



*St Edmundsbury*  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

## Development Control Committee 7 April 2016

### Planning Application DC/16/0172/FUL 69 Highfield, Clare, Sudbury, Suffolk

**Date:** 27 January                      **Expiry Date:** 23 March 2016  
**Registered:** 2016

**Case Officer:** Aaron Sands                      **Recommendation:** Refuse

**Parish:** Clare Town Council                      **Ward:** Clare

**Proposal:** Planning Application - construction of 1no. two-storey dwelling  
(demolition of existing single storey attached out-house)

**Site:** 69 Highfield, Clare

**Applicant:** Mr and Mrs M Wimpress

**Agent:** Dean Jay Pearce Architectural Design & Planning Ltd

#### **Synopsis:**

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

#### CONTACT CASE OFFICER:

Email: [aaron.sands@westsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:aaron.sands@westsuffolk.gov.uk)

Telephone: 01284 757355

**Background:**

**This application has been referred to Committee following consideration by the Delegation Panel. This application was originally referred to the Delegation Panel as the position of the Clare Town Council was contrary to the recommendation of the case officer to refuse.**

**A site inspection is scheduled for 31 March 2016.**

**Proposal:**

1. Planning permission is sought for a two storey dwelling to the end of an existing pair of dwellings. The dwelling is 9 metres in overall depth and 7.5 metres in width. It measures 8.5 metres in height and 5.7 metres at the eaves with a hipped roof form. A single storey element is located to the rear measuring 3.4 metres in overall height and 2.4 metres to the eaves. The development is proposed in facing and roofing materials to match the existing dwellings.

**Application Supporting Material:**

2. Information submitted with the application as follows:
  - Application Form
  - Design and Access Statement
  - Land Contamination Report
  - Land Contamination Questionnaire
  - Flood Map
  - Location Plan
  - Topographical site survey (Drawing no. 16/007/01)
  - Existing Floor plans and Elevations and proposed Site Plan (Drawing no. 16/007/02)
  - Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations (Drawing no. 16/007/03)

**Site Details:**

3. The site comprises an existing dwelling within the Housing Settlement Boundary at the end of a terrace. The property is a corner plot with expansive garden and is located facing a central green space serving a number of dwellings. There is a rhythm and distinctiveness to the area created by the regular positioning and scaling of dwellings around the central green.

**Planning History:**

4. None Relevant

**Consultations:**

5. Highway Authority: No objection subject to conditions
6. Environment Officer: No objection subject to informatives
7. Public Health and Housing: No objection subject to conditions
8. Rights of Way: No objection
9. Clare Society: Support in principle

**Representations:**

10. Clare Town Council: Support
11. One other representation received incorporating the following points:
  - a. Adverse impact on parking arrangements

**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:

12. Joint Development Management Policies Document:
  - Policy DM1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
  - Policy DM2 (Creating Places – Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness)
  - Policy DM22 (Residential Design)
13. St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December 2010
  - Policy CS3 (Design and Local Distinctiveness)

**Other Planning Policy:**

14. National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

**Officer Comment:**

15. The issues to be considered in the determination of the application are:
  - Principle of Development (including impacts on character and urban form)
  - Design and Form
  - Impact on Neighbour Amenity
  - Precedent

Principle of Development (including impacts on character and urban form)

16. The application site forms part of a development of dwellings characterised by pairs of dwellings joined in terraces of four by single storey garages and facing onto a central green space. The urban form and pattern of development is a distinct feature of the area that contributes to

the character and attractiveness of this group of properties. Policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies requires that development not affect adversely the urban form, including significant street patterns, individual or groups of buildings and open spaces.

17. While the proposal is located in a sustainable area, and is therefore supported in principle noting its position within the settlement boundary of Clare, the development would significantly alter the form of this terrace and fails to respect and reflect the particular character of the locality. Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy and paragraph 60 of the NPPF seek to reinforce local distinctiveness, ensuring that features that contribute to an area are not eroded, and it is considered that this is not represented by the proposed scheme.
18. While it is noted that the development would make a contribution to the housing stock within a sustainable area the NPPF makes it clear that good design is indivisible from good planning. While there are obvious benefits to the scheme proposed it is not considered that any of these would outweigh the adverse impacts upon the character of the area. The development is not for an affordable dwelling, is not of an outstanding or innovative design and the proposal would only make a modest contribution to housing supply.

#### Design and Form

19. The dwelling is proposed in a similar form to the existing dwellings in the area, with similar arrangements in fenestration, roof form and material. The appearance of the dwelling per se, and in terms of its scale in relation to other properties, is not considered to be inappropriate. However, as set out above, it is the wider impact upon the character and appearance of the area resulting from the erosion of the regular and consistent spacing of dwellings that this proposal would materially, and adversely, erode which is what weighs against this proposal.

#### Impact on Neighbour Amenity

20. The property adjoins the applicant's property 69 Highfield, dividing the existing residential garden. While there would be a level of overlooking caused by the development it is not considered that this would be materially harmful given this arrangement and context and also given the degree of overlooking that might reasonably be expected within an urban area.
21. The development is located away from the boundary shared with the neighbouring dwelling at 68 Highfield. Additionally, this property features a sizeable amenity space, and while some modest overbearing impact may be caused to the parking area to the front of the property this would not be a material impact and would be mitigated by the substantial remaining amenity space.

## Precedent

22. While each application is discussed in its own merits there are a number of similar properties in the area. The proposal would set an uncomfortable principle for development that could further erode the regular and spacious character of the area, particularly in cases of corner properties, where such dwellings could form an awkward angled terracing effect. Regardless, this proposal is considered on its own merits, on balance, as being unacceptable.

### **Conclusion:**

23. In conclusion, the proposal is considered to represent an in principle objection based on the harm identified to the urban form and character of the developed area. This conclusion is balanced against the obvious benefit of providing a dwelling in an otherwise suitable location, with no significant adverse effects. Members are advised therefore that this remains a fine balance, but one which Officers consider falls in favour of refusal.

### **Recommendation:**

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

1. The proposed dwelling would be an inappropriate deviation from the prevailing pattern of development in the area, and from the rhythm of built form, which are both strongly characterised by the terraced dwellings divided into groups of two attached via link garages surrounding a central green space, and with a simple regularity to their spacing that contributes to the character of the area. The proposal, which will extend one pair of dwellings uncharacteristically, whilst also eroding the space within the corner, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area, therefore fails to recognise the key features of the area in contradiction to policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies (JDM) and policy CS3 of the Core Strategy. As a result the proposal would be contrary to these policies and also to policy DM22 of the JDM, as well as paragraph 60 of the NPPF, which seeks to reinforce local distinctiveness.

### **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=summary&keyVal=O1M3FBPD05L00>

Case Officer: Aaron Sands

Date: 3 March 2016