

BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL

From: Head of Economy	Report Number: P39
To: Planning Committee	Date of Meeting: 23 July 2014

PLANNING PERFORMANCE – 1 APRIL 2014 TO 30 JUNE 2014

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 This report provides an overview of the number of planning applications and appeals which were considered by Development Management and an indication of performance against national indicators for the period 1 April 2014 – 30 June 2014.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the information contained within this report be noted.

3. Financial Implications

- 3.1 There are no financial implications arising directly from the content of this report.

4. Risk Management

- 4.1 There are no significant risks arising directly from the content of this report.

5. Consultations

- 5.1 In view of the content of this report consultation has not been undertaken.

6. Equality Analysis

- 6.1 There are no Equality implications arising directly from the content of this report.

7. Shared Service/Partnership Implications

- 7.1 There are no Shared Service/Partnership Implications arising directly from the content of this report with the exception of the following:-

- The Babergh and Mid Suffolk Development Management service is transforming and has been designed on a “One Service Model”. Integration is taking place with a new shared Operational Delivery team in place from the 1st July 2013 onwards, with staff working flexibly to address workload needs across both Councils. However the sovereignty of both Councils and the Local Planning Authority status remain separate.

8. Key Information

- 8.1 This quarterly report shows the performance of Development Management against National Performance Indicator 157: The Determination of Planning Applications and the former BVPI 204: Planning Appeals, which has been retained as a local performance indicator.
- 8.2 Government performance indicators require all local planning authorities to determine:
- 60% of major applications within a period of 13 weeks (16 weeks when accompanied by an Environmental Statement). Since 1 April 2008 the major category has been divided into large-scale and small-scale major developments but for the purposes of this report, they are combined. (A large-scale major application is defined as a development comprising 200 or more dwellings whereas a small-scale major application is defined as a development comprising 10 or more dwellings up to 199 dwellings);
 - 65% of minor residential and commercial applications within a period of 8 weeks. (i.e. up to 9 dwellings or 1000 sq metres of floor space); and,
 - 80% of other applications (which are mainly householder applications) within a period of 8 weeks.
- 8.3 Local Planning Authorities were also required to monitor the number of appeals allowed against the authority's decision to refuse permission and express it as a percentage of the total number of appeals against the refusal of permission. An acceptable threshold was deemed to be 30% as it provided a useful indicator as to whether more applications were being refused in order to meet performance targets. Babergh has retained this indicator to monitor the outcome of appeal decisions.

Applications Received and Determined

- 8.3 Table 1 provides an overview of the number of planning applications that were on hand at the beginning of the quarter, the number that were received during the quarter, withdrawn, on hand at the end of the quarter, and actually determined. Table 1A also shows how many applications were determined in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation expressed as a percentage of all decisions. A commonly held to be a measure of good practice for delegated decisions is 90%. (As Members will be aware the Protocol for both Councils' Scheme of Delegation changed in April 2013 and are now identical). The first quarter of 2014 figures are 93.6% compared with the first quarter of 2013 which was 88.4%. The preceding eight quarter's figures are also detailed for comparison purposes.

TABLE 1	01.04.12 to 30.06.12	01.07.12 to 30.09.12	01.10.12 to 31.12.12	01.01.13 to 31.03.13	01.04.13 to 30.06.13	01.07.13 to 30.9.13	01.10.13 to 31.12.13	01.01.14 to 31.03.14	01.04.14 to 30.06.14
Number of applications on hand at beginning of quarter ¹	309	282	332	248	256	219	231	259	339
Number of applications received during quarter	299	304	242	302	298	264	289	255	305
Number of applications withdrawn	24	18	20	25	18	27	16	21	23

TABLE 1A	01.04.12 to 30.06.12	01.07.12 to 30.09.12	01.10.12 to 31.12.12	01.01.13 to 31.03.13	01.04.13 to 30.06.13	01.07.13 to 30.9.13	01.10.13 to 31.12.13	01.01.14 to 31.03.14	01.04.14 to 30.06.14
Number of applications on hand at end of quarter	280	336	242	257	206	195	238	242	291
Number of applications determined during quarter	304	232	312	268	330	261	266	251	330
Percentage of delegated decisions	88.4%	88.36%	91.6%	85%	88.4%	91.95%	92.48%	91.6%	93.6%

Source: General Development Control PS1 Return

Performance Against Target

8.5 Table 2A shows the number of planning applications that were determined during the quarter in each of the three categories defined by NI 157. Table 2B shows how many of these planning applications were determined within the prescribed period as a percentage of all decisions within the relevant category. Table 2C shows the performance achieved for the two year period 1 April 2012 to 31 March 2014 in comparison with the national target. It also provides an indication of the achievement against the national target.

TABLE 2A	01.04.12 to 30.06.12	01.07.12 to 30.09.12	01.10.12 to 31.12.12	01.01.13 to 31.03.13	01.04.13 to 30.06.13	01.07.13 to 30.9.13	01.10.13 to 31.12.13	01.01.14 to 31.03.14	01.04.14 to 30.06.14
Total number of MAJOR applications determined	9	9	8	6	13	9	11	10	14
Total number of MINOR applications determined	75	38	79	59	68	48	50	48	59
Total number of OTHER applications determined	220	185	225	203	229	204	205	193	257
Total number of applications determined during quarter	304	232	312	268	310	261	266	251	330

¹ The number of applications on hand at the beginning of the quarter may be less than those on hand at the end of the previous quarter if the status of an application has changed after registration.

Source: General Development Control PS2 Return

TABLE 2B	01.04.12 to 30.06.12	01.07.12 to 30.09.12	01.10.12 to 31.12.12	01.01.13 to 31.03.13	01.04.13 to 30.06.13	01.07.13 to 30.9.13	01.10.13 to 31.12.13	01.01.14 to 31.03.14	01.04.14 to 30.06.14
Percentage of MAJOR applications determined on time	44	33	37.5	66.67	69.2	71.43	81.82	60	92.86
Percentage of MINOR applications determined on time	60	50	46.84	59.32	60.29	66.67	70.00	54.17	52.54
Percentage of OTHER applications determined on time	72	61.08	59.11	75.37	85.49	81.86	86.83	71.5	77.43

Source: General Development Control PS2 Return

TABLE 2C	Previous YTD 2012/13	Last YTD 2013/14	National Target	01.10.13 to 31.12.13	01.01.14 to 31.03.14	01.04.14 to 30.06.14	Direction of Travel YTD
Percentage of MAJOR applications determined on time	42.4	69.77	60	81.82	60	92.86	Positive (and exceeds national target)
Percentage of MINOR applications determined on time	53.75	62.79	65	70.00	54.17	52.54	Negative
Percentage of OTHER applications determined on time	66.71	81.67	80	86.83	71.5	77.43	Positive (but is below national target)

Source: General Development Control PS2 Return/Departmental Records

8.6 As will be noted the performance for Majors and Others exceeded the national target for the year to date (YTD). However in respect of planning performance for the fourth quarter the following applies:-

- a significant percentage increase on Majors from the fourth quarter 2013/14 to the first quarter 2014/15 (from 60% to 92.86%)
- a slight percentage decrease on Minors from the fourth quarter 2013/14 to the first quarter 2014/15 (from 54.17% to 52.54%)
- a percentage increase on Others from the fourth quarter 2013/14 to the first quarter 2014/15 (from 71.5% to 77.43%)

Whilst planning performance now exceeds national targets for Majors on year to date figures 2013/14, Majors and Others show an improvement compared with the previous year end quarter January to March 2014. All these improvements should also be viewed against the fluctuating resource in the Operational Development Team in Development Management and changes to planning legislation.

- 8.7 In respect of the planning performance on Minor developments, it is clear that this has decreased slightly in the first two quarters of this year. However focussed activity will continue over the forthcoming quarters with the aim of improving current performance.
- 8.8 Planning performance has improved on majors although there are a number of cases which will be presented to Planning Committee in the forthcoming quarters which when finally determined will cause the overall percentage figures for the year to decrease as they are out of time. Some of these cases will involve the use of new policies in the Core Strategy (e.g. policy CS11).
- 8.9 A significant employment proposal involving application of policy CS11 was presented to Planning Committee on the 9th July 2014 at Nayland and approved. If implemented this proposal would allow the provision of 20-30 jobs in a village location. The determination of major cases by the Council are key because where they can be supported they contribute significantly to the supply of housing and jobs across the District.

Planning Fees

- 8.10 Table 3 provides an overview of the income received from fee generating applications during the last quarter against the projected position for the quarter. Previous quarters figures are also included. It excludes listed building applications which do not attract a fee.
- 8.11 It was estimated that £379,500 would be received in planning fees during 2013/14. However as will be noted below, £450,884.50 has been received in total which is an increase of 18.8% over the anticipated position. In addition to the income received from fee generating applications for the year 2013/14, a further £23,243.50 has been received from the administration of non-material amendments to existing planning applications and submissions relating to the approval of information required by planning conditions against a revised budget estimate of £15,000.
- 8.12 For the first quarter of this year the number of fee generating applications received is higher than the preceding eight quarters and is 19.9% higher than the projected fee income (cumulative) for the first quarter (see Table 3 below).
- 8.13 Indeed if this quarter's fee income (113,807.50) is compared with the first quarter of 2013 (£77,924) it is clear that there is a marked uplift between the two and also in terms of fee income projection for this quarter (estimated at £94,875)

TABLE 3	01.04.12 to 30.06.12	01.07.12 to 30.09.12	01.10.12 to 31.12.12	01.01.13 to 31.03.13	01.04.13 to 30.06.13	01.07.13 to 30.09.13	01.10.13 to 31.12.13	01.01.14 to 31.03.14	01.04.14 to 30.06.14
Number of fee applications received	232	215	203	230	243	223	260	271	273
Cumulative fees receive	155,453	218,919	331,102	412,327	77,924	201,728.50	302,163	450,884.50	113,807.50
Projected fee income (cumulative)	94,875	189,750	284,625	379,500	94,875	189,750	284,625	379,500	94,875

Source: Departmental Records

Appeals

8.13 Table 4 provides details of the number of appeals allowed expressed as a percentage of the total number of appeals determined. The previous seven quarters are shown for comparison purposes. As can be seen from these figures the Councils performance on appeal is good.

TABLE 4	01.04.12 to 30.06.12	01.07.12 to 30.09.12	01.10.12 to 31.12.12	01.01.13 to 31.03.13	01.04.13 to 30.06.13	01.07.13 to 30.09.13	01.10.13 to 31.12.13	01.01.14 to 31.03.14	01.04.14 to 30.06.14
Number of appeals allowed	8	7	0	4	1	5	6	4	3
Total number of appeals	14	17	7	11	11	15	13	14	13
Percentage of appeals allowed (%)	42.86	41.18	0	36.36	9.09	33.33	46.15	28.57	23.08

8.14 There has been one partial award of costs against the Council during this quarter. However there has not as yet been any approach from the appellants and no figures are known at this time.

8.15 The Appendix gives information relating to all the appeal decisions within this quarter, with the opportunity for Members to access the application details and the appeal decision using hyperlinks.

Source: Departmental Records

9. Appendices

Title	Location
Appeal Decisions 1 April 2014 to 30 June 2014	Attached

10. Background Documents

10.1 None.

Authorship:

Christine Thurlow
Corporate Manager –
Development Management

Tel: 01473 825860
Email: christine.thurlow@babergh.gov.uk



Development Control Appeals Decided DC and EC

Version 6

Between 1-Apr-14 and 30-Jun-14

Development Control

Total Number of DC Appeals Allowed - Permission Granted:	1
Total Number of DC Appeals Allowed - Split decision allowed in part:	2
Total Number of DC Appeals Dismissed:	9
Total Number of DC Appeals Withdrawn:	1
<hr/>	
Total Number of DC Appeals Decided:	13
Percentage of appeals allowed	23.08%

Total Number of DC Appeals Outstanding:	10
---	----

Enforcement Control

Total Number of EC Appeals :

Total Number of EC Appeals Decided:

Total Number of EC Appeals Outstanding:

Development Control

Number of Written Representations	10	Granted:	3
Number of Informal Hearings	0	Granted:	0
Number of Public Enquiries	2	Granted:	0

Allowed - Permission Granted

Final Decision: Allowed - Permission Granted

Application No: B/13/01511 FHA **Appellant:** Mr Crepy

Application decision: Development Committee **Appeal Decision Date:** 23-Jun-14

Appeal Procedure: Written Representations **Appeal Type:** Refusal of planning permission

Location: Topaz, Sudbury Road, Lavenham, SUDBURY, CO10 9SB

Proposal: Conversion of existing garage into additional living accommodation and erection of detached new garage.

Appeal Notes: Key Issue(s): The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including the setting of an adjacent Conservation Area.

Conclusion: A 'modest' domestic structure within a residential curtilage would have little harm on the setting of the Con. Area given that modern housing developments also feature in the vicinity. There is little uniformity to the way in which frontages are enclosed and with the garage benefitting from some screening and being sited close to the host dwelling, the openness of the wider street scene would be maintained.

Application Details: <http://planning.babergh.gov.uk> (Quick Search: 13/01511)

Appeal Decision: http://planning.babergh.gov.uk/doldp/122141_1.pdf

Allowed - Split decision allowed in part

Final Decision: Allowed - Split decision allowed in part

Application No: B/13/00484 FHA **Appellant:** Ms Youngs

Application decision: Delegated **Appeal Decision Date:** 9-Apr-14

Appeal Procedure: Written Representations **Appeal Type:** Refusal of planning permission

Location: The Doctors House, High Street, Bures St Mary, BURES, CO8 5HZ

Proposal: Erection of a single-storey and two-storey rear extension (following demolition of existing single-storey extension), relocation of entrance gates, and erection of cartlodge and shed/workshop.

Appeal Notes:

Conditions - Extract from decision requires :

The Council has not suggested any appropriate conditions. However, it would be necessary to impose the standard condition concerning the implementation of the consent and permission. It is also reasonable to require the proposals to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning and the protection of heritage assets. However, there is some ambiguity about whether the entrance gates will be replaced, as well as relocated; there is also a risk the outward opening of the gates might have implications for a neighbour's window. I shall therefore require the details of the gates and their method of opening to be agreed with the Council.

Application Details: <http://planning.babergh.gov.uk> (Quick Search: 13/00484)

Appeal Decision: http://planning.babergh.gov.uk/doldp/110019_2.pdf

Final Decision:

Allowed - Split decision allowed in part

Application No:

B/13/00485 LBC

Appellant:

Ms Youngs

Application decision:

Delegated

Appeal Decision Date:

9-Apr-14

Appeal Procedure:

Written Representations

Appeal Type:

Refusal of Listed B/Con Area consent

Location:

The Doctors House, High Street, BURES, CO8 5HZ

Proposal:

Application for Listed Building Consent - Demolition of existing single-storey extension & erection of a two-storey rear extension, internal alterations, insertion of rooflight, replacement of two sash windows with french doors.

Appeal Notes:

Conditions - Extract from decision requires :

The Council has not suggested any appropriate conditions. However, it would be necessary to impose the standard condition concerning the implementation of the consent and permission. It is also reasonable to require the proposals to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning and the protection of heritage assets. However, there is some ambiguity about whether the entrance gates will be replaced, as well as relocated; there is also a risk the outward opening of the gates might have implications for a neighbour's window. I shall therefore require the details of the gates and their method of opening to be agreed with the Council.

Application Details: <http://planning.babergh.gov.uk> (Quick Search: 13/00485)

Appeal Decision: http://planning.babergh.gov.uk/doldp/110024_2.pdf

Dismissed**Final Decision:**

Dismissed

Application No:

B/12/00688 FUL

Appellant:

David Wilson Homes

Application decision:

Development Committee

Appeal Decision Date:

16-Jun-14

Appeal Procedure:

Public Inquiry

Appeal Type:

Refusal of planning permission

Location:

Former Fleetwood Caravan Site, Hall Street, Long Melford, SUDBURY, CO10 9JG

Proposal:

Erection of 51 dwellings with associated access, parking, open space and landscaping (following demolition of existing buildings), as amended.

Appeal Notes:

Key Issue(s): Whether the proposal would provide safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access.

Conclusion: Although acceptable changes could be made to the junction with Hall Street, there are significant shortcomings and safety issues with the access way to the entrance of the site and questions of pedestrian safety within the site for the level of housing proposed. It is an existing access road, but the scale of the development proposed increases the potential for vehicle/pedestrian conflict. As such the Inspector found that the proposal would not provide safe and suitable access for all people as required by the Framework and would be detrimental to vehicular and pedestrian safety.

Application Details: <http://planning.babergh.gov.uk> (Quick Search: 12/00688)

Appeal Decision: http://planning.babergh.gov.uk/doldp/121675_1.pdf

Costs Decision: http://planning.babergh.gov.uk/doldp/109487_2.pdf

Final Decision:**Dismissed****Application No:****B/12/01115 FUL****Appellant:****Ms J Hately****Application decision:**

Delegated

Appeal Decision Date:

6-May-14

Appeal Procedure:

Written Representations

Appeal Type:

Refusal of planning permission

Location:

113 Bures Road, Great Cornard, SUDBURY, CO10 0JE

Proposal:

Erection of 1 no. single-storey dwelling and detached garage.

Appeal Notes:

Key Issue(s): a) the effect of the appeal proposals on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and b) whether the proposed development would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, with particular reference to noise and disturbance.

Conclusion: The proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would be contrary to policy CS15 of the Babergh Local Plan 2011-2031 Core Strategy and Policies (2014) and saved Policies CN01 and HS28 of the Babergh Local Plan Alteration No.2 2006 (the LP 2006). These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that the design and layout of new housing development is sympathetic to the site and its immediate surroundings. In this regard it would also not meet the aims of paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) to achieve high quality design. The proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions for future occupiers, with particular reference to noise and disturbance. It would be contrary to the amenity considerations set out in saved LP 2006 Policy HS28. It would also not meet the aims of paragraph 17 of the Framework to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupiers of buildings.

Application Details: <http://planning.babergh.gov.uk> (Quick Search: 12/01115)

Appeal Decision: http://planning.babergh.gov.uk/doldp/112754_3.pdf

Final Decision:**Dismissed****Application No:****B/12/01279 FUL****Appellant:****Hive Energy Limited****Application decision:**

Development Committee

Appeal Decision Date:

2-Jun-14

Appeal Procedure:

Public Inquiry

Appeal Type:

Refusal of planning permission

Location:

Land south of Valley Farm, Cox Hall Road, Tattingstone

Proposal:

Change of use of agricultural land to 38.43ha solar park generating up to 10MW of electricity (42,840 solar panels) and associated works comprising the installation of transformer housings, a control room, security fencing, CCTV cameras and internal roads as amended by drawings and details received 2nd May 2013 and further amended by details received 11th June 2013.

Appeal Notes:

Key Issue(s): Impact on the landscape/countryside and loss of agricultural land

Conclusion: The inspector referred to a number of ministerial statements and planning guidance adopted by the government since the decision was made.

The inspector gave full weight to Policy CR04 of the Local Plan 2006 believing the Special Landscape Area designation to be robust and based on evidence (The Babergh Draft Landscape Assessment and Action Programme 2004). The Inspector also referred to Suffolk County Councils Landscape Assessment and one commissioned by the Stour and Orwell Society (The Shotley Peninsula Landscape Character Assessment 2013).

From considering these landscape assessments and from her site visit, the Inspector considered the site to be 'sensitive' being unspoilt and tranquil.

The Inspector concluded that the panels would be urbanising and industrial in character. They would harm the rural character and the setting of an ancient woodland.

The Inspector found a 'high' magnitude of change, particular in the area surrounding the site. Even with mitigation this would not drop down past 'medium'.

The hedging proposed as mitigation was considered to safeguard landscape character by reintroducing a historic landscape feature; it would however be ineffective by way of visual mitigation. The hedging would take too long to mature and even then would not screen the development from view. The hedging would also block views across the site, in an area now characterised by open views. The proposal would therefore result in harm to public visual amenity (no harm was found to private visual amenity).

The impact of noise from the invertors would also have an effect on eroding tranquillity.

With regards to the use of agricultural land, the Inspector took the view that the site was 'significant development' within the meaning of the NPPF and therefore the appellant should have considered no agricultural and low quality agricultural sites first in a sequential approach. The appellant had failed to do this.

In terms of looking at alternative sites, the Inspector considered it reasonable to require the applicant to consider sites outside of the district including commercial roof space at Ipswich and lower quality agricultural land in Suffolk Coastal District – both reasonably close to the appeal site.

The applicants approach to site selection was considered 'far from robust and completely inadequate'. The use of agricultural land was not therefore considered necessary.

The inspector dismissed the appeal due to the harm to the landscape and the poor justification for using higher quality agricultural land. The benefits of the scheme – to renewable energy targets and ecology – were not considered to outweigh this harm.

Application Details: <http://planning.babergh.gov.uk> (Quick Search: 12/01279)

Appeal Decision: http://planning.babergh.gov.uk/doldp/118054_39.pdf

Final Decision:	<u>Dismissed</u>		
Application No:	B/13/00616 FUL	Appellant:	Mr Merriweather
Application decision:	Delegated	Appeal Decision Date:	11-Jun-14
Appeal Procedure:	Written Representations	Appeal Type:	Refusal of planning permission
Location:	The Granary, Tower House, Freston Park, Freston, IPSWICH, IP9 1AD		
Proposal:	Erection of decking and glass balustrade (retention of), as amplified by agents email received on 26th July 2013.		

Appeal Notes:

Key Issue(s): The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, the setting of the listed buildings and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Conclusion: The decking does not appear to be subservient and it introduces a significant area of uniform hard surfacing that is not typical within the cluster of buildings. The decking and its supporting structure introduce an obtrusive and incongruous feature that is alien in the rural, informal setting. As such it detracts from the rural character and natural beauty of the area and the AONB. Whilst the decking would inevitably be of great benefit to the appellant this does not outweigh the harm caused to the rural area or AONB.

The setting of a listed building is not, necessarily, limited to its curtilage or grounds and any alterations to the

Granary could have an impact on the setting of the listed buildings regardless of the use of the building or its ownership. The size, design and location of the decking does not relate to the character of buildings nor does it blend into the informal character of the cluster of buildings that provides the setting for the listed buildings. Given the location of the decking it introduces an alien feature which attracts attention and detracts from the setting of the listed buildings. The development does not preserve the setting of the listed buildings and is contrary to saved LP Policy CN06 and the NPPF.

Application Details: <http://planning.babergh.gov.uk> (Quick Search: 13/00616)

Appeal Decision: http://planning.babergh.gov.uk/doldp/117051_3.pdf

.....

Costs decision: http://planning.babergh.gov.uk/doldp/117051_2.pdf

Conclusion: Application for an award of costs has been refused as unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary expense has not been demonstrated.

Final Decision:

Dismissed

Application No:

B/13/00657 FUL

Appellant:

Aquatix-2U Ltd

Application decision:

Delegated

Appeal Decision Date:

28-Apr-14

Appeal Procedure:

Written Representations

Appeal Type:

Refusal of planning permission

Location:

Glebe Farm, London Road, Copdock And Washbrook, IPSWICH, IP8 3JN

Proposal:

Erection of storage building for part Class B8 warehouse and part agricultural use.

Appeal Notes:

Key Issue(s): Whether or not the proposal would provide a suitable location for employment, having regard to the principles of sustainable development, and the effect of the proposed building on the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion: The proposal would not have the benefit of increasing jobs nor would it take-up identified employment land in a sustainable location such as a nearby town or village. The site is not a suitable location for further commercial development, which if permitted would impact its rural setting.

Application Details: <http://planning.babergh.gov.uk> (Quick Search: 13/00657)

Appeal Decision: http://planning.babergh.gov.uk/doldp/111945_3.pdf

Final Decision:

Dismissed

Application No:

B/13/00774 OUT

Appellant:

Mr Cook

Application decision:

Delegated

Appeal Decision Date:

23-Apr-14

Appeal Procedure:

Written Representations

Appeal Type:

Refusal of planning permission

Location:

Russetts, Hadleigh Road, Sroughton, IPSWICH, IP2 0BT

Proposal:

Outline - Demolition of existing dwelling. Erection of 12 No. dwellings with access from Ventris Close & erection of 2 No. dwellings with access from Hadleigh Road.

Appeal Notes:

Key Issue(s): Effect of the development on the provision of affordable housing in the area

Conclusion: The proposal does not make any provision for affordable housing on the site or by means of contribution to off-site provision. Nor is the development viability evidence submitted which might support a level of provision lower than the 35% specified in policy CS19.

Agreed that Council's Housing Needs Survey is dated. However the provisions of Policy CS19 are clear in that affordable housing is a key priority, that there is a substantial need in the district, and that this need is expected to persist throughout the plan period and not to be addressed through predicted supply. No substantive evidence has been submitted to suggest that there is unlikely to be a need for affordable housing.

Policy CS19 is broadly consistent with the with the approach of the NPPF which seeks to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, to boost significantly the supply of housing, and to meet the needs of different groups in the community.

The schemes benefits of economic generation and contribution to housing supply in a sustainable location are outweighed by the Inspector's conclusion on affordable housing.

Application Details: <http://planning.babergh.gov.uk> (Quick Search: 13/00774)

Appeal Decision: http://planning.babergh.gov.uk/doldp/112757_3.pdf

Final Decision:**Dismissed****Application No:****B/13/00796 FUL****Appellant:****Mr K Lansdown****Application decision:**

Development Committee

Appeal Decision Date:

8-May-14

Appeal Procedure:

Written Representations

Appeal Type:

Refusal of planning permission

Location:

6 Collinsons, Sproughton, IPSWICH, IP2 0DS

Proposal:

Erection of 1 no. two-storey dwelling (following demolition of existing double garage).

Appeal Notes:

Key Issue(s): The effect of the proposal on: the character and appearance of the surrounding area; the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 4 Collinsons, with particular reference to outlook; and whether the proposal makes adequate provision for any additional need for infrastructure, services and facilities arising from the development.

Conclusion: The proposal would result in the loss of the characteristic openness of this part of the estate; the increased depth and height of the proposed dwelling would dominate, result in loss of existing open outlook, and loss of light from the living room window of the adjacent dwelling at No 4 resulting in a detrimental impact on the living conditions of this neighbouring property; a completed section 106 agreement submitted with the appeal secures adequate contribution towards the upkeep and provision of infrastructure, services and facilities impacted by the development.

Application Details: <http://planning.babergh.gov.uk> (Quick Search: 13/00796)

Appeal Decision: http://planning.babergh.gov.uk/doldp/112901_4.pdf

Final Decision:**Dismissed****Application No:****B/13/01220 FHA****Appellant:****Mr K Maude****Application decision:**

Delegated

Appeal Decision Date:

28-Apr-14

Appeal Procedure:

Written Representations

Appeal Type:

Refusal of planning permission

Location:

Tor Gable, Silver Hill, Hintlesham, IPSWICH, IP8 3NJ

Proposal:

Erection of one and a half storey side extension

Appeal Notes:

Key Issue(s): Impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its rural surroundings.

Conclusion: Scale and massing of the proposed extension would result in a bulky structure which would be overbearing on the existing dwelling. Given its elevated position the proposal would be conspicuous in the countryside, including views from the public highway. Given the isolated and elevated location of the site and the absence of streetlights, the excessive amount of proposed glazing would result in a significant degree of light spillage that would have a harmful urbanising effect at this rural location. The proposal would therefore have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of Tor Gable and its rural surroundings.

Application Details: <http://planning.babergh.gov.uk> (Quick Search: 13/01220)

Appeal Decision: <http://www.pcs.planningportal.gov.uk/pcsportal/fscdav/READONLY?OBJ=COO.2036.300.12.6509653&NAME=/APPEAL%20DECISION.pdf>

Final Decision:**Dismissed****Application No:****B/14/00192 FHA****Appellant:****Mr & Mrs Currie****Application decision:**

Delegated

Appeal Decision Date:

24-Jun-14

Appeal Procedure:

Written Representations

Appeal Type:

Refusal of planning permission

Location:

Meadow View, High Street, Long Melford, SUDBURY, CO10 9DB

Proposal:

Erection of first-floor extension

Appeal Notes:

Key Issue(s): The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area and the setting of Hill House, a grade II listed building.

Conclusion: When viewed together with the existing garage and annexe (previously approved), the cumulative massing of the proposed extension with these structures would result in a sizeable and cluttered scale of development with an evident domestic appearance, at odds with the predominant rural character. This would be particularly evident in views out of the Conservation Area and from views within the curtilage of Hill House. Significant weight was placed on the largely undeveloped character of the appeal site providing the established rural setting to the east of the listed Hill House and the Conservation Area. No public benefit could be derived from the works.

Application Details: <http://planning.babergh.gov.uk> (Quick Search: 14/00192)

Appeal Decision: http://planning.babergh.gov.uk/doldp/122140_1.pdf

Withdrawn**Final Decision:****Withdrawn****Application No:****B/14/00038 FUL****Appellant:****Mr Staveley****Application decision:**

Delegated

Appeal Decision Date:

1-May-14

Appeal Procedure:**Appeal Type:**

Refusal of planning permission

Location:

Gate and West Farm, Golden Lane, Lawshall, BURY ST EDMUNDS, IP29 4PT

Proposal:

Siting of a caravan, including mains water connection, electric and septic tank for occupation by an agricultural worker.

Appeal Notes:

Appeal Withdrawn

Total Number of DC Appeals Decided:**13**

Enforcement Control

Final Decsion:

Appeal Decision Date:

Application No.:

Appeal Procedure:

Appeal Type:

Location:

Description of Breach:

Appeal Notes:
