



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2019

by P Mileham BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W3520/W/19/3232493

Land opposite Magnolia House, Wilby Road, Stradbroke IP21 5JP

- 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 and Mrs K Flatman against the decision of Mid Suffolk District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/18/04706, dated 18 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 28 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a proposed residential dwelling and detached cart lodge with associated residential curtilage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The original description of development included a reference to the application as being a resubmission of a previous planning application referenced DC/18/02821/FUL. As this does not in itself form part of the act of development, I have omitted this element from the description above to avoid any confusion with the above header.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would be in a suitable location for new housing having regard to access to services and facilities.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is an area of unused land on Wilby Road which is bordered by mature trees and hedging with a drainage ditch located long the road frontage. Opposite the site is a large detached two storey dwelling known as 'Magnolia House'.
5. The site is located approximately 250 metres (m) from the edge of the settlement of Stradbroke which contains a range of education, services and community facilities. The site is approximately 550m from the High School and 650m from the community centre complex.
6. In the part of Wilby Road where the site is found there is no footway, street lighting or cycle way, and the road at this point is at the national speed limit of 60 miles per hour. Whilst the road appears to be relatively lightly trafficked, speeds could still be high on approach to the site as the proposed development

would be some distance from the 30 miles per hour limit at the edge of Stradbroke. No objections were raised from the local Highway Authority in respect of highway safety albeit the lack of footway and the speed of traffic would dissuade people from travelling other than by car. No details have been provided of any regular public transport services to Stradbroke or any other settlement with a range of services to meet day-to-day needs that would serve the proposed development.

7. As such, whilst it is acknowledged that the site may be closer to some services and facilities than various locations within the defined settlement boundary, the lack of a footway, cycleway and street lighting, and the absence of public transport and the nature of the road, would actively discourage future occupants of the proposed development from utilising non-car based transport in order to gain access to the services and facilities. I consider these factors would result in a development that, in all likelihood, would be almost entirely reliant on private cars to access occupant's day to day needs. As a result, it would not be in a suitable location for new housing due to its reliance on private cars to access services and facilities.
8. Paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) seeks to avoid the development of isolated new homes in the countryside. As stated above, directly opposite the site is Magnolia House. Hence, due to the relationship of the site with this property, I consider that it would not result in the creation of an isolated dwelling. However, whilst the proposed development would not be an isolated dwelling, I consider that it would still be divorced from the services and facilities available in Stradbroke. Therefore, the fact it would not be an isolated dwelling under the Framework has not altered my consideration that the site would be in an unsuitable location for new housing.
9. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would not be in a suitable location for new housing having regard to access to services and facilities. The proposal would be contrary in this respect to saved Policies GP1 and H7 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998), Policies CS2 and CS5 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (2008) and Policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Focussed Review (2012) which seek to direct development to settlements with a greater range of services and facilities, to control development in the countryside and maintain and enhance the environment, amongst other considerations.
10. Notwithstanding the fact that the proposal would not result in an isolated dwelling, it would not accord with the Framework insofar as it would result in a dwelling that would not be in a location that would enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities due to the distance to services and facilities.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has indicated that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area, would result in good living conditions for its future occupiers and would be developed using construction materials that harmonise with the surrounding landscape. These matters would be required by the Council's policies for all development, and as such, have neutral weight in relation to the proposal.
12. It has been indicated that the proposed development would be for a self-build dwelling. Whilst I acknowledge that this is a benefit of the scheme, I consider

that the unsuitability of the location for housing outweighs this benefit. As such, this has not altered my conclusions in respect of this appeal.

13. The Council has indicated in its appeal statement that it can demonstrate a deliverable five year housing land supply. Whilst this position has been disputed by the appellant, no evidence has been submitted to suggest why this is the case. The appellant also considers that the development plan cited in the Council's reason for refusal are out of date. The proposed development would only result in the addition of a single dwelling which would have a minimal effect on the overall supply. Therefore, even if I were to have found that the Council did not have a five year land supply and the development plan policies are out of date, I consider that the harm identified would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of providing a single additional dwelling.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons outlined above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

P Mileham

INSPECTOR