



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

DEV/SE/16/22

Development Control Committee

3 March 2016

Planning Application DC/15/2503/HH
27 Springfield Avenue, Bury St Edmunds

Date: 11 January **Expiry Date:** 7 March 2016
Registered: 2016

Case Officer: Jonny Rankin **Recommendation:** Refuse

Parish: Bury St Edmunds Town **Ward:** Risbygate

Proposal: Householder Planning Application - Installation of external wall insulation to the front and rear elevations (Resubmission of DC/15/1343/HH)

Site: 27 Springfield Avenue, Bury St Edmunds, IP33 3AY

Applicant: Mr Oliver Ingwall King

Synopsis:

Application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and associated matters.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Committee determine the attached application and associated matters.

CONTACT CASE OFFICER:

Email: jonny.rankin@westsuffolk.gov.uk

Telephone: 01284 757621

Background:

This application is referred to the Development Control Committee because it is made by a contracted employee of St. Edmundsbury Borough Council.

Proposal:

1. Planning permission is sought for the installation of external wall insulation to the front and rear elevations. The proposed insulation is has a total depth of approximately 10cm (96mm) and is proposed in Lemon Yellow.
2. The application was previously submitted as DC/15/1343/HH but was withdrawn by the agent.
3. Further information was received in relation to the poor repair of existing external render, building fabric and damp within the host dwelling on 14 February 2016.

Application Supporting Material:

4. Information submitted with the application as follows:
 - Application Form
 - Location Plan
 - Street View
 - External Wall Insulation Information
 - Energy Performance Certificate
 - Photos

Site Details:

5. The application site comprises a two storey, mid-terrace dwelling situated within the Housing Settlement Boundary of Bury St Edmunds. The host dwelling is in prominent position along Springfield Avenue. The other properties within the terrace and neighbouring terraces are of similar design and form.
6. The host dwelling includes external brickwork at ground floor level and render at first floor. As set out above, the re-rendering of the first floor would not require planning permission on the basis that the proposed external materials are 'similar in appearance' to the existing. However, 96mm. of external insulation and render would materially change the appearance of the front and rear elevation of the property by virtue of the material, depth and colour of the proposed external insulation. Hence, planning permission is required.

Planning History:

7. DC/15/1343/HH Householder Planning Application - installation of external wall insulation on the front and rear elevation. Withdrawn.

Consultations:

8. None received.

Representations:

9. Bury St Edmunds Town Council: No Objection based on information received.

Policy: The following policies of the Joint Development Management Policies Document and the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December 2010 have been taken into account in the consideration of this application:

10. Joint Development Management Policies Document:

- Policy DM1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
- Policy DM2 (Creating Places – Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness)
- Policy DM7 (Sustainable Design and Construction)
- Policy DM24 (Alterations or Extensions to Dwellings)

11. St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December 2010

- Policy CS3 (Design and Local Distinctiveness as supported by SPD Development Design and Impact)

Other Planning Policy:

12. National Planning Policy Framework (2012) Core Principles, paragraphs 56 – 68 requiring good design and paragraphs 93 – 108 meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change.

Officer Comment:

13. The issues to be considered in the determination of the application are:

- Principle of Development
- Design and Form
- Impact on the Neighbouring Amenity

Principle of Development

14. Policy DM24 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document states that proposals for extensions or works to residential dwellings must respect the character and appearance of the immediate and surrounding area. Within this context the principle of works to the property are considered satisfactory.

15. Policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document states that proposals should recognise and address key features of the area and/or building. In addition, proposals should respect the character, design, scale, density and massing of the locality.

16. Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy states that the proposals should recognise and address key features of the area and/or building. They should also incorporate designs of a mass, height, density and materials compatible with the locality and respect local distinctiveness.

Design and Form

- 17.27 Springfield Avenue is a two storey, mid terrace dwelling situated within the Housing Settlement Boundary of Bury St Edmunds. It forms one of the middle dwellings in a terrace of four properties, the form of which is repeated by four blocks of four properties along the southern side of Springfield Avenue. There are also two facing terraces of the same form on the northern side.
18. The proposed works involve the installation of external wall insulation to the front and rear elevations of the property. The materials on facing properties, numbers 12 and 14 Springfield Avenue are brick on the ground floor with 'pebble dash' render on the first floor. Properties 25 and 29 either side of the applicant's property also follow the same appearance.
19. Within this context concern is held in relation to the impact of this proposal upon the appearance of the area. The host property and those it adjoins are simple and attractively detailed dwellings. The use of external render at ground floor on only one of these properties will disrupt the appearance and uniformity of the whole terrace and adjacent terraces, to their detriment. It is the effect of the proposal upon the integrity of the entire terrace which is considered most harmful in this context.
20. The projection of the external wall insulation would clearly alter its relationship with the neighbouring properties at 25 and 29 Springfield Avenue. The disparity would be exacerbated by shadows falling on the neighbouring property that would in turn denote the separation of the dwellings. It would be acutely apparent if viewed in the context of the terrace as a whole, with the external wall insulation creating a substantial difference in the overall form of the dwelling, being particularly noticeable around window surrounds and where it meets the neighbouring property.
21. It is therefore considered as a result of this that the proposed external wall insulation to the ground floor front elevation fails to respect the character and appearance of the existing terrace which fails to recognise and address the features of the group of properties introducing a jarring and incongruous addition to the terrace.
22. It is considered that the provision of external wall insulation to the rear of the property is not considered to be as harmful, due to the restricted and minimal views from the public realm and street scene.
23. Whilst the introduction of external wall insulation at the application dwelling is considered inappropriate and to the detriment of the appearance of the terrace, which presently creates a strong and positive aspect along Springfield Avenue. This conclusion recognises and respects

the energy saving and building fabric benefit that will accrue from this proposal and attaches weight to such in the balance of considerations.

24. The benefits arising from the modest carbon emission reductions that would result from this development is significantly outweighed by the detrimental and harmful design and character impacts set out above. The proposal runs counter to the requirement for high quality design required by the NPPF and relevant Local Plan Policies. The proposal would provide only modest environmental benefits to the host dwelling which, whilst a material consideration, does not outweigh the incongruous and poor design of the proposal.
25. Information was submitted on 14 February 2016 in relation to damp within the property offering the external insulation as a solution to this problem. No information on the cause of the damp or alternative solutions to ameliorate the problem has been provided. As such, only limited weight can be attached to this matter.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

26. Given the nature and scale of the proposed works, there will be no adverse impact on the neighbouring amenity by virtue of overlooking, loss of light or over bearing impact. However, despite these positive aspects, plus any energy benefits that will accrue to the property owner, these are not considered sufficient to overcome the concern in relation to the impacts upon character and appearance.

Conclusion:

27. The proposed development is contrary to Policy DM2 and DM24 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015 and Policy CS3 of the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December 2010 and is recommended for refusal.

Recommendation:

It is **RECOMMENDED** that planning permission be **Refused** for the following reasons:

1. Policies DM2 and DM24 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, along with Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy 2010, require development proposals to respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the immediate and surrounding area. The host property and those it adjoins in a terraced block are simple and attractively detailed dwellings with uniform appearance. The application of projecting external insulation to one of the properties on the terrace would, if approved, disrupt the appearance and uniformity of the whole terrace, to the detriment of its appearance and the character of the area. It is the effect of the proposal upon the integrity of the entire terrace which is considered most harmful in this context. The proposal is therefore contrary to the requirements of national planning policies for design set out in the NPPF. The proposals are also contrary to the provisions of

Policies DM2, DM24 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015 and Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy 2010 in this respect.

Documents:

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online:

<https://planning.westsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=NZ3MR3PDLYD00>

Case Officer: Jonny Rankin

Date: 17th February 2016

Development Control Manager:

Date: