

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 23 December 2014

---

**AGENDA ITEM NO** 2  
**APPLICATION NO** 1835/14  
**PROPOSAL** Erection of two-storey detached dwelling.  
**SITE LOCATION** Land adj 2 Riverside Cottage, Mendlesham Green, Mendlesham  
**SITE AREA (Ha)** 0.028  
**APPLICANT** Mr & Mrs C Huntingford  
**RECEIVED** June 6, 2014  
**EXPIRY DATE** September 16, 2014

---

**REASONS FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE**

The application is referred to committee for the following reason :

The Head of Economy considers the application to be of a controversial nature having regard to the planning history of the site

**PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE**

1. No pre application advice was sought prior to the submission of this application.

**SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

2. The site was previously part of the side garden to No. 2 Riverside Cottages, which lies to the west of the application site. It is within the Mid Suffolk Local Plan's previous settlement boundary to Mendlesham Green (removed from September 2008) towards the western edge of the hamlet and comprises an infill gap along the frontage where the road starts to drop downhill.

The site is currently fenced off with heras fencing and has been left to become overgrown. It is relatively flat and has a frontage of 11.5 metres which tapers to 9.5 metres at the rear boundary.

There is a mixed form of old and more recent housing in the locality comprising largely of detached and semi-detached buildings including modern detached houses opposite. Numbers 1 and 2 Riverside Cottages to the immediate west are traditional modest 2 storey cottages, as are the properties to the east where the adjacent cottage called Crickhollow has a double garage with a tall pitched roof at the side to the application site.

**HISTORY**

3. The planning history relevant to the application site is:

3187/10	[Retention and completion of the] erection of two-storey dwelling including integral garage. Formation of vehicular access, parking and turning area and all ancillary works pursuant to Section 73A of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (As amended).	Refused 22.8.11 Enforcement Notice served Appeal dismissed
2533/10	Erection of detached dwelling (submission of reserved matters pursuant to outline planning permission 1894/07)	Granted 15/02/2011
1894/07	Erection of detached dwelling.	Granted 17/08/2007
0986/07	Erection of one dwelling and construction of new vehicular access.	Refused 05/07/2007

**PROPOSAL**

4. Planning permission is sought for the erection of a detached dwelling. It would comprise of a central hallway with a living room, kitchen/diner, utility, WC and attached single garage on the ground floor and three double bedrooms and a bathroom on the first floor.

A vehicular access would be served off Kays Hill in the western part of the site. This would lead to a driveway to the single garage. The dwelling would be set 2.5 metres into the site, with no turning area for vehicles provided.

The dwelling has an L-shape with a side elevation of 13.8 metres along the eastern boundary. It has a gable facing the road with a height to the eaves 4.118 metres and an overall height of 7.534 metres. It would be constructed with a brick plinth, with rendered walls and part brick under a pantile roof. It has an integral garage. A rear amenity space of just over 60 square metres has been provided.

**POLICY**

5. **Planning Policy Guidance**

See Appendix below.

**CONSULTATIONS**

6. **Parish Council:** This site has a turbulent planning history. Whilst this is a new application and has been considered on that basis, it is also prudent to learn from past experiences and errors. Mendlesham Parish Council unanimously recommends refusal of this planning application for the following reasons. **Policy:** This site is located at Mendlesham Green, a designated countryside village with no settlement boundary (red line). This application is therefore not in accordance with current policy. **Sustainability:** Mendlesham Green or this application cannot be considered sustainable.

There are no shops, public meeting places etc so residents rely on cars to access either services at Mendlesham Village, a Key Service Centre, some two miles away or other locations such as Stowmarket. Whilst there is a bus service this ceases mid afternoon and does not provide sufficient service for residents of Mendlesham Green to access Mendlesham or other work/service locations. There is no safe access to Mendlesham for walkers/cyclists along the unpathed highway and rights of way do not directly link Mendlesham and Mendlesham Green. **Design:** It is noted that this design is lower in height than previous applications. However, the height of the building is still considered as too dominant for both the village and immediate neighbouring properties. If built, the property roofline would be much higher than other rooflines and would be a prominent and unattractive feature. The size and shape of the proposed property is considered too big for the site and does not provide sufficient space to build or maintain the property on either side or provide room for planting or landscaping to soften the impact of the property, particularly for Crickhollow. The building has also been set forward, closer to the road and it would be more sympathetic to the street profile if it was set further back onto the plot. **Size of plot:** Whilst we are not opposed to a building on the plot, notwithstanding it is outside policy, the current proposal has been "shoehorned" into the site and perhaps a smaller property/ chalet bungalow would be more appropriate? **Highways:** The current proposal does not allow sufficient room for cars to be moved on the site itself so that cars do not have to back out onto the highway. The road outside is narrow with no room for road parking and we would question that sufficient provision for the number of cars, residents of this property are likely to have has been properly considered and provided for? If built this also needs consideration for contractor vehicles? **Crickhollow: Neighbours loss of amenity.** Whilst Crickhollow is surrounded by neighbouring properties on its other boundary, this development would seem to have happened historically piecemeal, over a period of time and still provides the garden of Crickhollow a pleasing/ fairly open aspect with light and skyline views. We cannot see a measurement on the plans for this application, determining the distance between the new build and the boundary for Crickhollow but continue to support the Planning Inspector's opinion for the previous property, that the proposed walls of this proposed property closest to Crickhollow will be dominant and detrimental to the living conditions of the residents of Crickhollow. If this application is agreed, we note the intention to seek a S106 agreement.

- **Enforcement Department:** There is no current or open enforcement case however previous Enforcement Notice was served against "operational development comprising of a two-storey dwellinghouse including integral garage together with the formation of a vehicular access and all associated foul sewerage and surface water drainage works." This was appealed and the Enforcement Notice was upheld by the Planning Inspectorate on the 16.08.2012. The steps that were specified in the Enforcement Notice were fully complied with in the 05.06.2013.
- **SCC Highways:** Recommends conditions should permission be granted. Advised conditions relate to manoeuvring and parking for vehicles and bound materials for first 5 metres of access.
- **Environmental Health - Land Contamination:** Noted that a land contamination questionnaire has been submitted. This alone is not sufficient

land contamination assessment. Although an assessment need not require an intrusive investigation, as a minimum it should also include a desk top study evaluating existing and historic environmental data. If the study identifies the likelihood of contaminants then a further detailed investigation will be required. Would recommend that the applicant submits a contaminated land screening assessment. This assessment usually comprise as on line search of historic data and OS maps. It is widely available from available companies specialising in environmental information.

- **Communities Officer:** The contribution is in accordance with the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document for Social Infrastructure including Open Space, Sport and Recreation. The Open Space, Sport and Recreation Strategy recognises the need to improve the existing facilities in the ward of Mendlesham. This includes the parish's of Mendlesham, Cotton and Wickham Skeith. There is significant need in this locality of improvements to community facilities, which will be exacerbated by growth in the number of residents using the facilities. Specifically funding for a replacement Village hall/Community Centre for Mendlesham; Cotton Village Hall needs improvement.

### LOCAL AND THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

7. This is a summary of the representations received.

Letters of objection:

- Historically mistakes have been made and nothing was done until the house was constructed.
- Should this application be approved reassurance is needed to check the build is correct as it progresses.
- Mendlesham Green is not a Key Service Centre. It does not have the amenities to be a sustainable village.
- Mendlesham is 2 miles away and the road has no pavement and is used by large lorries, school coaches and farm vehicles. It would be unsafe to use these roads.
- Whilst acknowledge that the proposed dwelling is lower than that previously constructed the plinth will be higher than the road and the roof will not be in line with the neighbouring houses.
- The site does not have room for a turning circle and access on and off the busy road and thus would be prejudicial to highway safety.
- The site does not have good visibility.
- The application is inaccurate.
- Mendlesham Green is a countryside village and therefore contrary to policy.
- The scale of the dwelling would be overbearing to the dwelling known as Crickhollow and out of context with the site and its surroundings.
- The development would result in a loss of light and privacy for the occupants of the dwelling known as Crickhollow.

## ASSESSMENT

8. The core planning considerations raised by this application are:

- Background
- Principle of development
- Impact upon locality
- Residential amenity
- Highway matters
- Social Infrastructure
- Contamination
- Biodiversity

### Background:

It is important in assessing this application to understand the background of the application site. In 2007 outline planning permission was granted under reference 1894/07 for a two storey dwelling. Approval of reserved matters was subsequently granted under reference 87/09.

The dwelling approved by permission 1894/07 and 87/09 was commenced. However as the dwelling drew closer to completion the Council's Enforcement Team investigated complaints that it was not being built in accordance with the details agreed by the Approval of Reserved Matter (87/09). These investigations also highlighted that the plot area supporting the house and its curtilage was materially different to the area of land shown for the approved plot as edged in red on the location plan received with the Outline application in July 2007 (1894/07) and with the location and site layout plans received with the reserved matters application 0087/09.

An application was submitted under reference 3187/10 which sought to retain and complete the dwelling that was under construction. This application was presented to Planning Committee where following from site visits and deferment and amendments to the dwelling a decision to Refuse Planning Permission was made by Planning Committee A for the following reason:

*"The dwelling as proposed, including the alterations forming part of the application, is unacceptable by reason of its design and bulk in proximity to the boundary with the neighbouring property Crickhollow and would have a dominant and unacceptable effect upon the normal residential amenities of occupiers of that property. The dwelling would moreover be out of character with its setting and intrusive within the street scene and would fail to safeguard local distinctiveness and be inconsistent in scale and form with its surroundings. On that basis the development would be contrary to the principles of Planning Policy Statement 1, contrary to policy CS5 of the adopted 2008 Core Strategy and contrary to policies GP1, H13, H15 and H16 of the adopted 1998 Mid Suffolk Local Plan."*

Subsequently an Enforcement Notice was served on the 1st January 2012 which required the dwelling to be demolished, all resultant materials to be taken from the site and the vehicular access be stopped up.

The Enforcement Notice and the refusal of planning permission were appealed.

A hearing was held for both of these appeals. On the 16th August 2012 the Inspector dismissed the appeal against the refusal of planning permission, and dismissed the appeal against and upheld the Enforcement Notice. A copy of the Inspectors Appeal Decision is enclosed within the agenda bundle. In summary the Inspector found that the dwelling that had been constructed was out of scale and character with the locality. They also found that the design and positioning of the dwelling was overbearing to the occupiers of the dwelling known as Crickhollow.

The dwelling has since been demolished and the site has been left vacant and overgrown.

- Principle of development:

When outline planning permission was granted in 2007 the Local Plan Mendlesham Green settlement boundary was in force. However in September 2008 with the adoption of the LDF Core Strategy Mendlesham Green was determined not to be a sustainable village which could support additional housing development and its settlement boundary was removed. Mendlesham Green is not within the defined settlements detailed with Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy and, is therefore assessed against Policy CS2 - Countryside and Countryside Villages.

As there was an extant outline planning permission for the site the approval of the reserved matters house design in March 2009 was unaffected by the change of policy. The reserved matters application was approved at the 18th March 2009 Planning Control Committee B meeting.

In planning terms, the application site is therefore now deemed to be 'countryside' when assessing any application against development plan policy. The following is a summary of the relevant development plan policies in relation to the principle of the proposal.

Whilst this development would add a single dwelling to the supply of housing land in the District your officers are also of the view that the location of the proposal and the Inspectors findings are such that this development cannot be considered to be a sustainable form of development which safeguards local distinctiveness. The adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF as a whole and in particular paragraphs 17, 55, 56 and 60.

### Development Plan

#### The Local Plan 1998 (Saved Policies)

Policy H7 states that in the interest of protecting the existing character and appearance of the countryside, outside settlement boundaries there will be strict control over proposals for new housing.

#### The Local Development Framework Core Strategy (DPD) adopted 2008

Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy states that the majority of new development will be directed to towns and key service centres. As the proposal is outside any

settlement boundary it must be considered in policy terms to be countryside and as such the proposal is contrary to Policies CS1 and CS2.

### The Core Strategy Focused Review (CSFR) 2012

The Core Strategy Focused Review (CSFR) was adopted by Full Council on 20 December 2012 and should be read as a supplement to the Mid Suffolk's adopted Core Strategy (2008). This document updates some of the policies of the 2008 Core Strategy. The document does introduce new policy considerations, including Policy FC 1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development. However, the text of the policy qualifies this principle, stating that the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether: any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when used assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework as a whole; or specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.

Policy FC 1.1 sets out Mid Suffolk's approach to delivering Sustainable Development and states that *"development proposals will be required to demonstrate the principles of sustainable development and will be assessed against the presumption in favour of sustainable development as interpreted and applied locally to the Mid Suffolk context through the policies and proposals of the Mid Suffolk new style Local Plan. Proposals for development must conserve and enhance the local character of the different parts of the district. They should demonstrate how the proposal addresses the context and key issues of the district and contributes to meeting the objectives and the policies of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy and other relevant documents."*

Policy FC 2 sets out the provision for allocating greenfield sites and it is evident from this that any such development is to be focused solely within those settlements defined with Policy CS1 from the Core Strategy (2008) from which Mendlesham Green is excluded.

### NPPF

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2012. It provides that the NPPF *"does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved, and proposed development that conflicts should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise"*.

Policy CS2 sets out the development that is considered, subject to other criteria, being acceptable. This lists rural exception housing however permission is sought for an open market dwelling. The proposal therefore runs contrary to development plan policies which seek to ensure housing development is sustainable and doesn't not cause harm to the intrinsic value of the countryside. The policy presumption against the principle of development on this site remains the overriding planning consideration.

The history of the site is noted, however case law clearly stipulates that a decision must be made on the up to date development plan policies, which in this case means that the site is countryside for planning purposes and new open

market housing runs contrary to the development plan and the NPPF:

- Impact upon locality:

One of the reasons that the Inspector dismissed the appeal against the refusal of application 3187/10 was that the development was out of keeping with the character and appearance of this part of Mendlesham Green. The Inspector in reaching this decision acknowledged that the traditional pattern of ribbon development in Mendlesham Green had been consolidated over the years by infilling and small-scale housing development. However he found that the application site lies in a part of the settlement which retained something of the traditional village character. He went on to state:

*"The dwellings on each side of the site are older-style village properties; their main ranges are generally linear in form and modest in scale, which contributes to their harmonious character. The properties have simple facades and 'cottage style' proportions including upper floor windows tucked up under relatively low eaves. There is a wider mix of properties on the opposite side of the lane, including modern, larger infill dwellings with a variety of architectural styles."*

The Inspector found that the dwelling that had been constructed was, due to its scale and bulk, significantly more imposing than the traditional village properties either side of the application site. In addition it was found that this was accentuated by the height of the ridge of the roof and the projecting gable wing. The Inspector determined that the scale and design of this dwelling may have been acceptable in some locations but found in this specific site context that it constituted a clear and abrupt change in the scale and character of housing in this part of Mendlesham Green and that its overall scale and projecting wing contributed to its unduly and dominating presence between the adjoining older-style properties.

The Inspector stated in their decision (paragraphs 16 and 17):

*"Whilst the scale and design of this dwelling might be appropriate in some locations, it constitutes a clear and abrupt change in the scale and character of housing within this part of the village. This is readily apparent when approaching from east, where the dwelling can be seen rising above the adjacent cottages, despite the general fall in levels to the western end of the village. This difference appears less marked when approaching from the west; the dwelling filters views of 'Crickhollow' and appears to be part of the general progression of housing rising up the lane. However, the abrupt change in the scale and character of housing becomes noticeable nearer to the site."*

*"Notwithstanding the presence of the modern dwellings on the opposite side of the lane and elsewhere in the village, I conclude the existing dwelling is inappropriate to its particular context and it harms the character and appearance of this part of the village."*

The decision of the Planning Inspector is a material planning consideration in the assessment of this application and has a bearing on the acceptability of the scheme as submitted. It is acknowledged that Officers did recommend that application 3187/10 be granted but both Members of the Planning Committee and the Planning Inspector found harm by the development. On this basis consideration has been given to the differences to the development submitted



under this application and that dismissed at appeal.

The drawings submitted within the application have identified that the dwelling and garage are sited in a similar position to that previously on the site but would be approximately 1 metre narrower and over a metre greater in depth. The floor plan does show that the dwelling has more of an L-shape with there being a more obvious projecting wing with the garage being set back. The ridge height would also be set over 1.2 metres lower than the dwelling that was demolished.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the dwelling has been reduced in scale the application submission still identifies that the ridge would still be almost 1.5 metres higher than both Crickhollow and 2 Riverside Cottages which lie either side of it and the wing element would be more prominent. Officers are of the opinion that the reduction in scale and alteration in design is not sufficient to address the objections that the Inspector raised to the development sought to be retained under application 3187/10. The application therefore cannot be supported as it would cause harm to the local distinctiveness of this part of Mendlesham Green.

- Residential amenity:

Saved Local Plan Policies H13 and H16 seek to ensure that residential amenity is protected. This objective is in line with the NPPF (paragraph 17) which seeks to ensure the amenities of both existing and future occupants are protected from development. In dismissing application 3187/10 the Inspector found that the extensive flank wall in close proximity to the boundary with Crickhollow created an oppressive sense of enclosure along this boundary.

The current dwelling has been designed to ensure no windows would provide the opportunity to overlook the garden of either property that adjoins the application site. The dwelling has been set a metre into the application site and so will be 1.149 metres at its closest part with the boundary of Crickhollow. The dwelling has also been reduced in height however it still has a flank wall of 13.565 metres. Having regard to the Inspectors concerns and the amendments made Officers still consider that the dwelling would constitute an unneighbourly form of development which would significantly harm the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers of Crickhollow due to its overbearing and dominating impact.

The design and separation distance to No. 2 Riverside Cottage and those properties on the opposite side of Kays Hill is considered to be sufficient to not cause any unacceptable harm to the amenities of the occupiers of those dwellings.

- Highway Matters:

The application seeks to create a vehicular access onto Kays Hill where there is a speed limit of 30mph. There have been concerns raised over the fact that cars would have to be reversed into the road when exiting the site. This is a similar situation to that previous sought under application 3187/10 where no objection was raised by the Inspector. In addition the Highway Authority has not raised any objection to the proposal subject to conditions being imposed upon any permission.

It is not uncommon for vehicles to reverse into the highway and given the nature of the road, the speed limit for this part of Kays Hill and the advice of the Highway Authority Officers do not consider refusal on highway safety grounds of the access and turning facilities could be substantiated.

Since the application was submitted there has been the emergence of the Suffolk Guidance for Parking which has been adopted by Suffolk County Council. As an application should be determined in accordance with the development plan at the time of the decision this is a material consideration in the assessment of this application. This guidance has revisited the standard of parking required for all development and for a three bedroomed dwelling it would seek a provision of two spaces. It has also specified that for a garage to count as one of these dwellings it needs to have an internal dimension of 3 metres by 7 metres. As the proposed garage does not meet these standard dimensions only one car parking space is being provided for the development and therefore fails to provide sufficient on site parking.

- Social Infrastructure:

As this is an application for residential development Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy and the SPD relating to social infrastructure applies which seek to ensure that any residential development provides a contributions towards social infrastructure. The proposed dwelling would require a contribution of £2,868. There is a need for improvements to village hall facilities with Mendlesham, Cotton Village Hall and the Scout Hut. A unilateral undertaking has been completed which is the mechanism Mid Suffolk District Council uses for securing this contribution and thus the proposal is compliant with Core Strategy Policy CS6 and the SPD.

- Contamination:

As the application seeks the end user of the application site to be residential the local planning authority needs to ensure that there are no contaminants on the site that could cause harm to said user. A land use questionnaire has been submitted as part of the application. It is noted that the Council's Environmental Health department has advised additional information should be provided. This consultation response is noted however given this site has already been granted permission for a residential property it is not considered that it would be reasonable to refuse the application on this basis.

- Biodiversity:

The application do not trigger the need for a biodiversity report to be submitted as part of the validation process. On this basis the local planning authority has discharged their duty to ensure development would not cause harm to biodiversity.

- Other matters:

The agent has provided a supporting statement within the application. This has stated that the site is within a short distance away from Mendlesham which has been designated as a Key Service Centre and as there is a regular bus service the occupants of the dwellinghouse would not be reliant upon the private car.

The agent has made reference to paragraph 7 of the NPPF in relation to defining sustainable as he considers that the development satisfies this criteria.

Mendlesham is 2 miles away and, whilst there may be a bus service, it cannot be said that any future occupants would not be heavily reliant on the car to access services. Mendlesham Green has been designated as a countryside village as it does not have the facilities required to support further expansion. Mid Suffolk has had its settlement hierarchy assessed by Inspectors when reviewing the Core Strategy DPD (2008) and the Core Strategy Focused Review (2012) both of which have been found sound therefore it is reasonable to consider the application site as an unsustainable location.

Officers do not consider that this is a sustainable development in line with the NPPF. Occupants of the proposed dwelling cannot easily walk to access services and the construction jobs that would be provided would be limited in the construction of this single dwelling. The comment from the agent that the dwelling will satisfy a need for a dwelling in this location has not been supported by any evidence and this is an open market dwelling and thus does not outweigh the fundamental planning presumption against development in the countryside.

Reference has been made by the agent to two appeal cases, one within the Mid Suffolk District and another outside our district. The case in Woolpit was an exception where it was easily walkable to access services and is not a true comparison to the application site and thus does not change the objection to this application.

- Conclusion:

The proposed application runs contrary to the fundamental policy presumption against development in the countryside. Furthermore the siting, scale and form of the dwelling would cause harm to the local distinctiveness of Mendlesham Green and cause unacceptable harm to the occupiers of Crickhollow. The development has failed to overcome the concerns of the Inspector when dismissing application 3187/10. The application has also failed to secure the appropriate provision of on site car parking.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **That Full Planning Permission be Refused**

1. The dwelling as proposed would be an unjustified and non-sustainable development within the countryside it is, furthermore unacceptable by reason of its design and bulk in proximity to the boundary with the neighbouring property Crickhollow and would have a dominant and unacceptable effect upon the normal residential amenities of occupiers of that property. New dwellings in the countryside will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that there are overriding needs which justify an exception being made to established policies. There is no such exceptional justification for this development and as such represents an unsustainable form of development. The dwelling would moreover be out of character with its setting and intrusive within the street scene and would fail to

safeguard local distinctiveness and be inconsistent in scale and form with its surroundings. On that basis the development would be contrary to Saved Local Plan Policies GP1, H7, H13, H15 and H16 (1998), Policies CS1, CS2 and CS5 of the Adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (2008), Policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the Adopted Core Strategy Focussed Review (2012). The development would also be contrary to the objectives of the NPPF (Paragraphs 17, 55, 56 and 60)

2. The proposal fails to provide adequate on site parking and as such would be prejudicial to highway safety in the locality. As such the proposal is contrary to saved Policy T9 and T10 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998).

Philip Isbell  
Corporate Manager - Development Management

Lisa Evans  
Planning Officer

## **APPENDIX A - PLANNING POLICIES**

### **1. Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the Core Strategy Focused Review**

**Cor2** - CS2 Development in the Countryside & Countryside Villages

**Cor5** - CS5 Mid Suffolks Environment

**Cor6** - CS6 Services and Infrastructure

**CSFR-FC1** - PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

**CSFR-FC1.1** - MID SUFFOLK APPROACH TO DELIVERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

**Cor1** - CS1 Settlement Hierarchy

### **2. Mid Suffolk Local Plan**

**GP1** - DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF DEVELOPMENT

**H7** - RESTRICTING HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

**T10** - HIGHWAY CONSIDERATIONS IN DEVELOPMENT

**H16** - PROTECTING EXISTING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

**H13** - DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

**H15** - DEVELOPMENT TO REFLECT LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

**T9** - PARKING STANDARDS

### **3. Planning Policy Statements, Circulars & Other policy**

**NPPF** - National Planning Policy Framework

## **APPENDIX B - NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS**

Letters of representation have been received from a total of 2 interested parties.

The following people **objected** to the application

Mr C. and A. Smith, Crickhollow, Mendlesham Green, Mendlesham

Mrs C Triscott, Riverside Cottage, Mendlesham Green, Mendlesham

The following people **supported** the application:

The following people **commented** on the application: