

Parish: SUDBURY

Location: 1 Queens Terrace, Newton Road

Proposal: Erection of single-storey rear extension (existing outbuilding to be demolished).

Applicant: Mr & Mrs A Gartland

Case Officer: Gareth Durrant

Date for Determination: 09.02 2010

The application is reported to Development Committee as the applicant is a member of staff. A panel of Members visited the site on 8 July 2009 in relation to the previous application for a similar proposal at the site (ref application B/09/00/516/FHA). The Monitoring Officer has reviewed the application file and is satisfied that the application has been processed properly and normally.

THE SITE

1. The application site is a two-storey end-terrace dwelling on Newton Road, one of the principal approaches to Sudbury town centre.

THE PROPOSAL

2. Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single-storey rear extension to the dwelling. The extension would replace an existing attached outbuilding which is proposed for demolition. The proposed extension, which is off-set from the rear corner of the dwelling house such that it is partly visible to the side of the dwelling, is proposed to be constructed up to the eastern site boundary and does not project at right-angles from the rear wall of the dwelling.
3. The extension projects a maximum of 8.3 metres from the rear wall of the existing dwelling. The rear garden slopes down to the south and the extension is stepped down just beyond its centre (4.3 metres from the rear of the dwelling) in order to follow this site feature. The roof of the extension is dual pitched the ridge height steps down at the centre by approximately 400mm. Given the land levels, the overall height (to ridge) of the extension varies along its length between 3.2 metres (minimum) and 3.6 metres (maximum). Similarly, the eaves heights vary for the same reasons. On eastern site boundary, the eaves are concealed behind a parapet feature, the height of which varies between 2.5 metres (minimum) and 2.8 metres (maximum).
4. The information submitted with the application indicates the extension is to be finished (externally) in brick and slate to match the materials on the host dwelling.
5. The application is accompanied by a short planning statement in support of the proposals. The key points raised are summarised as follows;
 - *A recent application was refused planning permission because of concerns about impacts upon the amenities of the neighbouring dwelling.*
 - *The amended scheme has been designed to fulfil the applicants' needs while successfully meeting the neighbours and local Member's concerns.*

- *The roof design has been changed by moving the ridge to the centre, away from the boundary.*
- *Floor levels have been stepped in line with the downward slope to reduce impact upon the neighbour.*
- *It was suggested during the last planning application to move the extension away from the boundary and to 'square' it off from the main building. This has not been incorporated as it would create a dead space which the owners could not use and reduce the amount of amenity space.*
- *Concerns were raised previously regarding loss of natural light to the neighbouring property. Additional details have been added to the drawings to demonstrate that the new design allows the required natural light to the neighbouring property.*

RELEVANT HISTORY

6. 2009 – Planning permission refused for the erection of a single-storey rear extension refused (B/09/00516/FHA). Planning permission was refused for the following reasons;
 - The proposed single storey rear extension, would by virtue of its height, length and position on the eastern side boundary, have an overbearing and un-neighbourly impact upon the attached neighbouring residential property, and would cause an unacceptable loss of natural light to main living space at the rear of the neighbouring dwellinghouse.

NATIONAL GUIDANCE

7. **PPS1:** (Delivering Sustainable Development)

PLANNING POLICIES

8. The Development Plan comprises the East of England Plan, adopted 2008, saved policies in the Suffolk Structure Plan, adopted 2001, and the Babergh Local Plan (Alteration No. 2) adopted 2006. The following policies are relevant to this proposal:

East of England Plan 2008

- **SS1** (Achieving Sustainable Development)
- **ENV7** (Quality in the Built Environment)

Babergh Local Plan (Alteration No.2) 2006

- **HS33** (Extensions to dwellings)
- **CN01** (Design Standards)

The relevant documents can be viewed via the internet. Please see Page 4 for details.

CONSULTATIONS

9. TC – recommend approval.

REPRESENTATIONS

10. One letter of objection has been received from the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling. The following comments are made;
 - Whilst we acknowledge that some steps have been made towards the recommendations of the Development Committee we do not consider the amendments to the original plans to be significant enough to fully address the concerns raised at the meeting.
 - We consider the proposed extension to still be unneighbourly and overbearing by virtue of its proximity to our property (69cm at one point) and in particular due to its length along the line of the boundary which cuts in front of our building line.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

11. Local Plan policies HS33 and CN01 set out the relevant criteria for the consideration of applications to extend dwellings. The key issues in this case are the:
 - Design and impact of the proposal upon the character of the area, and,
 - Impact upon residential amenity

Design and impact upon character

12. The rear extension, although deep relative to the existing dwelling, is of single-storey scale and would not be unduly prominent on the rear elevation to the dwelling. The extension would not be prominent from the site frontage and public realm. Private access is provided to the rear of the site for a number of dwellings, including Queens Terrace. The extension would not be particularly visible from the rear because of its single-storey scale and the presence of outbuildings and soft landscaping at the site and at neighbouring properties. The proposed extension is relatively deep insofar that it would extend 8.3 metres from the rear wall of the dwellinghouse. However, the set back nature of the neighbouring property (Penrose) and the drop in height approximately half way along the extension would help to assimilate the proposal into the site in an acceptable manner.
13. The materials to be used externally on the extension (brick and slate) would match those on the host dwelling and are acceptable.

Impact upon residential amenity

14. Planning permission was recently refused (paragraph 6 above) for a similar proposal for the erection of a single-storey extension in a similar position on the grounds of its adverse impacts upon the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling (Penrose). In particular, the Council was concerned that the extension would be over-bearing, unneighbourly and cause an unacceptable loss of natural light to the main living space to the rear of the neighbouring property.
15. The current application is an amended scheme to that which was refused planning permission in 2009. The extension proposed within this amended application is in the same position, has the same internal layout and has the same size of footprint as the scheme considered and rejected in 2009. There are, however, two significant design changes which have been undertaken in order to overcome the Council's previous concerns.

16. The first design change is to the roof of the extension. In the refused scheme, the extension had a monopitched roof with the highest part of the roof positioned on the side boundary with Penrose next door. The roof form has been changed to a dual pitched roof, such that the highest part of the roof is moved away from the boundary by approximately 1.8 metres. The eaves of the roof remains on the boundary and on that side (east) elevation a parapet feature is proposed in order to manage rain water runoff. Given the falling levels along the length of the proposed extension, the height of the parapet wall on the boundary varies between 2.5 metres and 2.8 metres.
17. The second design change is a step in the height and floor levels of the extension. The scheme which was refused planning permission last year proposed a consistent floor level along the length of the extension with a datum at the junction of the extension and the dwelling. The floor level did not follow land levels which fall away from the dwelling to the south. The height of the extension would therefore have been accentuated at its southern end; it was the final few metres of the proposed extension which impacted mostly upon the rear bay window of the neighbouring property. Whilst the extension which was refused planning permission was shown on drawings to have a height of 3.3 metres at its southern end, these did not illustrate the increase in ground levels that would have been required to facilitate the consistent internal floor level. Accordingly, with those alterations to raise ground levels, the extension would have been approximately 3.8 metres high at its southern end if measured from existing ground levels.
18. The extension proposed in this revised application includes a drop in height approximately half way along its length. The result of this design change is that the height of the extension is also reduced at its southern end when compared with the height of an unbroken ridge line.
19. The step in the ridgeline of the proposed extension combined with its altered roof design considerably improves its relationship with the neighbouring dwelling to the south (Penrose) when compared with the scheme which was refused planning permission. The height of the structure on the boundary line with the neighbour is considerably reduced from that which was refused planning permission last year. The reduction in height differs along the length of the boundary, but a 1 metre (approximate) reduction in the height of the extension on the boundary is achieved at the southernmost point. The extension is taller at its ridgeline than its eaves, but the ridge is located approximately 1.8 metres into the site away from the boundary.
20. The extension proposed within this amended application would not significantly dominate over or significantly reduce light to the neighbouring property to the east (Penrose). Furthermore, there would be no overlooking of the dwelling or its garden (no windows are proposed in the eastern elevation). There would be no adverse impacts upon the amenities of No.2 Queens Terrace to the west.

REASONS FOR APPROVAL

21. The proposal for the erection of a single-storey rear extension is in accordance with the provisions of policies HS33 and CN01 of the Babergh Local Plan, Alteration No.2 (2006). These policies seek to ensure all developments are of appropriate scale, form, detailed design and materials for the area (CN01) and proposals for extensions to dwellings are of appropriate design, respect the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties, protect trees and retain safe access and sufficient parking. In this case, the proposed rear extension is of a suitable scale, design and external materials such that it would not detract from the character of the existing dwelling or its wider urban setting. Furthermore, the development would have no materially adverse impact upon the amenities enjoyed by occupants of nearby dwellings and would have no impact upon important tree specimens, vehicular access arrangements or off-street parking/maneuvering provision.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to conditions, including;

- Withdraw permitted development rights for the insertion of new windows into the eastern (side) elevation of the extension.