

**Mid Suffolk District Council Planning Control Department  
131 High Street Needham Market IP6 8DL**

**REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION  
Town and Country Planning Act 1990  
THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT  
PROCEDURE) (ENGLAND) ORDER 2010**

Date of Application: February 19, 2015      REFERENCE: 0642 / 15

Date Registered: May 6, 2015

Documents to which this decision relates: **Defined Red Line Plan:**

The defined Red Line Plan for this application is Drawing TL-3470-15-1A received 6th May 2015 only. This drawing is the red line plan that shall be referred to as the defined application site. Any other drawings approved or refused that may show any alternative red line plan separately or as part of any other submitted document have not been accepted on the basis of defining the application site.

**Refused Plans and Documents:**

Application form; Design and Access Statement received 19th February 2015.  
Document by Eco-Check Ltd (dated 28th April 2015); Groundsure report and  
Drawing No. TL-3470-15-1A received 6th May 2015.

---

**CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:**

Mr Linstead  
Anglia Design LLP  
11 Charing Cross  
Norwich  
Norfolk  
NR2 4AX

---

**NAME AND ADDRESS OF  
APPLICANT:**

Mr Lebbon  
11 Charing Cross  
Norwich  
Norfolk  
NR2 4AX

---

**PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION OF THE LAND:**

Erection of 2 no. semi-detached dwellings with associated parking and amenity areas. Installation of package treatment plant -  
Springfield, Norwich Road, Stonham Parva

---

The Council, as local planning authority, hereby give notice that **PLANNING PERMISSION HAS BEEN REFUSED** for the development proposed in the application in accordance with the particulars and plans submitted for the following reasons:

1. The proposal is not considered to form sustainable development within the criteria set out by the NPPF, by reason of the lack of pedestrian access to services, contrary to the principles of sustainable development and lack of social and economic benefits to outweigh this harm. Furthermore no exceptional circumstances or other material considerations have been demonstrated to outweigh the harm identified in this respect. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the NPPF, Policy CS2 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (2008), GP1 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan 1998 and Policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Focused Review (2012).
2. The proposal would be prejudicial to highway safety on the A140 by reason of failure to achieve sufficient turning space to enable vehicles to exit the site in forward gear and would result in vehicles manoeuvring within the highway. The proposal would therefore conflict with the requirements of Policy and T10 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan 1998 and paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure that all developments should have safe and suitable access for all people.
3. The proposed development would by reason of its siting, scale and relationship to existing property represents a cramped and poorly related development at odds with the prevailing character of development and the street scene. The NPPF and development plan policies seek to ensure that new development makes a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. Furthermore the scale and siting of the proposed development would cause an unacceptable overbearing, intrusive and overlooking effect upon the occupiers of Springfield. As such the proposal is contrary to Local Plan Policies GP1, H13, H15 and H16 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998), Policy CS5 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy DPD (2008), Policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the Mid Suffolk Focused Review (2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraphs 17, 56, 60, 64 and 131).

#### SUMMARY OF POLICIES AND PROPOSALS WHICH ARE RELEVANT TO THE DECISION:

1. This permission has been refused having regard to policy(ies)

COR1 - CS1 SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY

COR2 - CS2 DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE & COUNTRYSIDE VILLAGES

COR5 - CS5 MID SUFFOLKS ENVIRONMENT

CSFR-FC1 - PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

CSFR-FC1.1 - MID SUFFOLK APPROACH TO DELIVERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Document, and to all other material considerations.

2. This permission has been refused having regard to policy(ies)

GP1 - DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF DEVELOPMENT

H7 - RESTRICTING HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

T9 - PARKING STANDARDS

T10 - HIGHWAY CONSIDERATIONS IN DEVELOPMENT

H13 - DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

H15 - DEVELOPMENT TO REFLECT LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

H16 - PROTECTING EXISTING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan, and to all other material considerations.

3. This permission has been refused having regard to policy(ies)

NPPF - NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

of the Planning Policy Statement, and to all other material considerations.

#### NOTES:

1. **Statement of positive and proactive working in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Section 106 and development plan statement:**

The Councils adopted "development plan" policies for new development include policies are set out in the Core Strategy (adopted 2008), the Core Strategy Focused Review (adopted 2012) and the saved Local Plan. This up to date policy document is a very important planning consideration and the applicant is encouraged to fully refer to it (available to view on the Council's website - [www.midsuffolk.gov.uk](http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk)). Planning decisions are normally expected to be taken in accord with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The application has been unsuccessful as it is in an unsustainable location and there are design and amenity issues. While the applicant did not take advantage of the service, the Council provides a duty planning officer and pre-application advice service prior to the submission of any application. The opportunity to discuss a proposal prior to making an application allows potential issues to be raised and addressed pro-actively at an early stage, potentially allowing the Council to make a favourable determination for a greater proportion of applications than if no such service was available.

This relates to document reference: 0642 / 15

**Signed: Philip Isbell**

**Dated: July 1, 2015**

**Corporate Manager  
Development Management**

**MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL, 131 HIGH STREET, NEEDHAM MARKET,  
IPSWICH IP6 8DL**