

Committee Report

Planning Committee South – 6 March 2024 Application no DC/23/3698/FUL

Location Ford Gatehouse Ford Road Marlesford Woodbridge Suffolk IP13 0AS

Expiry date	30 November 2023
Application type	Full Application
Applicant	Mr Dominic Gravener
Parish	Marlesford
Proposal	First floor extension and internal alterations
Case Officer	Jamie Behling
	07919 303788
	Jamie.Behling@eastsuffolk.gov.uk

1. Summary

- 1.1. This application seeks planning permission to add a first floor to Ford Gatehouse, Ford Road, Marlesford.
- 1.2. The application was presented to the Referral Panel on 19 December 2023 as the officer recommendation of approval is contrary to the Parish Council's objection to the scheme. The Panel decided that the application should be determined by Planning Committee South due to the significant impact of the alterations on the character of the dwelling and the wider landscape.
- 1.3. The proposal is considered, on balance, to comply with the Development Plan and the application is therefore recommended for approval.

2. Site Description

- 2.1. Ford Gatehouse is a detached chalet bungalow located outside of a settlement boundary and therefore is within the countryside. The property has no immediate neighbours and is slightly set back from the road and features a single storey detached garage adjacent with a large garden to the rear. There is a public right of way (PRoW) which runs along the northeast boundary of the site. The site is located in the B6 Ore Valley landscape character area, which is defined by often steep valley slopes and a distinct valley floor containing the tightly meandering and treelined course of the River Ore.
- 2.2. The site has previously been granted permission for the wholesale replacement of the dwelling under ref. C/13/0785 in 2013. This was never implemented. Permission was also granted in 2019 for an extension to the property, raising the eaves and ridge, under ref. DC/19/1944/FUL.

3. Proposal

3.1. The current proposal seeks to erect a first floor over the main part of the original house and the extension directly to the rear. The first floor would accommodate four bedrooms, a bathroom, landing and ensuite. The roof would be finished in matching slate tiles with the walls being rendered and painted.

4. Consultees

Third Party Representations

- 4.1. One representation has been received, from the Suffolk Preservation Society, making the following summarised comments:
 - Given the historic links of the dwelling with the Wickham Market to Framlingham branch railway line, Ford Gatehouse could be a non-designated heritage asset.
 - The increase is excessive and will increase the prominence of the building in the surrounding river valley landscape.

Parish/Town Council

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Marlesford Parish Council	11 October 2023	1 November 2023

Summary of comments:

Marlesford Parish Council (MPC) is concerned about the considerable expansion proposed for the crossing -keeper's cottage on three counts.

Firstly, the location, in the fields just outside the village at the old railway crossing, means that the existing design and proportions fits in with the historic context of the site. A large property, isolated on its own would stick out like a sore thumb.

Secondly, expanding a small single-story cottage into a large two-story house would degrade the housing mix of the village. MPC is aware of several young couples, who would have liked to remain in the village (and MPC believe would have enhanced the life of the village) have been forced to relocate in order to get their feet on the housing ladder. Changing a small cottage into a large house exacerbates this problem.

Thirdly, changing a small cottage into a large house statistically means more cars. Access to the site from either direction is via single track Quiet Lanes. We are against more traffic on our Quiet Lanes.

For the above reasons MPC opposes the application.

Please note that there is an error in the application. Under the heading "Site Visit", it is stated that the site cannot be seen from a public road or public footpath. In fact, the site is clearly visible from Marlesford Road.

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Hacheston Parish Council	11 October 2023	No response
Summary of comments:		
No comments received.		

Statutory consultees

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
SCC Rights Of Way	11 October 2023	No response
Summary of comments:		
No comments received.		

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Environment Agency - Drainage	3 November 2023	21 November 2023
Summary of comments:		
No objections.		

Non statutory consultees

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
East Suffolk Landscape Team	3 November 2023	8 November 2023 &
		23 November 2023
Summary of comments:		
Comments received 8 November 2023:		
Concerned about scale of development prop	osed within a sensitive river v	alley location.

Comments received 23 November 2023:

Further to my site assessment I have undertaken a brief assessment to establish potential landscape and visual impacts as a result of the development. Visual impacts are not considered to be significantly adverse, and there are opportunities for new hedge planting to better screen the site. Additionally, the existing residential curtilage is to remain the same so there will be no further expansion of the site into the countryside. Glazing and lighting should be carefully designed so as to reduce potential light spill into the surrounding river valley landscape.

Site notices

General Site Notice	Reason for site notice: General Site Notice
	Date posted: 12 October 2023
	Expiry date: 2 November 2023

5. Planning policy

National Planning Policy Framework 2023

SCLP10.4 - Landscape Character (East Suffolk Council - Suffolk Coastal Local Plan, Adopted September 2020)

SCLP11.1 - Design Quality (East Suffolk Council - Suffolk Coastal Local Plan, Adopted September 2020)

SCLP11.2 - Residential Amenity (East Suffolk Council - Suffolk Coastal Local Plan, Adopted September 2020)

6. Planning Considerations

Design, Visual Amenity, Street Scene and Landscape

- 6.1. The application proposes a large extension to the property resulting in a modest cottage becoming a two-storey dwelling. There is relevant planning history to take into account when considering this proposal, most notably that the Local Planning Authority permitted the dwelling's replacement (and therefore the loss of the existing dwelling) in 2013 and subsequently approved relatively large-scale extensions in 2019.
- 6.2. This proposal seeks to go further than what was previously granted in extending the dwelling by making it fully two-storey. The overall roof height would be 7.2 metres, with a depth of 11.5 metres. This however is smaller than the replacement dwelling permitted in 2013 which had an overall height of 7.7 metres and a depth of 17.5 metres. The width would be wider, but not to such an extent that it would substantially alter the massing of the building.
- 6.3. The enlargement is proposed on the existing footprint of the building and does not extend beyond this. The extension creates space directly above the existing ground floor of the main part of the house. The design is relatively simple, with a shallow pitched roof, standard window arrangement and rendered finish.

- 6.4. The Council's Senior Landscape Officer visited the site in order to make an assessment of the impact on the surrounding landscape. They noted the approach to the site from the west is well screened due to the sunken nature of the lane and the existing field boundary hedgerow, which is currently out of management, however, there are some wider views across from Marlesford Road. Close proximity views are possible from the public right of way (PRoW) opposite the site and on the approach from the east along Ford Road, however, existing garden trees help to soften these. Back garden trees and scrubby riverside vegetation help to screen views from PRoWs to the east and from the Church. The visual impacts of the proposal are not considered to be significantly adverse such that the application should be refused. The Landscape Officer highlighted potential gains which could be achieved through the development which included the replacement of a hedge at the front of the site.
- 6.5. The applicant however advised that they would not be agreeable to replace this hedge as the spray from the road damages the planting along the front. As this is not considered by officers to be necessary to make the scheme acceptable, this should not be conditioned as part of any approval.
- 6.6. The level of glazing on the proposal is not considered excessive and is deemed acceptable based on the location of the dwelling within a sensitive landscape area.
- 6.7. Overall the proposal, although substantially increasing the size of the property, would not significantly harm the appearance of the street scene or the character of the area. The character and appeal of the Ore Valley landscape character area is preserved with limited harm to the appearance of the wider landscape.

Residential Amenity

6.8. There are no nearby neighbours who would be affected by the changes. The proposal therefore would not harm the residential amenity of the occupants or neighbours and is compliant with policy SCLP11.2.

Landscaping/Trees

6.9. The proposal would not require any trees or vegetation to be removed in order to be completed.

Parking and Highway Safety

6.10. The site has sufficient space for the parking of three vehicles on site, which meets the guidelines for a four-bedroom property. The proposal is not considered to lead to such a substantial increase in vehicular movements that the development would be considered unacceptable due to being on a single track, quiet lane.

Flooding

6.11. The site lies within flood zone 1, with part of the site within 20 metres of a main river. The Environment Agency have been consulted but have no objections to the proposal, which does not see an increase in ground floor space.

<u>Other</u>

6.12. There are no policies which restrict the enlargement of a property due to reducing the housing mix in an area. Although the Parish Council's concerns are noted, this is not a reason to refuse the application.

7. Conclusion

7.1. The proposed design is much larger than the previously approved extension and not as attractive as the previously approved replacement dwelling, but on balance it is acceptable and would not substantially harm the wider landscape, or have any impact on neighbour amenity. The development is considered to comply with the policies listed above.

8. Recommendation

8.1. Approval subject to the conditions below.

Conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within a period of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be completed in all respects strictly in accordance with Proposed Floor Plans and Proposed Elevations, Block and Site Location Plan received 26/09/2023, for which permission is hereby granted or which are subsequently submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and in compliance with any conditions imposed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to what has been considered and approved.

3. The materials and finishes shall be as indicated within the submitted application and thereafter retained as such, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development in the interests of visual amenity

Informatives:

1. The Local Planning Authority has assessed the proposal against all material considerations including planning policies and any comments that may have been received. The planning application has been approved in accordance with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and local plan to promote the delivery of sustainable development and to approach decision taking in a positive way.

Background information

See application reference DC/23/3698/FUL on Public Access

Мар



Key



Notified, no comments received



Objection



Representation



Support