

Application reference DC/20/05572- The Bungalow, Church Road, Bacton

Please note this as a further objection to the above application.

Firstly, it is important to note that the District Council are unable to formally determine the application. The applicant has submitted an appeal on non-determination under s78(2) of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 and as a result of such the formal decision making duties are taken out of the hands of the local planning authority and placed with the Planning Inspectorate.

The recommendation on the Committee papers is therefore incorrect. Whilst the Committee can make a resolution on what they would have determined if they had the powers to formally determine the application, the recommendation is seeking the Committee to grant permission. They no longer have this power.

The application has generated significant local opposition from interested parties and the Parish Council. The matter was deferred from Committee in April following concerns on how the scheme related to the previous outline consent. It is unfortunate that no changes have been proposed to the design and layout which remains unacceptable.

Whilst it is accepted that this is a FUL application and is not bound by the conditions of the outline, the previous permission is a significant material consideration in the assessment of this application. A number of conditions were imposed on that permission which were considered important to the Council and met the stringent tests for imposition of conditions and had valid reasons for their imposition.

Of particular importance is the buildings being limited to 1.5 storeys in height and the landscaping along the western boundary. The current application fails to respond to these key requirements for the site.

The proposed dwelling occupies the full width of the plot. This means that there is insufficient space to provide any landscaping on its western edge. The blank, wide gable and squat will present itself from long distance views due west along Church Road. The footprint should be reduced to enable landscaping of a good quality. Similarly, there will be limited space between the proposed dwelling and its approved neighbour, resulting in a terracing effect. This runs contrary to the grain of the immediate locality where there is clear spacing between properties so they read as individual plots.

Turning to the design, the outline consent was clear that dwelling should be limited to 1.5 storeys in height and there have been no differences to the site or its locality which would warrant a different approach. Although a reduced height, the dwelling is clearly two storeys (1.5 would be rooms contained within the roof slope). To keep the height down the roof slope is artificially shallow which is not 'suffolk style' or responds to the local character. Such a shallow pitch increases the perceived width of the property and extenuates the impact from the west.

It is clear that the applicant is seeking to get too much from the site and its over-development of the plot.

Turning to access, this again deviates from the outline and raises concern. This section of Church Road is very close to the junction at Tailors Green and is parked end to end at school drop off and collection time. Whilst one additional access was agreed there is no need to create a third access which could cause conflict with the existing parking issues. A dwelling on this site can be implemented with the shared access as approved. The scheme should revert back to the shared access point as accepted by the community.

The proposed does not amount to good design as required on the NPPF (2021) and represents over-development of the site which in turn presents problems of visual appearance, lack of landscaping options and possible highway conflict. The community ask that the Council advise the Planning Inspector that permission would be refused for the development and defends that stance through the appeal process. The community accept development of the site, but requests that it is high quality development in such a prominent location. This is a stance, which in our opinion, could be robustly defended at appeal with the support of the community. It is important to note again that the Council cannot determine this application

just endorse a recommendation and the formal decision lies with the Planning Inspector. The community ask the Committee to support their request for improved design and layout.