

# Consultee Comments for Planning Application DC/18/01379

## Application Summary

Application Number: DC/18/01379

Address: The Newsagent Bell Hill Cottage The Street Rickingham Inferior Diss Suffolk IP22 1BN

Proposal: Planning Application - Change of use of rear of building to A5 Hot Food Takeaway.

Retention of existing front room for retail use, installation of extract equipment internally, flue through roof and internal alterations to provide sound and fire proofing to party wall.

Case Officer: Katherine Hale

## Consultee Details

Name: Mrs Leeann Jackson-Eve

Address: Wayside, Cherry Tree Lane, Botesdale Diss, Suffolk IP22 1DL

Email: rickingham\_pc@btopenworld.com

On Behalf Of: Rickingham Superior And Inferior Parish Clerk

## Comments

The Parish Council strongly objects to this application and we refer you to our comments on application DC/17/04483 below, which we would like you to consider in relation to the new application. We would reiterate that the information about the extraction system is still woefully inadequate and any consideration of this application should be delayed until that is properly addressed. Furthermore, our objections relating to parking have not been addressed in the new application and we would request that Highways carry out a parking survey, as they did in Eye when the applicant applied for similar premises. The lack of parking was a significant issue for the Newsagent/Post Office to the extent that the Parish Council applied to have bollards placed to prevent parking on the pavement in front of the shop as it threatened the safety of pedestrians and prevented pushchairs, etc from passing. The results of a traffic survey, which went to every household in 2016, showed that 67% of residents supported the bollards.

In addition to our previous comments, we would add that the loss of residential space is contrary to the current aim to increase the housing stock within Mid-Suffolk and should not be encouraged.

The Newsagent, Bell Hill Cottage, Rickingham - DC/17/04483

Rickingham Parish Council received a substantial number of objections to this application, both in writing and at its meeting on 5 October. Residents feel very strongly that the application is misleading in a deliberate attempt to downplay the impact on Botesdale and Rickingham (the village) and exaggerate the potential for trade at that location. The village is repeatedly referred to as a town and the location of the shop a retail centre, conjuring up an image of abundant public parking, plentiful foot traffic and a bustling shopping area. This could not be further from the truth. Although Botesdale and Rickingham are, together, a key service centre, they still retain a village

feel with a handful of long-established retail premises in a predominantly residential community.

Of particular concern is the assertion that there is sufficient on street parking for customers and workers. In 2016 Botesdale and Rickinghall undertook a traffic survey in the village, the results of which highlighted the problems of parking at the Newsagent/Post Office, specifically the frequency with which customers parked on the pavement in front of the shop and the adjoining Bell Hill House. As the result of several incidences reported to the Parish Council, in which customers were nearly hit as they descended the steps onto the pavement, bollards were proposed with the support of 67% of survey respondents. Customers regularly blocked nearby drives to the point where in 2016 Botesdale Parish Council pursued a Keep Clear marking for Warrens Lane, opposite. This reflected a general shortage of public parking in the village, as does the line of cars regularly parked on the pavement of the market place opposite the existing takeaways. As the parking opposite is mainly used by residents, it is unlikely that it will be able to accommodate vehicles for staff, the residents of the 2-bedroom flat above and customers. The planning statement does not even take into account the delivery vehicles which would be necessary to make up for the lack of foot traffic. There is no evidence to support the assertion that 50% of customers will arrive by foot; as Botesdale and Rickinghall form a long, linear community and most people like to eat their takeaway hot, it is very likely that residents from either end will drive to collect their food. It should be noted that there is nowhere for customers and delivery drivers to turn around except for driveways and the pub car park, neither of which is acceptable. The conclusion is that the proposals do not meet the standards for providing parking and manoeuvring of vehicles. (Policy T9)

An equal concern is the effect on residential amenity, particularly to the residents of Bell Hill House which adjoins on both levels with a flying freehold directly above the shop. This was acceptable when the shop was a quiet newsagent/post office with daytime hours but will be intolerable to the residents with the proposed opening hours of 11am to 10pm and this is no doubt the reason that pre-application advice from the planning officer was for a closing time of 9pm. That advice has been completely ignored by the applicant, giving some indication of how committed they are to protecting residents from any negative effects of the proposed business. It is felt that the combination of noise and fumes from the extraction system, risk of fire, noise from customers and the inevitable increase in litter will significantly reduce the amenity and privacy of nearby residents and will erode the character of the surrounding area. (Policy H16)

Any study of this application should include consideration of the loss of the Post Office. Although, the application describes the previous use as a Newsagent, it was in fact a permanent, full-time post office and the loss of this service to a rural community is considerable. Supplementary Planning Guidance on Retention of Shops, Post Offices and Public Houses in Villages strongly encourages not only the retention of rural services, but support for resisting alterations that would prevent reopening and demands that proposals for change of use are properly justified. The applicant has made no case in this respect. Although both parish councils have been pursuing a replacement since it closed last summer, they have so far been unable to find alternative

arrangements.

The impact on public health must also be considered. Public Health England provides guidance on Obesity and the Built Environment which links obesity with the proliferation of fast food outlets. The NHS urges planning authorities to manage the impact of hot food takeaways in proximity to schools and it should be noted that there are four existing takeaway businesses within sight of this shop.

Finally, the applicant states that a pizza takeaway will benefit the vitality and viability of the centre. It is hard to imagine how it will do more to benefit the village than the three existing businesses nearby which already provide takeaway pizza and have only recently invested heavily to expand their trade in this direction. Any loss of trade by those businesses will directly affect existing local employment.

Policy FC1 states that permission will not be granted if any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Furthermore, Policy FC1.1 requires that proposals should actively conserve and enhance the local character. This application neglects consideration of any benefits of the proposal and provides no evidence of any enhancements to the local character. It is not, in fact, evident how either could be accomplished with this proposal. However, the adverse impacts are abundantly clear and the Parish Council therefore objects to the application and has requested that our District Councillor call in the application to be considered by the Planning Committee. We would urge the Committee to visit the site to get a true picture of its effect on the community.

# Consultee Comments for Planning Application DC/18/01379

## Application Summary

Application Number: DC/18/01379

Address: The Newsagent Bell Hill Cottage The Street Rickingham Inferior Diss Suffolk IP22 1BN

Proposal: Planning Application - Change of use of rear of building to A5 Hot Food Takeaway.

Retention of existing front room for retail use, installation of extract equipment internally, flue through roof and internal alterations to provide sound and fire proofing to party wall.

Case Officer: Katherine Hale

## Consultee Details

Name: Mrs Leeann Jackson-Eve

Address: Wayside, Cherry Tree Lane, Botesdale Diss, Suffolk IP22 1DL

Email: botesdale\_pc@btopenworld.com

On Behalf Of: Botesdale Parish Clerk

## Comments

Botesdale Parish Council considered this new application for a takeaway at the site of the former post office and noted that it has addressed few of the concerns voiced in reply to application DC/17/04483.

There is considerable local opposition to the application as evidenced by the number of individual comments, and they are consistent in raising the issues of the potential for the dispersion of oil fumes and odour if the ventilation system is inadequate, and of the effect of traffic and parking. The Planning Statement makes reference to a specialist installers diagram for the ventilation system, but that is not provided, only providing catalogue information of potential components that may be included. Without a process flow diagram, the efficiency of the proposed ventilation system cannot be assessed.

The opposing residents all emphasise the traffic and parking issues currently encountered with the existing businesses, and specifically with the previous use as a post office. The fact that the proposed business would generate a comparable level of traffic to the previous use does not make it acceptable. Residents are only too aware of the road safety and pedestrian safety issues which occurred during the use of the premises as a Post Office and consider that a return to those conditions would be unacceptable.

The retention of the front of the shop as retail is a transparent workaround which the applicant uses to ignore rather than deal with concerns about sound and fire-proofing. The effect on the owners of Bell Hill House of people gathering in the waiting room, below a sleeping space, until 10pm every night will be profound and stud partition sound-proofing along the party wall will have no mitigating effect on the rooms above. Additionally, to say that relocating the A5 use negates the

need for other safety measures is to ignore the fact that this is a single structure and all of it including Bell Hill House will be vulnerable if the premises are not properly fire-proofed. This should be a given when even part of a building is used as a hot food takeaway. Finally, the loss of residential space to allow the applicant to relocate the A5 use is not to be encouraged when there is a shortage of housing.

In conclusion, please consider the PC's objections to application DC/17/04483 below as part of our reply to DC/18/01379, as the majority of the concerns also apply to the new application.

The Newsagent, Bell Hill Cottage, Rickinghall - DC/17/04483

The Parish Council noted that there are many inaccuracies in the Planning Statement as well as information which is misleadingly presented and/or incomplete. This has resulted in an application which is not well thought out and is based on assumptions which are not appropriate for the proposed site. The following are the most significant.

Section 1:

The premises are described as a former Newsagent but, until it closed last year, its main function was as a full-time Post Office. The change of use will make the loss of a much-needed service permanent.

The applicant states that there is sufficient on-street parking for customers and employees. The reality is that there is barely enough on-street parking for residents, as is routinely illustrated by the multiple vehicles parked on the pavements whilst customers visit other food outlets. Both photos included to illustrate the available parking show gaps which are driveways to multiple residences (the keep clear markings are clearly visible).

Section 2:

The proposed location is described as a Town Centre. The applicant's other outlets are in town centres, with plenty of nearby car parks. Botesdale and Rickinghall is a village with no public car park and existing issues with traffic and parking.

Section 4:

The ventilation, filtration and odour control system is not adequately described in the statement. Examples of components which may or may not be appropriate is not sufficient to make informed comment. This is particularly vital given its location in a residential area and the unillustrated impact on the Listed building.

No evidence is provided to support the statement that 50% of orders will normally be collected on foot. Botesdale and Rickinghall form a very linear community and the reality is that those at either end will drive in order to keep their food hot.

Section 5-6:

The villages are again referred to as a market town or historic town both implying a potential for trade which may not exist and downplaying the impact both on traffic/parking and the existing businesses. This is not a retail centre in a town, but a residential area with a scattering of commercial properties.

Section 9:

The applicant states that it will benefit the vitality and viability of the centre. However, it would be in direct competition with three existing businesses nearby which already provide the same service (pizza) and have recently made substantial investment to do so. Any loss of trade by those businesses will directly affect existing local employment.

The Mid Suffolk approach to sustainable development requires that proposals must actively conserve and enhance the local character and this has not been addressed within the application (Policy FC1.1). In fact, the addition of a large ventilation system through the roof will have a detrimental effect on a key element of local character the line of rooftops viewed from the top of Crown Hill to Maypole Meadow.

The proposal for extended trading hours beyond those of the Post Office will materially reduce the amenity and privacy of adjacent dwellings, without consideration of the noise and exhaust fumes from the extraction system, and the inevitable increase in litter and late night gathering by customers will erode the residential character of the surrounding area (Policy H16).

The proposal makes no provision for parking and manoeuvring of vehicles in accordance with parking standards and is entirely reliant on the use of residents parking opposite for a significant number of regular attendees including staff, delivery vehicles and residents of the flat above, before customers are even taken into account. This will lead to unsafe and antisocial parking in front of the shop and nearby residences and, contrary to the statement in the application, it is a significant material concern. (Policy T9)

Supplementary Planning Guidance on the Retention of Shops, Post Offices and Public Houses in Villages aims to encourage the retention of rural services; ensure that proposals for changes of use are properly justified; and to enable reopening of services or facilities at a future stage by resisting specific building alterations that would prevent reopening. This proposal meets none of those aims.

Finally, Public Health Englands guidance on Health Matters identifies the relationship between the proliferation of fast food outlets and obesity. It recommends that planning policies control the over-concentration and proliferation of hot food takeaways as part of plans to tackle obesity.

The picture presented is of an application in which the adverse impacts the loss of a site for a permanent post office; the loss of amenity in a residential area due to increased noise, odour and litter; further exposure to an unhealthy food environment; the effect on existing businesses; and additional strain on already strained on-street parking far outweigh the benefits, of which there is no evidence in the application. (Policy FC1 Core Strategy Focused Review)

**From:**Philippa Stroud

**Sent:**23 Apr 2018 14:41:29 +0100

**To:**BMSDC Planning Mailbox

**Cc:**Katherine Hale

**Subject:**DC/18/01379 The Newsagent, Bell Hill Cottage, The Street, Rockinghall Inferior - EH Land Contamination

WK/240452

## **APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION - DC/18/01379**

### **EH – Land Contamination**

**Proposal:** Planning Application. Change of use of rear of building to A5 Hot Food Takeaway. Retention of existing front room for retail use, installation of extract equipment internally, flue through roof and internal alterations to provide sound and fire proofing to party wall.

**Location:** The Newsagent, Bell Hill Cottage, The Street, Rickinghall Inferior, Diss, Suffolk

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above planning application.

I have no objection to raise with respect to land contamination.

Regards,

**Philippa Stroud**

Senior Environmental Protection Officer

**Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Councils - Working Together**

t: 01449 724724

e: [Philippa.Stroud@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:Philippa.Stroud@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk)

**BABERGH/MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Development Control.

For the attention of: Katherine Hale.

FROM: Ray Bennett, Environmental Protection Team.

DATE: 17.04.18.

YOUR REF: DC/18/01379.

SUBJECT: Change of use of rear of building to A5 Hot Food Takeaway. Retention of existing front room for retail use, installation of extract equipment internally, flue through roof and internal alterations.

ADDRESS: The Newsagents, The Street, Rickinghall Inferior, DISS, IP22 1BN.

---

Thank you for the opportunity to comment of the above planning application.

Although I have no objection, in principle, to the proposed development. I would however recommend the following conditions:

1. The additional sound proofing as detailed in the application to be installed.  
Reason – To minimise detriment to nearby residential amenity.

2. The extraction system detailed in the application should be fitted and maintained as recommended by the manufactures.

Reason – To minimise detriment to nearby residential amenity.

3. Given that the extraction system is now to be installed in a habitable room the first floor living quarters should not be sublet to persons not associated with the proposal.

4. The hours of operation to be as detailed in the application 11.00 to 22.00 this should include any deliveries/collections.

Thank you

Ray Bennett  
Environmental Protection officer.

Mid Suffolk District Council  
Planning Department  
Endeavour House  
Russell Road  
Ipswich  
IP1 2BX

Fire Business Support Team  
Floor 3, Block 2  
Endeavour House  
8 Russell Road  
Ipswich, Suffolk  
IP1 2BX

Your Ref:  
Our Ref: FS/F190985  
Enquiries to: Angela Kempen  
Direct Line: 01473 260588  
E-mail: Fire.BusinessSupport@suffolk.gov.uk  
Web Address: <http://www.suffolk.gov.uk>

Date: 17/04/2018

Dear Sirs

**The Newsagent, Bell Hill Cottage, The Street, Rickinghall Inferior IP22 1BN**  
**Planning Application No: DC/18/01379**

I refer to the above application.

The plans have been inspected by the Water Officer who has the following comments to make.

**Access and Fire Fighting Facilities**

Access to buildings for fire appliances and firefighters must meet with the requirements specified in Building Regulations Approved Document B, (Fire Safety), 2006 Edition, incorporating 2010 and 2013 amendments Volume 1 - Part B5, Section 11 dwelling houses, and, similarly, Volume 2, Part B5, Sections 16 and 17 in the case of buildings other than dwelling houses. These requirements may be satisfied with other equivalent standards relating to access for fire fighting, in which case those standards should be quoted in correspondence.

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service also requires a minimum carrying capacity for hard standing for pumping/high reach appliances of 15/26 tonnes, not 12.5 tonnes as detailed in the Building Regulations 2000 Approved Document B, 2006 Edition, incorporating 2010 and 2013 amendments.

**Water Supplies**

No additional water supply for fire fighting purposes is required in respect of this planning application.

Continued/

OFFICIAL

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service recommends that proper consideration be given to the potential life safety, economic, environmental and social benefits derived from the provision of an automatic fire sprinkler system. (Please see sprinkler information enclosed with this letter).

Consultation should be made with the Water Authorities to determine flow rates in all cases.

Should you need any further advice or information on access and fire fighting facilities, you are advised to contact your local Building Control in the first instance. For further advice and information regarding water supplies, please contact the Water Officer at the above headquarters.

Yours faithfully

*Water Officer*

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service

Enc: [chloe@robertsmolloy.co.uk](mailto:chloe@robertsmolloy.co.uk)  
Enc: Sprinkler information

Created: September 2015

Enquiries to: Fire Business Support Team  
Tel: 01473 260588  
Email: [Fire.BusinessSupport@suffolk.gov.uk](mailto:Fire.BusinessSupport@suffolk.gov.uk)



Dear Sir/Madam

## **Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service – Automatic Fire Sprinklers in your Building Development**

We understand from local Council planning you are considering undertaking building work.

The purpose of this letter is to encourage you to consider the benefits of installing automatic fire sprinklers in your house or commercial premises.

In the event of a fire in your premises an automatic fire sprinkler system is proven to save lives, help you to recover from the effects of a fire sooner and help get businesses back on their feet faster.

Many different features can be included within building design to enhance safety and security and promote business continuity. Too often consideration to incorporate such features is too late to for them to be easily incorporated into building work.

### **Dispelling the Myths of Automatic Fire Sprinklers**

- Automatic fire sprinklers are relatively inexpensive to install, accounting for approximately 1-3% of the cost of a new build.
- Fire sprinkler heads will only operate in the vicinity of a fire, they do not all operate at once.
- An automatic fire sprinkler head discharges between 40-60 litres of water per minute and will cause considerably less water damage than would be necessary for Firefighters tackling a fully developed fire.
- Statistics show that the likelihood of automatic fire sprinklers activating accidentally is negligible – they operate differently to smoke alarms.

### **Promoting the Benefits of Automatic Fire Sprinklers**

- They detect a fire in its incipient stage – this will potentially save lives in your premises.
- Sprinklers will control if not extinguish a fire reducing building damage.
- Automatic sprinklers protect the environment; reducing water damage and airborne pollution from smoke and toxic fumes.
- They potentially allow design freedoms in building plans, such as increased compartment size and travel distances.
- They may reduce insurance premiums.
- Automatic fire sprinklers enhance Firefighter safety.

- Domestic sprinkler heads are recessed into ceilings and pipe work concealed so you won't even know they're there.
- They support business continuity – insurers report 80% of businesses experiencing a fire will not recover.
- Properly installed and maintained automatic fire sprinklers can provide the safest of environments for you, your family or your employees.
- A desirable safety feature, they may enhance the value of your property and provide an additional sales feature.

### **The Next Step**

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service is working to make Suffolk a safer place to live. Part of this ambition is as champion for the increased installation of automatic fire sprinklers in commercial and domestic premises.

Any information you require to assist you to decide can be found on the following web pages:

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service

<http://www.suffolk.gov.uk/emergency-and-rescue/>

Residential Sprinkler Association

<http://www.firesprinklers.info/>

British Automatic Fire Sprinkler Association

<http://www.bafsa.org.uk/>

Fire Protection Association

<http://www.thefpa.co.uk/>

Business Sprinkler Alliance

<http://www.business-sprinkler-alliance.org/>

I hope adopting automatic fire sprinklers in your build can help our aim of making 'Suffolk a safer place to live'.

Yours faithfully

Mark Hardingham  
Chief Fire Officer  
Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service

Your Ref: DC/18/01379  
Our Ref: 570\CON\1401\18  
Date: 01/05/2018

**All planning enquiries should be sent to the Local Planning Authority.**  
Email: [planningadmin@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:planningadmin@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk)

The Planning Officer  
Mid Suffolk District Council  
1st Floor, Endeavour House  
8 Russell Road  
Ipswich  
Suffolk  
IP1 2BX

**For the Attention of:** Katherine Hale

Dear Katherine

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**  
**CONSULTATION RETURN DC/18/01379**

**PROPOSAL:** Planning Application. Change of use of rear of building to A5 Hot Food Takeaway. Retention of existing front room for retail use, installation of extract equipment internally, flue through roof and internal alterations to provide sound and fire proofing to party wall.

**LOCATION:** The Newsagent, Bell Hill Cottage, The Street, Rickinghall Superior, Suffolk, IP22 1BN

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highway Authority make the following comments:

The current proposal would not have any severe impact on the highway network in terms of vehicle volume or highway safety. Therefore, Suffolk County Council does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.

Yours sincerely,

**Mr Kyle Porter**  
**Development Management Technician**  
Strategic Development

## Consultation Response Pro forma

<b>1</b>	<b>Application Number</b>	DC/18/01379 Bell Hill Cottage, Rickinghall Inferior	
<b>2</b>	<b>Date of Response</b>	25.5.18	
<b>3</b>	<b>Responding Officer</b>	Name:	Paul Harrison
		Job Title:	Heritage and Design Officer
		Responding on behalf of...	Heritage
<b>4</b>	<b>Summary and Recommendation</b> (please delete those N/A)  Note: This section must be completed before the response is sent. The recommendation should be based on the information submitted with the application.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Heritage Team considers that the proposal would cause <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no harm to a designated heritage asset because impact on historic fabric is limited because of the existing finishes and proposed fixing methods.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. The Heritage Team recommends approval with appropriate conditions.</li> </ol>	
<b>5</b>	<b>Discussion</b> Please outline the reasons/rationale behind how you have formed the recommendation. Please refer to any guidance, policy or material considerations that have informed your recommendation.	<p>The proposal was subject of earlier applications which were withdrawn for reasons unrelated to heritage. The Heritage team initially raised concerns about the lack of information in the application, and the potential impact of new acoustic and fire separation treatments.</p> <p>Subsequently we raised concerns about the aesthetic value of the historic wall finishes, and the potential impact of fixings for the proposed ceiling linings. Further information on the ceiling fixings was submitted, on which we advised that the proposed ceiling lining was acceptable as minimal intervention, and capable of being reversed.</p> <p>The present application points out that the west wall of the shop area is currently lined out with shopfittings, which all but obscure the historic structure and fabric. Heritage team acknowledge that the proposed fire and sound insulation would be little different in terms of impact on heritage value of the building, and in aesthetic terms would possibly represent a modest enhancement. We would also acknowledge that any change of use to this space would entail upgrading to the party wall in order to achieve satisfactory standards of safety and amenity.</p> <p>There are two amendments to the proposal in this application:</p>	

Please note that this form can be submitted electronically on the Councils website. Comments submitted on the website will not be acknowledged but you can check whether they have been received by reviewing comments on the website under the application reference number. Please note that the completed form will be posted on the Councils website and available to view by the public.

		<p>The service counter is now replaced by a screen of timber studs with glass sliding doors. Heritage would not raise objection to the design, and would expect, as the Statement states, that the screen would indicate the historic layout of this part of the building.</p> <p>The arrangement of the staff accommodation and shop service areas is amended so that the accommodation is now at first floor and the service areas at ground floor. We do not consider that this has any particular impact on heritage issues.</p>
6	<p><b>Amendments, Clarification or Additional Information Required</b> (if holding objection)</p> <p>If concerns are raised, can they be overcome with changes? Please ensure any requests are proportionate</p>	
7	<p><b>Recommended conditions</b></p>	As recommended for previous applications.

Please note that this form can be submitted electronically on the Councils website. Comments submitted on the website will not be acknowledged but you can check whether they have been received by reviewing comments on the website under the application reference number. Please note that the completed form will be posted on the Councils website and available to view by the public.



Historic England

EAST OF ENGLAND OFFICE

Ms Katherine Hale  
Babergh Mid Suffolk District Councils  
Endeavour House  
8 Russell Road  
Ipswich  
Suffolk  
IP1 2BX

Direct Dial: 01223 582737

Our ref: **W**: P00857411

12 April 2018

Dear Ms Hale

**T&CP (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015  
& Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990**

**THE NEWSAGENT, BELL HILL COTTAGE, THE STREET,  
RICKINGHALL INFERIOR, DISS, SUFFOLK IP22 1BN  
Application No. DC/18/01379 - Planning Application. Change of use of rear of  
building to A5 Hot Food Takeaway. Retention of existing front room for retail  
use, installation of extract equipment internally, flue through roof and internal  
alterations to provide sound and fire proofing to party wall.**

Thank you for your letter of 10 April 2018 regarding the above application for planning permission.

On the basis of the information available to date, Historic England do not wish to offer any comments. We would therefore suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, and other consultees, as relevant.

It is not necessary for us to be consulted on this application again, unless there are material changes to the proposals, however, if you would like detailed advice from us, please contact us to explain your request.

Yours sincerely

**Eric Martin**  
Business Officer  
e-mail: [eric.martin@HistoricEngland.org.uk](mailto:eric.martin@HistoricEngland.org.uk)



24 BROOKLANDS AVENUE, CAMBRIDGE, CB2 8BU

Telephone 01223 582749  
[HistoricEngland.org.uk](http://HistoricEngland.org.uk)





## Consultation Response

<b>1</b>	<b>Application Number</b>	DC/18/01379 Rickinghall Inferior	
<b>2</b>	<b>Date of Response</b>	12/04/2018	
<b>3</b>	<b>Responding Officer</b>	Name:	Dawn Easter
		Job Title:	Economic Development Officer
		Responding on behalf of...	Economic Development & Tourism
<b>4</b>	<b>Recommendation</b> Note: This section must be completed before the response is sent. The recommendation should be based on the information submitted with the application.	No objection	
<b>5</b>	<b>Discussion</b> Please outline the reasons/rationale behind how you have formed the recommendation. Please refer to any guidance, policy or material considerations that have informed your recommendation.	<p>The premises are easily accessible and located in the main street of the village, close to other pubs and shops.</p> <p>The conversion will bring the rear of the building into commercial use and help to support four new jobs.</p>	
<b>6</b>	<b>Amendments, Clarification or Additional Information Required</b> (if holding objection) if concerns are raised, can they be overcome with changes? Please ensure any requests are proportionate		
<b>7</b>	<b>Recommended conditions</b>		

Please note that this form can be submitted electronically on the Councils website. Comments submitted on the website will not be acknowledged but you can check whether they have been received by reviewing comments on the website under the application reference number. Please note that the completed form will be posted on the Councils website and available to view by the public.