and layout of development
H18 - Extensions to existing dwellings
HB01 - Protection of historic buildings
CS01 - Settlement Hierarchy
CS02 - Development in the Countryside & Countryside Villages
CS05 - Mid Suffolk's Environment

List of other relevant legislation

- Human Rights Act 1998
- Town & Country Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990

- Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 (any rural site)
- The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010
- Localism Act
- Consideration has been given to the provisions of Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act, 1998, in the assessment of this application but the proposal does not raise any significant issues.

List of other relevant legislation

- Human Rights Act 1998
- Town & Country Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990
- Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 (any rural site)
- The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010
- Localism Act
- Consideration has been given to the provisions of Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act, 1998, in the assessment of this application but the proposal does not raise any significant issues.

Details of Previous Committee / Resolutions and any member site visit

None

Details of any Pre Application Advice

None

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

Athelington Parish Council - No objections and support the application.

MSDC Heritage - Summarised comments on proposal as originally submitted. (See full consultation response.)

The proposal would cause less than substantial harm to an undesignated heritage asset as the scale of the proposed extensions and design of the proposed alterations with regard to the dormers and porch would harm the character of the Victorian former rectory.

Recommend that the scheme is revised to reduce the scale of extensions proposed to the south and east elevations, that the proposed dormers on the east elevation be reduced in scale and rearticulated, and that the porch be omitted from the proposal.

The proposed coach house would be erected to the north west of the dwelling, of red brick with white brick detailing to mirror that of the main dwelling, with a slate roof and timber side hung doors. The Heritage team supports this aspect of the proposal.

The proposals would not harm the setting of adjacent listed assets, but would cause less than substantial harm to the character of the host building, which is considered to be an undesignated Heritage asset. As

such, the Heritage team is unable to support the proposal in its current form, and considers the scheme to be contrary to the principles of the NPPF (para 135) and Local Plan policies HB1 and HB3. The concerns could be likely to be overcome by amendments as recommended above.

Recommend conditions relating to materials to match existing, with English bond to match.

MSDC Heritage Amended

An informal response to the amended scheme has suggested that the scheme appears similar to the original proposal. The ridge of the extension and the length of the porch have been reduced by 100mm but the porch is still considered inappropriate to the host dwelling. The amendments to the dormers is an improvement but the other alterations do not really address the concerns.

English Heritage - Do not wish to offer any comments. Recommend seeking the views of Council's specialist conservation and archaeological advisors as relevant.

SCC Archaeological service. - This site lies in an area of archaeological potential recorded on the County Historic Environment Record, in close proximity to the medieval church of St Peter (ATH 004), a medieval moat (ATH 002) and a scatter of medieval metalwork. As a result, there is high potential for the discovery of below-ground heritage assets of archaeological importance within this area, and groundworks associated with the development have the potential to damage or destroy any archaeological remains which exist.

There are no grounds to consider refusal of permission in order to achieve preservation in situ of any important heritage assets. However, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 141), any permission granted should be the subject of a planning condition to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage asset before it is damaged or destroyed.

Recommend standard condition of investigation.

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 decision, 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. The Site and Surroundings

- 1.1. The Old Rectory sits within its own grounds in a countryside location, fronting Horham Road. Opposite the site is the grade 2* Parish Church. To the north is the grade 2 listed Church

Farmhouse. A public footpath runs along the north east boundary of the site with agricultural land beyond the hedged site boundary. The site is well screened by trees and hedges to the western roadside boundary. Agricultural land lies further to the south.

2. The Proposal

2.1. The proposal is composed of a number of elements:

The erection of a rear single storey extension to provide a kitchen/dining room linked to the house by a library/hall. This element wraps around the south east corner of the host dwelling and presents a lean-to roof together with a gable to the south elevation.

It is proposed to re-roof a first floor lean-to roof to form a 'pyramid' roof. There is associated raising of the brickwork to create a new eaves line.

A loft conversion and roof extension/raising of the main ridge to create an extra bedroom with new dormers to the west (front) and east (rear) elevations.

A new porch is proposed over the front door on the west elevation.

The erection of a detached 3 bay coach house with room over.

2.2. The additional floorspace is given as 252sq.m.

2.3. The proposal includes a 3 bay coach house with associated turning area.

2.4. The ridge height of the single storey extension is given as 4.133m. The raised pyramid roof is dimensioned as 7.024m and the proposed ridge height of the main dwelling is given as 8.917m

2.5. The proposed materials are to match the existing red brick with white brick details. The drawings indicate that brick type, pointing, mortar, brick bond and pattern will all match the existing. Natural slate will match the existing roof covering.

3. National Planning Policy Framework

3.1. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) contains the Government's planning policies for England and sets out how these are expected to be applied. Planning law continues to require that applications for planning permission are determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The policies contained within the NPPF are a material consideration and should be taken into account for decision-making purposes.

4. Core Strategy

4.1. Policy CS1 presents a Settlement Hierarchy which places Athelington and the application site as a countryside village and countryside. Policy CS2 identifies that in such a location the extension of dwellings is acceptable, in accordance with other policies. Policy CS5 seeks development of a high quality of design respecting local distinctiveness and respecting and enhancing the built historic environment.

5. Saved Policies in the Local Plans

5.1. Local Plan policy GP1 requires that proposals should maintain or enhance the character and appearance of their surroundings, using traditional materials and respecting architectural styles and making proper provision for garaging, parking and turning. Policy HB1 places a high priority on protecting the character and appearance of all buildings of architectural or historic interest and the

protection of the setting of listed buildings. Policy H18 relates to extensions to dwellings which should be in keeping with the size, design and materials of the existing and not materially or detrimentally affect the amenities of neighbours or the character and appearance of the area.

6. The Principle Of Development

6.1. The property is a domestic dwelling and as such, should be considered in the light of the policy considerations above.

7. Sustainability Assessment Of Proposal

7.1. The NPPF identifies 3 strands of sustainable development and the economic, social and environmental roles of planning and the need for decisions to be taken in accordance with development plan policies.

8. Site Access, Parking And Highway Safety Considerations

8.1. The proposal utilises an existing vehicular access and provides for parking and turning associated with the proposed 3 bay coach house.

9. Design And Layout

9.1. The large Victorian Old Rectory has an enclosed courtyard to the rear and overall the property has a range of ridge heights with a variety of roof forms: pitched, lean-to and hipped, with gables to the west and north elevations and a large bay window to the south. The design of the proposed extensions and alterations continue the pattern of incremental additions to the original house. The width of the single storey gable and ridge height has been reduced slightly in the light of the original comments from the Heritage team. The projection of the porch has been reduced and its glazing patterns have been altered. The proposed dormer windows have been amended so that on the east elevation three small dormers are proposed instead of the large single dormer as originally proposed. Materials and brick detailing are to match the existing.

10. Landscape Impact

10.1. The site is not prominent in the landscape and the proposal is not of material landscape impact. A public footpath runs along the north eastern boundary of the site, beyond a boundary hedge but from which the property is visible, although the proposal does not cause any material harm.

11. Environmental Impacts - Trees, Ecology And Land Contamination

11.1. The site is well screened from the road and the proposal does not necessitate the removal of any trees. As the proposal is for an extension to an existing dwelling land contamination issues do not arise.

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

12.1 The Heritage team have advised that the house be regarded as an undesignated heritage asset. The site lies within the setting of the grade 2* listed Church and grade 2 Church Farmhouse. The proposed coach house would be erected to the north west of the dwelling, of red brick with white brick detailing to mirror that of the main dwelling, with a slate roof and timber side hung doors and the Heritage

team supports this aspect of the proposal which is not considered to harm the setting of adjacent listed assets.

Heritage advised that the proposal be revised to reduce the scale of extensions proposed to the south and east elevations, that the proposed dormers on the east elevation be reduced in scale and rearticulated, and that the porch be omitted from the proposal. Amendments were received which Planning Officers regard as acceptable although Heritage have advised that, although the amendments to the dormers is an improvement the other alterations do not really address their concerns. Planning Officers have taken into account the guidance in para 135 of the NPPF relating to non-designated heritage assets and have weighed the judgement that the main area of concern – the large dormer has been amended and that together with the other amendments the scheme is now considered acceptable.

13. Impact On Residential Amenity

13.1. The proposal does not have an impact on residential amenity.

14. Planning Obligations / CIL (delete if not applicable)

14.1. CIL forms have been submitted and forwarded to the appropriate section.

15. Details Of Financial Benefits / Implications (S155 Housing and Planning Act 2016)

15.1. No benefits or implications under S155.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

16. Statement Required By Article 35 Of The Town And Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015.

16.1. When determining planning applications The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 requires Local Planning Authorities to explain how, in dealing with the application they have worked with the applicant to resolve any problems or issues arising.

16.2. In this case the scheme was amended following discussions and has been made acceptable to Planning officers.

17. Identification of any Legal Implications and/or Equality Implications (The Equalities Act 2012)

17.1. None are known by your officers.

18. Planning Balance

18.1. On balance and taking into account the amendments which were submitted it is considered that the scheme is acceptable. It presents a good standard of design, use of materials and detailing. The Old Rectory is a substantial sized property and the scale of the extensions are considered appropriate. Although there would be some impact on the architectural character of the host building overall it is considered that the scheme falls within policy and is acceptable.

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
- Materials, brick pointing, mortar bond and details as shown to match existing.
- Archaeological investigation.