



Development Control Committee

7th September 2017

Late Papers

Item 5 – DC/17/0232/FUL – 65 Horsecroft Road, Bury St Edmunds

Clarification and amendments to committee report

1. Paragraph 2 (page 46) – For clarification purposes the dimensions that are referred to are that of the amended dwelling as shown on plans 160910/003 REV C, & 160910/004 REV C. The amended dwelling will measure 12.05m wide, 9.55m deep, 2.8m to the eaves and 4m to the ridge, and will have a floor area of approximately 115sqm. The correct amended site layout plan (160910/001 rev C) is attached at appendix A.
2. Paragraph 3 (page 46) – The amended proposal has not reduced the overall ridge height of the dwelling proposed under this application; it remains at 4m to the ridge as originally submitted.
3. Representations (page 47) – Additional representations have been received from 136 Hardwick Lane. The objection raised is in line with the previous objections already made, as noted on page 47.
4. Paragraph 29 (page 50) – For clarification, the dwelling that was considered under the previous application DC/14/2281/FUL and by the inspector, measured 5.9m to the ridge (copy of appeal decision attached at Appendix B). The ridge line height for this amended scheme which have been submitted as part of this application measures 4m in height.
5. Page 50 – for reference, the following are the site areas (as measured by the Case Officer) of the proposed and neighbouring dwellings.

Address	Site Area (sqm)	Dwelling (sqm)	Curtilage (sqm) (site area – dwelling footprint)
61 Horsecroft Road	2240	131	2109
63 Horsecroft Road	995	183	812
65 Horsecroft Road (Existing)	1472	153	1319

65 Horsecroft Road (Proposed) (Not including shared access track)	870	173	697
65a Horsecroft Road (Proposed dwelling) (Not including shared access track)	796	115	681
67 Horsecroft Road	1523	227	1296
69 Horsecroft Road	1797	207	1590
Stonebridge Cottage, Horsecroft Road	795	62	733
136 Hardwick Lane	1027	190	837

As noted in the above table, the subdivision of the site results in the site area and curtilage of the proposed dwellings being significantly less than those of adjacent plots. This further reinforces Officer's concerns regarding the proposed impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area, as noted in paragraph 30 of the committee report.

6. Pages 51 and 52 – The applicant has suggested that 10m of the existing fence (fronting Horsecroft Road) could be repositioned a further 900mm back into the site. This would then provide sufficient space for planting an evergreen Laurel hedge 1500-2000mm high. The applicant has stated that the Laurels would be spaced at x2 per metre, for 10mts. (= 20 Plants). Officers consider that this would resolve both the urbanising impact from the fencing, and the lack of private amenity space for no.65. Whilst the recommendation remains for refusal, if members were minded to grant permission, then officers could request a planting plan showing the layout, spacing, and detail of the proposed hedge and fencing. Given this detail paragraphs 35 to 37 are no longer relevant in the determination of this application.
7. Page 53 – Refusal Reason 1 amended to read:

The proposal will result in a contrived and cramped development which does not recognise the existing spacious urban form and pattern of development in this locality, which consists of dwellings set within generous plots. The subdivision of the site will cause the existing dwelling No. 65 to be out of proportion with surrounding plot sizes with minimal private amenity space. Consequently, the scheme will result in a harmful disruption to the spacious character of the area. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to the principles of good design set out within Policy CS3 of the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy (2010), Policies DM2 and DM22 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document (Feb 2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

8. Page 52 – Following the suggestion to plant hedging as detailed in paragraph 6 of this Late Paper, it is no longer necessary for refusal reason 2 to form part of the recommendation.

Documents:

- Appendix A – Amended site layout plan
- Appendix B – Appeal decision relating to DC/14/2281/FUL