

SIMPLIFIED REPORT PROTOCOL HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION APPROVALS

Reference: DC/26/02424

Address: Magnolia House
Barrells Road
Thurston
Bury St Edmunds
Suffolk
IP31 3SF

Case Officer: Helen Noble

I confirm that I undertook a site visit on 10.09.2026 and was able to see sufficient context along with submission details to enable me to determine this application, having regard to all material planning considerations. I have uploaded relevant site photographs taken from appropriate viewpoints to the casefile.

ANY OBJECTIONS?

	Yes	No	Comments
Parish/ Town Council		X	Comments received 27.08.2026 "Thurston Parish Council raises no objections to DC/26/02424 and resolves to support the application as submitted, on the basis that it would not negatively affect neighbouring properties or the wider village setting."
Consultees		X	Ecology comments received 18.08.2026 "no objection, subject to conditions securing biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures."
Neighbours		X	One comment of support from a neighbour received on 10.08.2026; no reasoning provided.
Member Call-In Note: If it is an unconditional call in this procedure is not suitable		X	

IS THE APPLICATION SUPPORTED BY SUFFICIENT INFORMATION TO ALLOW FOR DETERMINATION?

Yes	No	Comments
X		

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STATUS

No NP	NP at early stages	NP consultation	NP referendum	Made/ Adopted NP
				X

Comments on Neighbourhood Plan status and policies:

Thurston Neighbourhood Plan (Oct 2019) relevant policies:

Policy 4: Retaining and Enhancing Thurston Character through Residential Design
Policy 8: Parking Provision
Policy 11: Provision for Wildlife in New Development

ASSESSMENT

Relevant Policies:

SP03 - The sustainable location of new development
SP09 - Enhancement and Management of the Environment
SP10 - Climate Change
LP03 - Residential Extensions and Conversions
LP15 - Environmental Protection and Conservation
LP16 - Biodiversity & Geodiversity
LP23 - Sustainable Construction and Design
LP24 - Design and Residential Amenity
LP29 - Safe, Sustainable and Active Transport

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

In your professional opinion will the proposal give rise to unacceptable impacts that cannot be reasonably mitigated by condition in the following areas and/or would be contrary to relevant policies and guidance that relate to:

	Yes	No	Comments
Principle		X	Outside settlement of Thurston where development will normally only be permitted in accordance with one of the policies listed under

			'Table 5' of Policy SP03. One listed exception is policy LP03, extensions of existing dwellings, thus, the proposal is acceptable in principle when assessed against policies SP03, LP03 of the JLP and policy SP05 of the NPPF.
Design		X	Plot is sufficient in size to accommodate the three extensions without appearing over developed and maintain expansive private amenity space. The two storey extension is discreetly sited, extending off the rear elevation and spanning its width. All three extensions would mirror the host dwelling's roof pitch, are modest in scale and finished in external materials to mirror those existing on the host dwelling. The design ensures the extension is sympathetic to the host dwelling and character of the area.
Parking		X	Existing access and parking/manoeuvring area remain unaltered by the proposal. The proposal would create an additional bedroom, thus increase the parking demands of the site. Magnolia House benefits from a large parking area and double garage. From a site visit conducted, Officers consider the large parking area can accommodate four parking spaces, in accordance with the requirements of Suffolk Parking Guidance (2023) for a four bedroomed house.
Highway Matters		X	Existing access, visibility splay, on site parking an manoeuvring space remain unaltered by this proposal.
Heritage		X	The site is not listed, not within the conservation or near any heritage asset.
Trees		X	Site does not contain any trees with preservation orders on them. No trees would be impacted by the proposal.
Flooding		X	The site is within Flood Zone 1 and not identified as being vulnerable to flooding from fluvial, reservoir, foul and groundwater sources, however, there are areas at risk of surface water flooding, as per the Flood Map for Planning mapping system. In accordance with NPPF policy F4 a site specific flood risk

			assessment, prepared by MTC Engineering, was submitted, which demonstrates surface water run off would be dealt with on site. The extension would be predominantly sited in the same location as the existing conservatory, surrounded by an extensive permeable grassed garden. The proposal would lie outside any flood extent, thus, the flood risk on site and elsewhere would be unaltered by the proposal and flood resilient construction methods are not necessary.
Ecology		X	The site consists of maintained garden land in a residential area. The conservatory proposed for removal has no roof voids. The proposal would involve groundworks within 500m of several waterbodies and modifications to the roof which may provide suitable habitat for species that are afforded legal protection as outlined within the Council's statutory duties. Therefore, a preliminary bat roost assessment, prepared by Arbtech, was submitted with this application. No evidence of bats on site was found. Our ecologist has been consulted and requests precautionary construction techniques are adhered to, to minimise risks to any ground dwelling animals on site. As such there would be no adverse ecological impacts arising from the development. The Council cannot require the delivery of 10% biodiversity net gain on this development, and owing to its orientation and low height it is considered unreasonable and impractical to insist upon biodiversity enhancements to satisfy the aims of JLP policy LP16 and Thurston Neighbourhood Plan policy 11.
Landscape		X	Site is not within a National Landscape Area or on any other designated land.
Harm to outlook		X	The proposed extensions would be substantially distanced from its nearest, adjacent, neighbours, with intervening mature boundary vegetation; nearby dwellings would not be affected.
Loss of privacy		X	The proposed extensions would be substantially distanced from its nearest,

			adjacent, neighbours, with intervening mature boundary vegetation; nearby dwellings would not be affected.
Back-to-back distances		X	N/a
Overlooking		X	The proposed extensions would be substantially distanced from its nearest, adjacent, neighbours, with intervening mature boundary vegetation; nearby dwellings would not be affected.
Loss of sunlight		X	The proposed extensions would be substantially distanced from its nearest, adjacent, neighbours, with intervening mature boundary vegetation; nearby dwellings would not be affected.
Loss of daylight		X	The proposed extensions would be substantially distanced from its nearest, adjacent, neighbours, with intervening mature boundary vegetation; nearby dwellings would not be affected.
Noise		X	Existing residential dwelling, no change in use.
Overshadowing		X	The proposed extensions would be substantially distanced from its nearest, adjacent, neighbours, with intervening mature boundary vegetation; nearby dwellings would not be affected.
Other issues		X	

If you answer YES in any part of the ASSESSMENT section then the Simplified Report Protocol cannot be used and a standard delegated report is required

Note to case officer and their mentor:

- Please use this form to screen and review cases
- Should the Simplified Report Protocol be used to determine a case, the decision shall be reviewed and signed off by the mentor

Initial meeting date with mentor:

FF agreed 08.09.2026

Key actions: N/A**SUMMARY COMMENTS:**

The extensions proposed maintain the existing height of the host dwelling, are sympathetically designed, discreetly positioned and would not cause any detrimental impact. The proposal accords with the Development Plan and the recommendation is therefore to grant planning permission.

Summary of conditions:

- Time limit
- Approved plans
- ECOLOGICAL APPRAISAL RECOMMENDATIONS
- PRECAUTIONARY Householders BIODIVERSITY METHOD STATEMENT
- Biodiversity Enhancement Measures

Mentor sign off date: 02/10/2026**Mentor signature:** Averil Goudy