

SPROUGHTON – Land to rear of 21 Collinsons

The erection of 2no. dwellings and associated garages and construction of new vehicular access

Applicant: LAB Developments

Case Officer: Chris Tivey

---

SITE

1. The application site relates to a roughly square parcel of land situated to the south of Collinsons and between nos. 17 and 21. The application site backs onto a more recent development, Woodward Close and shares its south western boundary with no. 5 Woodward Close. The site is approximately 0.09 hectares in area and currently forms part of the curtilage to Landamere which is situated on Hadleigh Road.
2. The site whilst previously undeveloped and originally forming part of an orchard is within the built up area boundary of the Ipswich fringe. The site has no specific designation within the Babergh District Local Plan Alteration Number 2 (2006). The land slopes up from the north eastern boundary where adjacent to Collinsons to the southern corner of the site.

PROPOSAL

3. Planning permission is sought for the erection of 2no. detached properties set back from Collinsons, each with individual access drives and detached single garages. The existing grass verge which contains a mature apple tree is excluded from the application site. The submitted Tree Survey and Arboricultural Implication Assessment states that no dig construction would be employed for driveway construction where within the root protection zone of the tree.
4. The proposal is for the construction of two family sized dwellings, each with four bedrooms. The dwellings have been individually designed and the applicant in their Design and Access Statement states that the layout and orientation of the proposed dwellings ensures that there is no overlooking or loss of privacy to the surrounding properties, and that the private gardens to the proposed dwellings are not overlooked by existing dwellings.
5. The design of the two dwellings is based on a traditional Suffolk style incorporating traditional materials and proportions. There is a combination of one, one-and-a-half and two storey elements which complements the size and shape of the adjacent dwellings.
6. The proportions of the Plot 1 dwelling would comprise a main two storey element with a ground to ridge height of 8.95m and a forward projecting gable at 7.4m high. The width of the dwelling would be approximately 9.95m and its total depth would measure 11.35m, when including the forward projecting gable and a single storey lean-to extension to the rear, to house the kitchen. The detached garage served by a

driveway which runs along the south eastern boundary of the site would be 4.9m high, 6.05m deep and 4.1m wide (the proportions of the garage to Plot 2 are identical).

7. The dwelling to Plot 2 would have a ground to ridge height of approximately 8.75m. The building would be 10m wide and up to 10.9m deep where including a projecting two storey rear gable. The overall design of this property is symmetrical on the front elevation and would be quite traditional in form and in terms of materials proposed (facing brick and tile).

#### RELEVANT HISTORY

8. 2007 – Erection of 2no. detached two storey dwellings with 1no. detached single garage and 1no. attached double garage, construction of new vehicular access (B/07/00772/FUL refers and was withdrawn 07.08.2007).

#### NATIONAL GUIDANCE

9. **PPS1 (2005) – Delivering Sustainable Development**

##### **PPS3 (2006) – Housing**

#### PLANNING POLICIES

10. The following Development Plan Policies are relevant to the determination of this proposal:

##### **Suffolk Structure Plan 2001**

- CS3 (New Development)
- ENV3 (Design Standards)
- T9 (Private Car Parking)

##### **Babergh Local Plan (Alteration No. 2) 2006**

- HS02 & HS03 (Villages)
- HS27 (Housing Density and Type)
- HS28 (Infilling and Groups of Dwellings)
- HS30 (Design)
- HS32 (Public Open Space – Developer Contributions)
- CN01 (Design Standards)
- TP15 (Parking Standards)

#### OBSERVATIONS

11. PC – No objection. The proposed development will not change the character of existing housing. There would be no overlooking or loss of privacy to surrounding properties.
12. LHA – No objections to the development.
13. Tree Officer – No objections to the proposal subject to the recommendations of the Tree Survey and Arboricultural Implication Assessment being adhered to. However, no trees on the site are worthy of Tree Preservation Orders.

14. Environment Agency – No objection to the proposed development.
15. SCC Archaeological Service – The site lies within an area of archaeological interest and there is a strong possibility that archaeological deposits could be encountered. They suggest that a full archaeological condition be imposed.
16. Third Party Representations - Two letters of representation have been received from local residents. They raise concern with the proposed new vehicular access with the proposals allowing traffic onto Collinsons at a point where there is a bend in the road and with regard to road conditions during the winter months. Other concerns raised are with regards to the loss of trees on the site and mention is made of Hazels situated to the rear of the site. They consider that trees should receive a Tree Preservation Order Designation as they are of high public amenity value and are potentially under threat with the loss of a traditional orchard having potential implications for wildlife. If planning permission is granted conditions should be applied to prevent the felling of any trees on or adjacent to the site and hardsurfacing should be kept to a minimum in order to maintain permeable surfacing for rainwater.

### ASSESSMENT

17. The principle of residential development on this site is acceptable with it falling within an existing built up area boundary on the fringe of Ipswich.
18. The site was formerly part of an orchard which has been developed over time and includes the Collinsons development and the recent Woodward Close development to the rear.
19. The Tree Officer has been party to discussions both during the previously withdrawn application and the current application and has concluded that none of the trees on the site are worthy of a Tree Preservation Order.
20. The most prominent tree an apple tree on the grass verge in front of the application site, does not in fact fall on land within the applicant's control and therefore is excluded from the proposed development. However the Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report concludes that a no dig form of construction will be employed so as to ensure that roots to this tree are not damaged from the construction of the driveway to Plot 1.
21. The letter of representation that made reference to Hazel trees to the north western boundary may not have been made aware of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment carried out, as drawing 07.07.1540A of that Report clearly shows a hazel tree on the boundary with 5 Woodward Close to be protected. It is unlikely that the application site is of high ecological value, however, Officers have requested that the applicant give attention to the concerns of local residents and a response to those matters raised is expected to be available by and reported at the Meeting.
22. The general character of the area comprises large detached two storey houses all of a modern design. The two proposed dwellings are sympathetic to the Suffolk vernacular and provided that quality materials are employed, should blend in well into the street scene.

23. With individual access drives and garages sited well back into the application site, the visual presence of parking would be limited and with the existing vegetation to the site frontage softening the overall appearance of the development.
24. In terms of the relationship of the proposed dwellings to each other and to surrounding residential properties, the spacing would be similar to the prevailing pattern of development in the locality. The orientation of the dwellings is such that there should be no direct overlooking and therefore loss of amenity to immediate neighbours.
25. Policy HS32 of the Adopted Local Plan requires all applications proposing new dwellings to make provision for Public Open Space. This is either in the form of on-site provision or off-site provision in the form of a commuted payment. Given the relatively small size of the site and layout of the development, an on-site Public Open Space provision is not considered appropriate and accordingly the Recommendation below makes provision to secure a commuted payment.

### REASONS FOR APPROVAL

26. The erection of two detached dwellings would make efficient use of an undeveloped site whilst being sympathetic to the general prevailing pattern of development in the area. The development would not give rise to a material loss of amenity to neighbouring residential properties. The proposal is therefore compliant with Policies HS02, HS03, HS27 and CN01 of the Babergh District Local Plan (Alteration No. 2) 2006.

### RECOMMENDATION

- A. The Solicitor to the Council be authorised to secure a planning obligation under Section 106 of the 1990 Act to ensure:
  - (i) The payment of contributions towards Public Open Space provision.
- B. Upon securing the obligation the Chief Planning Control Officer be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject to the following conditions –
  - Materials
  - As recommended by CHA
  - PD rights removed for insertion of further windows and extensions.
  - Landscaping scheme
  - Recommendations of Arboricultural report to be carried out
  - Archaeological programme of investigation

Otherwise,

- C. REFUSE planning permission
  - Inadequate provision of Public Open Space and play equipment.

### DECISION

---

---