

## **Development Control Committee 6 July 2022**

### **Planning Application DC/21/1780/HH – Place Farm, Clay Cottage, Ipswich Road, Rougham**

<b>Date registered:</b>	1 September 2021	<b>Expiry date:</b>	27 October 2021, Extension of Time requested to 8 July 2022
<b>Case officer:</b>	Adam Yancy	<b>Recommendation:</b>	Refuse application
<b>Parish:</b>	Rushbrooke with Rougham	<b>Ward:</b>	Rougham
<b>Proposal:</b>	Householder planning application - two storey side extension with repositioning of existing solar panels		
<b>Site:</b>	Place Farm, Clay Cottage, Ipswich Road, Rougham		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Jack Teagle		

**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:**

Adam Yancy

Email: [adam.yancy@westsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:adam.yancy@westsuffolk.gov.uk)

Telephone: 01638 719264

**Background:**

**The application is presented before the Development Control Committee following consideration by the Delegation Panel. It was referred to the Delegation Panel at the request of Ward Member (Rougham) Councillor Sara Mildmay-White.**

**The application is recommended for refusal.**

**Proposal:**

1. Planning permission is sought for a two storey side extension to the dwelling and the repositioning of the existing solar panels on to the proposed extension.
2. Amended plans have been received during the consideration of the proposal which reduce the width of the proposed extension by 50 cm'.

**Site details:**

3. The site consists of a two-storey detached cottage which is located with Place Farm. The dwelling is accessed by a track which is set a considerable distance from New Road located in the countryside.
4. The property has previously benefited from two storey and single storey extensions which are positioned on the side elevation of the property.
5. The boundaries of the site, in particular the western boundary, has limited screening through hedging and assorted vegetation which allows for long uninterrupted views of the dwelling from certain viewpoints.

**Planning history:**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Decision date</b>
SE/12/1233/HH	Planning Application - Extend over existing single storey extension and remodel and refurbish existing dwelling. Remove existing flat roof over retained single storey and construct new mono-pitch roof. Construct new open porch to front entrance, and insert new windows to upper floor side elevations.	Application Granted	12 November 2012

**Consultations:**

6. No comments received from the parish council.
7. Councillor Sara Mildmay-White – Request the matter be presented before the Delegation Panel.

## **Representations:**

8. No representations received.

## **Policy:**

9. 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.
10. 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 DM24 Alterations or Extensions to Dwellings, including Self Contained annexes and Development within the Curtilage

Core Strategy Policy CS3 - Design and Local Distinctiveness

## **Other planning policy:**

11. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
12. The NPPF was revised in July 2021 and is a material consideration in decision making from the day of its publication. Paragraph 219 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 2021 NPPF that full weight can be attached to them in the decision making process.

## **Officer comment:**

13. The issues to be considered in the determination of the application are:
  - Principle of Development
  - Design and Appearance, and Impacts upon the host dwelling and character of the area.
  - Impact on Amenity

## Principle of Development

14. 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.
15. It is also a requirement that development proposals must not result in over-development of the dwelling and curtilage and shall not adversely affect the residential amenity of occupants of nearby properties.
16. For dwellings that are located within the countryside, this policy is notably more restrictive in the sense that it goes on to state that proposals for the alteration or extension of an existing dwelling in the countryside outside of towns and villages with settlement boundaries will also be required to demonstrate that they are subordinate in scale and proportion to the original dwelling.
17. Accordingly, while it can be accepted that the principle of extending any dwelling can be supported, the matters of detail are important, in fact integral to the acceptability or not of proposals to extend dwellings in the countryside.

## Design and Appearance

18. It is important, by way of context, and before considering the design related impacts arising from this scheme, to note the provisions of the latest revisions to the NPPF, in particular Chapter 12 relating to the achieving well designed places. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and to emphasise this, the NPPF states, quite bluntly and unambiguously at paragraph 134, that 'development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies'.
19. In this case, DM24 is considered to be the Authority's 'local design policy', setting out as it does the considerations and provisions that apply in relation to the extension of dwellings within the countryside. In order to protect the character and appearance of rural, often isolated or individual dwellings, and in order also to protect the countryside from the urbanising effects of significant extensions, Policy DM24 introduces a number of key policy tests.
20. These relate, common with extensions proposed to dwellings within towns and villages with settlement boundaries, to a requirement to respect the character scale and design of the existing dwelling and the wider area, to not result in any over development of the curtilage, and to also not adversely affect the amenities of any nearby properties.
21. In this regard officers are satisfied that the development proposed will not lead to any overdevelopment of the otherwise generous curtilage.
22. DM24 also introduces a further key test, which only applies in relation to the extension of dwellings within countryside locations. This site is within

the countryside. This additional test requires it to be demonstrated that extensions to dwellings in the countryside are subordinate in scale and proportion to the original dwelling. Key to assessing this policy is an analysis of the physical parameters of the dwelling, noting particularly that this assessment is made against the dwelling as originally built (and so excluding any already built extensions), not against the dwelling as might currently exist at the time of any application.

23. This is a key nuance of the policy that introduces a therefore much stricter requirement against which extensions in the countryside must be assessed. , This is in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the countryside, for example against the potentially harmful urbanising effects arising from extensions otherwise subsuming or dominating the architectural modesty or integrity of an original structure, to the detriment of the character and appearance of both that original building and the wider area.
24. In the case of the application, the dwelling has previously benefited from a first-floor extension over the existing single storey extension on the east elevation in 2012. As such, officers must assess the proposed extension in relation to the original dwelling as it was first built as stated with Policy DM24 for extensions to dwellings located in the countryside.
25. The principle of extending on the side elevation is considered acceptable. However, it is not considered that the proposed two storey side extension would appear as a subordinate addition to the dwelling in particular when viewed from the front elevation. This is due to the wide and expansive nature of the proposed extension which would lengthen the front elevation of the dwelling and which would therefore erode the modest nature of the existing cottage. This would also be emphasised when combined with the existing first floor extension which is positioned on the opposite side elevation leading to a generously proportioned elevation with an inevitable consequential urbanising impact.
26. In addition to the scale and appearance of the extension, the host dwelling is positioned in an isolated location within minimal vegetation on the boundary of the site, in particularly the western boundary which the proposal relates to. This would result in an extension that would be widely visible from close to and outside the site and to anyone who would be using the existing track.
27. It was recommended that the scale of the proposed extension was reduced to better respect the scale of the host dwelling. Amended documents were received which reduced the width of the proposed extension from 5.4 metres to 4.9 metres. However, it was considered that this reduction would not be enough to overcome the concerns officers had from a proposal which remains disproportionate in length compared to the scale of the host dwelling.
28. In conclusion, the two-storey rear and front extensions would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area placing it at odds with Policies DM2 and DM24 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015 (DMP) and Policy CS5 of the Forest Heath Core Strategy 2010.

29. These policies seek to secure high quality design that recognises key features of a building and, in the case of extensions in the countryside, respect the character, scale and design of existing dwellings and are demonstrably subordinate to the original dwelling. These policies are consistent with Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Noting this, and noting the conclusions drawn above, this proposal is not considered to be 'well designed' in this specific context and in accordance with Para. 134 of the NPPF should therefore be refused

#### Impact on Amenity

30. The property is an isolated dwelling with no immediate neighbours located on either boundary of the site. In this regard, officers are satisfied that the proposal would not result in an adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties.

#### Conclusion:

31. In conclusion, the principle and detail of the development is not considered to be acceptable and in compliance with relevant development plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### Recommendation:

32. It is recommended that planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. In order to protect the character and appearance of rural, often isolated or individual dwellings, and in order also to protect the countryside from the urbanising effects of significant extensions, Policy DM24 introduces a number of key policy tests. These relate to a requirement to respect the character scale and design of the existing dwelling and the wider area, to not result in any over development of the curtilage, and to also not adversely affect the amenities of any nearby properties. DM24 also requires extensions to dwellings in the countryside to be subordinate in scale and proportion to the original dwelling.

The addition of a two-storey extension to the side elevation of the dwelling does not prove to be subordinate in scale or proportion to the original dwelling. In particular, when viewed from the front elevation, the proposed extension would disproportionately elongate the front elevation of the host dwelling in a way that is considered unacceptable and in conflict with the requirements of Policy DM24.

The result in this extension when considered with the existing first floor addition on the opposite elevation is a proposal which would erode the character of the existing cottage. The presence of this extension of significantly increase the mass and bulk of the property in a way that would be considered harmful to its original form. The proposal would also be visible from a wider area which leading to a more widely felt urbanising effect that would be prejudicial to the wider character and appearance of the area.

In conclusion, the two-storey side extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area placing it at odds with

Policies DM2 and DM24 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015 (DMP) and Policy CS3 of the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy 2010.

These policies seek to secure high quality design that recognises key features of a building and, in the case of extensions in the countryside, respect the character, scale and design of existing dwellings and are demonstrably subordinate to the original dwelling. These policies are consistent with Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Noting this, and noting the conclusions drawn above, this proposal is not considered to be 'well designed' in this specific context and in accordance with Para. 134 of the NPPF should therefore be refused.

**Documents:**

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online [DC/21/1780/HH](#)