



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 September 2019

by Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E3525/W/19/3227102

5 Norse Avenue, Stanningfield, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk IP29 4RN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Kevin Sobkowiak against the decision of St Edmundsbury Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/18/1781/FUL, dated 31 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 23 October 2018.
 - The development proposed is a 1½ storey detached dwelling with off-street parking following demolition of existing garage and single storey element of the host dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Norse Avenue is a cul-de-sac which serves a mixture of two storey houses and bungalows, the latter being grouped around the end of the cul-de-sac. Vikings Close is a private drive extending from Norse Avenue next to the appeal property, serving a small group of houses. The appeal property is a semi-detached house which, together with its neighbour appears to date from around the mid-20th century while the rest of the dwellings in the immediate area are more recent. The appeal property and its neighbour have larger rear gardens than the more recent development.
4. The proposed dwelling would be within the rear garden of the host property with its access to the side of the existing house. The proposal would be adjacent to Vikings Close but not accessed from it, being separated by a fence. The dwellings on Vikings Close are arranged in a group around the end of the drive. The garden of the appeal property provides openness which contributes to the space in front of the houses at the end of the drive. The proposed dwelling would be entirely forward of the adjacent dwelling at 1 Vikings Close and would be forward of the gable wall of the host dwelling. It would have an enclosing effect in relation to Vikings Close and would reduce the sense of spaciousness at the front of the adjacent dwellings. For these reasons the proposal would be unacceptably intrusive in the context of its immediate surroundings.

5. Furthermore, the proposed layout would be contrived in that access to the dwelling would be via a long drive to the side of the host dwelling rather than from Vikings Close. The proposed drive and car parking areas would introduce a disproportionate extent of hardstanding. Although the existing fence could be reduced in height, the proposal would not read as being directly related to Vikings Close.
6. Overall, in my view the development would be cramped and intrusive in appearance and would relate poorly to the surrounding development. For these reasons the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. It would not accord with Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy¹ which requires a high-quality environment, or with Policies DM2 and DM22 of the Development Management Policies² which require recognition of key characteristics of the area and creating a coherent and legible place.
7. While the proposal would be within the built-up area with access to services and facilities, this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified. The appellant has referred to housing need but no evidence in this respect has been put forward.
8. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nick Palmer

INSPECTOR

¹ St Edmundsbury Core Strategy (December 2010)

² West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document (February 2015)