

Development Control Committee 7 April 2021

Planning Application DC/20/2197/HH - Holly Bungalow, Stow Road, Ixworth

Date registered:	5 January 2021	Expiry date:	2 March 2021
		EOT agreed:	8 April 2021
Case officer:	Debbie Cooper	Recommendation:	Refuse application
Parish:	Ixworth & Ixworth Thorpe	Ward:	Ixworth
Proposal:	Householder planning application - single storey side extension to create an annexe following demolition of existing garage		
Site:	Holly Bungalow, Stow Road, Ixworth		
Applicant:	Mrs Jayne Burrell-Mills		

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:

Debbie Cooper

Email: deborah.cooper@westsuffolk.gov.uk

Telephone: 07866 172895

Background:

This application is before the Development Control Committee following consideration by the Delegation Panel. It was referred to the Delegation Panel as the Parish Council raised no objections to the application, contrary to the officer's recommendation of REFUSAL.

Proposal:

1. Planning permission is sought for a single storey side / front extension to create an annexe for occupation by family members, comprising of a living/dining/kitchen room, bedroom, shower room and study. The existing detached front garage is to be demolished.
2. The extension measures up to 11.5 metres in depth and 6.1 metres in width, projecting 9.7 metres beyond the front wall of the house and 4.5 metres beyond the footprint of the garage. The height to the eaves is 2.3 metres with a ridge height of 3.9 metres. The extension will be constructed with a brick plinth and black timber cladding, with concrete tiles to match the existing.

Site details:

3. The application site comprises of a single storey detached dwelling situated within the settlement boundary of Ixworth. The site falls within a designated Conservation Area, with adjacent listed buildings to both sides.
4. The dwelling is set back from the road with off-road parking and a detached garage to the front.

Planning history:

5.

Reference	Proposal	Status	Decision date
SE/08/1233	Planning Application - Erection of detached garage	Application Granted	1 October 2008

Consultations:

6. **Environment & Transport – Highways:** The Highway Authority notes that after the loss of the garage space the dwelling will still retain five car parking spaces which exceeds the Suffolk Guidance for Parking minimum requirement of three spaces. Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highways Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.
7. **Conservation Officer:** The proposed development involves extending a modern building located on a corner plot within a conservation area. To the east and south west of the proposed development are listed buildings. The proposed development is modest in scale incorporating timber cladding and otherwise matching materials. It is sufficiently distanced and seen in context with existing modern development so as not to adversely affect the setting of any nearby listed buildings or the character or appearance of the conservation area. I therefore have no objections. No conditions required.

Representations:

8. **Parish Council:** no objections
9. **Neighbours:** no representations received

Policy:

10. On 1 April 2019 Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council were replaced by a single authority, West Suffolk Council. The development plans for the previous local planning authorities were carried forward to the new Council by regulation. The development plans remain in place for the new West Suffolk Council and, with the exception of the Joint Development Management Policies Document (which had been adopted by both councils), set out policies for defined geographical areas within the new authority. It is therefore necessary to determine this application with reference to policies set out in the plans produced by the now dissolved St Edmundsbury Borough Council.

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

- Policy DM1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy DM2 Creating Places Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness
- Policy DM15 Listed Buildings
- Policy DM17 Conservation Areas
- Policy DM24 Alterations or Extensions to Dwellings, including Self Contained annexes and Development within the Curtilage

- Core Strategy Policy CS3 - Design and Local Distinctiveness

- Vision Policy RV1 - Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development

Other planning policy:

12. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

13. The NPPF was revised in February 2019 and is a material consideration in decision making from the day of its publication. Paragraph 213 is clear however, that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of the revised NPPF. Due weight should be given to them according to their degree of consistency with the Framework; the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework; the greater weight that may be given. The policies set out within the Joint Development Management Policies have been assessed in detail and are considered sufficiently aligned with the provision of the 2019 NPPF that full weight can be attached to them in the decision-making process.

Officer comment:

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

- Principle of Development
- Impact on character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area.
- Impact on neighbouring amenity
- Impact on adjacent Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area

Principle of development

15. Policy DM24 states that extensions and alterations (including annexes) 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 dwelling curtilage or adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings.

16. In this case, the dwelling is located within a curtilage which can accommodate the proposed annexe extension without over-development occurring. Impact on the character of the area and residential amenity will be considered further below.

Character and appearance

17. Policies DM2, DM24 and CS3 all seek to ensure that proposed extensions to dwellings respect the character, scale and design of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

18. The proposed annexe extends 9.7 metres beyond the front wall of the existing property, representing a large increase in the overall footprint of the house in a prominent position, with the timber cladding exacerbating this prominence. Whilst there is an existing detached garage (to be demolished), this has a much smaller footprint, with the proposed annexe extending 4.5 metres beyond the current position of the garage.

19. Given the position, size and material finish of the proposed extension, it is not considered to respect the scale and character of the existing house nor the character and appearance of the surrounding area. There are options to achieve a similar level of accommodation by setting the extension back within the site or by extending to the rear. Whilst the applicants are not minded to do this, they have expressed that they would consider either amending the material finish of the extension to a matching brick or cladding the front elevation of the property to match a timber clad extension. Whilst these changes may improve the proposal, it is not considered to be sufficient to overcome the concerns raised regarding scale and character. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policies DM2 and DM24.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

20. The dwelling occupies a corner plot, with the proposed extension along the Eastern boundary, adjacent to Peacock Rise. Given the distance and relationship to neighbouring properties, there are no significant adverse impacts on residential amenity arising. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with policies DM2 and DM24 in this respect.

Impact on adjacent Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area

21. Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
22. Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.
23. The proposed extension is seen in context with existing modern development, with a varied building line. The proposal is considered to have no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, nor does it adversely harm the setting of adjacent listed buildings, as confirmed by the Conservation Officer. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with policies DM15 and DM17.

Conclusion:

24. In conclusion, the proposed development is considered to comply with policies DM15 and DM17, in that it has no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, nor does it adversely harm the setting of adjacent listed buildings, as confirmed by the Conservation Officer. Likewise, it is considered to comply with criteria (b) and (c) of policy DM24, as it does not constitute overdevelopment or adversely impact on neighbouring residential amenity. However, the proposed development is not considered to comply with criterion (a) of policy DM24 nor policy DM2 given the harmful impact identified on the character and appearance of both the dwelling and surrounding area, by reason of its footprint, material finish and prominent siting forward of the dwelling.

Recommendation:

25. It is recommended that planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reason:

- 1 Policy DM2 states that proposed developments must produce designs that respect the character, scale and density of the immediate and surrounding area in order to retain local character. Likewise, Policy DM24 strives to ensure that extensions to existing dwellings respect the character, scale and design of the dwelling as well as the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed extension, by reason of its footprint, material finish and prominent siting forward of the dwelling, would create an incongruous addition that does not respect the scale and character of the dwelling nor the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Joint Development Management Policies DM2 and DM24 and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), particularly paragraph 127.

Documents:

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online <DC/20/2197/HH>