

## **Development Control Committee 2 March 2022**

### **Planning Application DC/21/2261/FUL – Abbey Gardens, Angel Hill, Bury St Edmunds**

**Date registered:** 2 December 2021      **Expiry date:** 27 January 2022  
EOT 05 March 2022

**Case officer:** Connor Vince      **Recommendation:** Approve application

**Parish:** Bury St Edmunds      **Ward:** Abbeygate  
Town Council

**Proposal:** Planning application - re-configuration of staff compound area; a. three bay garage (following demolition of existing concrete garage); b. drainage and irrigation system; c. water bowser area with hose store and greenhouse; d. tarmac surface and skip and compactor area

**Site:** Abbey Gardens, Angel Hill, Bury St Edmunds

**Applicant:** West Suffolk Council (Colin Wright)

**Synopsis:**

Application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and associated matters.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that the committee determine the attached application and associated matters.

**CONTACT CASE OFFICER:**

Connor Vince

Email: [connor.vince@westsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:connor.vince@westsuffolk.gov.uk)

Telephone: 07866 913717

## **Background:**

**This application is before the Development Control Committee as it is an application having been submitted by West Suffolk Council's Property Services department.**

## **Proposal:**

1. Planning permission is sought for the re-configuration of staff compound area within the Abbey Gardens complex. This includes:
  - A three bay garage (following demolition of existing concrete garage)
  - The installation of a drainage and irrigation system
  - The construction of a water bowser area with hose store and greenhouse
  - To tarmac the surface
  - The creation of a skip and compactor area
  
2. For clarity, the building referred to as the 'Mess Room' does not form part of the application, despite the submitted plans and supporting statements referring to it. The indicated works to the Mess Room require planning consent and also have ecological implications, which will be discussed in subsequent sections of this report.

## **Application supporting material:**

- Application Form
- Existing Photographs
- 3D Views
- Location Plan
- Surface Water Drainage
- Existing Site Layout
- Proposed Site Layout
- Cartlodge – Proposed Elevations
- Roof Plan
- Bat Roost Assessment
- Bat Survey
- Biodiversity Checklist
- Design & Access Statement
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Planning Statement
- Greenhouse
- Standpipe Details
- Hose Store Elevations
- Efford Bed Design
- Garage Elevation and Details
- Garage Layout
- Gate Details

## **Site details:**

3. The application site lies within the Abbey Gardens site which is a scheduled ancient monument pursuant to the Ancient Monuments Act 1953. The site is also located within the Bury St Edmunds Conservation Area.

4. The proposal relates to a small section of the Abbey Gardens site which is located to the immediate south of the Garden's boundary wall, adjacent to the Aviary.

### **Planning history:**

5.

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Decision date</b>
DC/14/1864/TCA	Trees in a Conservation Area Notification - 2no Sycamore (7 and 8 on plan) Reduce height by 1.5metres and lateral spread by 1m back to the line of the natural crown shape. 1no Maple (27 on plan) Reduce lateral spread on the north side by 1metre, on the east side by 0.5 metre on South side by 1metre, west and north west side by 1metre. Reduce height on the southern side by 1metre.	Application Withdrawn	3 November 2014
DC/18/2523/FUL	Planning Application - Installation of new plant sales retail building (A1 use) including removal of existing timber frame gardener's store and part of existing aviary	Application Granted	01 April 2019

### **Consultations:**

#### **6. Bury St. Edmunds Town Council:**

- "No objection based on information received, subject to Conservation Area issues and Article 4 issues."

#### **7. Historic England:**

- We recognise this has always been a working area of the park. It provides a valuable supporting function and is vital to the parks maintenance team for supporting the gardening and visitor operation.
- In term of impact the overall footprint of the new development and overall redevelopment of this small area of the park would have a relatively modest impact on the setting of the designated assets and may provide a minor element of enhancement through consolidation of existing facilities and providing a more wholistic approach to the 'back of house' area.

- We note in the Heritage Statement that is applied with the application that attempts have been made to reduce the level and depth impacts of the new scheme to avoid disturbing buried archaeological deposits and this is welcomed. There is however still an unknown element relating to archaeological deposits as to what survives in this area and at what depth. This potential impact therefore does needs to be mitigated.
- This is clearly an important area for the continued operation of the park and garden and its maintenance function we therefore support the proposal to consolidate and refresh this area.
- We recognise the potential for harm but recognise this is likely to be less than substantial in relation to the impact of the proposal on the significance of the designated assets through changes to their setting.
- The heritage statement is however erroneous in terms of the description of additional permission, in particular where it says
- '... it is intended that the excavations for the new garage substructure will not exceed 300 mm below existing ground level. As per Historic England guidance, this is the depth allowed for day-to-day gardening operations at the Abbey Gardens, without the requirement for an Archaeological assessment or field evaluation.'
- The works do not constitute an extension of existing horticultural operations as that is primarily to allow for the continuation of existing planting and these works represent new works (new structures, new pipes, planting beds and so on) in term of the 1979 Act.
- We therefore accept there would likely be some localised archaeological impacts, but we believe these would be mitigated best through a programme of archaeological works. If you are minded to grant planning permission in this case then an archaeological condition on the application would be appropriate as mitigation.
- The applicant does however note and accepts the requirement for Scheduled Monument, Consent and we would therefore anticipate a consent application in due course.
- Historic England supports the application on heritage grounds. We consider that the application meets the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraph numbers 200, 202 and 206.
- In determining this application, you should bear in mind the statutory duty of section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

#### **8. Conservation Officer:**

- This application is for improvements within the gardeners' compound situated in the Abbey Gardens. The compound is located in a discrete corner of the gardens and largely screened from public view by the enclosing fencing and gates. In addition to providing better and safer facilities for the gardeners, the proposals would visually improve the area

and include measures to protect the historic precinct wall which forms the north boundary of the compound.

- Accordingly, I have no objection to this application. A considerable amount of detail has been submitted with the application so no conservation conditions are required.

#### **9. Ecology:**

- We have reviewed both the Bat Roost Assessment report and Bat Surveys report (both Aspen Ecology, Oct 2021) for this application and note that the Mess Room does not form part of this application.
- We note that the bat roost assessment identified that the garage/machine store does not provide any bat roost potential so would support its demolition without any further bat surveys.
- We are satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available for determination of this application. This provides certainty for the LPA of the likely impacts on designated sites, protected and Priority species & habitats and, with appropriate mitigation measures secured, the development can be made acceptable.
- Should any lighting for security reasons be required, we recommend that a condition for a wildlife sensitive lighting scheme is secured by a condition of any consent to avoid impacts on the known bat roost in the Abbey Walls. We note however that there are no details of any biodiversity enhancements to secure net gains for biodiversity, as outlined under Paragraph 174d of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). We therefore recommend that details of reasonable biodiversity enhancement measures should be outlined within a Biodiversity Enhancement Layout such as bird, bat and insect boxes to be secured by a condition of any consent.
- This will enable LPA to demonstrate its compliance with its statutory duties including its biodiversity duty under s40 NERC Act 2006. Impacts will be minimised such that the proposal is acceptable, subject to the conditions below based on BS42020:2013.

#### **10. Landscape comments:**

- The proposed site is located within the grounds of Abbey Gardens, a registered heritage Park and Garden in the centre of Bury St Edmunds. Within Abbey Gardens, the proposed site is located on the northern boundary, adjacent to the historic Abbey wall and formal gardens. The proposal retains the current land use as a staff maintenance compound used for the general maintenance, waste collection, mess facilities and storage within Abbey Gardens, but proposes the reconfiguration of the compound area within the existing perimeter.
- Given its context within Abbey Gardens, the proposal is subject to Policy DM19: Development Affecting Parks and Gardens of Special Historic or Design Interest of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document (2015): Proposals for development which affect the character, setting, or views into and/or out of parks and gardens of special

historic or design interest and their settings must not have a detrimental impact upon:

- a. the overall design and layout;
  - b. features, both built and natural, which form an integral part of the design and layout; and
  - c. views into, through, or out of the park or garden, particularly those which are an integral part of the design.
- In line with Policy DM19, the proposal seeks to retain the layout and appearance of the existing compound within the reconfigured design. Materials are selected based on the existing buildings and fencing within the compound, in addition to marginally raising the height of the close board fence to accommodate the increase in built infrastructure visible within the compound.
  - Whilst the site is located within the grounds, the mature tree belt that runs between the formal gardens and the proposed compound provides substantial screening from much of Abbey Gardens. The location and existing screening from within Abbey Gardens reduces the overall visual impact of the proposal. We do however note the proposed close boarded fence is higher than the existing. For visual amenity purposes and to be sympathetic to the character of the registered Garden we ask that other boundary treatments such as brick walls are explored.
  - The submitted existing photographs suggest that a number of mature trees are present within the vicinity of the proposed site. We therefore seek clarifications as to whether tree works will need to be undertaken to accommodate the proposals.

#### **11. Suffolk County Council as Local Highway Authority:**

- Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highways Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission due to the application not having a detrimental effect upon the adopted highway.

#### **12. Suffolk Archaeology:**

- The proposed development lies within the Scheduled Monument of the medieval abbey of Bury St Edmunds. It will therefore require Scheduled Monument consent, which is administered by Historic England on behalf of the Secretary of State.
- We note from the submission that the scheme has been designed to minimise impacts as far as possible, but will still involve some excavation within the Abbey precinct. We also note Historic England advice that the application relates to a working area of the park, that the harm may be considered less than substantial in relation to the impact of the proposal on the significance of the designated assets, and a recommendation that any consent should be subject to conditions to secure a programme of works.
- Therefore, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 205), any permission granted should be the subject of planning conditions to secure record and advanced understanding of the significance of any heritage asset before it is damaged or destroyed.

## **Representations:**

13. No third-party representations received.

## **Policy:**

14. On 1 April 2019 Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council were replaced by a single authority, West Suffolk Council. The development plans for the previous local planning authorities were carried forward to the new Council by regulation. The development plans remain in place for the new West Suffolk Council and, with the exception of the Joint Development Management Policies Document (which had been adopted by both councils), set out policies for defined geographical areas within the new authority. It is therefore necessary to determine this application with reference to policies set out in the plans produced by the now dissolved St Edmundsbury Borough Council.

The following policies of the Joint Development Management Policies Document and the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy 2010 & Vision 2031 have been taken into account in the consideration of this application:

### **SEBC Core Strategy 2010**

- Core Strategy Policy CS1 - St Edmundsbury Spatial Strategy
- Core Strategy Policy CS2 - Sustainable Development
- Core Strategy Policy CS3 - Design and Local Distinctiveness

### **Bury Vision 2031 document**

- Vision Policy BV1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

### **Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015**

- Policy DM1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy DM2 Creating Places Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness
- Policy DM10 Impact of Development on Sites of Biodiversity and Geodiversity Importance
- Policy DM11 Protected Species
- Policy DM12 Mitigation, Enhancement, Management and Monitoring of Biodiversity
- Policy DM13 Landscape Features
- Policy DM17 Conservation Areas
- Policy DM19 Development Affecting Parks and Gardens of Special Historic or Design Interest
- Policy DM20 Archaeology
- Policy DM46 Parking Standards

### **Other planning policy:**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021

The NPPF was revised in July 2021 and is a material consideration in decision making from the day of its publication. Paragraph 219 is clear however, that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were

adopted or made prior to the publication of the revised NPPF. Due weight should be given to them according to their degree of consistency with the Framework; the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework; the greater weight that may be given. The policies set out within the Joint Development Management Policies have been assessed in detail and are considered sufficiently aligned with the provision of the 2021 NPPF that full weight can be attached to them in the decision making process.

### **Officer comment:**

15. The issues to be considered in the determination of the application are:

- Principle of Development
- Design, Form and Scale & Resulting Impact of the Proposal upon Heritage Assets
- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Ecological implications
- Arboricultural Implications
- Archaeological Implications
- Other Matters

### **Principle of Development**

16. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) requires that applications are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan for St Edmundsbury comprises the Core Strategy, the three Vision 2031 Area Action Plans and the Joint Development Management Policies Document. Policies set out within the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained at its heart are also material considerations.

17. Development will need to be in accordance with policy DM2 and is considered generally to be acceptable provided that the proposal respects the character and appearance of the immediate and surrounding area, and providing that there is not an adverse impact upon residential amenity and highway safety. Along with CS3, DM2 requires development to conserve and where possible enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the area.

18. The principle of development in this location is therefore something the LPA are able to support, subject to other material planning considerations which, in this instance, are predominantly related to the impact of the proposal upon Abbey Gardens and the Bury St Edmunds Conservation Area.

### **Design, Form and Scale and Resulting Impact of the Proposal upon Heritage Assets**

19. The proposal under determination involves the demolition of the existing concrete garage within the staff compound, as well as re-configuration and general improvement to the site. The compound is located in a discrete corner of the wider Abbey Gardens and largely screened from public view by the enclosing fencing and gates, adjacent to The Aviary.

20. The proposal includes the addition of tarmac and gravel over the existing hard surfacing area, with outlined walking routes. A designated skip (three spaces) and compacting area will be situated on the north-eastern edge of the application site. The existing concrete garage on the north-western edge of the



site is to be demolished and replaced with a brick and timber, 3-bay garage with a pitched roof form approximately 1 metre east of the sales building adjacent to the site. The greenhouse is to be relocated to the south-eastern edge of the site with hose store within this designated water bowser area. Lastly, the installation of a drainage and irrigation system is proposed on the south-western edge of the site. The Mess Room does not form part of this application.

21. The application site lies within the Bury St Edmunds Conservation area and Abbey Gardens is a scheduled monument in its own right. Accordingly, the impact upon these heritage assets must be considered fully as per the statutory duty placed on the LPA by paragraphs 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

22. In policy terms the National Planning Policy Framework identifies protection and enhancement of the historic environment as an important element of sustainable development and establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development in the planning system (paragraphs 7, 8, 10 and 11). The core planning principles of the NPPF are observed in paragraphs 8 and 11 which propose a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This includes the need to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life for this and future generations as set out in Chapter 16.

23. At paragraph 199 the NPPF goes on to require planning authorities to place 'great weight' on the conservation of designated heritage assets, and states that the more important the asset the greater the weight should be, and that 'this is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance'. Paragraph 200 also recognises that the significance of an asset can be harmed from development within the setting of an asset, and that 'any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification'. It is also recognised in the NPPF (paragraph 201) that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

24. As confirmed by Historic England and the Conservation Officer, this specific area of the Abbey Gardens has traditionally been a working area of the park. It provides a valuable supporting function and is vital to the parks maintenance team for supporting the gardening and visitor operation.

25. The overall footprint of the development and subsequent redevelopment of this works area of the park is considered to have a relatively modest impact on the setting of the designated assets and may provide a minor element of enhancement through consolidation of existing facilities whilst providing a more holistic approach to the 'back of house' area.

26. As confirmed within the submitted Heritage Statement, attempts have been made to by the applicant to reduce the level and depth impacts of the new scheme to avoid disturbing buried archaeological deposits, an approach welcomed by Historic England in particular. All matters relating to Archaeological deposits are discussed below. However, Historic England supports the application on heritage grounds and consider that the application meets the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraph numbers 200, 202 and 206.

27. The proposal is therefore able to meet the requirements of policies DM17, DM19 and DM20.

### **Impact on Residential Amenity**

28. Whilst the proposed development is located within the confines of Abbey Gardens, there are residential properties to the North of the application site, beyond the Abbey wall. Accordingly, given the thrust of policy DM2, the potential impact of the proposal upon existing residential amenity must be considered.

29. In this instance, the proposed works will not be visible from within the residential properties and the proposed re-configuration and improvement works to the compound are not considered to engender any adverse implications that the LPA would otherwise seek to resist. Given the enclosed nature of the application site and the extent to which the use will assimilate into the existing Abbey Gardens site, the proposal is not judged to give rise to an unacceptable impact with respect to residential amenity.

### **Ecological Implications**

30. As required by the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) at paragraphs 8c, 174 and 179 the LPA have a duty to consider the conservation of biodiversity and to ensure that valued landscapes or sites of biodiversity are protected when determining planning applications. At a local level, this is exhibited through policies CS2, CS3, DM10, DM11 and DM12.

31. Policy DM11 states that development will not be permitted unless suitable satisfactory measures are in place to reduce the disturbance to protected species and either maintain the population on site or provide alternative suitable accommodation. Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 requires that public authorities (which explicitly include the Local Planning Authority) must have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.

32. Policy DM12 seeks to ensure that, where there are impacts to biodiversity, development appropriately avoids, mitigates or compensates for those impacts. The policy requires that all development proposals promote ecological growth and enhancement.

33. The National Planning Policy Framework (2021) indicates that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities must aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity and that opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged (Paragraph 180). This is underpinned by Paragraph 8 of the NPPF, which details the three overarching objectives that the planning system should try to achieve and it is here that the Framework indicates that planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

34. It is not anticipated that the proposal would have a harmful impact on biodiversity interests in this case. Nonetheless, noting the need to secure biodiversity enhancements in any scheme, a condition which requires the submission of basic ecological enhancement measures is recommended.

35. The submitted Bat Survey notes that the bat roost assessment identified that the garage/machine store does not provide any bat roost potential and so would support its demolition without any further bat surveys.

36. The LPA and Ecology consultant are satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available for determination of this application. This provides certainty for the LPA of the likely impacts on designated sites, protected and Priority species and habitats and, with appropriate mitigation measures secured, the development can be made acceptable.

37. A condition requiring the submission of biodiversity enhancement measures has therefore been imposed. These biodiversity enhancements have been recommended to secure measurable net gains for biodiversity, as outlined under Paragraph 174d of the National Planning Policy Framework 20121

38. As the Mess Room does not form part of this application, no further surveys are required in this instance prior to determination. The applicant has been made aware of the need for further survey work to the Mess Room in advance of any future planning application.

### **Arboricultural Implications**

39. Policy DM13 states development will be permitted where it will not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character of the landscape, landscape features, wildlife, or amenity value.

40. The proposed site is located within the grounds of Abbey Gardens, a registered heritage Park and Garden in the centre of Bury St Edmunds. Given its context within Abbey Gardens, the proposal is subject to Policy DM19, as previously mentioned.

41. Policy DM19 states: Proposals for development which affect the character, setting, or views into and/or out of parks and gardens of special historic or design interest and their settings must not have a detrimental impact upon:

- a. the overall design and layout;
- b. features, both built and natural, which form an integral part of the design and layout; and
- c. views into, through, or out of the park or garden, particularly those which are an integral part of the design.

42. In line with Policy DM19, the proposal seeks to retain the layout and appearance of the existing compound within the reconfigured design. Materials are selected based on the existing buildings and fencing within the compound, in addition to marginally raising the height of the close board fence to accommodate the increase in built infrastructure visible within the compound.

43. A mature tree belt runs between the formal gardens and the proposed compound provides substantial screening from much of Abbey Gardens. The location and existing screening from within Abbey Gardens reduces the overall visual impact of the proposal.

44. In response to the comments received from Place Services – Landscaping, no arboricultural works are proposed as confirmed by the supporting documents, with the existing fencing on the southern boundary to be replaced with a moderately taller 2.1 metre fence than the current 1.8 metre high fence. There will be no further encroachment into the soft landscaping area which screens the site from wider public view from the Abbey Gardens. The material choice for the

replacement fence is therefore considered to be acceptable, with no wider concerns raised by the Conservation Officer.

45. As previously mentioned, the site is located within a conservation area. Therefore, if any works would be needed to facilitate the proposed works, given the context of the area and the mature soft landscaping specimens, any tree over 75mm in diameter, at 1.5m above ground level, is automatically protected.

### **Archaeological Implications**

46. Policy DM20 (Archaeology) states development will not be acceptable if it would have a material adverse effect on Scheduled Ancient Monuments or other sites of archaeological importance, or their settings.

47. On sites of archaeological interest, or of potential archaeological importance, provided there is no overriding case against development, planning permission will be granted subject to satisfactory prior arrangements being agreed.

This will include one or a combination of the following:

- a. an appropriate desk based assessment and/or field evaluation of the archaeological interest or significance prior to determination.
- b. the preservation of archaeological remains in situ;
- c. the adequate recording of the heritage asset by archaeological investigation before development commences (preservation by record).

48. Suffolk County Council's Archaeology service have confirmed that there is a need for a planning condition which requires a programme of works, which has been agreed with the applicant.

49. Given the context of the application, Scheduled Monument Consent is also required for the works, as confirmed by Historic England. The applicant is aware of this requirement and is taking the necessary measures to apply accordingly.

### **Other Matters**

50. Given the nature of the proposed works, there will be no adverse impacts upon the adopted highway, as confirmed by the Local Highway Authority. The proposed works will be used in conjunction with the maintenance of the Abbey Gardens site.

### **Conclusion:**

51. In conclusion, the principle and detail of the development are considered to be acceptable and in compliance with relevant development plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Recommendation:**

52. It is recommended that planning permission be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than 3 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:

Reason: To define the scope and extent of this permission

3. No development above ground level shall take place until details of a hard landscaping scheme for the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include proposed finished levels and contours showing earthworks and mounding; surfacing materials; means of enclosure and boundary treatments; car parking layouts; other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulations areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (for example furniture, play equipment, refuse and/or other storage units, signs, lighting and similar features); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (for example drainage, power, communications cables and pipelines, indicating lines, manholes, supports and other technical features); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration where relevant. The scheme shall be implemented prior to the occupation of any part of the development (or within such extended period as may first be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority).

Reason - To assimilate the development into its surroundings and protect the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with policies DM2 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. No development shall take place on site until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work has been secured, in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme of investigation shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:
  - a. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording.
  - b. The programme for post investigation assessment.
  - c. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording.
  - d. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation.
  - e. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation.
  - f. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.
  - g. Timetable for the site investigation to be completed prior to development, or in such other phased arrangement, as agreed and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard archaeological assets within the approved development boundary from impacts relating to any groundworks associated with the development scheme and to ensure the proper and timely investigation, recording, reporting and presentation of archaeological assets affected by this development in accordance with

policy DM20 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies. This condition is required to be agreed prior to the commencement of any development to ensure matters of archaeological importance are preserved and secured early to ensure avoidance of damage or loss due to the development and/or its construction. If agreement was sought at any later stage there is an unacceptable risk of loss and damage to archaeological and historic assets.

5. A lighting design scheme for biodiversity shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall identify those features on site that are particularly sensitive for bats and that are likely to cause disturbance along important routes used for foraging; and show how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting location plan and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent bats using their territory.

All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the scheme and maintained thereafter in accordance with the scheme. Under no circumstances should any other external lighting be installed without prior consent from the local planning authority.

Reason: To allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 as amended and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority habitats & species). To safeguard the visual amenities of the locality and the ecological value of the area, in accordance with policies DM2 and DM12 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

6. Prior to development above slab level, details of biodiversity enhancement measures to be installed at the site, including details of the timescale for installation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any such measures as may be agreed shall be installed in accordance with the agreed timescales and thereafter retained as so installed. There shall be no occupation unless and until details of the biodiversity enhancement measures to be installed have been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To secure biodiversity enhancements commensurate with the scale of the development, in accordance with policies DM11 and DM12 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

<b>Reference No:</b>	<b>Plan Type</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
169/2021/11 P1	Application Form	15 November 2021
	Existing Photographs	15 November 2021
	3D Views	15 November 2021
	Location Plan	15 November 2021
	Surface Water	15 November 2021
	Drainage	15 November 2021

WSC6004 001	Existing Site Layout	15 November 2021
WSC6004 002	Proposed Site Layout	15 November 2021
WSC6004 004	Cartlodge – Proposed Elevations	15 November 2021
WSC6004 009	Roof Plan	15 November 2021
AE21081	Bat Roost Assessment	15 November 2021
AE21081	Bat Survey	15 November 2021
	Biodiversity Checklist	15 November 2021
20078	Design & Access Statement	15 November 2021
	Flood Risk Assessment	15 November 2021
	Planning Statement	15 November 2021
	Greenhouse	02 December 2021
	Standpipe Details	02 December 2021
WSC6004	Hose Store Elevations	02 December 2021
WSC6004 003	Efford Bed Design	02 December 2021
WSC6004 005	Garage Elevation and Details	02 December 2021
WSC6004 006	Garage Layout	02 December 2021
WSC6004 007	Gate Details	02 December 2021

**Documents:**

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online <DC/21/2261/FUL>