

Parish: BOXFORD

Location: 21 Stone Street

Proposal: Erection of a part two-storey, part single-storey front extension (following demolition of existing single storey front extension and front porch).

Applicant: Mr Haythornthwaite

Case Officer: Alex Scott

Date for Determination: 01.07.09

The application is reported to Development Committee following a request from the Local Member. A panel of Members visited the site on 10 June 2009, to assess the impact of the development on the host building and the impact on the street scene.

THE SITE

1. The site is located at the southern end of Stone Street which comprises a small cluster of development around a narrow classified 'C' road. This part of the settlement of Boxford lies outside the Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB) of the village.
2. The site lies within the Boxford Conservation Area and a Special Landscape Area.
3. The host property forms one half of a modest, semi-detached pair of cottages. Two small single storey elements have previously been added to the front of the host property.

THE PROPOSAL

4. The application seeks planning permission for a part two-storey, part single-storey front extension to the building. The two storey element of the proposal would extend a maximum of 3.85 metres from the existing front wall of the property, at an overall width of 4.2 metres. The two storey element of the proposal would have a lean-to roof, with a maximum height of 4.3 metres, where it would adjoin the host building's existing front wall, sloping down to its minimum height of 2.25 metres, at the very front of the proposal. The single storey element of the proposal would extend a maximum of 1.75 metres from the existing front wall of the property, at an overall width of 3.5 metres. The single storey element of the proposal would have a lean-to roof, with a maximum height of 3 metres, where it would adjoin the host building's existing front wall, sloping down to its minimum height of 2.35 metres, at the front of this element. The proposal would cover approximately 75% of the existing front wall of the existing dwellinghouse.
5. The materials to be used in all exterior work will either exactly match, or be similar in appearance to materials used in the construction of the host property.

RELEVANT HISTORY

6. 2009 – Planning permission refused for the erection of a part two-storey, part single storey front extension to the property (B/09/00186/FHA).

7. 1976 – Planning permission granted for the erection of a front lobby extension to the property (B/76/00773/FHA).
8. 1969 – Planning permission granted for the erection of a front porch extension to the property (S/68/743/C).

NATIONAL GUIDANCE

9. **PPS 1** (Delivering Sustainable Development)

PLANNING POLICIES

10. The Development Plan comprises the East of England Plan, adopted 2008, saved policies in the Suffolk Structure Plan, adopted 2001, and saved policies in 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

- **CN01** (Design Standards)
- **CN08** (Development in or near Conservation Areas)
- **CR01** (Landscape Quality and Character of the Countryside)
- **CR04** (Special Landscape Areas)
- **HS33** (Extensions to Existing Dwellings)

The relevant documents can be viewed via the internet. For further details please see Page 4.

CONSULTATIONS

11. PC – Recommend approval of the application as they believe it will be in keeping with the environment and will enhance the current appearance.

REPRESENTATIONS

12. One letter of objection has been received from one neighbour; their comments are summarised as follows:
 - Proposal would unnecessarily overlook private neighbouring amenity space.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

13. The principle of a residential extension on this site is acceptable subject to an assessment of all material planning considerations. Key issues in the determination of this application are:
 - Layout and Design;
 - Impact on neighbouring amenities;
 - Impact upon the character of the conservation area;
 - Impact upon the special landscape quality and character of the countryside;
 - Highway safety and convenience issues.

Layout and Design

14. The proposal would cover approximately 75% of the front wall of the host property, obscuring most of its traditional detailing, creating architectural imbalance with that of its attached neighbour and negatively impacting upon the existing built form character of the street-scene. Furthermore, opportunities have not been fully explored to extend the property to the rear.
15. The proposed insertion of 2 no. roof-lights on the front roofslope would not reflect and respect the design of the host building and that of the surrounding area.
16. The proposal therefore, does not accord to the provisions of saved policy CN01 the Babergh Local Plan, Alteration No.2 (2006) and paragraph 34 of PPS 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development (2005) which state (inter alia) the all new development must pay particular attention to the scale, form and nature of adjacent development and the environment surrounding the site, and must be of high quality and inclusive design which is appropriate in its context, and take opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenities

17. The proposed development would be constructed adjacent to the north east boundary of the proposal site. The detached neighbouring dwelling to this side is situated further back in its site than the proposal property. The north eastern neighbour's garage (approximately 4.5 metres in height) is set forward of the host dwelling and adjacent to the boundary with the proposal site. Due to the proposal's intended siting in relation to this property, it would not result in a dominant feature, to the detriment of neighbouring amenity, nor would the proposal cause increased overshadowing of neighbouring amenity space to this side.
18. The nearest part of the proposal to the attached neighbouring property to the south west would be the single storey element of the proposal, which would be sited a minimum distance of 0.45 metres from the site boundary with this property. The two storey element of the proposal would be sited a minimum distance of 3.85 metres from the site boundary with this property. Due to the proposal's intended design, layout and sitting in relation to this boundary, it would not detrimentally impact neighbouring amenity, in regard to dominance or overshadowing, to this side.
19. The fenestration layout of the proposal is such that, no part of neighbouring property would be overlooked, that is not already overlooked from a public vantage point. Therefore, the proposal would not cause adverse overlooking of adjacent neighbouring private amenity space, to the detriment of neighbouring amenity.

Impact upon the character of the conservation area

20. The proposal would cover approximately 75% of front wall of the host dwelling, therefore removing the traditional frontage of the host property. The proposal would further intrude into the front garden of the host property, a space which contributes to the special character of the area. The proposal's scale, form and detailed design would not harmonise with its setting. The proposal's fenestration (namely the 2 no. roof-lights) would not respect its setting. In general, the proposal would not complement or harmonise with the character and appearance of the area, and would further erode the integrity of the Boxford conservation area.

Impact upon the special landscape quality and character of the countryside

21. The proposal would be of a design which would not be compatible to its traditional, rural surrounds and would therefore not respect the buildings appearance, character and rural context.
22. The proposal, due to its location and screening offered by surrounding development, would not have a detrimental impact upon the surrounding special landscape qualities of the locality.

Highway safety and convenience issues

23. Stone Street is narrow in nature and no on-street parking opportunities exist for the host property. Current parking provision for the proposal site is not ideal in terms of highway safety and convenience. There is scope for providing increased on-site parking provision at the front of the site, as has been achieved by the attached neighbouring property. A further front extension to the property would reduce these opportunities, which would detriment the future development of the site in relation to highway safety issues.

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse planning permission for the following reasons;

- (1) The proposal for the erection of front extensions is contrary to the provisions of policies CN01, CN08 and HS33 of the Babergh Local Plan Alteration No. 2 (2006). These policies (inter alia) seek to ensure development proposals are of appropriate scale, form and detailed design which blend with the character of the host building and its wider setting. The above policies also seek to preserve or enhance the character of conservation areas, through the strict control of development. The proposal, by reason of its size, scale, detailed design, fenestration layout, and position on the principal elevation of the dwelling does not respect the proportions, form, character and existing external architectural detailing of the host building. Furthermore, the proposal would result in an inappropriate form of development detrimental to the amenity, character and appearance of the host property's setting within the surrounding conservation area.
- (2) Stone Street is narrow in nature and no on-street parking opportunities exist for the host property. Current parking provision for the site is not ideal in terms of highway safety and convenience. There is scope for providing increased on-site parking provision at the front of the site, as has been achieved by the attached neighbouring property. A further front extension to the property would reduce these opportunities, which would detriment the future development of the site in relation to highway safety issues.