



EAST SUFFOLK COUNCIL

PLANNING ADVISORY PANEL SOUTH – 7 APRIL 2020

DECISIONS BY THE HEAD OF PLANNING AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT

The following decisions have been taken by the Head of Planning and Coastal Management under his delegated authority set out in Appendix 1 of Section E of Part 2 of the East Suffolk Council Constitution:

Application Number: DC/20/0270/FUL

Application Address: 65 Cherry Tree Cottage, High Street, Wickham Market

Advice provided by the Advisory Panel's Elected Members:

The Elected Members unanimously concluded that having regard to the written report, presentation and discussion the scheme was acceptable and could be supported. Several Members expressed concerns over the retrospective nature of the application and the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

Decision Made by the Head of Planning and Coastal Management:

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to appropriate conditions.

Reason for Decision:

The site falls within the defined physical limits boundary (SSP2) and Conservation Area of Wickham Market, which is defined as a 'Key Service Centre' (SP27) within the adopted settlement policy (SP19) of the Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan Core Strategy and Development Management policies.

SP8 (Tourism) sets out the importance of tourism in supporting the district's economy and notes (g) that the area west of the A12 (including Wickham Market) has the potential to absorb additional tourist pressure and, subject to the implications for the environment, including the generation of traffic, the council will support and promote tourism west of the A12.

DM18 (Static holiday caravans, cabins and chalets) notes that proposals for new sites and intensification of use of existing sites (by infilling) will be acceptable where:

- (a) The road network is able to accommodate the volume of traffic generated without having significant adverse impact on the free flow of traffic and highway safety.
- (b) They are of a scale appropriate to the nature of the locations and its setting;
- (c) They are of a high standards of design;
- (d) They are to be used as holiday accommodation only;
- (e) There are services available.

Considered against SP8 and DM18, the proposed holiday let would be sustainably located close to the district centre of Wickham Market, which provides a number of services and facilities within walking distance. The scale of the proposal, which included a modest one-bedroom apartment, was thus considered appropriate and proportionate to its location. The design (as approved) was also considered to be of a high quality. Services are available and an appropriate condition would be imposed to ensure that the proposal would not be occupied by the same person for 56 days or more in a calendar year.

In-line with the above assessment, the principle of development was thus deemed acceptable, subject to a satisfactory assessment of other material planning considerations, including highways, parking and residential amenity, as set out below.

The proposal sought to reduce the level of glazing approved by DC/17/4863/FUL and there would be no other external changes to the approved building, such that the proposal was not considered to impose any additional impacts on neighbouring amenity from loss of privacy or reduced access to daylight, when judged against DM23 (Residential amenity). The resulting physical relationship with other properties would also be unaffected since no new physical development was proposed.

In response to comments provided by the Highway Authority, the applicant provided additional information which confirmed adequate parking (three off-road spaces) and turning/manoeuvring provision was achievable. Indeed, the proposed holiday let would contain one additional bedroom above the three existing bedrooms of the host dwelling. As such, the proposed three spaces for an equivalent four-bedroom property would accord with DM19 (Parking standards). The applicant had also confirmed that the driveway would be covered in permeable paving to allay concerns over existing loose shingle surfacing entering the highway.

While the proposal did not seek to increase the existing visibility splays over that currently achieved, it was not considered that the minor intensification of the site's use (presented by one additional bedroom) would decrease the existing level of highway safety to unacceptable levels, given that the existing arrangement (including number of parking spaces) would not change. Furthermore, the visibility splay could only be increased through the demolition of the sections of an existing boundary wall which, while potentially feasible, was not deemed justifiable given the existing arrangement and the minor intensification presented by this scheme. Demolition of the wall would also serve to erode the quality of the Wickham Market Conservation Area.

When judged against SP8 and DM18, the proposal would not generate an unacceptable level of traffic and it would not have a significant adverse impact on the free flow of traffic and highway safety. Indeed, the NPPF para.109 makes clear that

'Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe'.

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management, when making his decision, noted the advice provided by the Development Management Team Leader (South) that the rear elevation of this property would not impinge unacceptably on the residential amenity of a neighbouring property. He considered that the addition of appropriate conditions would minimise the impact of the development locally.

Any Declarations of Interest declared:

None.

Any Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying declared:

None.

Any Dispensation Granted:

Not applicable.

Application Number: DC/20/0338/FUL

Application Address: 78 High Street, Wickham Market

Advice provided by the Advisory Panel's Elected Members:

The Elected Members unanimously supported the recommendation of the planning officer to approve the application, noting the positive design aspects. One Member suggested that strong conditions be attached to any approval regarding the impact on the heritage area.

Decision Made by the Head of Planning and Coastal Management:

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to appropriate conditions.

Reason for Decision:

The site falls within the defined physical limits boundary (SSP2) and Conservation Area of Wickham Market, which is defined as a 'Key Service Centre' (SP27) within the adopted settlement policy (SP19) of the Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan Core Strategy and Development Management policies. As such, the principle of development was deemed acceptable, subject to a satisfactory assessment of other material planning considerations, including visual amenity, parking and ecology, as set out below.

The proposal represented a marginal increase (25 square metres) in internal floorspace over that already approved under DC/17/2780/FUL. Notwithstanding, the resulting increase in the extension's area would be somewhat offset by an overall decrease in its ridge-height. Considered in context with the wider site, it was judged that the resulting development would be proportionate in scale to the site and would not result in overdevelopment. Indeed, the application was considered to represent a de minimis

impact on the surrounding area, including Conservation Area, such that the application was deemed to accord with DM21 (Design: aesthetics) and SP15 (landscape and townscape).

The proposal had been updated to accommodate an appropriate level of parking provision (three off-road spaces) and there would otherwise be ample room for vehicle access, turning and manoeuvring. The application thus accorded with DM19 (Parking standards) and DM22 (Design: function).

The proposal site comprises residential garden land and a submitted ecology appraisal confirmed that 'no significant adverse impacts of the development on protected and notable species are predicted' provided the garden vegetation be retained and allowed to mature. The applicant was not seeking to remove existing garden features and the proposal was also subject to contributions sought under the Council's Recreational avoidance mitigation strategy (RAMS). A sum of £321.22 had therefore been provided.

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management, when making his decision, said that he would review the proposed conditions to ensure that a satisfactory condition was in place regarding the impact on the heritage area.

Any Declarations of Interest declared:

None.

Any Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying declared:

None.

Any Dispensation Granted:

Not applicable.