

## LIDGATE PARISH COUNCIL

### Minutes of the planning meeting held on Monday 11<sup>th</sup> May 2020 via Zoom due to the Coronavirus restrictions

Councillors present: John Whitefield (Chairman), Carol Sharp, Annie Lee, Chris Stembridge, Hayley Mableson and Laura Perry

Also present: Joanne Kirk (clerk)

#### 1. Acceptance of apologies for absence

No apologies were received.

#### 2. Declaration of Interest in items on the agenda and dispensation requests

Laura Perry and Carol Sharp declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 3a on the agenda. No dispensation requests were made.

#### 3. Planning

##### a) DC/20/0619/FUL - Land adjacent to The Forge, The Street, Lidgate - Planning Application - (i) Change of use of land from agricultural to residential (ii) 2no. dwellings (iii) 2no. Cart lodges (iv) improvements to existing vehicular access

It was resolved that the Parish Council would object to the application for the following reasons:

##### ***Policy DM2 – Creating Places – Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness***

- Lidgate Parish Council believes that the proposal will adversely affect the distinctive historic character and architectural or archaeological value of the area.
- The site is within 35m of a Scheduled Ancient Monument (Lidgate Castle and C16 Fortified Manorial Complex), noted by Prof. Mark Bailey as of ‘unique importance within East Anglia and possibly within the entire UK’. The development must therefore be considered as adversely affecting its setting.
- Furthermore, Historic England is currently researching an historic burial site adjacent to this plot which also lies within the Castle Mere setting. The archaeological evidence is so significant that it would be threatened by this development. The Parish Council asks that any decision be delayed by West Suffolk until Historic England completed its research.
- The proposed dwellings have 8 parking spaces, which will increase the number of cars accessing the B1063 at a point where visibility is restricted.
- The proposal will affect the amenity of the neighbouring properties as the N and E sides of the development will overlook Lidgate Grange and the W side, The Forge, and lead to a loss of privacy. The increase to two properties on the site would double this effect.

##### **Policy DM5 protects ‘the countryside from unsustainable development’.**

- Lidgate has previously been ruled out as a development location (**Core Strategy 2010 Policy CS4 para 4.58** and **St Edmundsbury LDF Rural Site Allocations Preferred Options Document para 6.8** and **Rural Vision 2031 Section 39 para 39.1**).
- The Parish Council does not believe this development to be sustainable given the limited number of services available in the village which would increase reliance upon car use.
- Furthermore, the site itself is ineligible for development as it lies *outside* the Lidgate Housing Settlement Boundary (HSB or BUAB), in an Infill Village, where ‘*only* infill development comprising single dwellings or small groups of five houses or less *within the designated HSB* would be permitted’.
- The development fails to address local need for smaller, affordable dwellings e.g. for agricultural workers, young families etc.

##### **Policy DM10: Biodiversity Importance**

- Extensive evidence was previously submitted of species found on the site which are afforded Governmental protection, in some cases under NERC Section 41. Many of these protected species are likely to have been seriously affected by the clearance of the scrub on the site in September 2019 and tree works in January 2020. No mitigation measures have been put in place.

**Policy DM17 – Conservation Areas**

- The proposed dwelling will be in the Lidgate Conservation Area and the scale of the proposal will detract from the setting of and views into and out of the Conservation area.
- The proposal does not demonstrate a clear understanding of the historical and aesthetic significance of the Conservation Area and/or its setting, alongside an assessment of the potential impact of the proposal on that significance.
- In his response to DC/18/1147/FUL, the case officer, Ed Fosker, supported this application on the basis that the size and scale of the original design had been reduced to a more modest property; however the extended footprint of this application is approx. 80% greater and is significantly more imposing than the approved design. The scale of this new application does not comply with DM17 as it will be too large in scale, form, height, massing and alignment to respect the area’s character and setting.

**Policy DM15: Listed Buildings**

- In its modern, neo-Georgian style, the proposal does not respect the existing adjacent listed C16/17 farmhouse buildings and their setting in terms of scale, form, height, massing, and design.
- The proposal does not respect the setting of the listed buildings, including inward and outward views.

**Policy DM27: Housing in the Countryside**

- The proposal occupies a ‘visually important gap’ located directly on the main road through the village. The gap contributes to the rural scene and affords ancient open views to and from the castle and church settings, which merit preservation. It does not amount to infill of a continuous built up frontage as permitted by DM27

**There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.35pm.**

Signed ..... (Chairman) Dated .....