



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

DEV/SE/18/023

Development Control Committee 7 June 2018

Planning Application DC/18/0513/HH – Chapel Cottage, The Street, Lidgate, Newmarket

Date Registered: 29.03.2018 **Expiry Date:** 24.05.2018

Case Officer: Savannah Cobbold **Recommendation:** Approve Application

Parish: Lidgate **Ward:** Wickhambrook

Proposal: Householder Planning Application - (i) 1.5 storey rear extension (ii) single storey rear extension (iii) single storey side extension (following demolition of existing single storey side extension) and (iiii) insertion of dormer to rear elevation

Site: Chapel Cottage, The Street, Lidgate

Applicant: Mr & Mrs B Diffey

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:

Savannah Cobbold

Email: savannah.cobbold@westsuffolk.gov.uk

Telephone: 01284 757614

Background:

The application is referred to the Development Control Committee following considered by the Delegation Panel on 2 May 2018. The matter was referred to the Delegation Panel following an objection from Lidgate Parish Council.

A site visit will be conducted on 31 May 2018.

Proposal:

1. The application seeks planning permission for the construction of a 1.5 storey rear extension, single storey rear extension and a single storey side extension following the demolition of existing single storey side extension. It also includes the insertion of a dormer window to the rear elevation.
2. The proposed 1.5 storey will extend 6 metres from the rear wall of the original dwelling, measure 4 metres in width and 5.4 metres in overall height.
3. The proposed single storey rear extension will extend 5.7 metres from the rear wall of the original dwelling, measure 3.9 metres in width and 2.6 metres in height, incorporating a flat roof.
4. The proposed single storey side extension will extend 2.4 metres from the side elevation of the 1.5 storey rear extension, measure 9.1 metres in length and 4.2 metres in overall height.
5. The dormer window is to be located on the rear elevation of the host dwelling, facing into the rear garden of the application site.
6. This scheme is a resubmission of DC/17/2607/HH which was previously withdrawn. The current scheme has seen the dormer window facing into the garden of 1 Cherry Tree Cottage removed, along with a reduction in height and length.

Application Supporting Material:

- Application form
- Existing floor plans and elevations
- Proposed elevations
- Site location and block plan
- Proposed floor plans

Site Details:

7. The application site is located within the settlement boundary for Lidgate, fronting onto The Street. The site comprises a detached dwelling and its curtilage, with a garden to the rear of the property and a small area at the front providing off-street parking for one vehicle. The dwelling is located within an area of properties of mixed characteristics generally forming a uniform line along The Street. The dwelling is also located within the Conservation Area for Lidgate.

Planning History:

Reference	Proposal	Status	Decision Date
DC/17/2607/HH	Householder Planning Application - (i) Single storey rear and side extension (following of existing single storey side extension) and (ii) two storey rear extension to include 2no. dormer windows	Application Withdrawn	25.01.2018
DC/18/0513/HH	Householder Planning Application - (i) 1.5 storey rear extension (ii) single storey rear extension (iii) single storey side extension (following demolition of existing single storey side extension) and (iiii) insertion of dormer to rear elevation	Pending Decision	
E/80/3027/P	PROPOSED REAR EXTENSION PORCH AND MINOR ALTERATIONS TO COTTAGE	Application Granted	13.02.1981
E/80/2291/P	TWO STOREY AND PORCH EXTENSION	Application Withdrawn	08.07.1980

Consultations:

- Suffolk County Council as Highway Authority: *The property has a parking space, in the location shown on the plan but this space is accessed by bumping the kerb rather than using a dropped kerb. In my view, if the applicant was to apply for a dropped kerb it would not be approved because the access would be substandard. I note that the description of the proposed works on the application form doesn't mention the parking place so I am happy not to make any comment but clearly we do have reservations about continued use of the unapproved space.*
- Conservation Officer: No objections and no Conservation conditions required – this application is a resubmission of planning application DC/17/2607/HH, still comprising rear and side extensions but with the rear extension reduced in height. The application also proposes the reinstatement of the thatch to the main roof.
- The impact of proposals on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area is assessed from public vantage points rather than private gardens. When viewed from The Street, the side and rear extensions would be

partially visible but would appear subservient to the host property and the proposed materials – natural slate and painted render – are traditional materials appropriate to the Conservation Area. Furthermore, the single storey lean-to is an established form of extension, as is the addition of a rear wing to form an “L” shaped floor plan. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policy DM17.

11. The reinstatement of the thatched roof is an enhancement to the property and the Conservation Area.

Representations:

12. Parish Council: Object to the scheme – although the extension is now described as a 1.5 rear extension, it is not significantly lower.

- The extension is too large and does not respect the character, scale, density and massing of the locality
- The extension will adversely affect the amenities of adjacent properties by reason of overlooking, overshadowing and loss of light
- The proposal will adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties because of its size. The extension will extend beyond the line of existing rear buildings in neighbouring properties by approximately 2 metres
- Lidgate is a quiet, rural village in a Conservation Area and the Parish Council believe that this application will detract from its setting
- The scale of the proposed extension will not respect the areas character and setting
- The proposal does not respect the character, scale and design of existing neighbouring dwellings. The footprint of the extension is too large and will completely dwarf the original cottage. The character and appearance of the proposed extension is not in keeping with the surrounding area. Chapel Cottage is higher than the neighbouring properties so a 1.5 storey extension will still appear larger and height and will dominate the locality
- The proposed extension will result in over-development of the dwelling and curtilage
- It will adversely affect the residential amenity of the occupants of St Alice as it will completely overshadow this property and lead to a loss of sunlight in both the property and garden

13. Third Party Representations: Three letters of representation have been received in respect to this application.

14. The following representation has been received from the owner/occupier of 1 Cherry Tree Cottages:

- The resubmission of this proposed development appears to contravene policies within the Joint Development Management Policies Document February 2015.
- As an immediate neighbour to the site, we are of the view that due to the minimal reduction in length and height of the proposed development it will still have a serious impact on the enjoyment of our residential amenities.
- The proposed development is too large and does not respect the character, scale, density and massing of surrounding buildings and locality.
- The scale does not respect the character and historic nature of the original cottage.

- It will adversely impact upon the enjoyment of our garden and residential amenities within the quiet, private and peaceful setting of a Conservation Area.
- Although the plan now proposes a 1.5 storey extension, the plans show a reduction in height of less than 1 metre. As the ground of Chapel Cottage is higher than neighbouring properties it will still cause extensive overshadowing and loss of light to our home and garden.
- The proposed extensions will result in over-development of the dwelling and curtilage.
- It will adversely affect our residential amenity by means of overlooking, overshadowing and loss of light due to its size and height.
- It will extension approximately 2 metres beyond the building line of neighbouring properties, adversely affecting our residential amenities.
- Due to the cottage not sitting square within its plot and the line of our boundary with it, it appears that the flat roof extension will encroach onto our property.

15. The following representation has been received from the owner/occupier of 2 Cherry Tree Cottages:

- I appreciate that I am not an immediate neighbour of Chapel Cottage but as a secondary neighbour I object to this planning application.
- The proposed extension is too large and not sympathetic to the character and scale of the existing cottage and surrounding locality.
- The proposed extension would adversely affect the local amenity due to the scale of it as it would extend beyond neighbouring properties.
- The proposed extension is too large in scale and height to the original cottage and is not sympathetic to the cottage's character and history.
- The proposed extension is not sympathetic to the original cottage as the scale of it would overshadow the original cottage. It would also not be sympathetic to neighbouring properties as it would impact them by overshadowing and overlooking their homes.

16. The following representation has been received from the owner/occupier of St Alice:

- As immediate neighbours of the site we have objections based on its impact on our property, its residential amenities and the surrounding area. We understand that Chapel Cottage would benefit from some form of extension and have no objection to that principle.
- The proposed extension is too large and does not respect the character, scale, density and massing of the locality.
- The extension will adversely affect the amenities of our property by reason of overlooking, overshadowing and loss of light. The windows to the rear of the building will overlooking the neighbouring properties leading to a loss of privacy.
- The proposal will adversely affect the residential amenity of our property because of its size.
- Lidgate is a quiet, rural village in a Conservation Area. We believe that this application will detract from this setting.
- The proposed extension will be too large in scale, form, height, massing and alignment to respect the areas character and setting.
- The proposal does not respect the character, scale and design of the existing neighbouring dwellings.

- The footprint of the extension is too large and will be disproportionate to the original cottage.
- The character and appearance of the proposed extension is not in keeping with the surrounding area.
- Chapel Cottage is higher than our property so this extension will appear much larger and higher and will dominate our property and the locality. The new ridge line, extending rearwards appears to be above the roofline of our property making the extension overbearing.
- The proposed extension will result in over-development of the dwelling and curtilage and will adversely affect the residential amenity of our property as it will completely overshadow it and lead to a loss of sunlight in the building as well as a loss of view of sky from the ground floor windows facing.
- Sunlight will also be lost in the rear garden.

17. **Policy:** The following policies of the Joint Development Management Policies Document, the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy 2010 & Vision 2031 Documents have been taken into account in the consideration of this application:

1. Joint Development Management Policies Document:
 - Policy DM1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
 - Policy DM2 – Creating Places Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness
 - Policy DM17 – Conservation Areas
 - Policy DM24 – Alterations or Extensions to Dwellings, including Self Contained annexes and Development within the Curtilage
2. St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December 2010
 - Policy SCS3 – Design Quality and Local Distinctiveness

Other Planning Policy:

18. National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

Officer Comment:

19. The issues to be considered in the determination of the application are:
 - Principle of Development
 - Impact on residential amenity
 - Impact on street scene/character of the area
 - Impact on Conservation Area
 - Design and Form
 - Impact on Highway Safety
20. Policy DM24 states that planning permission for alterations or extensions to existing dwellings, self-contained annexes and ancillary development within the curtilage of dwellings will be acceptable provided that the proposal respects the character, scale and design of existing dwellings and the character and appearance of the immediate and surrounding area, will not result in over-development of the dwelling and curtilage and shall not adversely affect the residential amenity of occupants of nearby properties.
21. In the case of this application, the dwelling is located within a generously sized curtilage and one which is able to accommodate the scale of extension without over-development occurring.

22. The proposed extensions are considered to have no material adverse impact upon the residential amenity of occupants of nearby properties at any such level that would justify a refusal of planning permission. No material overbearing impact is considered to arise upon 1 Cherry Tree Cottages, located towards the east of the site, as a result of the 1.5 storey rear extension given that this extension is positioned more towards the west of the application site. From the previous scheme submitted we have seen a reduction in the height of this extension so that it sits below the ridge height of the host dwelling and a change in roof form. It has also been reduced in length by 1 metre. Although the proposed single storey rear element is located closer towards the boundary of 1 Cherry Tree Cottages, no overbearing impact is considered to arise on this property. This is because the extension is of single storey nature, incorporating a flat roof. There is also fencing between this neighbouring property and the application which will contribute to the screening of this element of the proposal. As the proposed single storey side extension is to be positioned on the western elevation of the dwelling, views of this from 1 Cherry Tree Cottages will be limited. There is also a garage towards the boundary within this neighbouring property which will ensure a sufficient separation distance between the proposed development and this property. In addition, this neighbouring property gained planning permission which allowed for the construction of a two storey rear extension and other alterations located towards the boundary of 2 Cherry Tree Cottages. This also included a rear facing dormer, similar to the one proposed within this application.
23. The proposed extensions are anticipated to have no significant impact upon St Alice, located towards the west of the site. Although the proposed 1.5 storey extension is to be positioned nearer this neighbouring property, no overbearing issues are considered to arise as there is more than satisfactory separation distance between this neighbouring property and the proposed extension. In particular, there is a driveway which runs east of St Alice within its curtilage which creates sufficient distance between the proposal and neighbouring property to ensure that any adverse effects will not be at a level that would justify refusal. There is also high hedging that runs between these two properties. Views of the proposed single storey rear extension will be limited or even non-existent from this neighbouring property given that views of this will be obscured by the 1.5 storey rear extension. Views of the proposed single storey side extension may be incurred from St Alice, however this is of single storey nature and will partially replace an existing single storey side element and will in any event be seen against the flank of the existing dwelling.
24. Taking this into consideration and the provision of high hedging along the boundary between this neighbouring property and the application site, no overbearing issues are considered to arise. St Alice features some later additions to the property such as a two storey rear extension with a single storey rear extension extending of that. The two storey rear extension extend approximately 3.2 metres from the rear elevation of the dwelling and is taller than the ridge height of the original dwelling. St Alice gained planning permission in 2017 for a further first floor addition, extending over an existing element towards Chapel Cottage.
25. The proposed dormer window to the rear elevation of Chapel Cottage is not considered to introduce any overlooking issues that would otherwise justify

a refusal. As mentioned previously 1 Cherry Tree Cottages features a dormer to the rear elevation closest towards Chapel Cottage. Under Schedule 2 Part 1 Class B of the GPDO rear facing dormer windows can generally be implemented under Permitted Development and do not require planning permission albeit it should be noted that this provision does not apply within a Conservation Area as is the case here. However, the reasons for this provision not applying relate to heritage impacts, not impacts upon amenity. Noting that the heritage impact is considered acceptable it is considered that the fact that this rear dormer could not otherwise be provided under permitted development rights should not preclude an assessment that it is otherwise acceptable. The provision of rearwards facing first floor windows in a residential context such as this is not unusual and it is not therefore considered that a refusal of planning permission on the basis of any adverse effects upon amenity arising from this rearwards facing dormer would withstand the scrutiny of an appeal.

26. Number 2 Cherry Tree Cottages has also had planning permission granted for a two storey rear extension in the late 90's.
27. The majority of the works proposed within this application are located at the rear of the host dwelling and will therefore not be visible from the public realm. Although the proposed single storey side extension will be visible from The Street, no adverse impact is considered to arise upon the street scene given that it is of single storey nature, replacing an existing element and respects the character and scale of the host dwelling.
28. Larger scale, later additions to the rear of properties appear to be a common feature within the properties along The Street and therefore the proposed additions within this application are considered to be in keeping with the immediate and surrounding area.
29. The proposed extensions are considered to be of an appropriate scale, form and design as to respect the host dwelling. The 1.5 storey rear extension has been reduced in length and set down at the ridge height to incorporate a level of subservience. Matching render is being incorporated into the design to ensure that the proposal blends in with the materials used on the host dwelling with the roof being thatched in place of the present corrugated metal roof.
30. Policy DM17 states that proposals for development within, adjacent to or visible from a Conservation Area should preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The site is located within the Conservation Area for Lidgate. The majority of the works are located at the rear of the dwelling and therefore will not be visible from the Conservation Area. Furthermore, the Conservation Officer has raised no objections to the scheme.
31. The Parish Council objected to the scheme on grounds of over-development, Conservation Area issues and the scale of the development. They believe that the proposed development does not respect the scale, density and massing of the locality and will adversely affect the amenities of adjacent properties by reason of overlooking, overshadowing and loss of light. The proposed 1.5 storey rear extension has been set down at the ridge and is considered to be a subservient addition to the host dwelling. It has also been reduced in length following the resubmission. It is considered that there is

a satisfactory separation distance between the proposed development and surrounding neighbouring properties. The dormer window facing sideways into the rear garden of 1 Cherry Tree Cottages has been removed from the initial design therefore reducing any potential overlooking issues towards this property to those arising from the rearwards facing dormer window, which has itself been assessed as acceptable.

32. The Parish Council also believe that the extension will extend beyond the line of existing rear buildings in neighbouring properties by approximately 2 metres. The proposed extensions extend approximately 6 metres from the rear wall of the original dwelling. Looking at plans recently submitted for an application at St Alice, the two storey rear extension and single storey rear extension extending from this measure approximately 7.4 metres in length. Therefore, the proposed works at Chapel Cottage do not extend beyond a line of other extensions on other neighbouring properties.
33. The Parish Council objection also states that Lidgate is a quiet, rural village in a Conservation Area. They believe that the proposal will detract from the setting. The site is located within the Conservation Area for Lidgate and given that the works are to the rear of the dwelling they will not be visible from the Conservation Area, therefore not having a negative impact upon the Conservation Area. The impact is the proposals on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area is assessed from the public vantage point. When viewed from The Street, the side and rear elevations would be partially visible but would appear subservient to the host property and the proposal materials are traditional and appropriate to the Conservation Area. The Conservation Officer has also raised no objections to the scheme.
34. They also state that it will not respect the character of the area. The objection from the Parish Council states that the proposal does not respect the character, scale and design of existing neighbouring dwellings. The footprint of the extension is too large and will completely dwarf the original cottage. The character and appearance of the proposed extension is not in keeping with the surrounding area. Chapel Cottage is higher than neighbouring properties so a 1.5 storey extension will still appear larger in height and will dominate the locality. The properties along The Street all vary in appearance. There is no real defined character to the area. The application seeks planning permission for the construction of a 1.5 storey rear extension whereas nearby neighbouring properties consist of two storey rear extensions. Given that the majority of the works are to the rear of the property, the front elevation will remain unaltered therefore will not dominate the area.
35. The Parish Council believe that the proposed extensions will result in over-development of the dwelling and curtilage. Looking at the proposed block plan, from the rear wall of the proposed 1.5 storey rear extension there is a distance of approximately 37 metres to the rear boundary of the property and sufficient space is otherwise maintained around the building. Taking this into consideration, the dwelling is located within a curtilage which is quite clearly able to accommodate the scale of extension without over-development occurring.
36. The Parish Council also believe that the proposal will adversely affect the residential amenity of occupants of St Alice as it will overshadow this property and lead to a loss of sunlight in both the property and garden. The

extensions within St Alice extend beyond the extensions proposed within this application by approximately 1.4 metres. There is also adequate separation distance between both properties to not have an overbearing impact upon St Alice, which also retains a generous garden area.

37. The following representation was received from the owner/occupier of 1 Cherry Tree Cottages:

They believe the resubmission still appears to contravene the policies within the Joint Development Management Policies Document February 2015. They also believe that the minimal reduction in length and height will still have a serious impact on the enjoyment of their residential amenities. They also state that it is too large and does not respect the character, scale, density and massing of surrounding buildings and the locality. They believe that the scale does not respect the character and historic nature of the original cottage. The original scheme submitted included a two storey rear extension which was set minimally down from ridge height. It also included the provision of a dormer window onto the side elevation, facing into 1 Cherry Tree Cottages. The placement of a dormer window to the side elevation of the two storey rear extensions raised concerns with Officer's that this would overlook into the neighbouring garden resulting in a negative impact upon the residential amenity. The proposed two storey rear extension within the original scheme also raised concerns as it appeared overbearing. The resubmission saw the dormer window on the side elevation removed, the extension set down from two storey to 1.5 storey and reduced in length by 1 metre. Following these changes, Officers are of the opinion that the concerns in relation to impact on residential amenity have been overcome. Chapel Cottage is not a Listed Building and therefore holds no particular historic value.

38. Although the plan now proposes a 1.5 storey extension, the plan shows a reduction in height of less than 1 metre. As the ground of Chapel Cottage is higher than neighbouring properties the neighbour considers that it will still cause extensive overshadowing and loss of light to their home and garden and that it will adversely impact upon the enjoyment of their garden and residential amenities within the quiet, private, peaceful setting of a Conservation Area. The original scheme saw the proposed two storey rear extension sit 0.07 metres below the ridge height of the original dwelling whereas the resubmission sees the extension sit 0.5 metres below the ridge height of the dwelling. It has also been reduced by 1 metre in length. It is considered that there is satisfactory separation distance between this element of the proposal and this neighbouring property. There are no windows on the side elevation of 1 Cherry Tree Cottages facing into Chapel Cottage and a garage is located on the boundary, closest to Chapel Cottage. This creates separation between the proposal and neighbouring property. The views from the Conservation Area are assessed from the public realm rather than private gardens.

39. The letter of representation also states that the proposed development will result in over-development of the dwelling and curtilage. This has already been considered above.

40. The owner/occupier of 1 Cherry Tree Cottages states that it will adversely affect their residential amenities by means of overlooking, overshadowing and loss of light due to its size and height. There are no windows on the

side elevation facing into 1 Cherry Tree Cottages, therefore this has eliminated any potential overlooking issues to those arising from the proposed rearwards facing dormer, which again has already been assessed above as being acceptable.

41. They also state that the extension will extend approximately 2 metres beyond the building line of neighbouring properties and due to the cottage not sitting square in the plot and the line of their boundary with it, it appears that the flat roof extension will encroach onto their property. Under guidance of the GPDO, extensions can be built within 2 metres of the boundary of the curtilage providing that the eaves height does not exceed 3 metres. In this case, the proposed extension measures 2.6 metres in overall height – there are other guidelines that the extension is expected to meet in order for it to comply as Permitted Development.

42. The following representation has been received from the owner/occupier of 2 Cherry Tree Cottages.

43. The proposed extension is too large and is not sympathetic to the character and scale of the existing cottage and surrounding locality. It would have a serious impact on immediate neighbours and affect the local amenity due to it extending beyond neighbouring properties. The proposed extensions are considered to be subservient to the host dwelling and are of an appropriate scale and design. Comments in relation to extending beyond neighbouring properties has been addressed above.

44. The letter of representation states that the proposed extension is too large in scale and height to the original cottage and is not sympathetic to the cottage's character and history. Chapel Cottage is not a Listed Building and therefore does not hold a significant historical value. The reinstatement of the thatched roof is an enhancement to the property and to the Conservation Area. The proposed extensions will clearly read as a later additions to the property and considered to respect the scale of Chapel Cottage following a reduction in height and length.

45. They also state that the proposed extension is not sympathetic to the original cottage as the scale of it would overshadow the original cottage. It would also not be sympathetic to neighbouring properties as it would impact them by overshadowing and overlooking their homes. There are no windows located in the side elevations of the proposed 1.5 storey extension which therefore eliminates any potential overlooking issues and it is considered that is enough separation distance between properties for no overbearing impact to arise. In addition, both immediate neighbouring properties feature large two storey rear extensions, with one extending above the ridge height of the original dwelling.

46. The following representation has been received from the owner/occupier of St Alice.

47. The proposed extension is too large and does not respect the character scale, density and massing of the locality and would adversely affect the amenities of our property by reason of overlooking, overshadowing and loss of light. The windows to the rear of the building will overlooking the neighbouring properties leading to a loss of privacy. The proposal has been reduced in size in order to reduce the impact upon neighbouring properties.

No overlooking issues are considered to arise as there are no windows contained at first floor within the side elevation of the proposed extension and any overlooking from the rearwards facing first floor window will be at an acceptable level given the general relationship between dwellings and the size of their garden areas.

48. The letter of representation also states that Lidgate is a quiet, rural village in a Conservation Area. They believe that this application would detract from that setting. The proposed extension will be too large in scale, form, height, massing and alignment to respect the area's character and setting. When the proposal be viewed from The Street, the side and rear extensions would be partially visible but would appear subservient to the host property and the proposed materials are traditional in appearance. The Conservation Officer has raised no objections to the scheme and states that the proposal is in accordance with Policy DM17.
49. They also state that the proposal does not respect the character, scale and design of existing neighbouring dwellings and the footprint of the extension is too large and will be disproportionate to the original cottage. There is no real defined character to the properties along The Street and following reductions, Officers are of the opinion that the resubmission has addressed concerns previously raised.
50. The letter of representation also states that the character and appearance of the proposed extension is not in keeping with the surrounding area. Chapel Cottage is higher than our property so this extension will appear much larger and higher and will dominate our property and the locality. Views of the proposed extension from The Street will be limited given that the majority of the works are to the rear of the dwelling. Even so, the materials used are an appropriate choice to match with the host dwelling.
51. The owner/occupier states that the new ridge line, extending rearwards, appears to be above the roofline of our property making the extension overbearing. St Alice features a two storey rear extension which actually extends above the ridge line of the host dwelling. There is also satisfactory separation distance between this property and the proposed development given that a driveway to the side of St Alice creates additional separation distance. Both properties are also detached.
52. They believe that the extension will result in over-development of the dwelling and curtilage. This issue is addressed above.

Impact on Highway Safety

53. The previous application received an objection from Suffolk County Council as Highway Authority in that it proposed a three bedroom dwelling with only a single existing car parking space. This present scheme has been reduced to a two bedroom dwelling through internal rearrangements. This means that the dwelling as extended meets the standards in the Suffolk Guidance for Parking.
54. The Highway Authority have commented further but have not raised an objection. Suffolk County Council indicate that the existing access is substandard and that in fact vehicular access to the property is obtained by cars 'bumping the kerb'. However, the proposal does not seek to increase

the number of bedrooms at the property and the frontage arrangement, including parking space / driveway and raised lawn area all appear to be historic so any refusal on the basis of insufficient car parking would be unlikely to withstand the scrutiny of an appeal. However, in order to ensure that the property does stay as a two bedroom property, and to limit any potential adverse harm if the internal floor plan was reorganised without requiring planning permission to include a greater number of bedrooms, a condition is proposed that limits the property to the floor plan as submitted, and to only two bedrooms.

55. With such imposed it is considered that the impact of the proposal upon highway safety would be at a level that would not otherwise justify a recommendation of refusal on these grounds.

Conclusion:

56. In conclusion, the principle and detail of the development is considered to be acceptable and in compliance with relevant development plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation:

57. It is recommended that planning permission be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Time limit
2. Compliance with plans
3. The layout of the extended property shall be as shown on drawing 9119/17/3. At no time shall the property benefit from more than two bedrooms. Reason: To define the scope of this consent, in the interests of highway safety.

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=P5OICNPD07P00>