

Parish: HINTLESHAM

Location: Silver Birches, Silver Hill

Proposal: Erection of 2 no. detached 1½ storey dwellings with attached garages (following demolition of existing single-storey dwelling). Construction of new vehicular access.

Applicant: Mrs G Cawthorne

Case Officer: Ben Elvin

Date for Determination: 24/12/08

SITE

1. The site consists of an existing bungalow located in a substantial plot within a Special Landscape Area. The site is partially within the Built-Up Area Boundary to Hintlesham. The boundary follows the edge of the access driveway and returns close to the rear of the bungalow. Access is achieved directly off the A1071, via a banked driveway that falls down to the road.
2. The existing bungalow is set-back in the plot and has a detached single garage to the side. The roadside boundary is bordered by a line of Silver Birch Trees, beyond which lies an access track to the adjoining bungalow known as Richmond. The existing property forms the last property in a line of bungalows on this edge of the village.

PROPOSAL

3. The application is an outline proposal and is for the erection of 2 detached 1½ storey dwellings with attached garages, with all matters of detail reserved.
4. Submitted with the application is an indicative plan showing how these dwellings could be provided on the site. This identifies the footprint of one of the properties being provided to the south-west edge of the site, with the second property being located to the north east of the existing garage. This second dwelling would be largely located outside the Built-Up Area Boundary.
5. A Design and Access Statement has been submitted with the application. In summary:
 - The illustrative drawing shows a pair of detached properties with the second floor accommodated in the roofspace. They have a gross floorspace of approximately 130 to 140 square metres excluding the attached garages.
 - The proposal can be accommodated without affecting any significant trees.
 - A development zone has been identified across the centre of the site, where the dwellings would be restricted to.
 - The dwelling proposed to be sited close to the boundary with Richmond will be some 4-5 metres nearer to the boundary than the existing bungalow.
 - The dwellings will be on sites that are comparable to the plot sizes with the majority of the bungalows to the south-west of Richmond.
 - Existing vehicular access can be widened to accommodate the extra dwelling and provide a safer access for Richmond.

- It is indicated that the dwellings would have a main central block with rooms in the roof space, with single-storey projections to the front and rear. They would have eaves heights of approximately 2.45 metres upto a maximum of 7 metres ridge height. The garages would be approximately 5 metres wide by 6 metres deep.

RELEVANT HISTORY

6. None.

NATIONAL GUIDANCE

7. **PPS1:** (Delivering Sustainable Development)

PLANNING POLICIES

8. The Development Plan comprises the East of England Plan, adopted 2008, saved policies in the Suffolk Structure Plan, adopted 2001, and the Babergh Local Plan (Alteration No. 2) adopted 2006. The following policies are relevant to this proposal:

East of England Plan, 2008

- **SS1** (Achieving Sustainable Development)
- **ENV7** (Quality in the Built Environment)

Babergh Local Plan (Alteration No.2) 2006

- **HS02** (Development in Villages)
- **HS04** (Protecting the Countryside)
- **HS27** (Housing Density)
- **HS30** (Design of New Houses)
- **HS32** (Public Open Space)
- **CR01** (Countryside)
- **CN01** (Design)
- **TP18** (Car Parking)
- **LP01** (Planning Obligations)

The relevant documents can be viewed via the internet. Please see Page 4 for details.

OBSERVATIONS

9. PC – no objections.
10. Local Highway Authority – To be reported.
11. Suffolk Preservation Society – state “The site is on the very edge of the village adjacent open countryside; the proposals constitute overdevelopment. It is possible that a pair of grouped properties could be accommodated here. The proposed houses have no sustainable features; contrary to current government guidelines”.
12. SCC Archaeological Service – recommend conditions.

REPRESENTATIONS

13. None received when the report was prepared.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

14. The Built-Up Area Boundary (BUAB) has been drawn along the outside edge of the access road that serves the bungalow known as Silver Birches and takes in a small area of garden land to the rear of the property. In preparing the Built-Up Area Boundaries, the Local Planning Authority has to consider the character of the area and look to ensure that existing development is contained to avoid encroachment into the countryside.
15. The proposed development puts forward two dwellings on this site, one set within the confines of the Built-Up Area Boundary, and one that lies across the boundary, part inside and part outside. In this respect, one of the key issues to consider is whether the provision of an additional dwelling on the edge of the village is such that would it be contrary to the aims of the development plan and the protection of the countryside.
16. In making this assessment, it is necessary to consider the context of the physical layout of this site and the position of the BUAB relative to the site boundaries. The side boundary of the site runs from east to west and consists of a tree lined boundary that becomes more sporadic to the eastern edge, close to the access point. The BUAB follows the edge of the access that runs from the north-east edge of the site and cuts across the site to the existing garage. It then follows the rear of the property to exclude the garden land at the rear. The land which is excluded from the BUAB to the side of the garage is a grassed area that hosts a few immature trees. It is screened from the open countryside beyond by the tree lined boundary, and there are no open views that exist from outside the site.
17. In view of the above, the provision of an additional dwelling on the site, whilst straddling the BUAB, would not cause any particular detriment to the character of the countryside beyond. The development proposal as shown on the indicative plan submitted with the application would provide a form of development that respects the pattern of development in the locality and would be such that it would represent an efficient use of land albeit that it would extend marginally beyond the BUAB. Indeed no harm would be caused to the countryside, and where the development proposal provides a more appropriate layout than otherwise may have been achieved on the site, it is considered that this proposal can be supported in principle.
18. This position is further supported by the consideration of recent appal decisions taken in the Duke Street area of Hintlesham, whereby an Inspector concluded that development that straddled the BUAB would not result in intrusion to the countryside by virtue of consideration of the existing pattern of development and the position of the new dwelling relative to the existing development pattern.
18. The development also needs to be considered in respect of the sustainability issues. Hintlesham is not a village that contains the relevant facilities and services to be determined as a sustainable village within the provisions of policy HS03 of the Local Plan. However, the site lies adjacent the A1071, close to the primary school and close to local bus stops. In this respect, the issues of sustainability are not considered to be such that would override the principle acceptability of the scheme as detailed above.
19. The dwelling that will be provided to the south edge of the site will fall closer to the neighbouring dwelling known as Richmond. However, the neighbouring property is set in from the side boundary and has an access road to that side and the scale of the proposed dwellings is such that should not give rise to detriment to Richmond. The formation of an improved access to the A1071 and the formalisation of the access to Richmond will improve highway safety and should be supported.

20. The applicant has submitted a draft Section 106 obligation for Open Space in respect of the requirements of policy HS32 which is currently being progressed.
21. In conclusion, whilst the proposal comprises development that falls partly outside the BUAB, the principle of the development can be supported in accordance with policy HS02 and in respect of recent decisions made in the locality that have provided direction in respect of this matter. The provision of two dwellings on this site can be accommodated without detriment to the character of the landscape, to the pattern of development or to the amenity of neighbouring properties. Landscape screening exists to the countryside boundary which will remain undisturbed by the proposal and will ensure that an appropriate boundary exists to the village with the open countryside beyond.

REASON FOR APPROVAL

22. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with the provisions of policies SS1 and ENV7 of the East of England Plan 2008 and policies HS02, HS03, HS27, HS30, HS32, TP15 and LP01 of the Babergh Local Plan Alteration No.2 (2006). In particular, the proposal constitutes acceptable development by virtue of its siting within and adjacent to the Built-Up Area Boundary and its relationship to the existing pattern of development in the locality. There is no highways objection to the principle of this development and the proposal results in a level of development consistent with the aims of PPS3 that will enhance the character of the area. The application also makes adequate provision for public open space in accordance with Local Plan Policy HS32 and PPG17.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That, the Solicitor to the Council be authorised to secure a Planning Obligation under Section 106 of the 1990 Act to ensure:

A financial contribution to the provision or upgrade of public open space.

2. That, subject to the completion of the planning obligation in Resolution (1) above being secured and the receipt of the Local Highway Authority views, the Chief Planning Control Officer be authorised to grant planning permission subject to conditions, including –

- Submission of reserved matters
- Materials
- Landscaping
- Levels
- Any as required by the LHA

3. That, in the event of the planning obligation referred to Resolution (2) above not being secured, the Chief Planning Control Officer be authorised to refuse planning permission for the following reason:

- Inadequate provision of public open space and play equipment contrary to Policy HS32 and PPG17