



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

DEV/SE/16/05

Development Control Committee

7 January 2016

Householder Application DC/15/2058/HH

2 Croft Rise, Bury St Edmunds

Date: 12 October **Expiry Date:** 7 December 2015 -
Registered: 2015 Extension of time to
8 January 2016

Case Officer: Kerri Cooper **Recommendation:** Grant

Parish: Bury St. Edmunds Town **Ward:** Southgate

Proposal: Householder Planning Application - Two storey rear extension

Site: 2 Croft Rise, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, IP33 2PY

Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. P. Ivory

Synopsis:

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

Recommendation:

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

CONTACT CASE OFFICER:

Email: kerri.cooper@westsuffolk.gov.uk

Telephone: 01284 757341

Background:

This application is before the Committee after being referred following consideration at the Delegation Panel. It was presented to the Panel at the request of Cllr. Sarah Stamp, one of the Ward Members on the grounds that there will be a detrimental impact to the neighbours should this proposal go ahead. Bury St Edmunds Town Council have no objection to the proposal.

A site visit is proposed to take place on Monday 4 January 2016.

Proposal:

1. Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two-storey rear extension to create an extended kitchen / dining room / family room plus utility room on the ground floor with two extended bedrooms on the first floor.
2. The proposal has a depth of 3.2 metres and a height of 7.5 metres to the ridge, which sits slightly below the ridge of the host property.

Application Supporting Material:

3. Information submitted with the application as follows:
 - Drawing nos. CRL11915 01, 02, 03 and 04 Rev B received 12th October 2015.

Site Details:

4. The application site comprises a two storey, detached dwelling situated within the Housing Settlement Boundary of Bury St. Edmunds. The host dwelling is set forward from its neighbour, facing a pedestrian walkway and open space.

Planning History:

5. There is no history that is relevant to the determination of this application.

Consultations:

6. N/A

Representations:

7. Town Council: Have no objection based on the plans received.
8. Neighbours: Two letters of objection have been received making the following summarised comments:

- The planning application for the two storey rear extension of 2 Croft Rise will considerably cause a reduction of light in to neighbouring conservatory as well as significantly reduce the pleasure and enjoyment of the conservatory which is family room used all the year round. This is because the proposed extension will extend beyond the back wall of the neighbouring property and therefore will block the afternoon sun in the conservatory particularly from late autumn to early spring.
- Consider that a single storey extension would be more in keeping with the properties in this location and would have less detrimental impact on both nearby property and the surrounding
- We purchased our house because of the large rear garden that is not overlooked and benefits from being a sun trap all day long. A 3.2 metre extension will significantly impact our enjoyment of our garden area and we are on lower ground than the house at No2, so the 2 stories will tower over our view. This extension is not allowing for this staggered line and will be an intrusion into our view from the rear windows / patio doors of our house as well as sunlight in our garden during the summer months.

9. Cllr. Sarah Stamp has requested that the matter is presented before the Delegation Panel *'on the basis that there will be a detrimental impact to the neighbours should this proposed extension go ahead'*.

Policy: The following policies of the Joint Development Management Policies Document, the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December 2010 and Bury St. Edmunds Vision 2031 have been taken into account in the consideration of this application:

10. Joint Development Management Policies Document:

- Policy DM1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
- Policy DM2 (Creating Places)
- Policy DM24 (Alterations and Extensions to Dwellings)

11. St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December 2010:

- Policy CS3 (Design and Local Distinctiveness as supported by SPD Development Design and Impact)

12. Bury Vision 2031:

- Policy BV1 (Housing Development within Bury St. Edmunds)

Other Planning Policy:

13. National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

Officer Comment:

14. The issues to be considered in the determination of the application are:

- Principle of Development
- Design and Form
- Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

15. Policy DM24 states that new extensions shall respect the scale, character and design of the existing dwelling and the character and appearance of the immediate and surrounding area. It should not result in over-development of the plot of the dwelling curtilage.
16. Furthermore, they should incorporate designs of a scale, massing, height and materials compatible with the locality and should not adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings.
17. In this case, the dwelling is positioned within a curtilage which is able to accommodate a degree of expansion without over-development occurring. It is also positioned to the rear of the property where the general design can be considered acceptable in this suburban context and where the impact upon the wider setting will, consequentially, be limited.
18. Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM24 of Joint Development Management Policies Document states that proposals will be permitted for new development provided they do not affect adversely residential amenity.
19. It is important to carefully assess the relationship of the proposal to adjacent off site property, noting the closely spaced dwellings and suburban context. Some adverse impacts might reasonably be accepted in such a context but care is needed to ensure that any such impacts are not significant.
20. The proposal includes an obscure glazed window on the east elevation. This could be installed under permitted development rights and, if done under such, would need to be obscure glazed. However, if installed following an express consent would not be otherwise so restricted and so a condition is necessary to secure obscure glazing. Noting that any additional flank windows subsequently installed would need to be obscure glazed under 1.6 m above finished floor level it can be robustly concluded that there will be no material adverse effect upon amenity from overlooking.
21. The existing dwelling and the extension is located approximately 12.8 metres from the rear elevation of No. 57 Home Farm Lane, and inset approximately 1.4 metres from the shared boundary between the two properties. It is located to the east of No. 57, with a commensurate eaves line and a modestly reduced ridge height when compared to the host dwelling. In this context it is noted that there will be some inevitable loss of light to this property and general overshadowing. However, noting the modest overall depth of the extension at 3.2 metres, it cannot be concluded that this will be severe, such that a refusal could be justified in this context, and neither is it considered that it would result in any materially adverse overbearing impact that might affect the enjoyment of the garden and property at No. 57, certainly not to the context that permission could be refused.
22. The relationship to No. 4 Croft Rise is also one which requires careful assessment. There is a modest existing stagger between these properties

such that No. 4 is approximately 1.9 metres behind the existing rear of No. 2. There is also a gap of 2 metres between the two properties. The extension, at 3.2 metres in depth, will therefore extend approximately 1.3 metres beyond the existing rear wall of No. 4. No. 4 has a conservatory on the rear, closest to No. 2, and noting that the extension will be positioned to its west, there will also inevitably be a degree of impact, including general loss of light and overbearing impact. However, noting the stagger, noting the separation, and noting the modest scale of the extension proposed, it is not considered that any adverse impacts would withstand the scrutiny of an appeal were this matter to be refused. The fact that the extension at No. 4 is a conservatory, such that adverse impacts upon light and overbearing effect are materially different than they would be if the extension at No. 4 was a brick built and tiled roof extension, is noted and weighted in the balance, but the impacts remain at a level that are not considered sufficient to justify a refusal.

Conclusion:

23. Therefore, the proposed development is considered to comply with Policy DM24 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015 and Policy CS3 of the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December 2010.

Recommendation:

It is **RECOMMENDED** that planning permission be **Granted** subject to the following conditions –

1. 01A - Time limit detailed.
2. 14FP – Development to accord with drawing nos. CRL11915 01, 02, 03 and 04 Rev B received 12th October 2015.
3. 11A - Proposed first floor window on East elevation to be obscure glazed and thereafter retained as such.

Documents:

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

<https://planning.westsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=NW3J2PPDKU900>

Case Officer: Kerri Cooper

Date: 17.12.2015