

Item No: 10

Reference: B/08/00499

Parish: SUDBURY

Location: 22 Rochester Way, Sudbury, Suffolk, CO10 1LP

Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension

Applicant: Mr. Colin Spence

Case Officer: Graham Chamberlain

Date for Determination: 10/06/08

This application is referred to the Development Committee as the applicant is a District Councillor.

THE SITE

1. The site is located in Rochester Road, a residential cul-de-sac to the north east of Sudbury. Rochester Road is accessed from Chaucer Road and runs parallel with the A131 Melford. The property comprises a detached house set back from the road designed in a mid to late 20th Century style. It is conventional in appearance with two storeys and an attached single garage. Rochester way is characterised by properties of a similar size and style arranged with a strong forward building line. There are residential properties to the sides and rear, and residential properties across the street. There are no relevant planning constraints affecting the site.

THE PROPOSAL

2. The application is for a single storey rear extension, the dimensions are as follows:-

Width – 4.3m

Depth – 4.6m

Height to Ridge – 3.9m

Height to eaves – 2.2m

Volume – 63 cubic metres

3. The extension would be finished in concrete inter-locking pan tiles (for the roof) and red/brown facing bricks, both to match the existing house. A window and patio door is proposed which would be finished in UPVC, also to match the existing house.
4. Planning permission is required because the proposed extension, in combination with the extension implemented 1992, would extend over 115 cubic metres, the maximum permitted by the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) 1995.

RELEVANT HISTORY

5. B/92/00482 Erection of single storey front extension Approved

NATIONAL GUIDANCE

6. **PPS1** – Delivering Sustainable Development

PLANNING POLICIES

7. The following Development Plan policies are applicable to the proposal:

CN01	New Development
HS33	Extensions to Existing Dwellings

This report only includes policy references. For further details please see Page 4.

OBSERVATIONS

8. Sudbury Town Council – No comment (too many members had an interest for a recommendation/observation to be made)

REPRESENTATIONS

9. No third party representations received.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

10. The proposal is for the erection of an extension to an unlisted building outside of a conservation area in the Sudbury built up area. Therefore in accordance with Policy HS33 the principle of the development is acceptable subject to compliance with other relevant planning policies.

Design and Impact on Character

11. Policy HS33 states that planning permission will be granted to extend a dwelling if the scale, massing, external materials and architectural details blend in with those of the dwelling. An extension should also reflect and respect the character of the wider area. This is reiterated in Policy CN01 which requires all new developments to maintain local distinctiveness by being appropriate to the setting. This is echoed in PPS1 which places design at the centre of the planning system (Para 35) stating that development which fails to improve the quality and character of the area should not be supported.

12. The proposal is for a single storey extension to the rear of the property. Its scale and massing would be clearly subservient to the host dwelling. The extension would have a pitched roof with a shallower angle than the host dwelling, to ensure that it would not block the first floor window and would leave the ground and first floors delineated. It does give the extension a slightly bulky appearance which is further evident due to the fact that the extension would not line up with the side elevation. The extension is not however visible from the public realm and consequently has no impact on the street scene or the visual character of the area. The subservient appearance, matching materials and location away from public views clearly outweighs any slight areas of concern. The extension therefore has no harmful impact on the character of the host dwelling, the street scene or the character of the area. The extension, in the proposed location, would be acceptable in the setting of Rochester Way. The application therefore adheres to Policies HS33 and CN01. The materials as indicated on the drawings are acceptable; therefore a condition stipulating materials is not required.

Impact on neighbouring Amenity

13. Policy HS33 states that an extension should not reduce the level of amenity enjoyed by occupants of neighbouring properties. The proposed extension would be located to the south east corner of the dwelling, away from No. 20 Rochester Way, the distance and orientation of the properties ensures that an extensions in the location proposed could only potentially impact on the occupants of 24 Rochester Way. No window is proposed facing No 24, the extension would only be single storey and is well screened by an existing fence and hedge. It must also be noted that there is a strong building line. The extension would not project unreasonably into the garden and would be set in from the boundary. As a result there would be no unreasonable loss of light, over looking or an oppressive, overbearing impact. The extension would not be unneighbourly and would, in effect, have no adverse impact. The scheme would therefore adhere to Policy HS33 and is acceptable.

REASON FOR APPROVAL

14. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies HS33 and CN01 of the Babergh Local Plan Alteration No. 2 (2006). The scale, materials and form of the extension would have no harm on the setting and character of the host dwelling or character of the area and there would be no harm to neighbouring amenity.

RECOMMENDATION

15. Grant planning permission.