



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2021

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI DMS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D3505/W/21/3276584

55 Schoolfield, Glemsford, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 7FJ

- 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 Beagrie Co Ltd against the decision of Babergh District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/20/04883, dated 31 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of 1no. three-bedroom detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in the appeal are the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers, in respect of outlook, privacy and sunlight, and the safety of users of the adjacent highway.

Reasons

3. The host property is a semi-detached house fronting Schoolfield; a wider estate of housing of broadly comparable scale and density, on the edge of this quite large Suffolk village. The access to a more recent development of 15 homes at Hammond Croft, located to the rear of this property, runs to one side of it. The proposal is for a rectangular plan, gable roofed house within the rear part of the back garden to No 55. The new house would front onto Hammond Croft and take access from it. The development plan includes the 2014 Local Plan¹ (LP) and, most relevant here, the saved policies of the 2006 Plan² (SLP). The site lies within the Glemsford settlement boundary and so the principle of a further dwelling is acceptable under LP Policy CS2, which directs new development to Core Villages such as this.

Character and appearance

4. The dwelling proposed would be sited close to the road and have a very short back garden relative to its size as a three-bedroom family dwelling. Although the arrangement of housing varies in the vicinity, the dwelling would appear cramped within the available dimensions of plot. Set between the more spacious Schoolfield housing and the comprehensively designed scheme of small dwellings in Hammond Croft, this proposal would reflect the pattern of neither and appear harmfully out of character. The host dwelling would be left

¹ Babergh Local Plan 2011-2031 Core Strategy & Policies (Part 1 of New Babergh Local Plan) February 2014

² Babergh Local Plan Alteration No.2 2006

with an uncharacteristically foreshortened back garden. Despite fronting the road and offering some natural surveillance, the proposal would appear both contrived and incongruous. In being out of keeping with the surrounding residential development, the proposal conflicts with SLP policies CN01 and HS28. These are consistent with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) for achieving well-designed places, with which the scheme would be in further conflict.

Living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers

5. One gable of the house would be sited close to the rear boundary of the back gardens of the adjacent pair of semi-detached dwellings in Hammond Croft. Because of its proximity to the side boundary of the plot, the house would have a materially harmful impact on the rear outlook from these neighbouring dwellings. The effect would be overbearing and also deprive these back gardens of some of their sunlight. Furthermore, additional activity would be focused into a small back garden of a family house with a first-floor rear facing bedroom window. These factors would combine to reduce the degree of seclusion and privacy offered by their own back garden to the occupiers of no 53 and be of harm to current living conditions.
6. Taking these factors into account, this proposal would result in an unacceptable degree of harm to the living conditions presently enjoyed by the occupiers of the immediately adjacent dwellings. This would bring the proposal into further conflict with SLP Policy HS28, insofar as this resists residential infilling where to the detriment of amenity.

Safety of users of the adjacent highway

7. Access would be onto a straight section of estate road leading to housing grouped around the head of this cul-de-sac. The scheme shows two parking spaces arranged end to end. Without space for vehicles to turn onsite and exit in a forward gear, such a parking arrangement would likely result in reversing movements where visibility onto the estate road is restricted. Although this is similar to the current situation in Hammond Croft, such vehicular movements would be more expected at the head of the cul-de-sac where most of the houses are grouped. There is no merit in a proposal introducing such unexpected vehicular movements within the section of straight road leading to this development.
8. The local highway authority is evidently not in support of this proposal on highway safety grounds, and there is nothing presented in evidence that would dissuade me from taking the same view. The proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, bringing the proposal into conflict with SLP Policy TP15 and paragraph 111 of the Framework.

Conclusion

9. The adverse impacts of the proposal would outweigh any small benefits and, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Price

Inspector