

9 September 2011

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

**For the attention of John Pateman-Gee, Planning Officer**

Dear Mr Isbell,

**Dunston House, Sandy Lane, Hemingstone – Proposed replacement dwelling  
reference: 2335/11**

1. I am writing on behalf of the Suffolk Preservation Society ('the Society') to submit representations regarding the above planning application for a replacement dwelling.

### **The Application**

2. The Society submits that the application is technically deficient in several aspects. Firstly, no analysis of the existing building has been submitted to demonstrate whether the existing property warrants treatment as an undesignated heritage asset in accordance with PPS5. The Society submits that an evaluation of the significance of the existing building should be undertaken on behalf of the applicant by an appropriately qualified and experienced architectural historian. Secondly, no landscape analysis has been submitted (including analysis of key views and verified photomontages) to demonstrate that the proposal would have an acceptable landscape impact.

3. Furthermore, the submission contains no comparison of the existing buildings with that for which consent is being sought, in terms of built floor area and possibly more importantly a volumetric comparison.

### **The proposals**

4. The application site is located in open countryside within a designated Special Landscape Area and adjoins the eastern boundary of Shrublands Park a historic park and garden included on the statutory register at grade I (indeed the only such entry within Mid Suffolk). The proposed dwelling clearly involves resiting in a markedly more prominent location; being significantly elevated relative to the existing property. Furthermore, even a cursory

inspection reveals that the proposed dwelling and attendant triple garage with accommodation over represents a vast increase in built floor area and volume. In the opinion of the Society, this disparity is so great that the proposals justify treatment as a wholly new house in the open countryside.

5. In the opinion of the Society, the scheme is contrary to national policy in PPS7 that seeks to ensure that development in the open countryside is strictly controlled. PPS4 Key principle (iv) states "new building development in the open countryside ...should be strictly controlled; the Government's overall aim is to protect the countryside for the sake of its intrinsic character ..."

6. In the opinion of the Society notwithstanding the shortcomings of the application identified above, the proposed scheme would result in material harm by reason of the significant increase in the scale and prominence of the built form. This adverse impact is contrary to strategic objective SO1 of the Adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy and allied policy CS5. In addition, the scheme is contrary to 'saved' policies HB7, H8, CL1 and CL2 of the Adopted Mid Suffolk Local Plan. In particular, the scheme is clearly contrary to H8 Replacement Dwellings that seeks to ensure that replacements '*by virtue of their size and scale do not detract from the character and appearance of its surroundings and landscape setting*'.

## Conclusion

7. The Society wishes to register its strong objection to the proposed development that it believes would serve to harm the character and appearance of this SLA contrary to adopted national and local planning policies that seek to protect the countryside from inappropriate forms of development.

8. We request that our representations are reproduced in full as part of any officer report to committee and not paraphrased as a reflection of the Society's position as the countywide amenity society representing many thousands of members and parish councils. Please can you keep the Society informed regarding progress in this case.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Simon Cairns', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Simon Cairns  
IHBC MRTPI  
Director