

Committee Report

Item No: 2

Ward: Stowmarket North..

Ward Member/s: Cllr Barry Humphreys MBE.
Cllr Dave Muller. Cllr Gary Green.

Reference: DC/17/05488

Case Officer: Jamie Edwards

Description of Development

Householder Planning Application - Erection of single-storey rear and side extension, first-floor extension, garage and loft conversion.

Location

1 Eliot Way, Stowmarket, Suffolk, IP14 1RG

Parish: Stowmarket

Site Area:

Conservation Area:

Listed Building:

Received: 31/10/2017

Expiry Date: 21/02/2018

Application Type: HSE - Householder Planning Application

Development Type: Householder

Applicant: Mr And Mrs Kerrie

Agent: Mr Lee Scales

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR CONSIDERATION

This decision refers to drawing number 17.125 PA.006A received 12/12/2017 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:

Proposed Site Plan 17.125 PA.007C - Received 12/12/2017

Existing Site Plan 17.125 PA.006A - Received 12/12/2017

Floor Plan - Proposed 17.125 PA.001A - Received 12/12/2017

Floor Plan - Existing 17.125 PA.003F - Received 12/12/2017

Elevations - Proposed 17.125 PA.005D - Received 12/12/2017

Elevations - Existing 17.125 PA.002A - Received 12/12/2017

Roof Plan - Proposed 17.125 PA.004D - Received 12/12/2017

Defined Red Line Plan 17.125 PA.006A - Received 12/12/2017

The application, plans and documents submitted by the Applicant can be viewed online at www.midsuffolk.gov.uk. Alternatively, a copy is available to view at the Mid Suffolk and Babergh District Council Offices.

PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

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

Called to committed by Cllr Green.

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:

None

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

GP01 - Design and layout of development
SB02 - Development appropriate to its setting
H02 - Housing development in towns
H18 - Extensions to existing dwellings
H15 - Development to reflect local characteristics
H16 - Protecting existing residential amenity
NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

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

Stowmarket Parish Clerk

No comments received

Highways Team

No comments provided

B: Representations

Five comments received in total.

Summarised:

- Do not wish to set a precedent for further development of similar size.
- Fear of on-road parking.
- Impact to neighbouring properties due to over development, overlooking and light levels.
- Existing issues with run-off water and drainage could be enhanced by the proposed development.

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 decisions, 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 Details of Amended Plans and Negotiations

1.1 Amended plans have been received for the following:

- Knocking through wall between bedroom 3 and 4 on the first floor of the existing dwelling.
- Keeping the existing two bay garages.
- Change to size and design of the existing windows on the porch and directly above on the landing
- Revised red line plan

2 Site and Surroundings

2.1 The proposed site is located within a cul-de-sac within the North-West area of Stowmarket. Properties within this cul-de-sac are of different shapes and characters. There is no coherent pattern to the development. The proposed site is a modest four-bedroom property with a double bay garage and bricked driveway and faces to the south. The neighbour on the east of the property is No. 2 Eliot Way. It is set back slightly from 1 Eliot way and at approximately a 45-degree angle facing the south east. No. 21 Thackeray Road is to the west of the proposed site, situated on the junction entrance from to Eliot Way from Thackeray Road.

3 Proposal

3.1 The proposal has multiple elements:

- Erection of single storey rear extension, which will have a flat roof and roof lantern.
- The loft will be converted into a playroom, which would be acceptable under permitted development.

- A first-floor extension above the double bay garage.

4 Principle of Development

4.1 National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27th March 2012. It provides that the NPPF "does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved, and proposed development that conflicts should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise".

4.2 Development Plan

The principle of the erection of single-storey rear and side extension, first-floor extension and loft conversion is supported, subject to detailed compliance with Policies GP1, SB2, H2, H16 and H18 of the saved Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998), Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy (2008) and Policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the Core Strategy Focused Review (2012) and other material considerations.

5 Design and Layout

- 5.1 The proposal is for a rear extension providing an open plan ground floor, including an enlarged kitchen and dining room. An existing rear extension will be replaced by the single storey rear extension. The proposed extension will run the length of the main dwelling before connecting with the rear of the garage at a parallel angle to the boundary line. The north elevation of the rear extension will have folding glass doors and a window, both made from white PVC. The rear extension will have a flat roof with a roof lantern that is central to the main dwelling. The exterior walls will be red brick to match the existing rear walls of the main dwelling. The proposal is also for a first-floor extension above the garage. This is for a master bedroom and en-suite.
- 5.2 Where brickwork is required it will match that of the main dwelling but for the most part the exterior walls will be cement based render to match the first-floor walls of the main dwelling. Roof tiles will match the existing.
- 5.3 The scale of the first-floor addition is to match that of the garage beneath. From ground level it will be 6.9m tall to the pitch of the roof, this is shorter than the main dwelling which stands at 7.620m tall. The width of the extension is approximately 2.5m thinner than the main dwelling. It will therefore, when also considering the rear single storey addition, be within scale of the existing main dwelling.
- 5.4 The proposal will convert the loft space into a 'playroom' with three roof lights - acceptable under permitted development.
- 5.5 The proposal also looks to replace the windows central to the south elevation that are situated at the entrance of the house and directly above on the first-floor landing area. The ground floor windows will have a rounded top. Similarly, the first-floor landing window will also have a rounded top but will increase in size.
- 5.6 The character of the surrounding area is of a variety of dwellings; mixed in size, shape, design and materials with no coherent pattern. In the light of this and the character of the proposal it is not considered that there would be an unacceptable impact in this respect.

The proposal is therefore acceptable and in accordance with the H2, H15 and H18 policy of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998).

6 Highway Safety (Parking, Access, Layout)

6.1 The original plans proposed to convert the two-bay garage in to a study, utility room and two bathrooms. This would mean the loss of two parking spaces. The plans proposed block paving the grass verge and tarmac path outside the property to allow for additional parking. Following recommendations from Highways Development Management team it was confirmed that the applicant does not own this land such that the proposal would result in insufficient parking.

6.2 Therefore, new plans have been submitted which keep the existing double bay garage. This amendment is now in line with Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2015) requiring a minimum of three parking spaces within the site for four or more bedrooms. In order to retain the parking spaces the permitted development rights to convert the garage will be removed.

7 Residential Amenity

7.1 A core planning principle in the NPPF is that Local Planning Authorities should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Policy SB2 of the Mid Suffolk Local plan also seeks to preserve privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties.

7.2 The proposed single storey extension will have minimal impact on the neighbouring amenity.

7.3 The first-floor extension above the garage with a pitched roof has been assessed to have minimal impact to residential amenity. Although the proposal of the single storey extension will be up to the boundary line, due to the orientation of the neighbouring property [2 Eliot Way] being nonlinear and at a 45-degree angle to the proposed site, it will have minimal impact to the amenity space. Using the 45-degree line from the proposed rear window on the first-floor extension, the viewable area of the adjacent neighbouring property (to the north east of the proposed site) is increased, but is restricted due to the orientation of the [2 Eliot Way] neighbouring property.

7.4 Using a 45-degree line from the neighbouring property's first floor window, which is on the front of their property above their single bay garage, the proposal will not have any impact on levels of light or overlooking. Considering all the above against the SB2, GP1, SB2, H2 and H15 of the Mid Suffolk Local plan (1998) the proposal is considered acceptable.

8 Planning Balance

8.1 The proposed development is significant in size, however not so significant as to be considered overdevelopment. However, it has been considered that these additions, of the rear single storey and first floor extensions, are in scale of the main property and curtilage. Currently there is sufficient parking for up to four cars, with a double garage and driveway parking within the site. The increase in bedrooms as part of this development warrant the preservation of all parking spaces via a condition. The loft conversion, roof

lights and new design windows are acceptable under permitted development. Residential amenity will not be unacceptably affected when considering both space and light levels. The final consideration for balance is how the proposal fits in the surrounding area and immediate cul-de-sac. The size, shape and design of the neighbouring properties follow no pattern and are of mixed variety. The proposal therefore is acceptable as it does not disturb the harmonisation or character of the surrounding area.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

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

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.

In this case the officer liaised with the applicant's agents and sought further information to resolve issues raised.

10 Conclusion

The proposal would not result in any demonstrable harm to any matter of planning substance. There would be no detrimental effect on the character or the appearance of the surrounding area. The impact on the privacy and amenity of nearby neighbouring properties is minimal and in accordance with the H16 policy of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998). It accords with relevant development plan policies and national planning guidance. The proposal is acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION

That authority be delegated to Corporate Manager – Growth & Sustainable Planning to grant planning permission subject to the conditions as set out below:

- Standard time limit
- To be in accordance with submitted documents and drawings.
- Remove Permitted Development rights to convert the double bay garage to preserve the existing parking spaces.