

Development Control Committee

Minutes of a meeting of the **Development Control Committee** held on **Wednesday 7 February 2024** at **10.00 am** in the **Conference Chamber, West Suffolk House**, Western Way, Bury St Edmunds IP33 3YU

Present **Councillors**

Chair Andrew Smith

Vice Chairs Jon London and Phil Wittam

Mick Bradshaw

Carol Bull

Mike Chester

Roger Dicker

Susan Glossop

Rachel Hood

Ian Houlder

Sara Mildmay-White

Lora-Jane Miller-Jones

Marilyn Sayer

David Smith

Jim Thorndyke

Don Waldron

In attendance

Sarah Broughton - Ward Member: The Fornhams and Great Barton

Beccy Hopfensperger - Ward Member: The Fornhams and Great Barton

David Taylor - Ward Member: Manor

Julia Wakelam - Ward Member: Abbeygate

409. **Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Andy Neal.

410. **Substitutes**

The following substitution was declared:

Councillor Don Waldron substituting for Councillor Andy Neal.

411. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 January 2024 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

412. **Declarations of interest**

Members' declarations of interest are recorded under the item to which the declaration relates.

Councillor Jim Thorndyke stated that he would need to leave the meeting before consideration of Report number: DEV/WS/24/006 (Planning Application

DC/23/0783/VAR - Doctors Hall, Bury Lane, Stanton). As ward member, he had produced a pre-prepared statement, which would be read out on his behalf by the Democratic Services Officer at the appropriate time during the consideration of that item.

413. **Planning Application DC/22/1887/FUL - Land off The Street, Fornham All Saints (Report number: DEV/WS/24/004)**

(Councillor Marilyn Sayer declared a non registrable interest as she had previously commented on this application in her capacity as a local resident living in the vicinity of the proposed development. She left the meeting and therefore did not take part in the debate or vote on the item.)

Planning application – create access into All Saints Golf and Country Club

This application was presented to the Delegation Panel as the officer's recommendation of approval conflicted with Fornham All Saints Parish Council and Councillor Beccy Hopfensperger's, one of the ward members, objection.

The application was referred to the Development Control Committee due to the public interest in the proposed development.

A supplementary 'late paper' was issued following publication of the agenda, which provided additional information supplied by the applicant. This included a statement by Highways Consultant G H Bullard & Associates LLP to address in detail concerns raised by local residents, the parish council and ward member. The information supported the officer recommendation of approval. Members noted that re-consultation with the Highways Authority was not required as no objection had been submitted regarding this development and the information did not change how the proposal was assessed.

A separate document from the applicant had also been provided as part of the 'late paper' named 'All Saints Explanatory Note' which contained further explanation relating to the need and justification for the development.

The Planning Officer reported that since the publication of the report, two further objections had been received from neighbouring residents which accorded with the concerns expressed by other objectors.

Speakers: Malcolm Hancock (neighbouring resident) spoke against the application
Chris Bond (neighbouring resident) spoke against the application on behalf of himself and two other objectors present at the meeting, Daren Watson (neighbouring resident) and Jane Stewart (neighbouring resident)
Councillor Martin Loveridge (Chairman of Fornham All Saints Parish Council and also representing the views of Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve Parish Council) spoke against the application
Councillor Beccy Hopfensperger (one of the ward members for The Fornhams and Great Barton Ward) spoke against the application.

Mark Knight (agent) spoke in support of the application

(Malcolm Hancock was not present at the meeting in order to address the Committee, instead the Democratic Services Officer read out a pre-prepared statement on his behalf.)

(Councillor Sarah Broughton, the other ward member for The Fornhams and Great Barton Ward was present at the meeting in support of the comments expressed by the objectors and Councillor Beccy Hopfensperger.)

The Committee acknowledged the strength of concern for the proposed construction of a new access road to the All Saints Golf and Country Club including the potential adverse impact on amenity, highway safety and the Conservation Area.

While noting that the Conservation Officer and Highways Authority had not objected to the proposal, some members expressed concern regarding the potential significant detrimental impact upon the historic environment and the potential harm caused to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Highway safety was also of concern and it was principally for this reason that Councillor Jim Thorndyke proposed to defer consideration of the application to allow a site visit to be undertaken. This was duly seconded by Councillor Mike Chester.

The discussion then led to several members raising concern regarding the necessity and justification for the access, together with its frequency of use and whether the access would be used for reasons other than maintenance. The Committee was informed that it needed to consider the merits of the application itself and the Highways Authority would have assessed the frequency of use, in terms of a worse case scenario position, when considering the application. In addition, the access would be restricted by condition to only allow maintenance access to serve All Saints Golf and Country Club and for no other purpose.

The potential impact on the privacy of Acer Lodge opposite the proposed access was also raised.

The motion for deferral to allow a member site visit to be undertaken was put to the vote and with 8 voting for the motion, 7 against and no abstentions, it was resolved that

Decision

Consideration of this application be **DEFERRED** to allow a member site visit to be undertaken.

(At this point, the Chair adjourned the meeting to allow a short comfort break. The meeting resumed at 11.13 am.)

(Councillor Marilyn Sayer returned to the meeting following the conclusion of this item.)

414. **Planning Application DC/23/0133/FUL - Land off Fordham Road, Freckenham (Report number: DEV/WS/24/005)**

Planning application - change of use of agricultural land to enclosed field for dog training and exercising and associated access and parking

The application was considered at the last meeting of the Committee meeting held on 3 January 2024 following a site visit which had been undertaken the day before.

Officers were recommending that the planning application be refused for the reason outlined in Paragraph 30 of the report. This recommendation was in conflict with the view of Freckenham Parish Council and Councillor David Taylor (Manor Ward Member) who supported the proposal.

Members at the meeting resolved that they were 'minded to' approve the planning application, subject to conditions, contrary to the officer recommendation of refusal. At this point, the decision making protocol was invoked, requiring a Risk Assessment report to be prepared for this matter before any decision was made.

Members had resolved that they were 'minded to approve' the application as a result of taking into account the biodiversity benefits the native hedging and trees would bring about and they considered that the landscape impact of the proposals would not be adverse.

A risk assessment had been undertaken by officers in accordance with the Committee's Decision-Making Protocol which set out the potential risks that might arise should planning permission be approved, as well as providing clarity on queries raised during the meeting and to also allow appropriate conditions to be drafted.

The report that had previously been presented to the Committee was attached as Working Paper 1, which contained details of the site and development, summaries of consultation responses and neighbour representations, and the officer assessment of the proposal.

A supplementary 'late paper' was issued following publication of the agenda, which gave details regarding the removal of two proposed conditions should permission be granted. For clarity, the revised list of proposed conditions was provided.

Speakers: Councillor David Taylor (Ward Member: Manor) spoke in support of the application
Tracy Cannam (applicant) spoke in support of the application

Having considered the risk assessment undertaken by officers and having inspected the site, members remained in support of the proposal. It was acknowledged that the landscape would change as a result of the fencing; however, members considered the ecological benefits of the mitigation hedging and tree planting that were proposed to the perimeter and site frontage far outweighed any potential harm to the character of the landscape.

To support the rationale for potentially approving the application, recognition was given to the openness of the area, that the fencing was a temporary structure, and that prior to modern farming methods, the countryside would have looked very different with numerous hedgerows providing natural divisions to the landscape into smaller parcels of land.

Recognition was also given to the economic, social and health benefits of the proposal. Members felt this was an innovative new business that would be a welcomed facility by users, which in turn would provide social, physical and well-being health benefits to those accessing the service.

Councillor Sara Mildmay-White proposed that the application be approved, contrary to the officer recommendation and following a risk assessment report where the Committee had been 'minded to approve'. This was duly seconded by Councillor David Smith.

The following reason was given for proposing approval of the application. This was duly accepted by Councillors Mildmay-White and David Smith as proposer and seconder of the motion:

That recognising the biodiversity merits of the proposals including the mitigating hedge and tree planting, the economic and ecological benefits of this proposal outweighed the harm to the landscape perceived by the Committee.

The motion for approval was put to the vote and with the vote being unanimous, it was resolved that

Decision

Planning permission be **APPROVED, CONTRARY TO THE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

Subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the following approved plans and documents, unless otherwise stated below:

Reason: To define the scope and extent of this permission.

Reference number	Plan type	Date received
-------------------------	------------------	----------------------

	Application Form	27 January 2023
--	------------------	-----------------

22:123-1	Location Plan	27 January 2023
22:123-2 C	Proposed Site Layout	17 January 2024
22:123-3	Proposed Elevations	6 March 2023
304/2023/02 P1	Vehicle Tracking Alignments Plan – Forward Bay Parking	17 November 2023
304/2023/03 P1	Vehicle Tracking Alignments Plan – Reverse Bay Parking	17 November 2023
	Fence Specifications	27 January 2023
	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	4 September 2023
	SUDs Proforma	17 March 2023
	Statement	27 January 2023
	Parking Details	17 November 2023
	Landscaping Specifications	17 January 2024

3. All planting comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting season following the commencement of the development (or within such extended period as may first be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority). Any planting removed, dying or becoming seriously damaged or diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced within the first available planting season thereafter with planting of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent for any variation.

Reason: To enhance the appearance of the development and ensure a satisfactory environment, in accordance with policies DM2, DM12 and DM13 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapters 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

4. The use of the development hereby approved shall only permit a maximum of 6 (six) dogs for exercising on the land at any one time and up to two owners at any one time. There shall not at any time be any professional training, obedience, agility classes or similar taking place on the site.

Use of the site shall be restricted to only between the hours of 8am to

8pm hours on any day.

Reason: To protect the amenity of occupiers of adjacent properties from noise and disturbance, in accordance with policies DM2 and DM14 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

5. No external lighting shall be installed on the application site without prior written consent from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring properties and to minimise light pollution, in accordance with policy DM2 and DM14 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

6. Before the access is first used visibility splays shall be provided as shown on Drawing No. 22:123-2 Rev C with an X dimension of 2.4 metres and a Y dimension of 45 metres [tangential to the nearside edge of the carriageway] and thereafter retained in the specified form. Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 2 Class A of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no obstruction to visibility shall be erected, constructed, planted or permitted to grow over 0.6 metres high within the areas of the C.

Reason: To ensure drivers of vehicles entering the highway have sufficient visibility to manoeuvre safely including giving way to approaching users of the highway without them having to take avoiding action and to ensure drivers of vehicles on the public highway have sufficient warning of a vehicle emerging in order to take avoiding action, if necessary, in accordance with policy DM2 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

7. No other part of the development hereby permitted shall be commenced until the new access has been laid out and completed in all respects in accordance with drawing no. 22:123-2 Rev C with an entrance width of 6 metres.

Reason: To ensure the access is laid out and completed to an acceptable design in the interests of the safety of persons using the access and users of the highway, in accordance with policy DM2 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

8. Prior to the development hereby permitted being first occupied, the new access onto the highway shall be properly surfaced with a bound material for a minimum distance of 5 metres measured from the nearside edge of the metalled carriageway, in accordance with details

that shall have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory access and to avoid unacceptable safety risks arising from materials deposited on the highway from the development, in accordance with policy DM2 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

9. The use shall not commence until the area(s) within the site shown on drawing no's. 22:123-2 Rev C, 304/2023/02, and 304/2023/02 for the purposes of manoeuvring, and parking of vehicles has / have been provided and thereafter the area(s) shall be retained, maintained, and used for no other purposes.

Reason: To ensure that sufficient areas for vehicles to be parked are provided in accordance with Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2019 where on-street parking and manoeuvring would be detrimental to the safe use of the highway, in accordance with policy DM2 and DM46 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

(Councillor Jim Thorndyke left the meeting at the conclusion of this item and did not return.)

415. Planning Application DC/23/0783/VAR - Doctors Hall, Bury Lane, Stanton (Report number: DEV/WS/24/006)

Planning application - application to vary conditions 2 (approved plans), 4 (insulation details) and 6 (breeding bitch numbers) of DC/17/1652/FUL for the material change in the use of the land from paddock to the breeding and keeping of dogs comprising the following: (a) 2.1 metre high close boarded timber fence and concrete post; (b) car parking area; (c) 2no. dog kennels and (d) 1no. stable block as amended by plans received 15 November 2023.

This application was presented before the Development Control Committee in December 2023, with a recommendation by officers for approval. The matter was deferred, for the completion of a 'Risk Assessment' report, with the Committee having resolved that it was 'minded to refuse' the application due to concerns about the noise implications of this proposal, and the consequential adverse effects upon amenity.

In accordance with the Council's Decision Making Protocol, the Committee considered this report which provided a risk assessment of the 'minded to refuse' resolution.

This application was initially referred to the Development Control Committee following consideration by the Delegation Panel. Stanton Parish Council objected to the application, contrary to the officer recommendation for approval.

Further background details regarding the application could be found in Working Paper 1 attached to the report.

A member site visit had previously been undertaken in November 2023.

Speakers: Councillor Jim Thorndyke (Ward Member: Stanton) spoke against the application
Charlie Taylor (applicant) spoke in support of the application
(Councillor Thorndyke was not present at the meeting in order to address the Committee, instead the Democratic Services Officer read out a pre-prepared statement on his behalf)

The Committee had previously expressed concerns regarding aspects of the operation of the site and although not material planning considerations but for members' information, the Licensing team had undertaken an inspection of the premises in late 2023 and the site was considered to be meeting the terms of its dog breeding licence.

This led to a discussion regarding the making of referrals of non-material planning considerations to the appropriate body and The Chair outlined the reporting mechanism for this. It was agreed that a referral be made to the Licensing team as licensing authority for issuing dog breeding licences in West Suffolk in respect of raising the Committee's concerns regarding the welfare of the dogs seen on site when the site visit was undertaken.

Councillor Jon London then proposed that the application be approved, as per the officer recommendation, subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 40 of the report, together with making the referral outlined above to the licensing authority. This was duly seconded by Councillor Don Waldron.

A discussion was held on the planning merits of the application. Concern was expressed regarding the potential impact on the single-track lane that led to the site. Three car parking spaces had been allocated under the present planning permission; however, concern was raised that by increasing the number of breeding bitches from ten to 20, this would effectively be doubling the size of the business and whether this would result in an increase in traffic movements. The three parking spaces were felt to be an insufficient number to accommodate visitors. The Committee was informed that the Highways Authority had not objected to the application for 20 breeding bitches and it was not envisaged that the amount of visits to the site would be significant to cause detriment to the access road. There was scope to enable further parking on the premises if it was deemed necessary.

The discussion turned to the reason for the Committee previously being 'minded to refuse' the application. Some concern remained regarding the potential adverse impacts upon amenity on nearby dwellings as a consequence of noise from the premises, which was largely considered to emanate from barking dogs.

The Public Health and Housing Officer had been satisfied that the noise implications arising from this application were satisfactory, subject to the installation of the required acoustic fence. It was noted that the previously

approved acoustic fence had now been installed in accordance with the outstanding details required by the permission granted under DC/17/1652/FUL. The Public Health and Housing team had powers to address any potential adverse impacts caused to neighbouring properties as a result of noise disturbance. Soft landscaping within the site had also started to be planted.

Following further discussion, the motion for approval was then put to the vote and with 10 voting for the motion, 2 against and 3 abstentions, it was resolved that

Decision:

Planning permission be **APPROVED**, following a Risk Assessment report where the Committee had been 'minded to refuse' and subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the following approved plans and documents:

Reference No:	Plan Type	Date Received
EP727-17-01 Rev A	Location Plan	18.05.2023
EP727-17-02 REV C	Proposed Site Plan	15.11.2023
EP727-23-03 REV B	Proposed Elevations	
	& Floor Plans	15.11.2023
EP727-17-04 REV A	Proposed Elevations & Floor Plans	15.11.2023
HA/AE338/V2	Noise Impact Assessment	18.05.2023

Reason: To define the scope and extent of this permission.

2. All planting comprised in the approved details of landscaping (Drawing Number EP727-17-02 Rev C) shall be carried out in the first planting season (March 2024) with evidence submitted to and acknowledged in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any planting removed, dying or becoming seriously damaged or diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced within the first available planting season thereafter with planting of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent for any variation.

Reason: To enhance the appearance of the development.

3. All of the noise protection and mitigation works associated with the development as detailed in the Healthy Abode (HA) Acoustics Report '*Noise Impact Assessment of Breeding Kennels Incorporating a 2.1 Metre Acoustic Barrier & Details on Sound Insulation to Support Discharge of Planning Consent Ref DC/17/1652/FUL, Condition 4'* (Reference HA/AE338/V2, Date 17 March 2023) shall be completed and retained in their entirety in accordance with the approved details. There shall be no dogs on site unless all acoustic measures have been completed and retained in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To protect the amenity of occupiers of adjacent properties from noise and disturbance, in accordance with policies DM2 and DM14 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Use Classes Order and the General Permitted Development Order 2015, the site shall be used for the purpose hereby approved, and for no other use.

Reason: In the interests of limiting the scope of this permission, in the interests of sustainable development.

5. No more than a total of 20 breeding bitches shall be kept or kennelled on the site at any one time.

Reason: In the interests of limiting the scope of this permission, in the interests of sustainable development and residential amenity.

6. The use hereby permitted shall only be undertaken by the owner and resident of the dwelling known as 'Doctor's Hall' as shown on the land edged in blue on drawing number EP727-17-01 Rev A.

Reason: Reason: In the interest of residential amenity in accordance with Policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Local Plan

7. Within 6 months of the date of this approval, the completion of the works shall be verified on site by a specialist noise consultant and the Local Planning Authority shall be notified in writing of the completion and verification of the works. Thereafter the approved works shall be retained.

Reason: To protect the amenity of occupiers of adjacent properties from noise and disturbance, in accordance with policies DM2 and DM14 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

8. Within 4 months of the date of this approval, a Noise Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Management Plan shall identify management practices to mitigate noise emanating from the development, and such practices shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plan at all times.

Reason: To protect the amenities of occupiers of properties in the locality, in accordance with policy DM2 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

(At this point, the Chair adjourned the meeting for a short comfort break. The meeting resumed at 12.31pm.)

416. **Planning Application DC/23/0812/FUL - 9 Risbygate Street, Bury St Edmunds (Report number: DEV/WS/24/007)**

Planning application - first floor flat above existing restaurant as amended by plans received 08 September 2023

This application was referred to the Development Control Committee following consideration by the Delegation Panel. It was referred to the Delegation Panel at the request of Councillor Julia Wakelam, one of the ward members for Abbeygate Ward.

Bury St Edmunds Town Council had recommended refusal in line with the views of the West Suffolk Conservation Officer, and the Officer recommendation was one of refusal.

A Member site visit was undertaken prior to the meeting.

The Principal Planning Officer reported the following additional comments following the distribution of the agenda and papers for this meeting:

- To clarify that the 2019 planning permission, approved in 2020 for a one bedroom flat at first floor level had now lapsed. That element now formed part of the current proposal albeit now with the addition of a flat roof side element.
- Further comments had been received from the Georgian Society whereby there remained no objections in principle to the extending of the building; however, the proposal was still a relatively large structure in comparison to the host building and other adjacent heritage assets through its scale and massing. The society felt it would cause harm to the historic setting and surrounding Conservation Area and unless a less harmful scheme could be formulated, the society would recommend the application be refused.

Speaker: Councillor Julia Wakelam (Ward Member: Abbeygate) spoke in support of the application.

Some members felt that having visited the site, although flat roofs were not in their opinion particularly aesthetically pleasing, it was felt that the proposed extension would not be publicly visible and therefore would not cause harm to the fabric of the existing listed building or its historical setting within the Conservation Area.

Councillor Lora-Jane Miller-Jones subsequently proposed approval of the application, contrary to the officer recommendation of refusal, which was duly seconded by Councillor Ian Houlder.

The debate continued and although a matter for Building Control, concern was expressed regarding provision of an adequate fire escape route which did not appear to have been satisfactorily provided in the design. The lack of bin storage provision was also of concern to some members; however, it was

noted that if the application were to be approved, a condition could be placed on the applicant to provide suitable bin storage facilities.

Some members felt that if the applicant were to submit a proposal that was more sympathetic and in keeping with the Conservation Area, the principle of the development may be acceptable. Generally, it was felt by some and in agreement with officers and comments made by the Conservation Officer and Victorian Society that through the present proposal's scale and massing, and for reasons of unsympathetic approach, in particular its flat roofed design being in conflict with the steeply pitched roofs of the host building to include historic extensions, it would dominate the historic structures causing harm to their setting and to the surrounding Conservation Area.

Before moving the vote on the motion for approval was taken, the Service Manager (Planning and Development) explained that the Decision Making Protocol would need to be invoked, requiring a Risk Assessment to be produced for consideration by the Committee, therefore making the decision a 'minded to' decision. This was because of the impact the development would potentially have on the listed building, its setting or features of special architectural or historic interest which it possessed, together with the potential impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

It was also reiterated that the development would not need to be publicly visible to cause intrinsic harm to the setting of the listed building and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The Council's duties under the relevant Planning Act regarding Listed Buildings and Conservation Area were also emphasised.

The motion for approval on a 'minded to approve' basis was put to the vote and with the vote being 3 for the motion, 11 against and 1 abstention, the motion was therefore lost.

Councillor Roger Dicker proposed refusal, as per the officer recommendation, and this was duly seconded by Councillor Phil Wittam.

Upon being put to the vote and with 11 voting for the motion, 3 against and 1 abstention, it was resolved that

Decision

Planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reason:

As set out in the NPPF, heritage assets should be conserved in a way that is appropriate to their significance. Heritage assets include an extensive range of features that include archaeological remains, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas.

DM17 states that proposals within Conservation Areas should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area, or its setting, views into, through and out of the area and be of an appropriate scale, form, massing and design. DM15 states that development affecting the setting of a listed building will be permitted where it is not detrimental to the buildings

character, architectural or historic features that contribute to its special interest.

No.9 Risbygate Street is an early nineteenth century structure with later nineteenth century alterations which forms part of a significant group of historic buildings including the adjoining grade II listed No.10, of which it once appears to have formed part. At the rear of the building is an earlier lower wing of eighteenth-century appearance which is also visible from the street. Through its scale and massing, and for reasons of unsympathetic approach, in particular its flat roofed design being in conflict with the steeply pitched roofs of the host building to include historic extensions, the proposed extension will dominate the historic structures causing harm to their setting and to the surrounding Conservation Area.

The proposed therefore development fails to respect the host building and its historic context, proving contrary to policies DM2, DM15, DM17 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015 and policy CS3 of the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy 2010. The development fails to preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area, and would adversely impact on the listed building itself, causing less than substantial harm. There is insufficient public benefit to outweigh this harm which results in a material conflict with paragraph 208 of the 2023 National Planning Policy Framework.

The meeting concluded at 1.09 pm

Signed by:

Chair
