

Development Control Committee 1 September 2021

Planning Application DC/21/1198/FUL – Land North of Green Acre, Thetford Road, Ixworth Thorpe

Date registered:	28 June 2021	Expiry date:	23 August 2021 EOT to 03 September 2021
Case officer:	Jo-Anne Rasmussen	Recommendation:	Refuse application
Parish:	Ixworth & Ixworth Thorpe	Ward:	Ixworth
Proposal:	Planning application - Three dwellings (following demolition of existing dwellings)		
Site:	Land North of Green Acre, Thetford Road, Ixworth Thorpe		
Applicant:	Frederick Hiam Ltd		

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:

Jo-Anne Rasmussen

Email: Jo-Anne.Rasmussen@westsuffolk.gov.uk

Telephone: 01284 757609

Background:

This application is presented to the Development Control Committee following consideration at Delegation Panel on the 27 July 2021. It was presented to the Delegation Panel due to the support from the Parish Council. This is a resubmission of a previously refused proposal determined at a previous Development Control Committee. The application is recommended for REFUSAL.

Proposal:

1. Full planning permission is sought for three dwellings. There are currently three dwellings on site and it is proposed that these will be demolished following completion of the development. The development relates to a pair of semi-detached two storey dwellings and a detached bungalow. The total floorspace for the proposed dwellings would be 435sqm².
2. The existing dwellings form a terrace of three. The dwellings are two-storey and relatively modest in size. The total floor space for the existing dwellings is 232sqm².
3. The dwellings would be built within the residential curtilage of the existing cottages, but pulled forward of their current siting to be closer to the highway and eastern boundary of the site.
4. An outline application for five dwellings, replacing the existing three, was refused by committee in 2019, planning reference DC/18/0544/HYB. The decision was appealed, (reference AP/21/0010/STAND) and the Council's decision was upheld and the appeal was dismissed.

Site details:

5. The site is located to the west of the A1088 in the village of Ixworth Thorpe, which for planning purposes does not have a settlement boundary and is therefore considered to be countryside. The site consists of a terrace of three two storey dwellings. On the northern boundary of the site, running along east to west, is a public foot path.

Planning history:

Reference	Proposal	Status	Decision date
DC/18/0544/HYB	Hybrid application – (i)full planning application – demolition of 3no.existing dwellings and (ii) outline planning application (means of access to be considered) for up to 5no dwellings.	REFUSED	4/12/2019

Consultations:

7. **Town/Parish Council comment:** No Objections, however the Parish Council have stated they would like the methods of heating the properties considered.
8. **Public Health and Housing:** No Objections, subject to conditions
9. **Environment Team:** No Objections subject to condition relating to Electric vehicle charging point.
10. **Waste Management:** No comments
11. **Highways:** No Objections, Subject to conditions relating to access, refuse collection, cycle storage and parking
12. **Natural England:** No Comments

Local member comment:

13. No comments received

Representations:

14. One letter of representation was received from Green Ixworth, 39 Micklesmere Drive, Ixworth. Their comments are summarised below;
 - Similar to previous refusal.
 - Site is within the countryside and should therefore abide by the replacement dwelling policy and should be of a similar size to the existing property/conflict with policy
 - Sustainability/ Minimum services within the locality/Will create more car use.
 - The existing properties should be renovated and refurbished rather than demolished.
 - Would remove smaller more affordable dwellings from the hamlet/ could be a rural exception site.
 - Concern over heating arrangements/ insufficient details/ solar panels likely to be ineffective.
 - No garages or outside storage provided
 - Poorly designed dwellings/ access to garden and bins

Policy:

15. On 1 April 2019 Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council were replaced by a single authority, West Suffolk Council. The development plans for the previous local planning authorities were carried forward to the new Council by regulation. The development plans remain in

place for the new West Suffolk Council and, with the exception of the Joint Development Management Policies Document (which had been adopted by both councils), set out policies for defined geographical areas within the new authority. It is therefore necessary to determine this application with reference to policies set out in the plans produced by the now dissolved St Edmundsbury Borough Council.

16. The following policies of the Joint Development Management Policies Document and the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy 2010 & Vision 2031 have been taken into account in the consideration of this application:

Joint Development Management Policies Document:

DM1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development.
DM2 Creating Places – Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness
DM5 Development in the Countryside
DM10 Impact of development on sites of biodiversity and geodiversity importance
DM11 Protected Species
DM12 Mitigation, Enhancement, Management and Monitoring of Biodiversity
DM13 Landscape Features
DM22 Residential Design
DM27 Housing in the Countryside
DM46 Parking standards

St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December 2010

Policy CS2 Sustainable Development
Policy CS3 Design and Local Distinctiveness
Policy CS4 Settlement Hierarchy and Identity
Policy CS13 Rural Areas

Other planning policy:

17. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The NPPF was revised in July 2021 and is a material consideration in decision making from the day of its publication. Paragraph 219 is clear however, that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of the revised NPPF. Due weight should be given to them according to their degree of consistency with the Framework; the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework; the greater weight that may be given. The policies set out within the Joint Development Management Policies have been assessed in detail and are considered sufficiently aligned with the provision of the 2021 NPPF that full weight can be attached to them in the decision making process.

Officer comment:

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

- Principle of Development
- Previous refusal and appeal
- Impact upon the form and character
- Neighbour amenity
- Highways

- Biodiversity
- Other planning considerations

Principle of Development

19. Decisions on planning applications are required by Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to be made in accordance with development plans unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise.
20. West Suffolk Council is able to demonstrate at least a five year supply of housing land for the period 2017 – 2022, plus necessary buffer, as detailed in the council's report "Assessment of a five year supply of housing land taking a baseline date of 31 March 2017". The relevant policies for the supply of housing are therefore considered to be up-to-date. The starting point for all proposals is therefore the development plan.
21. The Council's settlement strategy derives from a detailed understanding of the character of the area and the requirement to accommodate growth sustainably. The local policy framework seeking to deliver that strategy has been subject to a rigorous process of evidence gathering, consultation, and examination. It accords with the basic principles of the NPPF, which seeks to secure sustainable development and reduce the need to travel.
22. Ixworth Thorpe does not have a settlement boundary and is identified in the Core Strategy as countryside. Policy CS4 identifies these areas as unsustainable due to the reliance on motor cars to access shops, other facilities or employment. Policy CS13 further states that development permitted in such locations will only be so much as is necessary, reflecting the need to maintain the sustainability of services in the community they serve, and the provision of housing for local needs. Development outside defined areas will be strictly controlled.
23. Policy DM5 sets out the specific instances of development that are considered appropriate in the countryside, section g) of this policy states; the replacement of an existing dwelling on a one for one basis where it can be demonstrated that the proposed dwelling respects the scale and floor area of the existing dwelling and that extensions to existing curtilages are fully justified.
24. The existing dwellings on site are relatively modest, traditional workers cottages which have a combined floor space of 232sqm. The proposed dwellings are significantly larger with a combined floorspace of 435sqm. A floorplan of the existing dwellings was requested however this has not been provided.
25. There are no policies within the local plan which would protect or save the existing dwellings and in principle their demolition and replacement would be acceptable. However, DM5 is clear in stating that any such replacement should respect the scale and floor area of the existing dwelling. Given the significant size increase, nearly doubling that of the existing dwellings, it is not considered the proposed dwellings would be respectful or in-keeping and would therefore fail to comply with DM5 and as such would represent the introduction of unjustified and unsustainable form of housing within the countryside.

26. Further, whilst it is noted there may be enhancements in the construction of the dwellings in terms of sustainability, this would not be sufficient to outweigh the conflict with policy for replacement dwellings and the significant harm to the character of the settlement.
27. Policy DM27 was considered extensively during the previous application. Policy DM27 sets out additional criteria for new market dwellings in the countryside. Proposals will only be permitted on small undeveloped plots where they are within a closely knit cluster and front a highway. A small undeveloped plot is one that could be filled by either one detached dwelling, or a pair of semidetached dwellings, where plot sizes and spacing between dwellings is similar and respectful of the rural character and street scene of the locality.
28. The proposal is not within a closely knit cluster. It is located in a generally very loose collection of dwellings, which in themselves sit approximately 1.4km south from the closest settlement boundary which is at Honington Village which itself has limited services. The proposal is not for a single dwelling or pair of semi-detached dwellings, but a total of three dwellings. As such, the proposal does not accord with the provisions set out within DM27.
29. This proposal does not comply with policies CS4, CS13, DM5 or DM27 that all seek to protect the countryside from inappropriate and unsustainable development. DM5 specifically sets out when a replacement dwelling is acceptable and whilst the size of the replacement dwelling does not have to be an exact replica it does have to respect the size and scale of the original dwelling. In this case there is a very clear and significant increase in floorspace (87.5 percent) which cannot be considered to reflect the modest proportions of the traditional cottages. There is, consequently, an unequivocal policy conflict and this failure to meet the provisions of the Development Plan indicate that significant weight should be attached to this conflict against the scheme as a matter of principle.

Previous refusal and appeal

30. The previous application, planning reference DC/18/0544/HYB was refused by Committee in December 2019. The application proposed five dwellings, three being considered replacement dwellings and two being new development. The reason for refusal stated;

'The broad overall aim of paragraphs 77 and 78 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is to promote sustainable development in rural areas by locating housing where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities, by supporting its three dimensions - economic, social and environmental. This approach is also set out in the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy (CS), and the Joint Development Management (DM) Policy DM1 and DM5 which aims to protect the countryside from unsustainable and unjustified housing. In addition to this the Council's settlement strategy is derived from a detailed understanding of the character of the district and the requirement to accommodate growth sustainably.

The proposal is for dwellings outside the settlement boundary and would therefore fall within the remit of policies DM5 and DM27. It is not an infill plot within a cluster, being sited generally within a very loose collection of

dwellings, and therefore, as a result of its conflict with Policies DM5 and DM27 cannot be supported as a matter of principle.

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise.

The application site lies outside of the defined Housing Settlement Boundaries and is therefore classified as countryside where rural area policies of restraint apply. There is a presumption against residential development in such locations as set out in Policies CS4, CS13 and DM5.

Given the remote location of the site it follows that the occupiers of the proposed dwellings would have to travel by car to access shopping, education, recreation, and social facilities. The dwellings would also create demand for additional trips by visitors and service vehicles. There are no local shops, services or other facilities within a reasonable walking distance of the site that would appropriately cater for the day to day needs of any future occupiers of the proposed dwellings. The nearest reasonable range of day to day facilities are in Ixworth or Honington Airfield, both of which are over 2.5km from the site. In view of the limited options for travel other than by private car, which is exacerbated by the lack of a continuous formal pedestrian foot path linking the site to those settlements, the proposal would not contribute to sustainable travel patterns.

Policy DM5 states that areas designated as countryside will be protected from unsustainable development. Residential development within the countryside is only permitted where it is for affordable housing for local needs, a dwelling for a key worker essential to the operation of agriculture in accordance with the requirements of Policy DM26, infill development within existing clusters in accordance with Policy DM27, or the replacement of an existing dwelling on a one for one basis.

The NPPF represents up-to-date Government planning policy and is a material consideration when determining planning applications. The Framework reiterates that proposals that conflict with the development plan should be refused permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Policy DM2 requires development proposals to recognise the character and appearance of the area in which they are proposed. By reason of the location, but in particular from the expansive layout, the regular spacing of the buildings, and the visually prominent frontage car parking and driveway, the proposal would create a visual intrusion, having an unwelcome and highly urbanising effect on public views of the locality, creating a significant impact so as to cause material harm to the surrounding loosely grained rural character, contrary to the provisions of Policy DM2.

The proposal would not provide any substantial contributions to the locality in terms of economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. The proposal would be contrary to the pattern of development established in the Core Strategy, and would not respect the character and context of the countryside setting.

The proposal therefore fails to accord with policies DM2, DM5, DM13, DM27, DM33 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, policies CS2, CS3, CS4 and CS13 of the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy 2010 and paragraphs 77 and 78 in particular of the NPPF, which seek to tightly constrain development in the countryside to that which supports local services and is in appropriate locations. The proposal is in clear and significant conflict with local and national policies.'

31. The refusal was appealed, (reference APP/F3545/W/20/3245658) however this was dismissed in August 2020, with the inspector stating;

"The appeal proposal which would provide a net gain of up to 2 dwellings, would be situated in the countryside where development is strictly controlled and subject to JDMPD Policies DM5 and DM27. The proposed development does not meet any of the defined circumstances for development in the countryside as set out in Policy DM5 and therefore conflicts with that Policy. I saw at my site visit that the appeal site is not situated within a closely knit cluster of 10 or more dwellings. Rather, Ixworth Thorpe consists of a number of dwellings in a dispersed pattern, with significant gaps between individual and groups of dwellings. The appeal site, consisting of the 3 existing dwellings and an area of open land, does not constitute a small undeveloped plot and the proposal conflicts with Policy DM27.

To conclude on this matter, the proposal is not in a suitable location having regard to policies for housing development in rural areas, and of the development plan policies cited by the Council it is contrary to JDMPD Policies DM5, DM27 and to Policy DM33 which is concerned with the re-use or replacement of buildings in the countryside and to CS Policies CS4 and CS13."

The inspector stated that the "proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to JDMPD Policy DM2 which sets development principles including, amongst other things, that development recognises and addresses key features, characteristics and local distinctiveness and Policy DM13 which includes that development proposals should demonstrate their location, scale, design and materials, will protect, and where possible enhance the character of the landscape including the setting of settlements and the significance of gaps between them. It is also contrary to CS Policy CS3 which is concerned with design and local distinctiveness."

32. Whilst the previous refusal related to the addition of two dwellings, rather than just the three replacement dwellings, given the proposed siting of the dwellings, on what is currently open frontage, similarities can be drawn between the previous refusal and the proposed application in relation to the urbanising impact and harm the development would have upon the open character of the settlement.

Impact upon the form and character

33. Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy requires new development to create and contribute to a high quality, safe and sustainable environment. Proposals will be expected to address an understanding of the local context and demonstrate how it would enhance an area. This requirement is detailed further in Policy DM13 (Landscape Features) which states that development will be permitted where it will not have an unacceptable adverse impact on

the character of the landscape, landscape features wildlife or amenity value. DM2 seeks development to recognise and address the character of the area.

34. The settlement of Ixworth Thorpe has a small number of dwellings scattered along the highway, there is no defined building line with properties having a loosely grained settlement pattern, with the hamlet retaining an open, rural feel.
35. The proposal would look to re-site the replacement dwellings further to the front of the site, closer to the highway. The existing dwellings are small, traditional workers cottages, with the terrace almost appearing as one dwelling when viewed within the wider landscape, they are set back within the site and are relatively discreet and unobtrusive. Given the scale and design of the proposed properties, combined with the layout, the development would have an urbanising impact upon the site, with the dwellings being significantly more intrusive within the landscape and visible within the street scene.
36. The siting of the dwellings further to the front of the site is similar to that proposed indicatively within the previous application DC/18/0544/HYB. This application was refused and appealed. When referring to the re-positioning of the dwellings in this location the inspector noted;

“The appeal scheme would erode the openness of the settlement through the development of the open grassed area and front gardens of the dwellings to be demolished. Whilst there are existing hedges which it is suggested are to be retained, this loss of openness would nevertheless harm the character and appearance of the area.”
37. The small terrace of modestly sized dwellings is typical of the surrounding built character of the locality. There is a more modern bungalow neighbouring the site, however given the loose grain and separation distance between the dwellings this is not considered to be the dominant character of the locality. The design and more specifically the width and span of the new dwellings across the frontage of the site, eroding the open grassed area and front gardens of the dwellings to be demolished results in a more dominant and visually intrusive development, harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
38. The existing dwellings have a total width of approximately 14.5 metres and set at an angle and are between 34.6 metres and 42.6 metres from the eastern boundary of the site. The proposed dwellings have a cumulative width of 31.4 metres (plot 3 is 13.2 metres, plots 1 and 2 are 18.2 metres) and are set at varying points between approximately 6 metres and 13 metres from the frontage of the site. The significant increase in the width and scale of the properties does not respect the size of the existing dwellings or indeed reflective of their modest character. As such, the design of the dwellings which serves to elongate their width increases the urbanising impact upon the site. The relocation of the dwellings onto what is currently an open grassed garden area, significantly closer to the public highway, would have an unsympathetic, intrusive and visually harmful urbanising effect on public views of the locality.
39. Para 174 of the NPPF states that development proposals ‘should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic

character and beauty of the countryside'. The proposal fails in this regard. The proposal would create a significant level of visual intrusion in this rural location. The siting of the dwellings combined with their scale and design would not be in-keeping with or respectful of the loosely grained and open nature of the settlement of Ixworth Thorpe and would have a materially detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the area. As such the proposal would not accord with policies CS3, DM2 and DM13.

Biodiversity

40. Bats are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017, as amended) requires that competent Authorities (of which the Local Authority is one) have regard to biodiversity in carrying out its statutory duties, for example through the determination of planning applications.
41. The Local Planning Authority also has to have regard to conserving biodiversity as part of policy or decision making under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (NERC). Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act (2006) sets out a list of habitats and species that are of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England.
42. Policy DM10 requires that when considering development proposals which may have an adverse impact on nature conservation sites or interests, the local planning authority will have regard to the expert nature conservation advice provided by Natural England, the Suffolk Wildlife Trust and other specialist sources.
43. The applicant has submitted a nocturnal bat survey, dated October 2019 which found that;
 - Evidence of bats was recorded during the initial inspection and further surveys recommended.
 - The nocturnal surveys recorded maximum counts of four Brown Longeared and two Common Pipistrelle roosting in the cottages.
 - The demolition will result in the loss of the roosts and a Natural England licence will therefore be required.
 - The licence will need to be supported by appropriate mitigation.
44. The submitted bat survey report advises that a full mitigation package will be required with a Natural England Licence; the conservation significance is very low using a scale of very low to very high and the proportionate mitigation recommended in the Bat Mitigation Guidelines (2004) says for small numbers of common species there should be the following:
 - No timing constraints
 - Provision of bat boxes
 - No conditions about monitoring.
45. In this case there will be the provision of bat boxes, comprising of one Integrated Eco Crevice Bat Box and two Integrated Eco Cavity Bat Boxes; these boxes are readily used by the species recorded. The exact location of the bat boxes is yet to be determined but can be agreed by condition if necessary. They would be installed in the new cottages in south facing positions at a height not less than three metres from the ground. The boxes

will be complemented by bat friendly lighting; avoiding lighting of the boxes and generally directing light downwards through the use of hoods and cowls as appropriate which will also benefit those species using the site for foraging and commuting. Again this is a matter that could be agreed through the imposition of a condition if required.

46. The report indicates that the preferred work period is October to April; this will have minimal impact on bats as the buildings are thought to be unsuitable for hibernating bats. Again, this is a matter which can be controlled through the imposition of a planning condition.
47. Prior to work commencing an inspection of the buildings will be carried out by the licenced bat worker. Any works to the roof must be carried out by hand and supervised by the licenced bat worker; all other works with the potential to impact on roosting bats will be supervised by the licenced bat worker as required. Prior to commencement of works on site workers will be given a 'tool box' talk on the brief ecology of bats, how to remove materials carefully, what to look for and what to do if a bat is found. Should a bat be found, works will immediately cease and if the bat has not already flown away it will be removed by the ecologist wearing a glove. It will be placed in a cloth bag before being placed into one of the onsite bat boxes which will have already been suitably located. The ecologist will be on call for the duration of the works and workers will have been informed to stop works and call should a bat be found. The ecologist will then visit the site immediately, or instructions provided verbally if bat appears injured and needs instant help. These matters can all be secured through a condition which requires compliance with the provisions of the submitted ecological survey report.
48. Accordingly, with appropriate conditions in relation to mitigation and enhancement works, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies DM10, DM11 and DM12 of the Joint Development Management Policies as well as with the provisions of the NPPF in relation to biodiversity.

Neighbour Amenity

49. Policy DM2 seeks to ensure that new development does not have a detrimental impact on residential amenity.
50. Plot 1 has a first floor window on the north-west elevation which would serve a hallway. Given the separation distance between the proposed dwelling and the neighbouring property it is not considered this would give rise to overlooking or loss of privacy. Plot two has a first floor window on the south-east elevation which would serve a bathroom, a condition could be attached to ensure this is obscure glazed. Windows on the south-west elevation and north-east elevations of the properties would overlook the highway and countryside.
51. Given the relationship to neighbouring dwellings, design and layout, it is not considered the proposal would result in a harmful impact upon the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings.

Highways

52. Policies DM2 and DM46 both state that proposals for all development should produce designs that are in accordance with standards that maintain or

enhance the safety of the highway network and provide appropriately designed and sited car parking.

53. The development would utilise the existing access. Highways have not objected to the proposal but have requested conditions, as stated above. The plans illustrate that two parking places could be achieved for each property and given the level of accommodation this is sufficient and compliant with policy DM46.

Other planning considerations

54. The Parish Council has stated they would like the type of heating of the proposed dwellings taken into account. Details of the sustainability of building techniques to be used on the dwellings is not given, nor is there any comparison or details given as to the sustainability and or/heating of the existing dwellings or what could be achieved through renovation of the existing dwellings. However, even if the proposed dwellings could offer benefits in terms of heating methods this would not outweigh the clear conflict with policy identified above.

Conclusion:

55. Policy DM5 seeks to resist inappropriate and unsustainable development within the countryside and as such sets out criteria for acceptable forms of development. A replacement dwelling is one such form of development, which in principle could be acceptable, however policy DM5 is clear that any replacement dwelling should respect the floorspace and scale of the existing dwelling. The proposed replacement dwellings have a significant increase in terms of their floorspace and scale, they are in no way respectful or in-keeping of the character of the traditional terrace of dwellings and their modest proportions. As such it is considered the proposal does not accord with the provisions of DM5 and as such represents an unjustified form of development within the countryside.

56. Further to this the re-siting of the replacement dwellings within what is currently an open, grassed garden area would negatively impact upon the open, rural character of the settlement. The layout, specifically when combined with the increased size of the dwellings and their design would be significantly more intrusive within the streetscene and wider landscape. The proposed dwellings would not be in-keeping with the loosely grained settlement pattern which is an intrinsic characteristic of Ixworth Thorpe, as such, it is not considered the proposal would comply with policies CS3, DM2 and DM13.

57. As the proposal is contrary to policies within the development plan and core strategy, as well as the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) as set out above and with no material considerations which would indicate a different decision should be made, the recommendation is one of refusal.

Recommendation:

58. It is recommended that planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

The site is classified as being within countryside and as such policies which seek to protect the countryside from inappropriate and unsustainable forms of development would apply. Whilst policy DM5 allows for replacement dwellings in the countryside, these should be respectful of the scale and floor area of the existing dwelling. The proposed dwellings result in a significant increase in floorspace and the design and scale would not respect or be in-keeping with the modest terrace of properties that exist on the site at present. As such the proposal would be contrary to policy DM5.

Policy DM2 requires that development recognises and addresses key features, characteristics and local distinctiveness. Policy DM13 requires development proposals to protect, and where possible enhance the character of the landscape including the setting of settlements and the significance of gaps between them.

Policy DM2 requires development proposals to recognise the character and appearance of the area in which they are proposed. By reason of the location, but in particular, from the expansive layout, the spacing of the buildings and the visually prominent frontage car parking and driveway, the proposal would create a visual intrusion, having an unwelcome and highly urbanising effect on public views of the locality, causing material harm to the surrounding loosely grained rural character.

The proposal therefore fails to accord with policies DM2, DM5 and DM13 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, policies CS2, CS3, and CS13 of the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy 2010 and the NPPF, which seeks to ensure new development is sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting and should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. The proposal is in clear and significant conflict with both local and national policies.

Documents:

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online [DC/21/1198/FUL](https://www.stedmundsbury.gov.uk/DC/21/1198/FUL)