

## **Development Control Committee**

### **3 April 2024**

#### **Planning Application DC/23/0630/FUL – Vicarage Farm Cottage, Vicarage Farm Lane, Great Barton**

<b>Date registered:</b>	24 April 2023	<b>Expiry date:</b>	22 June 2023 EOT 5 April 2024
<b>Case officer:</b>	Amey Yuill	<b>Recommendation:</b>	Refuse application
<b>Parish:</b>	Great Barton	<b>Ward:</b>	The Fornhams and Great Barton
<b>Proposal:</b>	Planning application - one dwelling (following demolition of existing dwelling)		
<b>Site:</b>	Vicarage Farm Cottage, Vicarage Farm Lane, Great Barton		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr and Mrs Ben Hutton		

#### **Synopsis:**

Application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and associated matters.

#### **Recommendation:**

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

#### CONTACT CASE OFFICER:

Amey Yuill

Email: [democratic.services@westsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@westsuffolk.gov.uk)

Telephone: 01284 763233

## **Background:**

**This application was referred to the Delegation Panel due to Great Barton Parish Council commenting “no objection” to the proposal, contrary to the officer’s recommendation of refusal.**

**Following the Delegation Panel meeting on 30 January 2024, it was concluded that the application should be determined by the Development Control Committee.**

**During the course of the application two consultations have taken place with statutory consultees and neighbouring properties due to amendments being received, including alterations to the site layout and dwelling design.**

**A site visit is scheduled to take place on Tuesday 2 April 2024.**

## **Proposal:**

1. The application seeks planning permission for a two storey, detached dwelling measuring 10.10 metres in depth, 14.70 metres in width and 6.05 metres in height, following the demolition of the existing single storey, detached dwelling.
2. The proposed development has been amended during the course of the application, with the initial scheme proposing a two-storey dwelling with a height of 8.1 metres and a gross internal floor area (GIA) of 203m<sup>2</sup>. The scale of the proposed dwelling, along with the design has since been amended, reducing the scale of the dwelling to have a GIA of 174.25m<sup>2</sup> and a height of 6.05 metres (5.4 metres when measured from the existing ground level, noting the dwelling is proposed to be set down into the ground by 650mm).
3. The proposed external finish of the dwelling includes a tiled roof, vertical black timber or composite cladding, white render, and a red brick plinth.

### **4. Application supporting material:**

- Application Form
- Location Plan
- Existing Floor Plans and Elevations (drawing no. 07)
- Proposed Floor Plans and Roof Plan (drawing no. 10/C)
- Proposed Sections (drawing no. 13/A)
- Permitted Development Plan (drawing no. 15)
- Proposed Elevations (drawing no. 11/D)
- Proposed Site Plan (drawing no. 12/C)
- Land Contamination Assessment
- Land Contamination Questionnaire
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal
- Design and Access Statement
- Planning Statement
- Flooding Information
- Geology Information (Part 1)
- Geology Information (Part 2)

## Site details:

5. The application site lies to the north of Great Barton, outside the housing settlement boundary, in land designated as countryside for the purpose of planning.
6. The site currently comprises a mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, detached bungalow, which sits centrally within the plot and is bound by hedging, shrubs, and trees, apart from the access into the site.
7. The site is accessed via the single-track road, Vicarage Lane, with parking to the front of the existing dwelling, within the application site.
8. The site is surrounded by agricultural fields and open countryside to the North, South, East, and West, with a barn located to the East, which is within the applicant's ownership, and further barns, buildings, and a dwelling to the South-West.
9. A public right of way runs north to south along the western boundary of the site.
10. There is no relevant planning history for the site.

## Consultations:

11. **Private Sector Housing and Environmental Health** – No objections to the proposed development subject to conditions requiring the building envelope, glazing and ventilation of the dwelling to be constructed to provide appropriate sound attenuation against noise, the restriction of hours for site preparation, demolition and construction works, and control of lux levels for any external artificial lighting and informatives regarding an asbestos survey and noise, vibration and dust control.
12. **Suffolk Fire and Rescue** – No objection to proposal but advice provided in terms of building regulation requirements and suggestions regarding the installation of a sprinkler system.
13. **Suffolk County Council Highway Authority** – No objection to application subject to conditions including parking, cycle storage, electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure, and bin storage/presentation areas to be provided.
14. **Environment Team** – Advised they are satisfied that the risk from contaminated land is low and recommended that an advice note be added to the permission if granted which states that if contamination is encountered, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) should be contacted.
15. **Ecology Officer** – No comments received.
16. **Ramblers Association** – No comments received.

## Representations:

17. **Parish Council** – Great Barton Parish Council objected to the original proposal, stating:

18. It is contrary to GB1 spatial Strategy of the Great Barton Neighbourhood Plan; the site is outside of the settlement boundary (designated as in the countryside). It is also contrary to DM5 Development in the Countryside as the proposed replacement dwelling does not respect the scale and floor area of the existing dwelling, it is 136% larger. The site will therefore be overdeveloped. The location is considered a viewpoint across the land and as such this does not conform to West Suffolk Council policy DM5 development in the countryside or DM27 housing in the countryside.
19. Following the submission of the amended plans, Great Barton Parish Council stated they have "no objections" to the application.
20. **Ward Member** – No comments were received from Councillor Sarah Broughton or Councillor Beccy Hopfensperger of The Fornhams and Great Barton Ward. However, Councillor Sarah Broughton did attend the Delegation Panel meeting on 30 January 2024 in support of the application.
21. **Neighbour Representations** – Three neighbour representations were received during the course of the application. Two were received following consultation of the first iteration of the proposal; one from 1 Conyers Green and one from Vicarage Farm.
- 22.1 Conyers Green supported the original submission but did also make an observation that a colony of bees was present on the site when they walked past it, so asked that they are moved safely.
23. Vicarage Farm neither stated an objection or support for the proposal but made observations on the details of the application submission.
24. Following amended plans being submitted and a re-consultation taking place, just one neighbour representation was received, that being from Vicarage Farm.
25. The representation made observations about the amended drawings and documents, however, did not state whether they support or object to the proposal.

**Policy:**

26. 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.
27. 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:

- Policy DM1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy DM2 Creating Places Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness
- Policy DM5 Development in the Countryside
- Policy DM6 Flooding and Sustainable Drainage
- Policy DM11 Protected Species
- Policy DM12 Mitigation, Enhancement, Management and Monitoring of Biodiversity
- Policy DM13 Landscape Features
- Policy DM14 Protecting and Enhancing Natural Resources, Minimising Pollution and Safeguarding from Hazards
- Policy DM22 Residential Design
- Policy DM27 Housing in the Countryside
- Policy DM44 Rights of Way
- Policy DM46 Parking Standards

St Edmundsbury Core Strategy:

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

Rural Vision:

- Vision Policy RV1 - Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development
- Vision Policy RV3 - Housing settlement boundaries

Great Barton Neighbourhood Plan:

- Policy GB1 - Spatial Strategy
- Policy GB5 - Housing Design
- Policy GB12 - Development Design Considerations

**Other planning policy:**

## 28. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

29. The NPPF was revised in December 2023 and is a material consideration in decision making from the day of its publication. Paragraph 225 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 2023 NPPF that full weight can be attached to them in the decision making process.

### **Officer comment:**

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

- Principle of development
- Design and impact on street scene/character of the area
- Impact upon neighbouring amenity
- Other matters

### **Principle of development**

31. The development site sits outside the housing settlement boundary of Great Barton, in land designated as countryside for the purpose of planning, and currently houses a single detached dwelling which is proposed to be demolished.

32. Policy CS4 of St Edmundsbury Core Strategy (SECS) and policy RV3 of the Rural Vision relate to settlement hierarchy and discourage development outside housing settlement boundaries, apart from where exceptional circumstances apply, for example replacement dwellings or dwellings for key agricultural workers. CS13 of SECS goes on to state that development outside the settlements defined in policy CS4 will be strictly controlled, with a priority on protecting and enhancing the character, appearance, historic qualities and biodiversity of the countryside while promoting sustainable diversification of the rural economy.

33. DM5 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document (JDMPD) is also engaged, noting this policy is for development within the countryside. DM5 states areas designated as countryside will be protected from unsustainable development, which is required by policy DM1 of the JDMPD, CS2 of the SECS, and RV1 of the Rural Vision as well. Policy DM5 goes on to state that the replacement of an existing dwelling on a one for one basis would be acceptable where it can be demonstrated that the proposed replacement dwelling respects the scale and floor area of the existing dwelling, in accordance with other policies.

34. Policy GB1 of the Great Barton Neighbourhood Plan (GBNP) similarly aims to protect the countryside, stating that outside the settlement boundaries, priority will be given to protecting and enhancing the countryside from inappropriate development.

35. Policy GB1 states that proposals for development will only be supported where they are essential for agriculture horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation, and other exceptional uses, or it is in conformity with policy DM27 of the JDMPD and would not lead to a significant adverse impact on the landscape setting of Great Barton, would not result in the loss or erosion of important settlement gaps, and it would maintain the distinctive view of the surrounding countryside from public vantage points within, and adjacent to the built-up area.
36. DM27 of the JDMPD, which relates to new dwellings in the countryside, states that proposals for new dwellings will be permitted if the development is within a closely knit 'cluster' of 10 or more dwellings adjacent to or fronting an existing highway or the scale of the development consists of infilling a small undeveloped plot by one dwelling or a pair of semi-detached dwellings commensurate with the scale and character of the existing dwellings within an otherwise continuous built-up frontage.
37. Noting DM5 allows for replacement dwellings within the countryside, subject to meeting the requirements detailed above, and noting policy DM27 of the JDMPD and policy GB1 of the GBNP are silent on replacement dwellings within the countryside, officers have concluded that the proposal will be assessed against DM5 in terms of the principle of the development.
38. The existing dwelling (Vicarage Farm Cottage) is a modest bungalow which has reached the end of its useful life, therefore, the principle of its replacement with a modern dwelling is acceptable, in accordance with policy DM5, subject to compliance with other local and national policy and material planning considerations. Therefore, in order for the principle of development to be acceptable, the replacement dwelling is required to respect the scale and floor area of the existing dwelling.
39. The GIA of Vicarage Farm Cottage measures 95m<sup>2</sup> and the building has a height of 3.6 metres. The applicant has demonstrated that under permitted development (PD) rights, the dwelling could be extended to the rear by up to 4 metres without the need for planning permission or prior approval from the Local Planning Authority (LPA), taking the GIA to 155m<sup>2</sup>.
40. The initial scheme proposed a two-storey dwelling with a height of 8.1 metres and a GIA of 203m<sup>2</sup>. The scale of the proposed dwelling, along with the design has since been amended, following concerns being raised by officers that the scale and floor area did not respect that of the existing dwelling.
41. The proposed dwelling now before us has a reduced scale, with a GIA of 174.25m<sup>2</sup> and a height of 6.05 metres (5.4 metres when measured from the existing ground level as the dwelling is proposed to be set down into the ground by 650mm). The proposed dwelling results in an 83.4% increase in GIA and a 1.8 metre increase in the dwelling's height from the existing ground floor level, or a 2.45 metre increase when measured from the ground level which the dwelling will sit on.

42. Whilst it is acknowledged that PD rights can offer some materiality as a 'fall back' in terms of the increase in floor area, this weight is limited. Furthermore, the PD rights would not allow for an additional storey without prior approval first being sought, whereby the LPA would consider a first-floor extension's design, which the courts have clarified allows a consideration of the impact upon character.
43. The latest iteration remains generously scaled compared to the dwelling it replaces and would be substantially larger in gross internal floor area than that of what is existing, and what could otherwise be completed under PD rights without prior approval being sought. Accordingly, the proposed development does not accord with the provisions set out above for policy DM5 of the JDMPD in terms of development within the countryside, and this weighs heavily against the scheme.

### **Design and impact on street scene/character of the area**

44. Development such as the provision of a new dwelling or replacement dwelling will need to be in accordance with policy DM2 of the JDMPD. The policy requires proposals to respect the character and appearance of the immediate and surrounding area and not have an adverse impact upon residential amenity, highway safety or important trees within the street scene.
45. Along with CS3 of the SECS, DM2 requires development to conserve and where possible enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the area. Design that does not demonstrate it has regard to local context and fails to enhance the character, appearance and environmental quality of an area will not be acceptable.
46. Policy DM22 of the JDMPD states that residential development proposals should maintain or create a sense of place and/or character by utilising the characteristics of the locality to create buildings and spaces that have a strong sense of place and distinctiveness, using an appropriate and innovative design and approach and incorporating a mix of housing and unit sizes that is appropriate for the location.
47. Policy DM44 of the JDMPD relates to rights of ways and states that development which would adversely affect the character of, or result in the loss of existing or proposed rights of way, will not be permitted unless alternative provision or diversions can be arranged which are at least as attractive, safe and convenient for public use. This will apply to rights of way for pedestrian, cyclist, or horse rider use.
48. Furthermore, policy GB5 and GB12 of the GBNP require that development creates and contributes to a high quality, safe and sustainable environment, whilst reflecting and having regard to the local characteristics and the immediate area within which the site is located and will not have a detrimental impact on that character.
49. Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (NPPF) includes the requirement for planning decisions to ensure developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development; are visually attractive



as a result of good architecture; are sympathetic to local character; and establish or maintain a strong sense of place.

50.Paragraph 139 of the NPPF further explains that development that is not well designed should be refused.

51.The application site is in a rural setting, surrounded by agricultural fields and open countryside to the north, south, east, and west, and is visible from the public realm of Vicarage Lane and the public right of way, which runs north to south along the western boundary of the site. There are some buildings within the vicinity which include a black weatherboarding clad barn to the east, further barns and agricultural structures to the south-west, as well as a two-storey red brick dwelling with single storey extensions to the south-west. Therefore, it is acknowledged by officers that the character of buildings along Vicarage Farm Lane is relatively mixed.

52.As previously advised, the proposed scheme has been amended from what was originally submitted. The first design of the dwelling was a full two storeys, measuring 8.1 metres in height, with an asymmetrical, low eaves line, an off-centre projecting gable with floor to ceiling glazing to the front elevation, a single storey element to the rear and side and an array of varying scale and design windows and doors. This design was considered to be unsympathetic to both the surrounding area's character and the character of the existing dwelling, being overtly tall, wide, and the mismatch of eaves height, window sizes and positions and overall bulk failing to result in a good and visually attractive dwelling, in what is a sensitive rural location.

53.The revised design has reduced the height of the dwelling and has set the dwelling down into the ground to further reduce the height when viewed from outside the application site. In addition, the eaves of the dwelling have been levelled and the roof form has been simplified. The external materials proposed for the dwelling have a contemporary aesthetic and include a tiled roof, vertical black timber or composite cladding, white render, and a red brick plinth.

54.The revised design of the proposed dwelling is still considered to be inelegant in its design, with an over wide frontage and disorderly fenestration. The setting down of the proposed dwelling has improved the height to some degree and the black cladding would tie in with the barn to the east. However, the high eaves line, the wall dormers and the overall bulk of the proposed development is still not considered to respect the scale and character of the existing dwelling in accordance with policy DM5, nor would it result in good design which reflects and respects the character of the area, conflicting with policy DM2 and DM22 of the JDMPD, CS3 of the SECS, GB5 and GB12 of the GBNP, and paragraphs 135 and 139 of the NPPF.

### **Impact upon neighbouring amenity**

55.Policies DM2 and DM22 seek to ensure that new development does not have a detrimental impact on residential amenity, nor the amenities of the wider area. The policy states the amenities of adjacent areas by reason of noise, smell, vibration, overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light or other

pollution (including light pollution, or volume or type or vehicular activity generated), must be considered.

56. Vicarage Farm House, which sits over 70 metres from the application site, to the south-west, is the closest residential property to the proposed development.
57. There are no concerns raised regarding the neighbouring amenity of the Vicarage Farm House as a result of the proposed development due to the degree of separation between the application site and Vicarage Farm House, paired with the screening of much of the development from Vicarage Farm House as a result of the existing agricultural buildings which sit between the two sites. In addition, the orientation of the proposed dwelling means that any windows and the balcony at first floor level will not look into Vicarage Farm House, so loss of privacy is not a concern.
58. Therefore, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its impact on neighbouring amenity, in accordance with DM2 and DM22.
59. In terms of the noise impacts during construction of the dwelling, should permission be granted, the Environmental Health Officer raised no concerns regarding the proposal. However, they did suggest a condition be placed upon the permission to control the hours of construction and demolition, sound attenuation of the dwelling and the control of external artificial lighting, in order to protect neighbouring amenity, the amenity of any future residents of the building, and to limit light pollution in accordance with policy DM14 of the JDMPD, which are considered reasonable.

### **Other matters**

60. Policy DM46 of the JDMPD states that all proposals must comply with Suffolk Parking Guidance and Local Planning Authorities will seek to reduce over-reliance on the car and to promote more sustainable forms of transport. Furthermore, policy DM2 of the JDMPD seeks to ensure that proposals maintain or enhance the safety of the highway network.
61. The existing access is to be utilised for the proposed dwelling and with the proposed new location of the dwelling, more space for parking within the application site will be available, including the provision for electric vehicle (EV) charging.
62. The highway authority has reviewed the application and stated they have no objection to the proposed development, subject to conditions regarding parking, cycle storage, EV charging infrastructure, and bin storage/presentation areas to be provided, which are all considered by officers to be reasonable, should permission be granted.
63. Whilst the application site is located within Flood Zone 1, where flood risk is very low, with the proposed dwelling being set into the ground to reduce the perception of height, particular regard is necessary in terms of drainage, to ensure the development would not lead to an enhanced risk of flooding. Policy DM6 of the JDMPD which relates to flooding and sustainable drainage is therefore relevant. Policy states that proposals for

all new development will be required to submit schemes appropriate to the scale of the proposal detailing how on-site drainage will be managed so as not to cause or exacerbate flooding elsewhere.

64. Details have been provided on the Proposed Site Plan submitted for how the drainage would be managed on the site; a surface water soakaway would be located within the site, as well as a separate soakaway for the roof, both set lower than the dwelling. In addition, an ACO drain (a floor-based drain, consisting of a thin channel and a removable grating system placed over the top) would be installed around the outer perimeter of the sunken patio which surrounds the dwelling, as well as across the driveway entrance, to drain to the soakaway within the site. Therefore, officers are satisfied that the proposed dwelling would not lead to an increased risk in flooding within or surrounding the site.
65. The Environment Team submitted comments addressing contaminated land and air quality; stating that the risk from contaminated land is low in this case and that in accordance with Building Regulations, should permission be granted, an EV charging point should be provided.
66. Policy DM13 states 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. No trees are protected on the site, however, no trees within the site are proposed to be removed to allow for the development. The existing native hedge on the northern, southern and part of the eastern boundary are proposed to be infilled and maintained. If permission were to be granted, a condition could be placed upon the permission to require the implementation of the soft landscaping, in accordance with the details submitted.
67. Policy DM11 states that development which would have an adverse impact on species protected by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010) (as amended), the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981), the Protection of Badgers Act (1992), and listed in the Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plan, or subsequent legislation, will not be permitted unless there is no alternative and the local planning authority is satisfied that suitable measures have been taken to: a. reduce disturbance to a minimum; and b. i. maintain the population identified on site; or ii. provide adequate alternative habitats to sustain at least the current levels of population. Policy DM12 states as part of the requirements of other policies in this DPD, measures should be included, as necessary and where appropriate, in the design for all developments for the protection of biodiversity and the mitigation of any adverse impacts. Additionally, enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.
68. A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal was submitted with the application, which concluded the site is of low biodiversity value with no significant ecological constraints that would prevent the works. Furthermore, when mitigation and enhancement measures were recommended, it was stated that no further surveys or licences would be required to inform the ecological impact assessment or mitigation strategy. Therefore, the proposed development is considered to comply with policy DM11 and DM12 of the JDMPD, subject to conditions securing biodiversity mitigation, enhancement measures, lighting design and that the development is

carried out in accordance with the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal submitted, should permission be granted.

69. It is acknowledged that one neighbour representation stated that they had observed a colony of bees on the application site. Bees are not a legally protected species, however, an enhancement measure within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal includes a bee brick and bee post, as well as additional planting of native hedging being proposed, all of which will provide additional habitats for insects such as bees.

70. Suffolk Fire and Rescue provided comments on the application, raising no objection to the proposal, however, did submit recommendations and advice regarding the requirements for access to firefighting facilities and water supplies in order to meet building regulations.

### **Conclusion:**

71. In reaching a balanced position on this matter it is acknowledged that the proposal would replace the existing dwelling which has reached the end of its useful life and would result in some modest economic benefit during the construction of such a dwelling. However, this is not to a sufficient degree to outweigh the policy conflict and harm otherwise identified above. It is therefore considered that the proposal fails to meet the provisions for policy DM5 in terms of proposing a replacement dwelling in the countryside, as well as policy DM2, DM22 of the JDMPD, CS3 of the NPPF, GB5 and GB12 of the GBNP, and the provisions of the NPPF regarding good design and impact upon the character of the area.

72. There are no other material considerations which outweigh the harm arising from the proposal being contrary to the development plan and its impact on the rural character of the area. On this basis the application is recommended for refusal.

### **Recommendation:**

73. It is **recommended** that planning permission be **refused** for the following reasons:

1. The development site sits outside the housing settlement boundary of Great Barton, in land designated as countryside for the purpose of planning, as such, DM5 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document is engaged. Policy DM5 deals with development within the countryside and states that the replacement of an existing dwelling on a one for one basis would be acceptable where it can be demonstrated that the proposed replacement dwelling respects the scale and floor area of the existing dwelling, in accordance with other policies.

The existing dwelling is a modest rural bungalow that measures just 3.6 metres in height and has a floor area of 95m<sup>2</sup>. The proposed dwelling is two storeys, measuring 5.4 metres in height when measured from the existing ground level and has a floor area of 174.25m<sup>2</sup>. The proposal would therefore result in a dwelling which has an 83% larger floor area and an additional storey, from which it can be concluded does not respect the floor area or scale of the existing dwelling, as required by policy DM5.

2. Policies DM2 and DM22 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document and paragraphs 135 and 139 of the NPPF attach great importance to good design, expecting new developments to be visually attractive, responding to local character and reinforcing local distinctiveness. Design that does not demonstrate it has regard to local context and fails to enhance the character, appearance and environmental quality of an area will not be acceptable. This is supported by CS3 of the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy, as well as GB5 and GB12 of the Great Barton Neighbourhood Plan which state proposals for new dwellings should have regard to the character of the immediate area within which the site is located and not have a detrimental impact on that character, as well as reflecting the local characteristics and circumstances of the site by creating and contributing to a high quality, safe and sustainable environment.

The design of the proposed dwelling is considered to be inelegant, with an over wide frontage and disorderly fenestration. Whilst the setting down of the proposed dwelling into the ground lessens the impact of its two storey height to some degree and the black cladding would tie in with the barn to the east, with the high eaves line, the wall dormers and the overall bulk of the proposed development, the replacement dwelling is not considered to respect the scale and character of the existing dwelling, nor would it result in good design which reflects and respects the character of the area, conflicting with policy DM2 and DM22 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document, CS3 of the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy, GB5 and GB12 of the Great Barton Neighbourhood Plan, and paragraphs 135 and 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Documents:**

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online [DC/23/0630/FUL](https://www.stedmundsbury.gov.uk/DC/23/0630/FUL)