

Committee Report - Addendum

Item No: 7B

Reference: DC/23/05045

Case Officer: Alex Scott

Ward: Rattlesden.

Ward Member/s: Cllr Nicky Willshire.

AMENDED RECOMMENDATION - REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION/AGREE PUTATIVE REASON(S) IN RESPONSE TO APPEAL AGAINST NON DETERMINATION

Description of Development

Full Planning Application - Erection of 2 No detached dwellings and associated parking including landscaping, utilising public house access.

Location

Six Bells Inn, Church Road, Felsham, Bury St Edmunds Suffolk IP30 0PJ

Expiry Date: 12/01/2024

Application Type: FUL - Full Planning Application

Development Type: Minor Dwellings

Applicant: Cordage 44 Limited

Agent: Mr Jeremy Heppell

Parish: Felsham

Site Area: 0.17 of a hectare

Density of Development:

Gross Density (Total Site): 0.34 dwellings per hectare

Net Density (Developed Site, excluding open space and SuDs): NA.

AMENDED RECOMMENDATION

That Members resolve to delegate to the Chief Planning Officer to either: REFUSE planning permission; or, in the event that the appeal has begun, agree putative reasons for refusal, for the following reasons, or for reasons as required by the Chief Planning Officer:-

The current proposal would involve the erection of 2 no. substantial, detached dwellings, with relatively large built footprints, set in relatively small plots, positioned close together, at the head of a new proposed access road, on existing undeveloped land and space, noted for its spacious quality, within the Felsham Conservation Area.

Although set back from the street scene, there would be glimpsed views of the proposed dwellings through the access drive and through gaps in the vegetation from Church Road

and through gaps between buildings on Bury Road. The proposed dwellings would also be widely visible from the properties which surround the application site, including the retained outdoor space associated with the Six Bells Public House.

The proposal would noticeably introduce a significant bulk of compact modern development into this current undeveloped area of important visual space, being significantly harmful to its existing character and quality and positive contribution to the existing built environment of the village. The proposal would also result in an overall basic, bulky and cramped appearance which would conflict with the spaciouly arranged variation of traditional buildings within the locality.

The site currently forms part of a pleasant green undeveloped space in a prominent location within the village settlement and Conservation Area and, through the proposed development, the spacious quality of the site would be significantly eroded and a conflicting and incongruous form of development would be introduced. It is, therefore, considered that the proposed development would result in demonstrable harm to, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and quality, and visual amenity, of the village's built environment.

It is, therefore, concluded that the current proposal conflicts with paragraphs 128, 131, 135, 137 and 139 of the NPPF and fails to accord with the provisions of current adopted development plan policy LP24, which taken together seek to ensure well-designed and beautiful, attractive and healthy places and the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting.