



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 June 2019

**by John Braithwaite BSc(Arch) BArch(Hons) RIBA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 24 June 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W3520/W/18/3211490**

**Land adjacent to Charters Towers, Gallows Hill, Redgrave, Diss IP22 1RZ**

- 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 G Topham against the decision of Mid Suffolk District Council.
  - The application Ref DC/17/05663, dated 10 November 2017, was refused by notice dated 16 March 2018.
  - The development proposed is 30 residential units.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Reasons

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Redgrave Conservation Area (the RDA).
3. The RDA covers almost the entire village of Redgrave, where development is generally alongside Mill Road that runs through the village from north-west to south-east. Development is generally one plot deep, particularly to the north-west end of the village, and houses are set close to the road. There are views through roadside development of fields beyond and at either end of the RDA are open fields that complement the concentrated roadside dwellings and other buildings. The appeal site is one of these fields and is within the RDA.
4. The site is on the east side of Mill Road and to the north is scattered development outside the RDA. In this regard the appeal site is important to the character of the RDA because it provides a break between modern development outside the area and historic development within the area. Development on the site, as a matter of principle, would link existing development within and outside the RDA, and would take up an open space that is an important feature in, and which contributes to the character of, the RDA.
5. The proposed development would introduce a concentration of thirty dwellings, set around a central 'green', that would be alien in layout to the pattern of existing development. Most of the road frontage would be open affording views into the site of development at the rear. This development at the rear would, partly, be a terrace of five four-bedroom two-storey dwellings with a frontage of 50 metres. This 'building' would be massive compared to traditional development in the RDA, which is predominantly detached and link detached dwellings.

6. The proposed development would be almost wholly two-storey; there would be only three attached single storey garages and a few lean-to elements. All of the buildings would have gable roofs and, apart from four large contemporary houses in large plots at the north-east and south-east corners of the site, the buildings would have a generally uniform appearance; despite differing materials. The generally consistent appearance and form of the proposed dwellings, which include pairs of identical semi-detached houses, would be incongruous in a village where virtually no two buildings are alike.

7. The proposed development would have a spacious and generally open layout away from Mill Road that would be incongruous at the extremity of a village where development is dense and close to the road. For this and the other aforementioned reasons the proposed development would have a serious adverse effect on the character and appearance of the Redgrave Conservation Area. The development conflicts with, in particular, saved policy HB 8 of the Mid-Suffolk Local Plan.

Other matters

8. The housing supply position for the District has changed since the application was submitted; the Council can now demonstrate a housing supply in excess of the five year target required by the National Planning Policy Framework (the NPPF). Policies in the Development Plan, that relate to housing supply, can thus be considered to be up to date and the 'tilted balance' approach advocated in the NPPF for housing applications in Districts where there is an under supply of housing land is not required. Furthermore, in these circumstances, housing need and growth in Redgrave must be addressed through the Local Plan process.

9. A reason for refusal of the application relates to archaeological matters. Planning permission has been withheld so this matter does not need to be addressed. No matters mentioned in support of the appeal, either individually or collectively, outweigh the conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

10. The proposed development would have a serious adverse effect on the character and appearance of the Redgrave Conservation Area. Planning permission must therefore be withheld for 30 residential units on land adjacent to Charters Towers, Gallows Hill, Redgrave, Diss.

***John Braithwaite***

Inspector