

# Forest Heath District Council

**DEVELOPMENT  
CONTROL  
COMMITTEE**

**4 JUNE 2014**

**DEV14/118**

**Report of the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services**

**PLANNING APPLICATION DC/14/0398/HH – 6 ELLIOTT CLOSE, NEWMARKET**

## **Synopsis:**

Application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and associated matters.

## **Recommendation:**

**It is recommended that the Committee determine the attached application and associated matters.**

## **CONTACT OFFICER**

Charlotte Ballard (Case Officer)  
Tel: (01284) 757349

# Committee Report

---

**App. No:** DC/14/0398/HH      **Committee Date:** 4 June 2014

**Date Registered:** 11 March 2014      **Expiry Date:** 6 May 2014

**Case Officer:** Charlotte Ballard      **Recommendation:** Approve

**Parish:** Newmarket Town Council      **Ward:** Severals

**Proposal:** Erection of side and rear extensions and bay window to front elevation

**Site:** 6 Elliott Close, Newmarket

**Applicant:** Mrs Kay Phillips-Toro

---

## **Background:**

**This application is referred to the Development Control Committee due to objections received and at the request of the Delegation Panel.**

## **Application Details:**

1. Planning permission is sought for a rear and side extension to provide an enlarged kitchen and bedroom and a study. This would involve the replacement of the existing garage with a pitched roof structure which would be extended at the front to link with the dwelling. A front and side extension is proposed on the southern elevation to provide an entrance corridor. A bay window is also proposed to the front elevation.
2. Additional windows are shown on the southern elevation as a result of an internal reconfiguration. However, these are permitted development and as such, are not being considered as part of this application.

## **Amendments:**

3. None received.

## **Site Details:**

4. The application site comprises a single storey detached dwelling located within a close of similar sized dwellings, albeit of different forms and roof shapes. The dwelling is raised above road level with the front garden and driveway sloping

down towards the highway. A single flat roofed garage is located to the northern side of the dwelling and comprises the common boundary with no. 5.

**Application Supporting Material:**

5. Validation requirements statement, Plans.

**Planning History:**

6. None relevant.

**Consultations:**

7. None applicable for this application.

**Representations:**

8. Cllr Hirst (Ward Member): objects to the application on the following grounds:
  - The size of this proposal compromises this residential area and it is disproportionate to all the bungalows around it.
  - It changes the estate in a materially harmful way.
  - It takes a small two bedroomed building and makes it into a medium sized four bedroom bungalow. As the plots are small this has two results;
    - Firstly the proposed building fills a large part of the plot,
    - and secondly the walls of the proposed building close in on the gardens and properties of the neighbouring bungalows which alters the setting of the estate.
9. Two letters of objection have been received from the occupants of 5 and 7 Elliott Road. These can be summarised as:
  - Object to living area being extended to boundary – not in keeping with other properties in close which have space around them,
  - Will affect re-sale value of adjacent properties,
  - Pitched roof to garage will adversely affect sunlight reaching rear of no.5,
  - Rainwater will drain into no. 5 (Officer comment – the agent has specified a built in gutter which will address this issue),
  - Concern over damage to adjacent property and boundary fencing during construction phase,
  - Extension would almost double the existing living space and leave little garden,
  - Extension would be un-neighbouring and overbearing due to size and siting,
  - Hall extension would block light to kitchen of no. 7.
10. Parish Council: Did not initially object to the application but have subsequently raised concerns regarding potential over-development and the lack of clarity over the boundary wall which would need to be demolished.

**Policies:  
Development Plan**

11. Forest Heath Local Plan 1995 - HP 4.32 Extensions to dwellings

Core Strategy Policy CS5 - Design quality and local distinctiveness

**Other Planning Policy**

National Planning Policy Framework (2012) core principles and paragraphs 56 – 68.

**Officer Comment:**

12. The extension proposed to the rear of the dwelling will project 3.85m from the existing rear elevation. The eaves and ridge height will match the existing dwelling, measuring 4.8m to the ridge. Whilst this requires planning permission as it exceeds the dimensions permissible under permitted development, consideration must also be given to that which would be acceptable as an alternative. A rear addition with a matching footprint would be permitted development providing the ridge height was below 4m. In this case, the difference is 0.8m and this is not considered significant enough to refuse planning permission on this basis. The roof is pitched away from the neighbouring dwelling at no. 7 with a separation distance of 4m between properties. The sloping roof shape combined with the modest width of extension is considered acceptable in terms of impacts on residential amenity.
13. Similarly, it is possible to build an extension on the common boundary with a height up to 4m providing the eaves do not exceed 3m. With regard to the garage which is to be replaced and extended, this height meets the dimensions for permitted development and as such, the applicant would be able to replace their garage roof with a pitched structure without consent from the Local Authority.
14. The front and side extension projects 2.1m from the existing side elevation and projects 4m along the boundary. The eaves and ridge match those of the existing dwelling. Due to the orientation of the dwellings the side elevation of no. 7 is in shade much of the day, whilst a degree of daylight may be lost due to the proximity of the dwellings to each other, by reason of the modest scale of the proposed extension, any loss of light is unlikely to be of enough significance to justify a refusal of the application.
15. The extensions proposed, whilst increasing the living area of the dwelling fairly significantly still allow the retention of a reasonable sized garden for the plot, as well as accommodating parking space for two vehicles. For this reason, it is not considered that the proposal represents over-development of the plot. As the majority of the extensions are located at the rear, this proposal will have limited impact on the street scene and appearance of Elliott Close in general. For this reason, it is not considered that the proposal adversely affects the pattern of development in the area or setting of the locality.

## **Conclusion:**

16. Overall, the proposed extensions are, on balance, considered to be acceptable especially when taking into account what could be constructed as permitted development. The street scene will remain largely as existing which accommodates a variety of dwelling shapes, and although views from adjacent properties may experience some change it is not considered that these changes would result in unacceptable living conditions for the occupants due to overlooking, loss of light or structures being of an overbearing nature. Consequently, the application accords with the principles of Forest Heath Local Plan (1995) saved Policy 4.32, Forest Heath Core Strategy (2010) Policy CS5 and guidance contained within the NPPF (2012).

Therefore this application is recommended for approval subject to the following conditions.

## **Recommendation**

17. That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions –
1. Time limit
  2. Materials to match
  3. Removal of permitted development rights for windows on north and south elevations of extension
  4. Compliance with drawings

## **Documents:**

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online:

<http://planning.stedmundsbury.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=N1V6K5PDILK00>

Alternatively, hard copies are also available to view at Planning, Planning and Regulatory Services, Forest Heath District Council, District Offices, College Heath Road, Mildenhall, Suffolk, IP28 7EY (or West Suffolk House details as applicable)

Case Officer: Charlotte Ballard  
Tel. No. 01284 757349