



Rushmere St Andrew Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation on intention to take a decision that differs from the recommendation of the Examiner – Policy RSA9 ‘Design Considerations’ and Appendix 2.

Introduction

Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council submitted its Neighbourhood Plan and supporting evidence to East Suffolk Council in February 2022.

East Suffolk Council subsequently published the submission Neighbourhood Plan and supporting evidence and invited representations between 11th April 2022 and 6th June 2022. Representations were received from 10 respondents.

The Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan, evidence base and representations can be viewed at:

<https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/neighbourhood-planning/neighbourhood-plans-in-the-area/rushmere-st-andrew-neighbourhood-area/>

Mr Andrew Ashcroft BA(hons) MA DMS MRTPI was appointed as an independent Examiner to conduct the examination into the Neighbourhood Plan. He delivered his final report on 22nd August 2022. The Examiner’s Report concluded that subject to several modifications to the submitted Neighbourhood Plan it could proceed to a referendum.

<https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Neighbourhood-Planning/Designated-Neighbourhood-Areas/Rushmere/Examiners-report.pdf>

Consideration of the Examiner’s Report

Upon receipt of the Examiner’s Report, in accordance with the statutory provisions, East Suffolk Council has to consider each of the Examiner’s recommendations and come to a view as to whether to accept each of them.

Should the Council disagree with the Examiner’s recommendations, the Council is required under certain circumstances to undertake consultation.

Examiner's Report

The Examiner's recommendation in relation to paragraph 2 of policy RSA9 'Design Considerations', as set out in paragraphs 7.52 and 7.54 of his report, is:

Para 7.52: "The policy is an excellent local response to Section 12 of the NPPF. The local community has developed a detailed and distinctive approach to design. I recommend a modification to the wording of the second part of the policy so that it is clear that it applies specifically within The Street Special Character Area."

Para 7.54 (extract): "In the second part of the policy insert 'in The Street Special Character Area' between 'planning applications' and 'should'"

This would result in paragraph 2 of policy RSA9 reading as follows:

"In addition to having regard to the National Model Design Code, all planning applications in the Street Special Character Area should demonstrate how they satisfy the requirements of the Development Design Principles in Appendix 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan, as appropriate to the proposal."

The Council is minded not to accept this recommendation for the reasons set out below.

East Suffolk Council's Consideration

Paragraph 2 of Policy RSA9 in the [Submission Neighbourhood Plan \(February 2022\)](#) states:

"In addition to having regard to the National Model Design Code, all planning applications should demonstrate how they satisfy the requirements of the Development Design Principles in Appendix 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan, as appropriate to the proposal."

Appendix 2 in the [Submission Neighbourhood Plan \(February 2022\)](#) is titled:

"Appendix 2: The Street Special Character Area"

As stated above the Examiner recommends, in his report, a modification to paragraph 2 of policy RSA9 so that it applies specifically to The Street Special Character Area.

Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council have however indicated that Appendix 2 in the Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan was incorrectly titled. The Council agrees with this. In the Council's view neither paragraph 8.3 of the Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan, supporting text to policy RSA9, or the Design Guidelines and Codes (March 2021) indicate that Appendix 2 would apply to any other geography than the whole of Rushmere St Andrew Parish.

The Council therefore proposes to reject the Examiner's proposed modification to paragraph 2 of policy RSA9 and to instead correct the title of Appendix 2 to 'Development Design Checklist'.

The proposed changes are shown at the end of this paper.

Consultation

The Council is required to consult on its intention to make a decision that differs from the Examiner's.

Respondents are requested to address the specific question below and may also provide supporting information where relevant to support their views.

What are your views on rejecting the Examiner's modification to part 2 of policy RSA 9 and instead correcting the title of Appendix 2?

Please note that the scope of this consultation does not include any other parts of the Rushmere St Andrew Neighbourhood Plan. Comments on any other parts of the Neighbourhood Plan or any of the Examiner's other recommended modifications will not be accepted.

Consultation Period

The consultation period is Tuesday 11th October to 5pm on Wednesday 23rd November 2022.

Consultation Responses

Consultation responses must be received by East Suffolk Council by **5pm on Wednesday 23rd November 2022**

Comments can be made in the following ways:

Online – <https://eastsuffolk.inconsult.uk/rushmerestandrew2022/>

By email to – PlanningPolicy@eastsuffolk.gov.uk

By post to –

Planning Policy and Delivery Team
Riverside
4 Canning Road
Lowestoft
NR33 0EQ

Should you have any queries please contact the Planning Policy and Delivery Team on 01394 444557 or email planningpolicy@eastsuffolk.gov.uk.

Proposal to reject Examiner's recommended modification to policy RSA9 Design Considerations

Below is paragraph 2 of policy RSA9. The Examiner's suggested modification has been included but shown with the added text struck through to indicate that the Council proposes to reject the modification.

In addition to having regard to the National Model Design Code, all planning applications in ~~The Street Special Character Area~~ should demonstrate how they satisfy the requirements of the Development Design Principles in Appendix 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan, as appropriate to the proposal.

Paragraph 2 of policy RSA9 would therefore read as follows (as per the Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan (February 2022)):

In addition to having regard to the National Model Design Code, all planning applications should demonstrate how they satisfy the requirements of the Development Design Principles in Appendix 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan, as appropriate to the proposal.

Proposed Change to Appendix 2

The title in the Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan (February 2022) is shown below as a strikethrough, with the proposed correct title just beneath it underlined.

~~APPENDIX 2 – THE STREET SPECIAL CHARACTER AREA~~

APPENDIX 2 - DEVELOPMENT DESIGN CHECKLIST

As a first step, there are a number of design principles that should be present in any proposals. As general design guidelines, new development should:

- Respect the existing settlement pattern in order to preserve the character. Coalescence - development should be avoided;
- Integrate with existing paths, streets, circulation networks;
- Reinforce or enhance the established character of streets, greens and other spaces;
- Harmonise and enhance the existing settlement in terms of physical form, architecture and land use;
- Retain and incorporate important existing features into the development;
- Respect surrounding buildings in terms of scale, roofline, height, form, and density;
- Enhance and reinforce the property boundary treatments;
- Adopt contextually appropriate materials and details;
- Provide adequate open space for the development in terms of both quantity and quality;
- Incorporate necessary services and drainage infrastructure without causing unacceptable harm to retained features;
- Ensure all components e.g. buildings, landscapes, access routes, parking and open space are well related to each other; and
- Aim for innovative design and eco-friendly buildings while respecting the architectural heritage and tradition of the area whilst also integrating them with future development.

General questions to ask and issues to consider when presented with a development proposal

Street grid and layout

Does it favour accessibility and connectivity over cul-de-sac models? If not, why?

Do the new points of access and street layout have regard for all users of the development; in particular pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities?

What are the essential characteristics of the existing street pattern; are these reflected in the proposal?

How will the new design or extension integrate with the existing street arrangement?

Are the new points of access appropriate in terms of patterns of movement?

Do the points of access conform to the statutory technical requirements?

Local green spaces, views and character

What are the particular characteristics of this area which have been taken into account in the design; i.e. what are the landscape qualities of the area?

Does the proposal maintain or enhance any identified views or views in general?

How does the proposal affect the trees on or adjacent to the site?

Has the proposal been considered within its wider physical context?

Has the impact on the landscape quality of the area been taken into account?

In rural locations, has the impact of the development on the tranquillity of the area been fully considered?

How does the proposal affect the character of a rural location?

How does the proposal impact on existing views which are important to the area and how are these views incorporated in the design?

Can any new views be created?

Is there adequate amenity space for the development?

Does the new development respect and enhance existing amenity space?

Have opportunities for enhancing existing amenity spaces been explored?

Will any communal amenity space be created? If so, how this will be used by the new owners and how will it be managed?

Gateway and access features

What is the arrival point, how is it designed?
Does the proposal maintain or enhance the existing gaps between settlements?
Does the proposal affect or change the setting of a listed building or listed landscape?
Is the landscaping to be hard or soft?

Buildings layout and grouping

What are the typical groupings of buildings?
How have the existing groupings been reflected in the proposal?
Are proposed groups of buildings offering variety and texture to the townscape?
What effect would the proposal have on the streetscape?
Does the proposal maintain the character of dwelling clusters stemming from the main road?
Does the proposal overlook any adjacent properties or gardens? How is this mitigated?

Building line and boundary treatment

What are the characteristics of the building line?
How has the building line been respected in the proposals?
Has the appropriateness of the boundary treatments been considered in the context of the site?

Building heights and roofline

What are the characteristics of the roofline?
Have the proposals paid careful attention to height, form, massing and scale?
If a higher than average building(s) is proposed, what would be the reason for making the development higher?

Household extensions

Does the proposed design respect the character of the area and the immediate neighbourhood, and does it have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties in relation to privacy, overbearing or overshadowing impact?
Is the roof form of the extension appropriate to the original dwelling (considering angle of pitch)?
Do the proposed materials match those of the existing dwelling?
In case of side extensions, does it retain important gaps within the street scene and avoid a 'terracing effect'?
Are there any proposed dormer roof extensions set within the roof slope?
Does the proposed extension respond to the existing pattern of window and door openings?
Is the side extension set back from the front of the house?

Building materials and surface treatment

What is the distinctive material in the area, if any?
Does the proposed material harmonise with the local materials?
Does the proposal use high-quality materials?
Have the details of the windows, doors, eaves and roof details been addressed in the context of the overall design?
Does the new proposed materials respect or enhance the existing area or adversely change its character?

Car parking solutions

What parking solutions have been considered?
Are the car spaces located and arranged in a way that is not dominant or detrimental to the sense of place?
Has planting been considered to soften the presence of cars?
Does the proposed car parking compromise the amenity of adjoining properties?
Have the needs of wheelchair users been considered?

Architectural details and contemporary design

If the proposal is within a Conservation Area, how are the characteristics reflected in the design?
Does the proposal harmonise with the adjacent properties? This means that it follows the height massing and general proportions of adjacent buildings and how it takes cues from materials and other physical characteristics.
Does the proposal maintain or enhance the existing landscape features?
Has the local architectural character and precedent been demonstrated in the proposals?
If the proposal is a contemporary design, are the details and materials of a sufficiently high enough quality and does it relate specifically to the architectural characteristics and scale of the site?