

From: James Alflatt <James.Alflatt@bidwells.co.uk>
Sent: 22 November 2018 18:05
To: Bradly Heffer <Bradly.Heffer@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>; Gemma Pannell <Gemma.Pannell@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Cc: Robert Eburne <Robert.Eburne@hopkinshomes.co.uk>; Simon Bryan <Simon.Bryan@hopkinshomes.co.uk>; David <David@evolution-planning.co.uk>; Jake Lambert <jake.lambert@bidwells.co.uk>
Subject: RE: DC/18/04247 Land off Bury Road, Woolpit

Bradly,

Hope this finds you well.

Just picking up some of the points from our recent meeting, with regards to Historic England. Please see below correspondence between our heritage consultants (CgMS) and David Eve. As discussed, I would draw your attention to the fact that Historic England would not object to the application and acknowledge that the way the masterplan has set the proposed development away from the conservation area and is of a lower density in this area is a very positive approach endorsed by Historic England. Hopefully the below response from David expands upon their previous representations, confirming that they do not object to the application.

Any further queries regarding this, then please don't hesitate to contact me. We will revert back to you separately on both the ecology and LLFA matters once the required information is available.

Kind Regards,

James



James Alflatt BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI PIEMA
Partner, Planning

M: 07958 788124 | bidwells.co.uk



From: Eve, David [<mailto:David.Eve@HistoricEngland.org.uk>]
To: Thomas Rumley
Subject: [EXT]Re: HE Ref: P00972487 - Land off Bury Road Woolpit

Dear Tom,

thank you for discussing the above case on the phone with me and for your helpful summary of the discussion in your previous email. I think this summarises our position well, namely that we acknowledge the way the proposed layout has responded to the constraints of the historic environment and would not object to the application but do retain some concerns about the impact on views of the parish church from the north. The way proposed building is set away from the Conservation area boundary and the lower density of development with open space adjacent is very positive and does much to reduce this impact. We would therefore leave it to the Council to consider if further improvement could be made in this area, but as I say, would not object to the application.

I hope this clarifies the situation.

Best wishes

David

David Eve | Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas (Norfolk, Suffolk and Bedfordshire)
Direct Line: 01223 582721
Mobile: 07968 229581

Historic England | Brooklands
23 Brooklands Avenue | Cambridge | CB2 8BU

www.historic-england.org.uk



We are the public body that helps people care for, enjoy and celebrate England's spectacular historic environment, from beaches and battlefields to parks and pie shops.

Follow us: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) Sign up to our [newsletter](#)

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. We respect your privacy and the use of your information. Please read our full [privacy policy](#) for more information.

From: Thomas Rumley <thomas.rumley@cgms.co.uk>
Sent: 24 October 2018 10:46
To: Eve, David
Cc: Myk Flitcroft
Subject: Re: HE Ref: P00972487 - Land off Bury Road Woolpit

Hi David,

Thank you for discussing your response to planning application DC/18/04247 at Woolpit on Monday. I have summarised our telephone call conversation below. Please can you review this and confirm whether I have interrupted your follow-up comments correctly.

- You were aware and reviewed prior to your response the application's proposals plans for density, character areas, open space and landscape plans.
- You broadly agree with our assessment that there would be some harm to the significance of less St Mary's Church and the Conservation Area and that this would amount to less than substantial harm. However, you do not object to the proposals in principal.
- You raised concerns over the location of housing in the south-east quadrant of the development in regards to experiencing a countryside setting on entry/exiting the village however, you are aware of the design mitigation that we are proposing (lower density within this area, retention of open space, the position of a school site and extension of the cemetery) and indicated that these design/mitigation measures have responded better than other areas of new/recent development within Woolpit.
- Views towards the Church of St Mary's Church (Woolpit) and Church of St John (Elmswell) from the Site are not considered designed views but you welcome the incorporation of sight lines through the development which will help to retain/create new views of these churches. You suggested that opening these/widening of the sight lines in the south-east quadrant would be preferable however, we discussed that this area will contain a lower housing density and a country character in the built form (as described within the Design and Access Statement), which will help to preserve more sensitive areas and views to the church.

In the interim between our discussion, my client has asked whether you would consider revising your response to reflect our conversation?

Kind regards,

Tom

Tom Rumley BSc(Hons) MSc
Senior Heritage Consultant – CgMs/RPS Historic Environment
Tel: 01636 642 707
Mobile: 07979 537 481
Email Address: thomas.rumley@cgms.co.uk

CgMs Heritage

Part of the RPS Group Plc

Archaeology & Built Heritage Consultants

Sherwood House, Sherwood Avenue, Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG24 1QQ

Tel: 01636 642 707

Fax: 01636 610 696

Company Reg. No. 1470149

www.cgms.co.uk / www.rpsgroup.com/uk

This communication contains information which is confidential and may also be privileged. It is for the exclusive use of the addressee. If you are not the addressee please note that any distribution, copying or use of this communication, or any information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us by reply.

From: James Alflatt

Sent: 15 November 2018 18:05

To: 'Bradly Heffer' <Bradly.Heffer@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>; 'Gemma Pannell' <Gemma.Pannell@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>

Cc: Robert Eburne <Robert.Eburne@hopkinshomes.co.uk>; 'Simon Bryan' <Simon.Bryan@hopkinshomes.co.uk>; David <David@evolution-planning.co.uk>

Subject: DC/18/04247 Land off Bury Road, Woolpit

Bradly/Gemma,

Good to meet with you both yesterday and hopefully you found our meeting a useful update/review with regards to the consultee responses received on the above application and our direction of travel in addressing the outstanding issues. Thought it would be useful to outline our agreed actions:

Response to SWT and Place Services

Bidwells to liaise with Applied Ecology (Project Ecologist) and issue rebuttal correspondence to Council

Response to LLFA

MLM continue to finalise issue with LLFA including undertaking necessary dye testing. As discussed this was attempted on site this week, however the watercourse was dry. This will be re-attempted once weather conditions change.

One updated version of the FRA will be provided to the Council, once all LLFA matters have been addressed, and the LLFA have agreed the updated draft. The timing for this will be dictated by the timing of the above investigations.

Parish Council

Agreed that we would not be engaging any further with the Parish Council, as many of the issues raised, can now be rebutted by the positive statutory consultee responses received.

Historic England

Bidwells will share with Council updated response to be received from David Eve, following our archaeological consultants further discussions

S106

Council to instruct Council lawyers and Hopkins to instruct Birketts to commence drafting of the s106

Conditions

Council to issue preliminary set of draft conditions, based upon responses received, so we can review and agree

Viability

Agreed this would be issued shortly, and the Council was likely to appoint the District Valuer to review the appraisal.

Committee Dates

Subject to addressing technical matters prior to Christmas, agreed that committee dates in new year would be considered.

Hopefully the above picks up the key points, please don't hesitate to come back to me if you have any further queries.

Kind Regards,

James



James Alflatt BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI PIEMA
Partner, Planning

16 Upper King Street, Norwich, Norfolk. NR3 1HA
DD: 01603 229345 | M: 07958 788124 | bidwells.co.uk

Bidwells LLP, a limited liability partnership trading as Bidwells, is registered in England & Wales (registered number OC344553). The registered head office is Bidwell House, Trumpington Road, Cambridge, CB2 9LD, where a list of members is available for inspection.

To read our full disclaimer please click [here](#) To read our Privacy Notice please click [here](#)