

Development Control Committee 7 December 2022

Planning Application DC/22/0994/FUL – The Old Blacksmiths, The Street, Gazeley

Date registered:	6 June 2022	Expiry date:	1 August 2022 (EOT 9 December 2022)
Case officer:	Savannah Cobbold	Recommendation:	Approve application
Parish:	Gazeley	Ward:	Kentford and Moulton
Proposal:	Planning application - Reconstruct existing building, extension and conversion of forge to create two dwellings		
Site:	The Old Blacksmiths, The Street, Gazeley		
Applicant:	Mr P Wiseman		

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:

Savannah Cobbold

Email: savannah.cobbold@westsuffolk.gov.uk

Telephone: 07971 534117

Background:

The application was considered by the Delegation Panel on 15 November 2022 at the request of the Ward Member (Councillor Roger Dicker), where it was decided that the application should be presented at Development Control Committee.

Proposal:

1. The application seeks planning permission for the reconstruction of the existing forge building, along with a small extension, plus the conversion of the forge to create two dwellings. At present, the building is in a state of disrepair and is currently fenced off to protect the public under the provisions Building Control legislation.
2. The building will remain generally on the same footprint and the only notable change relates to the small rear element, which will consist of a slightly different roof form.
3. The existing building is subject to ongoing enforcement investigations that have led to the service of a Notice under Section 215 of the Town and Country Planning Act which requires the demolition of the building. Section 215 can be used to require works to be undertaken to remedy the appearance of land or buildings where that appearance is causing harm to the amenity of the area, as was considered the case in this matter due to the poor appearance of the structure. Compliance has been outstanding since July 2021 but the Notice does not in itself preclude the granting of planning permission, which must be considered on its own merits. Furthermore, if planning permission were to be granted and implemented, then the requirements of the Notice would be withdrawn.

Application supporting material:

- Application form
- Location plan
- Existing elevations and floor plan
- Proposed elevations and floor plans
- Block plan
- Design and access statement
- Structural survey

Site details:

4. The application site sits within the settlement boundary for Gazeley, fronting onto The Street. The building sits in a prominent position on an existing green area, sitting forward of a public house (The Chequers). There is a bus stop that sits towards the south of the site which is fenced off due to the current state of the building. There are various residential dwellings in the immediate proximity of the site.

5. Consultations:

Environment Team

No objections subject to conditions.

Public Health and Housing

No objections subject to conditions.

Suffolk County Council as Local Highway Authority

No objections subject to conditions – please refer to report.

Representations:

6. 18 letters of representation have been received which between them raise the following matters.
7. Officer comments are added where relevant in italics.
 - No objection but concerns that the proposal will not be brought forward and the eyesore would therefore remain indefinitely.
 - It is sad to see the loss of the building but it is already beyond repair and the demolition order should stand. The property is not fit or safe.
 - The building is currently spoiling the beauty and centre of the village. It would be much more beneficial if the space was utilised as village green.
 - Parked cars would be a hazard.
 - The properties have no gardens.
 - Query the accuracy of the plans. *Officers are satisfied that the plans are accurate.*
 - Query how services would be provided at the property. *This would be an issue for the developer to satisfy, including rights to cross any third party land.*
 - Query whether any trees would be affected. *There are no trees that would be affected.*
 - Query surface water and foul sewerage issues.
 - Any further expansion would encroach on the village green. *Any further expansion of the building would require planning permission.*
 - The proposed development would have a devastating and permanent impact on the use of the green and to the Gazeley community.
 - There is limited space for cycles and bins.
 - There is inadequate parking. *The plans have been amended to now show a car free scheme. SCC as Local Highway Authority offer no objections.*
 - The proposed windows would open directly onto the green and bus stop which would limit enjoyment of the green.
 - The proposal conflicts with Para. 130 of the NPPF and Para. 185.
 - The proposal would adversely affect the viability of the public house.
 - How will downpipes and guttering work? *Any fixtures on the exterior of the building would require the approval of any adjoining landowners.*

- The building has no solid foundations so how will it be built without encroaching on third party land. *This would be a matter covered by the Party Wall Act.*
- What has been done to ensure the privacy of residents and users of the bus stop?
- If approved the building should look the same as the current building.
- This would set a precedent for other applications. *All applications are considered on their own merits.*
- Strongly support the application.
- This is a sympathetic reconstruction of the building that will be in keeping.
- The site will never again function as a viable business and the proposed change of use to permit it to be developed as two small dwellings is, I submit, a modest one and a price well worth paying in order to improve the appearance of this part of the village which is currently severely blighted.
- Refusing this and allowing the building to be demolished would not lead to the space being incorporated back into the green.
- Objections on parking grounds are misplaced.
- Windows overlooking the green will preclude the use of the green.
- It is an eyesore and fully support the proposal.
- It will give first time buyers an opportunity to purchase in the village.
- How will the building be maintained once built?
- How will natural light be provided in the property?
- Changing from commercial to residential is the best possible outcome.
- Cars parked outside will calm traffic on The Street.
- There is enough garden and bin storage space.
- The proposal would be in the best interests of the village.
- Has a building regulations application been submitted? *This is not a material consideration.*
- Can the LPA require works to be completed within 24 months? *No, it would not be reasonable to impose such a requirement.*
- Does the car parking meet standards? *No, it does not, but no objection to such has been received from the Local Highway Authority.*

Gazeley Parish Council

8. 12 August 2022: The Parish Council has considered all the comments that have been submitted on the above application. The Parish Council has also held a village meeting to enable residents to comment further. The Blacksmith's Forge is a commercial storage property situated on the village green and has been in a state of dilapidation for many years. The village green is owned and maintained by Gazeley Parish Council. Due to the unsafe nature of the site, the use of this important amenity (including the bus stop) has been limited for quite some time. In March 2021 the walls of the building started to collapse and the District Council surrounded the whole building with emergency fencing in order to protect the public from falling masonry and roof timbers. At that point a Section 215 order was issued to the owner for the demolition of the building. The forge was subsequently sold but we understand that the demolition order is still 'live'. The saga of the Blacksmith's Forge has been one of increasing frustration to the residents of Gazeley and undoubtedly the feeling in the village is that a swift resolution to what has become a dangerous and unsightly property in the heart of the village is needed. The majority feedback from the village meeting was to support applications for a restoration of the property. That said, the plans that have been submitted by the new owner for the renovation of the building to restore it to its previous condition and to convert in into two dwellings need very careful consideration. This is a property which is not currently a residential one and does not have electricity, running water or sewerage facilities. Whilst there is large support for a successful renovation, it is the duty of the Parish Council to ensure that all views are put forward. To this end, several concerns have been raised in the village by residents who live nearest to the site and would be the most affected have included the following:

1 The possible lack of parking provision, in an area where none of the surrounding cottages have parking facilities, and the fear that future residents of the two units might have as many as four vehicles on the site, in which case two would have to be parked on the road. It is noted that Highways Development Control are unable to comment on the application due to lack of information and have recommended a holding objection until such information becomes available.

2 The lack of amenity space for the residents, as the building is abutted to three sides by a Registered Village Green.

3 The feasibility of providing enough space at the front of the building for the envisaged parking of two vehicles, six refuse bins, storage for two bikes, paths, lawns and hedges, as detailed on the plans.

4 The privacy of future residents, when all the windows will face the village green at ground level, especially as the building is in such close proximity to the Chequers public house, the public bus stop and bus shelter.

It is noted that the applicable period for the commencement of the project is three years, once the necessary approval has been obtained. However, as already mentioned, for the past 18 months the village has lost the amenity of the village green, and of the public bus shelter, because the building has, of necessity, been surrounded by the protective fencing. If

the application is approved, the Parish Council would like to see the work started as soon as possible so that these vital amenities can be restored to the village.

It is of some concern to the Parish Council that the present owner has failed to respond to correspondence sent to him, via his solicitor, with regard to his entering into an Access Licence Agreement to protect the village green and to allow access for contractors to install the necessary services to the site. It is essential that the green should be restored to its previous condition, once the work is finished, and that an agreement is in place before any contractors are allowed to access parish land.

Gazeley Parish Council is supportive of any attempts to restore this building to something resembling its previous appearance on the condition that all the above issues raised are properly addressed.

9. **15 November 2022:** This further submission is made by the Parish Council in response to the letter issued by Suffolk County Council (Highways Development Control) dated 27 October 2022 of which it has since received clarification to the effect that;

“given the previous use of the building street parking for these 2 small units would not create concerns in relation to highway safety”.

This statement contradicts HDC’s earlier provisional comment dated 28 July 2022, arising out of the original plans submitted by the applicant on 6 June 2022, that;

“The parking arrangement is acceptable in principle however the applicant should widen the parallel parking bay to 3m and lengthen them to 7m to facilitate safe access to the properties and width for driver egress on the roadside.”

HDC has offered no details of further information it requested/received of the applicant subsequent to its letter of 28 July 2022 or the circumstances which led to the applicant’s revised plan being submitted on 21 October 2022.

In the absence of any evidence to the contrary it is inferred that the applicant’s revised plan was filed as a result of further consultations between him, HDC and/or WSC and the details of which have not been made known to the Parish Council.

In its original submission the Parish Council noted their concerns that the application could lead to a; “possible lack of parking provision, in an area where none of the surrounding cottages have parking facilities, and the fear that future residents of the two units might have as many as four vehicles on the site, in which case two would have to be parked on the road.”

The proposed switch from on site to on street parking only serves to highlight and reinforce the Parish Council’s initial concerns regarding the lack of adequate parking provision.

Suffolk County Council’s own Guidance for Parking 2019 notes that: “parking is part of the palette that makes for a high quality environment and sense of place”.

Although the Parish Council is in principle sympathetic to the application it is respectfully submitted that the use of on street parking for the purposes of this development will not achieve the most desirable or satisfactory result for the village as a whole.

In particular the use of on street parking does not take into consideration the very close proximity of the proposed development to the junction of The Street/Higham Road and the former's junction with Stubbins Lane thereby increasing the risk of vehicle collisions at both junctions due to reduced visibility and the fact that they are both unlit at night.

In so far as HDC asserts that off street parking is satisfactory having regard to the "previous use of the building" the Parish Council submits that if in line with the current application the proposed change of use is permitted then parking provision must reflect its future usage and that its historical use as the former village forge is entirely irrelevant in this context.

The proposed use of on street parking to serve the development also fails to take into consideration its proximity to other nearby residential properties without on site parking, the use of the feeder road for parking by patrons of The Chequers PH, its proximity to Grade 1 listed All Saints Church, Gazeley, its proximity to the village green (which surrounds the property on all sides, save for its front elevation) and the adjacent village bus stop and shelter which is situate within a few feet of its southern elevation.

In conclusion the Parish Council urges HDC to reconsider its decision dated 27 October 2022 and to proceed in line with its provisional recommendations dated 6 June 2022 on the grounds that if its current decision stands it will significantly compromise highway safety in the immediate proximity of the development as well as compromising the village's environment and sense of place.

Policy:

10. 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 Forest Heath District Council.
11. The following policies of the Joint Development Management Policies Document and the Forest Heath Core Strategy 2010 have been taken into account in the consideration of this application:

Policy DM1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy DM2 Creating Places Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness

Policy DM7 Sustainable Design and Construction

Policy DM11 Protected Species

Policy DM12 Mitigation, Enhancement, Management and Monitoring of Biodiversity

Policy DM14 Protecting and Enhancing Natural Resources, Minimising Pollution and Safeguarding Hazards

Policy DM22 Residential Design

Policy DM46 Parking Standards

Core Strategy Policy CS1 - Spatial Strategy

Core Strategy Policy CS5 - Design quality and local distinctiveness

Other planning policy:

12.National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

13.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:

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

- Principle of development
- Impact on character and appearance of the area
- Impact on residential amenity
- Highway safety impacts
- Other matters

Principle of development

15.Policy DM1 states that when considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.

16.Policy CS1 of the Forest Heath Core Strategy deals with spatial strategy and states that the protection of the natural and historic environment, the

distinctive character of settlements and the ability to deliver infrastructure will take priority when determining the location of future development.

17. The application seeks planning permission for the reconstruction and conversion of the existing forge building to create two dwellings within the settlement boundary of Gazeley where within this area the principle of a new dwelling is generally considered acceptable subject to compliance with policies relating, amongst other things, to design, scale, layout, access and trees. Development such as the provision of a new dwelling will need to be in accordance with policy DM2 and requires proposals to respect the character and appearance of the immediate and surrounding area, and that there is not an adverse impact upon residential amenity, highway safety or important trees within the street scene. Along with CS5, DM2 requires development to conserve and where possible enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the area.
18. The existing building is subject to ongoing enforcement investigations that have led to the service of a Notice under Section 215 of the Town and Country Planning Act that requires the demolition of the building. Compliance is outstanding but the Notice does not in and of itself preclude the granting of planning permission in this instance, which must be considered on its own merits.
19. The structural survey provided with the application leads Officers to conclude that, based on the nature and extent of works required, that this proposal is a new building, rather than the conversion of the existing structure. The structural survey confirms that the building is not capable of conversion without such significant works that in the opinion of officers means that it would largely amount to a new structure.
20. Therefore, the assessment made by officers is on the basis of this being a new building within the settlement boundary, not as a conversion of an existing building. In reaching this conclusion officers note that the structural survey submitted with the application denotes that only a visual inspection was made and is in relation only to 'accessible parts' of the building. No structural measurements or calculations appear to have been taken or made. From a site visit, the condition of the building is clearly dilapidated and this alone casts significant doubt on the ability of the building to be converted. The survey submitted further indicates that parts of the wall have fallen away and the original roof has been removed. It also shows that the building has been in this condition for some considerable time. Extensive remedial works are required to flintwork and essential maintenance and repairs are necessary to allow for reinstatement of the building. It has also identified that there are several holes where flintwork is not in a satisfactory condition.
21. On this basis the proposal is considered to be a replacement building, not a conversion, as a matter of judgement based on the above matters and conclusions. However, noting the position of the building within the settlement boundary this is considered to be a development type that is supportable as a matter of principle, subject nonetheless to a further consideration of the matters of detail.
22. In this instance therefore, the principle of the development is considered acceptable.

Impact on character and appearance of the area

23. Policy DM22 states that all residential development proposals should maintain or create a sense of place and/or character by basing design on an analysis of existing buildings and landscape; and utilising the characteristics of the locality to create buildings and spaces that have a strong sense of place and distinctiveness.
24. In this case, the existing building is in an extremely dilapidated state in which the majority of the roof form is non-existent and for this reason, the site has been fenced off for public safety. The building has been a feature within the village of Gazeley for a number of years and features traditional flint walls. The proposals seek to restore the building to its original appearance with minor alterations to the fenestration in order to suit the new use and internal layout, albeit as concluded above, the current condition of the building plus the extent of works necessary does lead to a conclusion that it is a replacement building. There is however no increase in size to the floor area of the existing building nor any increase in height.
25. The proposal incorporates flint work and red brick quoins in order to reflect the existing forge building. Noting the condition of the existing structure on the site, this proposal is considered to better enhance the building, bringing it back to viable use.
26. Given the mixed character of this area of Gazeley and noting the condition of the existing building on site, this proposal is considered to positively reinforce the existing structure on site and enhance the character and appearance of the area.

Impact on residential amenity

27. The proposed dwellings are to sit in the same position as the existing forge building which is located on the village green. The building itself is detached and is generally spaced away from residential dwellings within proximity of the site. The building will remain as single storey and it is therefore considered that no harm will result upon residential amenity.
28. Representations have been received regarding this application, but these have been summarised under the representations tab of this report.
29. Given the location of the existing building, in a central location on village green, the impact on residential amenity is therefore considered satisfactory, noting the separation distance, in line with the requirements of policy DM2.

Highway safety impacts

30. On first submission of the application, the block plan showed a single parking space for each dwelling at the front of the site. The Local Highway Authority advised that the parking bay needed to be expanded in order to measure 7 metres by 3 metres to facilitate a safe access to the properties and width for driver egress on the roadside. The applicant supplied a revised plan showing the revised parking bays, however a further response from the Local Highway Authority then provided further objection

to the scheme as they had noted that the proposed spaces were in fact partially on land identified as public highway.

31. It is not acceptable for private parking spaces to be conditioned for retention on the highway, as the highway must remain available for the public in perpetuity. It was therefore requested that the applicant either find an alternative way to provide parking spaces in order to not obstruct the highway or otherwise to remove any proposed car parking spaces from the scheme. The result of this being that any parking associated with the dwellings would be on street.
32. The block plan also showed the provision of hedging along the boundary of the parking spaces in which the Local Highway Authority concluded that this was unacceptable because this planting would be on the highway and also because the southern boundary would have a detrimental impact on the departure area for buses leaving the adjacent bus stop.
33. The applicant provided a land registry map to show that the land was within their ownership. However, the ownership of the land is not contested it is simply that part of the land in the title of this property is maintainable highway and that development cannot therefore proceed within this area. Noting the limitations of the red line application site area, the applicant advised it would be near impossible to provide parking elsewhere on the site. Officers sought further advice from the Local Highway Authority and queried if the scheme would be looked at more favourably if the proposed car parking and front garden obstructions were removed completely. Noting that the roads in the vicinity have no restrictions precluding parking it would then be for vehicles associated with the dwellings to park where safe to do so. Officers also questioned if they would prefer to see a single unit, with an attached garage/carport. In the opinion of officers, the use of two dwellings with one bedroom each would generate a maximum of three cars for this whole development, thereby not putting any material pressure on on-street parking at any level that would give rise to highway safety related concerns.
34. The Local Highway Authority confirmed that an informal, unconditioned parking arrangement would be preferable taking into account the past commercial use of the site. There are no parking restrictions so parking in the vicinity would not be prohibited. Putting aside the highway obstacles/parking matter, the Local Highway Authority is open to all of the potential development configurations. They would wish to see sustainable transport measures supported with cycle storage facilities.
35. An amended plan was put forward, and the Local Highway Authority provided the following comments.

'On the assumption that residents may choose to park to the front, it was suggested the front hedge is not appropriate because it would prevent cars being parked clear of the carriageway. It would be desirable if the frontage area was not lawn, but was surfaced and could be used as informal parking'.
36. A further amended plan was put forward which shows 'grasscrete' at the front of the dwellings. The Local Highway Authority has confirmed that it has no objections to this and are satisfied that this is the optimal outcome

with regards to the safety of the highway. Given previous commercial use of the site, the unrestricted nature of on-street parking and the general arrangement of roads in the area the Local Highways Authority has raised no objection to the lack of on-site parking for this development and is satisfied this will not create highway safety concerns such that the application should be refused. The development demonstrates adequate secure cycle storage and is therefore considered to be in line with DM2 and DM46.

Other matters

37. The application is not supported by any information on land contamination. As the proposals are for a change of use to new dwellings, policy would normally require a land contamination assessment to be submitted with the application. The former use as a forge would normally be considered a potential source of contamination due to the historic activities at these sites. However, it is noted the very small scale of the development and site and its open nature mean the environment team consider that undertaking a desk based land contamination survey is unlikely to give any significant further details. However, small areas of landscaping are proposed to the front of the properties and there is the potential for future residents to interact with potentially contaminated soils. It was recommended that the standard land contamination condition is attached, should planning be granted.
38. Following amended plans, and removal of planting at the front of the site, the environment team have confirmed that the requirement for land contamination surveys is now not needed and Policy DM14 is therefore satisfied. No objections are offered by this service.
39. Public Health and Housing has reviewed the information submitted with this application and also raise no objections to this application subject to conditions relating to construction hours, which is considered reasonable to control via condition.
40. The Local Planning Authority is required 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) as updated by the Environment Act 2021.
41. Noting the condition of the existing structure on site, it is not considered that this would be suitable for roosting bats. The Local Planning Authority support biodiversity net gain through condition to secure the placement of ecological enhancements in accordance with Policies DM11 and DM12. This has therefore been conditioned.
42. During the course of the application, various representations have been submitted with regard to the proposal. A mix of support and objection comments have been received. Residents have raised no objections to the proposals but are concerned that the proposal will not be brought forward, and that the demolition order should still stand; the building is spoiling the beauty and centre of the village and it would be much more beneficial if the space was utilised as village green.

43. Concerns have been raised regarding car parking and how cars parked on the road would be a hazard. Following negotiations and discussions with the Local Highways Authority, no objections are raised to a car free scheme noting the 'no restrictions' to on-street parking. The front of the properties is to be laid with grasscrete to create informal car parking. Concerns have also been raised regarding the fact the properties will have no gardens; there is a small area of amenity space towards the front of the dwellings. Queries have been raised regarding the plans and how services would be provided to the properties; this would be an issue for the developer to satisfy, including rights across third party land. It is questioned if any trees would be affected by this development and how any further expansion would encroach on village green. No trees will be affected by this development and any further plans to extend the building would require planning permission which would be considered on its own merits.
44. Residents request that the building should look the same as the current building. The information submitted with the application concludes that the proposal will be to rebuild the building like for like and to restore it to its original appearance prior to its recent dilapidation with some minor alterations to fenestration.
45. In order to maintain the appearance of the building, Officers consider it appropriate to restrict permitted development rights in relation to alterations to the roof and fences/gates in the interests of highway safety and to protect the character and appearance of the area.
46. The Parish Council raise concern regarding the provision of parking and how this will impact other residential property's including the Grade I listed church. Officers consider the setting of listed buildings a satisfactory separation distance from the proposed development as to not have an adverse impact on these.
47. DM7 states (inter alia) proposals for new residential development will be required to demonstrate that appropriate water efficiency measures will be employed. No specific reference has been made in regards to water consumption. Therefore a condition will be included to ensure that either water consumption is no more than 110 litres per day (including external water use), or no water fittings exceeds the values set out in table 1 of policy DM7

Conclusion:

48. In conclusion, the principle and detail of the development is considered to be acceptable and in compliance with relevant development plan policies such as DM2 and DM22 and the National Planning Policy Framework, noting the settlement boundary location of the proposed dwellings and sympathetic design approach that seeks to replace this structure with a new building in a way that will restore the character and appearance of the area.

Recommendation:

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

1. Time limit

The development hereby permitted shall be commenced no 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. Approved plans

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

Plan Type	Reference	Date Received
Existing floor plans and elevations	22-2663-2	6 June 2022
Proposed elevations and floor plans	22-2663-3	6 June 2022
Location and block plan	22-2663-1 C	21 October 2022
Design and access statement		6 June 2022
Application form		6 June 2022

Reason: To define the scope and extent of this permission, in accordance with policy DM1 and DM2 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015 and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

3. Construction hours

Any site preparation, demolition, construction works and ancillary activities, including access road works and deliveries to / collections from the site in connection with the works shall only be carried out between the hours of:

8am to 6pm Mondays to Fridays
8am to 1pm Saturdays

And at no times during Sundays or Bank / Public Holidays without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

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.

4. Limit water use

The dwelling(s) hereby approved shall not be occupied until the requirement for water consumption (110 litres use per person per day) in part G of the Building Regulations has been complied with and evidence of compliance has been obtained.

Reason: To ensure that the proposal meets with the requirements of sustainability, in accordance with policy DM7 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

5. Bin storage

The areas to be provided for the storage and presentation for collection/emptying of refuse and recycling bins as shown on Drawing No. 22-2663-1 Rev C shall be provided in their entirety before the development is brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for no other purpose.

Reason: To ensure that space is provided for refuse and recycling bins to be stored and presented for emptying and left by operatives after emptying clear of the highway and access to avoid causing obstruction and dangers for the public using 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.

6. Cycle storage

The use shall not commence until the areas within the site shown on Drawing No. 22-2663-1 Rev C for the purposes of secure cycle storage have been provided and thereafter the areas shall be retained, maintained and used for no other purposes.

Reason: To ensure that sufficient areas for cycle storage are provided in accordance with Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2019), 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.

7. Ecological enhancements

Prior to occupation 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.

8. Material details

No development above slab level shall take place until details of all external materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with policy DM2 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

9. Removal of PD rights – alterations to roof

Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A, Class B and Class C of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order amending, revoking or re-enacting that Order), the roof space of each dwelling shall not be extended or altered in any way and shall not be used for living, hobby or other incidental domestic use, except for domestic storage associated with the occupation of the dwelling.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area and the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policies DM2 and DM22 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

10. Removal of PD rights – fences, gates and walls

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (or any order amending, revoking or re-enacting that Order), no fences, gates or walls shall be erected within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse in front of any wall of the dwellinghouse which fronts onto a road.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area and the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policies DM2 and DM22 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

Documents:

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online [DC/22/0994/FUL](https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/DC/22/0994/FUL)