


## MEMBER REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

See Planning Charter for principles. Paragraph references below link to Planning Charter.

Planning application reference	4372/15 and 4373/15
Parish	Wingfield.
Member making request	CLLr Elizabeth Gibson Harnies.
13.3 Please describe the significant policy, consistency or material considerations which make a decision on the application of more than local significance	The application is within the curtilage of Wingfield Castle which is of National Historical interest.
13.4 Please detail the clear and substantial planning reasons for requesting a referral	There is a wider interest by Historic England for these listed buildings.
13.5 Please detail the wider District and public interest in the application	Wingfield PC are supporting the application, the owners of the Castle are not and they are calling witnesses.
13.6 If the application is not in your Ward please describe the very significant impacts upon your Ward which might arise from the development	/
13.7 Please confirm what steps you have taken to discuss a referral to committee with the case officer	Discussing the case with the officer,

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
RECEIVED  
13 JAN 2015  
ACKNOWLEDGED  
DATE  
PASS TO



**Title:** Constraints

**Reference:** 4372/15 & 4373/15

**Site:**




**MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
 131, High Street, Needham Market, IP6 8DL  
 Telephone : 01449 724500  
 email: customerservice@csduk.com  
 www.midsuffolk.gov.uk



**SCALE 1:1250**

Reproduced by permission of  
 Ordnance Survey on behalf of HMSO.  
 © Crown copyright and database right 2016  
 Ordnance Survey Licence number 100017810

Date Printed : 02/03/2016




187


A 13.07.15 Notes added for road references  
Rev

		Church Farm Barn The Street Thorndon Suffolk IP23 7JR e enquiries@beecharchitects.com t 01379 678442	
<b>CLIENT</b> Warren Hill Farms			
<b>PROJECT</b> Castle Farm Vicarage Road Wingfield Suffolk IP21 5RB			
<b>DRAWING</b> Location Plan			
<b>SCALE</b> 1:1250 @ A3		<b>DATE</b> Dec 2014	
<b>DRAWING NUMBER</b> 00	<b>JOB NUMBER</b> 81	<b>STATUS</b> Preliminary	<b>REV</b> A

This drawing is copyright and remains the property of Beech Architects Ltd. Original size A1. Scale shown will be incorrect if reproduced in any other format



Site plan 1:200 scale



Site plan 1:1000 scale

NOTES

Copyright by Beech Architects Ltd. All rights reserved for the client and architect.

- D 11.11.15 Updated for planning application
- C 13.07.15 Updated for planning submission
- B 08.07.15 Updated for planning submission
- A 05.05.15 Site layout indicated for planning submission

Rev

**Beech**  
 Castle Farm Barn  
 The Beech  
 The Farm  
 Beech  
 IP21 7JH  
 www.beecharchitects.com  
 © copyright Beech Architects Ltd. 2015/16 01242


CLIENT Warren Hill Farms			
PROJECT Castle Farm Wearage Road Wingfield Suffolk IP21 5RH			
DRAWING Existing Site plan			
SCALE 1:200/1:1000 @ A1	DATE Dec 2014		
DRAWING NUMBER 01	JOB NUMBER B1	STATUS Preliminary	REV D

This drawing is copyright and remains the property of Beech Architects Ltd. Original site A1. Scale shown will be incorrect if reproduced in any other format.




188


NOTE:  
 Generally do not scale drawings. All dimensions to be checked on site.



ELEVATION 1 - NORTH MAIN BARN



ELEVATION 2 - SOUTH MAIN BARN




ELEVATION 3 - EAST MAIN BARN




ELEVATION 4 - WEST MAIN BARN




ELEVATION 7 - COURTYARD WEST




ELEVATION 8 - COURTYARD WEST



ELEVATION 9 - COURTYARD WEST



ELEVATION 5 - COURTYARD EAST



ELEVATION 6 - COURTYARD EAST

§ 11.12.13 Updated for zoning application  
 A. 08/21/18 Updated for zoning application

Client: **Beech**  
 Chasen P. Lee, Esq.  
 The Beech  
 1000 Beech  
 1000 Beech

Project: **Warren Hill Farms**  
 1000 Beech  
 1000 Beech

Product: **Warren Hill Farms**  
 1000 Beech  
 1000 Beech

Location: **Warren Hill Farms**  
 1000 Beech  
 1000 Beech

Drawing: **Existing Elevations Sheet 1**

Scale: **1:100 @ A1**

Date: **Dec 2014**






Job Number: **02**

Status: **Preliminary**

Rev: **B**

Sheet: **B**

This drawing is copyright and remains the property of Beech Architects Ltd. Original file A1. Other users will be notified if reproduced in any other form.



© 2014 Beech Architecture Inc. All rights reserved.  
 All drawings are subject to change without notice.  
 No part of this drawing may be reproduced without the written permission of Beech Architecture Inc.

**Beech**  
 Architecture Inc.  
 1000 Highway 101, Suite 100  
 St. Catharines, Ontario L2R 6K9  
 Tel: 905.688.1111  
 Fax: 905.688.1112  
 www.beecharchitecture.com


CLIENT  
 Warner 180 Farms

PROJECT  
 County Home  
 Warehouse Project  
 Warehouse  
 1000 sq ft



DATE  
 Existing Elevations Sheet 2

SCALE 1:100 @ A1	DATE Dec 2014
DRAWING NUMBER 02	JOB NUMBER 01
STATUS Preliminary	REV 0


This drawing is copyright and remains the property of Beech Architecture Inc. Original use only. Any other use without permission is prohibited.



Long Barn First Floor Plan



Granary First Floor Plan



Ground Floor Plan

1/b1

© 11.12.15 Updated for planning submission  
 A 08.07.15 Updated for planning submission  
 Rev

**Beech**  
 www.beecharchitects.com  
 Clients: Farnham Farm, The Bristol, Thurston, Blyth, IP23 7JP  
 e: enquiries@beecharchitects.com  
 t: 01206 870462


**CLIENT**  
 Warren Hill Farms

**PROJECT**  
 Castle Farm  
 Vicarage Road  
 Wingfield  
 Suffolk  
 IP21 5RB


**DRAWING**  
 Existing Ground and First Floor Plans

<b>SCALE</b> 1:100 @ A1		<b>DATE</b> Dec 2014	
<b>DRAWING NUMBER</b> 04	<b>JOB NUMBER</b> 81	<b>STATUS</b> Preliminary	<b>REV</b> B

This drawing is copyright and remains the property of Beech Architects Ltd. Original site A1. Scale shown will be ignored if reproduced in any other format.




Long Barn Internal Elevation facing north



Long Barn Internal Elevation facing south

192



Cross Sections Long Barn Main Space

Internal Elevation West Gable,  
Long Barn Main Space

Internal Elevation East Gable  
Long Barn Main Space

8.11.13.15 Updated for planning application  
 8.08.14 Updated for planning submission

**Beech**  
 www.beecherhitects.com  
 01279 873422

Client Farm Barn  
 The Great  
 Thomas  
 4400  
 SP21 7JP  
 enquiries@beechhitects.com  
 01279 873422

<b>CLIENT</b> Warren Hill Farms			
<b>PROJECT</b> Castle farm Wantage Road Wingfield Suffolk SP21 5RB			
<b>DRAWING</b> Long Barn Existing Internal Elevations & Sections			
<b>SCALE</b> 1:100 @ A1		<b>DATE</b> Dec 2014	
<b>DRAWING NUMBER</b> 05	<b>JOB NUMBER</b> B1	<b>STATUS</b> Preliminary	<b>REV</b> B

This drawing is copyright and remains the property of Beech Architects Ltd. Original size A1. Scale shown will be incorrect if reproduced in any other format.



193



B 11.12.14 Updated for planning application  
 A 08.07.16 Updated for planning submission  
 Rev

**Beech**  
 Church Farm Barn  
 The Barn  
 Trowse  
 Sudbury  
 IP9 7JR  
 www.beecharchitects.com  
 b.architect@beecharchitects.com  
 01376 876602

**CLIENT**  
 Warren Hill Farms


**PROJECT**  
 Cattle Barns  
 Vicarage Road  
 Wingfield  
 Suffolk  
 IP21 5RB

**DRAWING**  
 Overall Site Block Plan

<b>SCALE</b> 1:500 @ A1	<b>DATE</b> APR 2015		
<b>DRAWING NUMBER</b> 10	<b>JOB NUMBER</b> 81	<b>STATUS</b> Preliminary	<b>REV</b> B


This drawing is copyright and remains the property of Beech Architects Ltd. Original site A1. Scale shown will be incorrect if reproduced in any other format.





FIRST FLOOR PLAN

These foundations are 100mm above ground level. All foundations are 100mm above ground level. All foundations are 100mm above ground level.



BARN 3  
4.5 BEDROOMS  
270m<sup>2</sup>

BARN 2  
4 BEDROOMS  
290m<sup>2</sup>




BARN 1  
5 BEDROOMS  
373m<sup>2</sup>



© 1998 Beech Plans Ltd  
 All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without the prior written permission of Beech Plans Ltd.

<b>Beech Plans Ltd</b>		Client: Mr & Mrs The Beech 100m Road Wingfield Basingstoke Hants RG21 3JH Tel: 01256 284444 www.beechplans.co.uk	
PROJECT Haven Hill Farms Cottrell Farm Wingfield Road Basingstoke Hants RG21 3JH		DATE Dec 2014	
DRAWING NUMBER 11		JOB NUMBER 81	
DRAWING TITLE GA Plans - 3 No. Dwellings		STATUS Preliminary	
SCALE 1:100 @ A1		REV C	

This drawing is copyright and remains the property of Beech Plans Ltd. Original use only. All other uses without the prior written permission of Beech Plans Ltd. are prohibited.




© 2015 All rights reserved by Beech Architects Ltd.  
 A. Beech Architects Ltd. is a registered architectural practice.  
 Beech Architects Ltd.  
 100th Street

CLIENT	Warren Hill Farms
PROJECT	Warren Hill Farms
LOCATION	Warragamba Road Warragamba NSW 2128
DATE	Apr 2015
DRAWING NUMBER	81
STATUS	Preliminary
REV	C
DRAWING	Proposed Elevations - Barn 1 and 2


This drawing is copyright and remains the property of Beech Architects Ltd. Original drawings shall be returned to Beech Architects Ltd. upon completion of the project.

NOTES


Generally do not color drawings. All dimensions to be checked on site.




ELEVATION 11 - GRANNY BARN EAST




ELEVATION 11 - GRANNY BARN NORTH




ELEVATION 13 - GRANNY BARN WEST




ELEVATION 12 - GRANNY BARN SOUTH



BARN 3 - COURTYARD WEST



BARN 3 - COURTYARD EAST



CART LOOSE NORTH

CART LOOSE SOUTH

B 11.10.18 Updated for planning application  
A 08.07.18 Updated for planning consultation

Drawn by: [Name]

**Beech**  
www.beecharchitects.com

CLIENT  
Warren Hill Farms

PROJECT  
Crestle Farm  
Vauxhall Road  
Barnham  
IP21 1RB

DRAWING  
Proposed Elevations - Barn 3

SCALE  
1:100 @ A1

DATE  
Apr 2015



DRAWING NUMBER  
81

STATUS  
Preliminary


REV  
B

KEY

Area of Demolition - Removal of fabric or new opening created



Ground Floor Plan 1:100 scale



Site Plan - Demolitions 1:500 scale

197

C 11.12.15 Updated for planning application  
 B 12.07.15 Updated for planning submission  
 A 08.07.15 Updated for planning submission  
 Rev

**Beech**

Drush Farm Farm  
 The Beech  
 Thurston  
 Sudbury  
 IP25 7JF  
 www.beecharchitects.co.uk  
 e enquiries@beecharchitects.com  
 t 01509 673492

CLIENT Warren Hill Farms			
PROJECT Castle Farm Vicarsage Road Wingfield Sudbury IP21 5TB			
DRAWING Proposed Demolitions			
SCALE 1:100 & 1:500 @ A1	DATE July 2015		
DRAWING NUMBER 14	JOB NUMBER B1	STATUS Preliminary	REV C

This drawing is copyright and remains the property of Beech Architects Ltd. Original size A1. Scale shown will be incorrect if reproduced in any other format.

- Work Item**
- 1. Site Plan
  - 2. Foundation
  - 3. Framing
  - 4. Roofing
  - 5. Siding
  - 6. Windows
  - 7. Doors
  - 8. Mechanical
  - 9. Electrical
  - 10. Plumbing
  - 11. HVAC
  - 12. Insulation
  - 13. Drywall
  - 14. Painting
  - 15. Landscaping
  - 16. Final
- Other**
- 1. Site Plan
  - 2. Foundation
  - 3. Framing
  - 4. Roofing
  - 5. Siding
  - 6. Windows
  - 7. Doors
  - 8. Mechanical
  - 9. Electrical
  - 10. Plumbing
  - 11. HVAC
  - 12. Insulation
  - 13. Drywall
  - 14. Painting
  - 15. Landscaping
  - 16. Final



© 11/13 licensed for printing application  
 A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, P, Q, R, S, T, U, V, W, X, Y, Z  
 Rev




CLIENT	Warren Hill Farms
PROJECT	1.0000 @ A1
DATE	Dec 2014
DRAWING NUMBER	JOB NUMBER
15	81
STATUS	REV
Preliminary	C



This drawing is copyright and remains the property of Beech Architects Ltd. Original use  
 A1. All other details will be assumed if not provided in any other sheet.



Shutter shutter detail to existing opening. Closed screen behind, inward opening to allow for cleaning  
1:10



Section A - A

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
 DRAWN BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
 CHECKED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

© 1998 Beech Building Systems, Inc.  
 All rights reserved.


**Beech**  
 Building Systems, Inc.  
 www.beechbuilding.com

PROJECT:  
 Client: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Designer: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Architect: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0" @ A1  
 Date: APR 2018

DRAWING NUMBER	JOB NUMBER	STATUS	REV
08	01	Submittal	0

The drawing is copyright and remains the property of Beech Building Systems, Inc. Original use only. Any other use without written permission is prohibited.



Rev: A 11.05.18 Updated for planning application

**Beech**  
 The Beech  
 1000  
 1000  
 1000  
 1000

CLIENT  
 Warren Hill Farms

PROJECT  
 Castle Farm  
 Weymouth Road  
 Weymouth  
 Dorset DT98 3BB

DATE  
 APR 2018

SCALE  
 1/4" = 1'

DRAWING NUMBER  
 81

JOB NUMBER  
 81

STATUS  
 Preliminary

REV  
 A

DRAWING  
 3D Views sheet 1

This drawing is copyright and remains the property of Beech Architects Ltd. Copyright 2018  
 A1. Scale shown will be incorrect if reproduced in any other format.



201



Rev. A 11.13.14 (used for printing publication)

**Beech |**

www.beecharchitecture.com

1000 North 5th Street  
Boston, MA 02111  
Tel: 617.552.3800  
Fax: 617.552.3801

CLIENT	
Warren Hill Farms	
PROJECT	
Castle Hill	
Village Road	
Natick, MA	
IP21 0RB	
DRAWING	
3D views sheet 2	
SCALE	DATE
1/8" @ A1	APR 2015
DRAWING NUMBER	JOB NUMBER
18	B1
STATUS	
Preliminary	
REV	
A	

This drawing is copyright and remains the property of Beech Architecture Ltd. (England) Ltd.  
All other drawings and documents for this project are the property of Beech Architecture Ltd.

Commercial development could also create excess traffic issues and noise in what is a residential area.

If residential consent were granted this would safeguard the yard from falling into the hands of an obtrusive commercial operator.

We believe that by granting residential planning consent this would be the best way forward of preservation in the longer term and the most acceptable use in terms of impact.

Mr & Mrs Lyndon-Stanford states that he has offered an alternative use, we as owners since 1999 have not been privy to this offer.

Mr & Mrs Lyndon-Stanford have been offered the barns to purchase on numerous occasions, but have failed to commit, despite exhausting efforts by our land agents, lawyers and ourselves.

In 1999 as lot 3 by Durrants from the Askews.


In 2000 by ourselves.

In 2006 again by ourselves.

We have spent considerable time and money in trying to create a planning application that will meet the desired requirements for a residential development and preserve the barns.

We strongly believe that a residential development will benefit the surroundings more favourably than a commercial operation or continued dereliction.

Yours sincerely,



Andrew West

Your Ref: MS/4372/15  
Our Ref: 570\CON\4068\15  
Date: 13/01/2016  
Highways Enquiries to: kyle.porter@suffolk.gov.uk

**All planning enquiries should be sent to the Local Planning Authority.**

Email: [planningadmin@midsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:planningadmin@midsuffolk.gov.uk)

The Planning Officer  
Mid Suffolk District Council  
Council Offices  
131 High Street  
Ipswich  
Suffolk  
IP6 8DL

**For the Attention of:** Rebecca Biggs

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 - CONSULTATION RETURN MS/4372/15**

**PROPOSAL:** Demolition of 4no. modern agricultural buildings. Partial demolition of cattle shed and elements of castle farm barns. Conversion of barns to 3no. dwellings comprising rebuilding and repair of existing structures, new cartlodge to barn 3, landscaping to provide surfaced access, parking and amenity spaces. Installation of 3no. sewage package treatment plants & air source units to serve new dwellings

**LOCATION:** Castle Farm, Vicarage Road, Wingfield

Whilst the achievable visibility splays do not quite meet SCC standards, SCCs perception is that a road of this nature; narrow single lane, built up area with multiple bends will have slower speeds so on balance it is highly unlikely that the minor increase in traffic movements from the proposed existing access will be detrimental to highway safety. Therefore, notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highway Authority recommends that any permission which that Planning Authority may give should include the conditions shown below:

**1 V 1**

Condition: Before the access is first used visibility splays shall be provided as shown on Drawing No. 10 Rev: B with an X dimension of 2.4m and a Y dimension of 25.5m and thereafter retained in the specified form. Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 2 Class A of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no obstruction over 0.6 metres high shall be erected, constructed, planted or permitted to grow within the areas of the visibility splays.

Reason: To ensure vehicles exiting the drive would have sufficient visibility to enter the public highway safely and vehicles on the public highway would have sufficient warning of a vehicle emerging in order to take avoiding action.

**2 NOTE 02**

Note 2: It is an OFFENCE to carry out works within the public highway, which includes a Public Right of Way, without the permission of the Highway Authority.

Any conditions which involve work within the limits of the public highway do not give the applicant permission to carry them out. Unless otherwise agreed in writing all works within the public highway shall be carried out by the County Council or its agents at the applicant's expense.

The County Council's Central Area Manager must be contacted on Telephone: 01473 341414. Further information go to: [www.suffolk.gov.uk/environment-and-transport/highways/dropped-kerbs-vehicular-accesses/](http://www.suffolk.gov.uk/environment-and-transport/highways/dropped-kerbs-vehicular-accesses/)

A fee is payable to the Highway Authority for the assessment and inspection of both new vehicular crossing access works and improvements deemed necessary to existing vehicular crossings due to proposed development.

Yours sincerely,

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

**Michelle Windsor**

---

**From:** Richard Hoggett  
**Sent:** 08 February 2016 22:40  
**To:** Planning Admin  
**Subject:** FAO Rebecca Biggs - 4372/15 - Castle Farm, Wingfield - Archaeology

**Categories:** Green Category

Dear Rebecca,

Many thanks for your letter of 23rd December consulting us on the above application. Please accept my apologies for the delayed response.

We have considered the above application and are satisfied that the submitted Heritage Asset Assessment by Leigh Alston provides a sufficiently record of the building and that no further archaeological recording condition is required for this application.

Yours,

Richard

**Dr Richard Hoggett MCifA**  
Senior Archaeological Officer  
Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service Conservation Team  
Resource Management  
6 The Churchyard, Shire Hall, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, IP33 1RX  
Tel.: 01284 741226  
Website: <http://www.suffolk.gov.uk/archaeology/>

Search the Suffolk HER online at <http://heritage.suffolk.gov.uk>

<b>Planning Control Received</b>	
<b>- 8 FEB 2016</b>	
Acknowledged	MW
Date	10/02/16
Pass To	RB

**From:** RM Floods Planning  
**Sent:** 15 January 2016 13:49  
**To:** Planning Admin  
**Subject:** RE: Consultation on Planning Application 4372/15

FAO Rebecca Biggs

**4372/15 - Castle Farm, Vicarage Road, Wingfield IP21 5RB**

We have no comments on the following application.

Kind Regards

***Steven Halls***

Flood and Water Engineer  
Flood and Water Management  
Resource Management  
Suffolk County Council  
Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich, Suffolk. IP1 2BX

**From:** David Harrold  
**Sent:** 21 January 2016 10:55  
**To:** Planning Admin  
**Cc:** Rebecca Biggs  
**Subject:** Plan Ref 4372/15/FUL Castle Farm, Vicarage Road, Wingfield

Thank you for consulting me on the above application.

In respect of other environmental health issues I can confirm that I do not have any objection to the proposed development.

I note that the dwellings will be serviced by air source heat pumps (ASHP). These pumps produce 'fan' like noise similar to air conditioning equipment and can have an adverse impact where they are located close to neighbouring noise sensitive premises. This impact can be worse at night especially in rural or remote areas where background noise is very low. Barns 1 and 2 have ASHPs that are distant and screened from their immediate neighbours. Barn 3, however, has a pump located directly opposite and overlooked by a bedroom at Barn 2.

I would therefore recommend that the installation of the air source heat pump for Barn 3 is made conditional upon the applicant submitting details of the make, model and size of air source heat pump together with product information which includes sound power or sound pressure data, and agreed in writing with by the Local Planning Authority prior to installation.

David Harrold MCIEH

Senior Environmental Health Officer  
Babergh and Mid Suffolk Council

01449 724718

**From:** Nathan Pittam  
**Sent:** 04 January 2016 09:35  
**To:** Planning Admin  
**Subject:** 4372/15/FUL. EH - Land Contamination

**M3 : 173261**

**4372/15/FUL. EH - Land Contamination.**

**Castle Farm, Vicarage Road, Wingfield, DISS, IP21 5RB.**

**Demolition of 4no. modern agricultural buildings. Partial demolition of cattle shed and elements of castle farm barns. Conversion of barns to 3no. dwellings comprising rebuilding and repair of ...**

Many thanks for your request for comments in relation to the above application. I have reviewed the application which demonstrates that the site has been used for agricultural purposes for the last hundred years and the applicant infers that the site is therefore unlikely to be impacted by land contamination. I note that our own records indicate that there are storage tanks on site which may or may not have been decommissioned and as such these tanks pose a risk to both future end users of the site and also the wider environment. In light of the potential risks from the recorded tanks I would require that any permission for residential development at the site be conditioned to ensure that any contamination is adequately assessed and if necessary remediated. Without this condition there is no way that we can be assured that the site is suitable for use and that no unacceptable long term risks exist at the site.

Regards

Nathan

Nathan Pittam BSc. (Hons.) PhD  
Senior Environmental Management Officer  
Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils – Working Together  
t: 01449 724715 or 01473 826637  
w: [www.babergh.gov.uk](http://www.babergh.gov.uk) [www.midsuffolk.gov.uk](http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk)





## Consultation Response Pro forma

<b>1</b>	<b>Application Number</b>	4372/15, 4373/15 Castle Farm barn, Wingfield	
<b>2</b>	<b>Date of Response</b>	25.2.16	
<b>3</b>	<b>Responding Officer</b>	Name:	Paul Harrison
		Job Title:	Enabling 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.	1. The Heritage Team considers that the proposal would cause <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets because of compromise to the building's historic character arising from the change of use, and because of intrusion in the setting of the adjacent listed building; however, because the harm is limited and minimised and offers an important public benefit, the proposal is considered acceptable.</li> </ul> 2. The Heritage Team recommends approval with appropriate conditions.	
<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.	<b>Legislation</b> The Council is under duties in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings and their settings. Accordingly harm to a building or its setting is to be given great weight in decision making, and in NPPF terms requires clear and convincing justification such as by way of public benefits, and by demonstration that harm has been minimised.  <b>Listed building at risk</b> The building in question has appeared on the Council's Buildings at Risk register since 2009 when the condition of the roofs threatened decay to the historic frame. Since then repairs have been carried out to the main roof, but it has proved difficult to prevent deterioration of the single storey elements resulting from theft of roof tiles. Securing a viable long-term use for the building is considered a substantial public benefit.  <b>Planning history</b> A previous scheme was refused on grounds of its impact on the setting of the Castle. Upon appeal, the Inspector considered whether a change of use was fully justified, but he found the external alterations acceptable and was ultimately unconvinced that residential use would be harmful to the setting of the Castle. However, he found the internal subdivision of the building harmful and	

Please note that this form can be submitted electronically on the Council's 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 Council's website and available to view by the public.

dismissed the appeals on these grounds. Since his decision, Heritage officers have joined planning colleagues in informal discussion with agents on amended schemes, resulting in applications in 2015 (withdrawn), and in the present scheme. The Heritage Team have expressed support for proposals on the basis that they appeared to successfully address the issues which resulted in dismissal of the appeal.

#### Appraisal

The application is accompanied by a Heritage appraisal which assesses the building's historical significance in exemplary manner, shedding new light on the original form and subsequent evolution of the building, and its role in the setting of the Castle.

#### Drawings

There appear to be discrepancies in the survey drawings in the layout and detail of the timber frame between the plan and elevation, and between these and other survey drawings such as those in the heritage appraisal (although these in turn may rely on someone else's drawing); in particular the first floor layout plan may not be reliable in relation to position of frame members, trusses, and existing openings. These appear to result in discrepancies in the positions of windows at first floor in the western part of the building.

#### Buildings

In the main barn the existing subdivision, dating from about 1860, is retained unaltered apart from a floor inserted in one bay. The Inspector found the degree of subdivision to be the main fault of the previous scheme, and by limiting the conversion to two units in this building the present scheme has substantially reduced harm in this respect.

#### Setting of the Castle

Reducing the number of units can also be expected to result in reduced levels of activity.

On the rear elevation, facing the Castle and its outbuildings, the application scheme uses existing openings, adding only one first floor window, fitted with louvres. On the south elevation again there are new openings, also reduced from the withdrawn scheme, but on the whole the impact is considered much the same as the appeal scheme, although it is regrettable that the barn doors are to be lost. When considering the impact of the scheme on the setting of the Castle, the Inspector found that the rear elevation treatment of the previous scheme did not warrant dismissal, and in that context it is

		<p>considered that this additional opening would not critically add to harm. It should also be noted that an 1800s building and a more recent outbuilding stand between the Castle and the barn, introducing a degree of domestication to the area. The Inspector also noted that steps can be taken to control activities in the area immediately north of the barn.</p> <p>The Heritage appraisal draws new attention to the position and orientation of the barn, concluding that it forms part of a designed, formal approach to the main barn, a point which has not been explicitly addressed before. The Inspector's view was that any use, including continued agricultural use, would result in some level of disturbance and intrusion, but removal of 1900s additions and buildings would enhance the setting of the barn, and the wider setting of the Castle. The integrity of the physical layout of the barn and Castle, as now understood, is compromised by the 1800s additions and alterations which partly screen the farm buildings from the Castle grounds. This new understanding of the significance of the layout is not considered to amplify the level harm beyond what the Inspector found acceptable.</p> <p><b>Summary</b> The Heritage Team is satisfied that harm to the significance of the application building and to the setting of the Castle has been minimised, and is outweighed by the benefit to the public of securing a viable ongoing use for an important heritage asset.</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>	<p>The accuracy of the survey drawings should be confirmed, and if necessary the proposal drawings adjusted accordingly.</p> <p>Partly because of the discrepancy of the various survey drawings, recording by measured survey of extant fabric should be considered. The Archaeologist may have a view on this point.</p>
7	<p><b>Recommended conditions</b></p>	<p>Timber survey and repair schedule. Insulation details, notwithstanding. Fenestration. Materials. Schedule of repairs to single storey wings.</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.



EAST OF ENGLAND OFFICE

Ms Rebecca Biggs  
Mid Suffolk District Council  
131 High Street  
Needham Market  
Ipswich  
Suffolk  
IP6 8DL

Direct Dial: 01223 582721

Our ref: P00491790

11 January 2016

Dear Ms Biggs

**Arrangements for Handling Heritage Applications Direction 2015 & T&CP (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015**

**CASTLE FARM, VICARAGE ROAD, WINGFIELD, IP21 5RB  
Application No 4373/15**

Thank you for your letter of 22 December 2015 notifying Historic England of the above application.

**Summary**

The application proposes the conversion of the barn and associated farm buildings at Wingfield Castle Farm to form residential dwellings. Historic England has given advice on two previous applications for the residential conversion of the group and consistently expressed concern in relation to this change of use because of the impact on the buildings and the setting of the adjacent grade I listed Wingfield Castle. The present application includes minor amendments to the design but does not address our concerns.

**Historic England Advice**

The Castle Farm complex consists of a long barn with fold yards, a cartshed/granary and other outbuildings, listed Grade II, which were constructed as the farmstead to Wingfield Castle which lies immediately to the northwest, itself listed Grade I. The complex is significant both intrinsically as surviving agricultural buildings of the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries and because of its group value with the Castle. The dominant building in the farmstead is the long barn which dates from the mid sixteenth century. The timber framing of this period which survives on the first floor is similar to that found in the residential range of Wingfield Castle which was constructed shortly after 1544. The barn was under-built in the later nineteenth century when the other farm buildings were constructed, creating a good example of a farmstead of this period. The significance of the Castle and farm group, both historically and visually, is clearly expressed in the listing description. It is the long historical association between the two heritage assets, the close physical proximity of the farmstead to the Castle and



24 BROOKLANDS AVENUE, CAMBRIDGE, CB2 8BU

Telephone 01223 582749  
HistoricEngland.org.uk





EAST OF ENGLAND OFFICE

the inter-visibility between the two that lends added significance to the farm buildings. It also makes the farmstead particularly sensitive to change.

Proposals to convert the farm to residential use have been made before and we have long expressed concern regarding this in terms of its impact on the character of the barns and the setting of the Grade I listed Castle. Conversion to residential use is usually considered to be the most damaging of the potential range of new uses for agricultural buildings because of its impact on their historic character, features and their setting. The requirements for modern residential use, both in terms of the fabric of the barns and change to their immediate surroundings could remove much of the essential character of the farmstead and affect the established visual relationship between the Castle and farmstead. This relationship is a vital part of both its character and that of the setting of the Castle.

The farm complex historically operated as an integral part of the Castle's estate for a considerable period of time and still remains an integral part of the surrounding landscape. There is a strong inter-visibility between the Castle and the farm buildings. Much of the complex is visible from the within the Castle and its grounds, including the roof of the principal barn, the north elevation and area of land adjacent to this, the western elevation and part of the southern elevation including the fold yards, the western and part of the north elevation of cartshed/granary and the southern elevations are only shielded by an area of vegetation. The farm buildings frame views of the Castle on its principal approach and are prominent in general views of the Castle from fields beyond. The traditional agricultural character and use of the site is a key part of its relationship with the Castle.

A previous application for conversion of the farm to four residences was submitted in 2006 (application number 1296/06/FUL). We expressed great concern about the impact on both Castle and farm buildings in our letter to the Council of 31<sup>st</sup> July 2006. The application was refused permission, a decision subsequently upheld at appeal. In his decision (paragraph 10) the Planning Inspector questioned the appellants' assertion that an alternative to residential use could not be found as little evidence had been submitted of efforts to secure such a use. He particularly suggested countryside stewardship support and also noted that at the time 'the adjoining owner [was] willing to acquire the buildings for agricultural use and to put them into a good state of repair. In those circumstances an alternative use is not urgently required in order to secure preservation of the listed building and the proposed conversion to residential use is not warranted.' We share the Inspector's view that the onus is on the applicant to put forward a convincing case for why the site cannot be used for an agricultural, storage or other low-key business uses.


New applications for conversion of the farm buildings to three residences were submitted in 2015 (numbers 2471/15 and 2472/15). The Design and Access Statement accompanying the applications stated that the buildings are not capable of



24 BROOKLANDS AVENUE, CAMBRIDGE, CB2 8BU

Telephone 01223 582749  
HistoricEngland.org.uk





EAST OF ENGLAND OFFICE

modern agricultural use, but did not address any other uses alternative to residential or contain any supporting evidence. The Statement also failed to consider the Castle's historic setting and its development or how the farmstead might be seen from other directions, including after the modern farm structures have been removed. Despite this the document drew conclusions about the level of visual impact.

In our letter of 26<sup>th</sup> August 2015 we noted the potential for the farm buildings' new use to be clearly apparent from the Castle and from the land between them. We raised specific concerns about the treatment of the northern and western sides of the main barn and the need to protect the highly sensitive space between barn and castle from gaining a domestic character. We also commented on the south elevation of the barn and both the north and south sides of the granary/cartshed and how they might appear in views. We also drew attention to the detail of alterations to the interior of the historic farm buildings and how in his 2006 decision the Planning Inspector, when rejecting the scheme for residential conversion stated that subdivision of the long barn would mean 'it would no longer be possible to appreciate the full effect of its existing spaces, particularly on the first floor. The interest of the cart shed/granary would also be diminished by subdivision. The listed building as a whole would be substantially changed and it would not be preserved in a form consistent with its essential agricultural character' (paragraph 9).

The current application is mainly comprised of information submitted with the previous scheme and does not have any further information justifying the change of use. There have been some modifications to proposals to convert the barn. These do not fundamentally change the interior of the barn's residential scheme or address all the issues we raised concerning its northern elevation. We therefore do not feel the current application has addressed the concerns expressed by the Inspector in consideration of the 2006 application, or those of Historic England.

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 establishes that in considering applications for listed building consent the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting (paragraph 16.2). Similarly, in considering applications for planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting local planning authorities shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting (paragraph 66.1).


The National Planning Policy Framework builds upon the 1990 Act. It 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 6, 7 and 14). The NPPF also states that the significance of listed buildings can be harmed or lost by alteration to them or development in their setting (paragraph 132) and that the conservation of heritage assets (in this case Wingfield Castle and the farm buildings) is a core principle of the



24 BROOKLANDS AVENUE, CAMBRIDGE, CB2 8BU

Telephone 01223 582749  
HistoricEngland.org.uk





## EAST OF ENGLAND OFFICE

planning system (paragraph 17). Furthermore, paragraph 137 states that proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to, or better reveal the significance of the heritage assets should be treated favourably.

This application seriously raises concerns about the impact on the setting and significance of Wingfield Castle by the proposed development. As the Castle is grade I listed it is in the top 2.5% of listed buildings nationally. The NPPF states that the conservation of heritage assets should be given 'great weight' in the planning system. The importance of the Castle and sensitivity of its setting makes that particularly pertinent here.

Paragraph 128 of the NPPF requires applicants to submit sufficient information on the significance of heritage assets to allow assessment of a development's impact upon that significance. While the analysis of the historic barn is good there is insufficient information on the setting of the heritage assets, its historical development and how it contributes to their significance as well as the visual impact of certain aspects of the development. Given the significance of the heritage assets concerned this information is important and we do not consider the application has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 128.


Based on the information that has been submitted we are concerned that conversion of the historic farm buildings to residential use would result in harm to the significance of Wingfield Castle in terms of the NPPF paragraphs 132 and 134. This would be caused by the permanent curtailing of the agricultural use and bringing domestic activity into a part of the Castle's immediate setting which was an ancillary service area. The detail of the design would also result in harm to the significance of the grade II listed farm buildings and in particular some of the external alterations to the farmstead would have a harmful impact on the Castle's setting and significance. The amendments made to the proposed designs do not address these concerns.


The farm buildings are in need of repair and being brought into use. This and the removal of modern farm structures adjacent to them could be considered a public benefit in terms of the NPPF paragraph 134 for the Council to weigh against the harm to the heritage assets. However, the NPPF paragraph 132 required a 'clear and convincing' justification to be made for 'any' harm. We do not feel sufficient justification has been made for the proposed use. Furthermore, the impact on the most significant areas of the farm buildings and the changes to the exterior of the buildings which would have a harmful impact on the Castle has not been justified. We leave it to the Council to consider any public benefit resulting from the development but if the justification for the harm required by the NPPF is not made we recommend the application is refused.



24 BROOKLANDS AVENUE, CAMBRIDGE, CB2 8BU

Telephone 01223 582749  
HistoricEngland.org.uk





EAST OF ENGLAND OFFICE

**Recommendation**

Historic England is concerned by the proposal to convert the farmstead to residential units which would result in harm to the significance of the barns and Wingfield Castle in terms of the NPPF paragraphs 132 and 134. The amended plans do not address these concerns and we do not consider the justification required by the NPPF has been made for the proposed use, the impact on the most significant areas of the farm buildings and the changes to their exterior which would have a harmful impact on the Castle. We leave it to the Council to consider any public benefit resulting from the development and if the reuse of the buildings could be achieved without harm to the heritage assets but if the justification for the harm required by the NPPF is not made we recommend the application is refused.

Yours sincerely

**David Eve**

Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas  
E-mail: david.eve@HistoricEngland.org.uk



24 BROOKLANDS AVENUE, CAMBRIDGE, CB2 8BU

Telephone 01223 582749  
HistoricEngland.org.uk





**From:** Consultations (NE) [mailto:consultations@naturalengland.org.uk]  
**Sent:** 04 January 2016 16:19  
**To:** Planning Admin  
**Subject:** 4372/15 Consultation response

Application ref: 4372/15  
Our ref:175117

**Natural England has no comments to make on this application.**

The lack of comment from Natural England does not imply that there are no impacts on the natural environment, but only that the application is not likely to result in significant impacts on statutory designated nature conservation sites or landscapes. It is for the local planning authority to determine whether or not this application is consistent with national and local policies on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may be able to provide information and advice on the environmental value of this site and the impacts of the proposal to assist the decision making process. We advise LPAs to obtain specialist ecological or other environmental advice when determining the environmental impacts of development.

We recommend referring to our SSSI Impact Risk Zones (available on Magic and as a downloadable dataset) prior to consultation with Natural England.

Yours faithfully

Jacqui Salt  
Natural England  
Consultation Service  
Hornbeam House  
Crewe Business Park  
Electra Way,  
Crewe  
Cheshire, CW1 6GJ

Email: [consultations@naturalengland.org.uk](mailto:consultations@naturalengland.org.uk)  
[www.gov.uk/natural-england](http://www.gov.uk/natural-england)



**Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service**

Mid Suffolk District Council  
Planning Department  
131 High Street  
Needham Market  
Ipswich  
IP6 8DL


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

Your Ref: 15/4372/FUL  
Our Ref: FS/F180593  
Enquiries to: Angela Kempen  
Direct Line: 01473 260588  
E-mail: Fire.BusinessSupport@suffolk.gov.uk  
Web Address: <http://www.suffolk.gov.uk>

Date: 11/01/2016

Dear Sirs

**Castle Farm, Vicarage Road, Wingfield IP21 5RB**  
**Planning Application No: 15/4372/FUL**



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**

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service records show that the nearest fire hydrant in this location is over 170m from the proposed build site and we therefore recommends the use of an existing area of open water as an emergency water supply (EWS).

Criteria appertaining to Fire and Rescue Authority requirements for siting and access are available on request from the above address.

continued

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



Mrs A Kempen  
Water Officer

Copy: Mr C Beech, Church Farm Barn, The Street, Thorndon IP23 7JR  
Enc: Sprinkler Information

**From:** Nigel Brett  
**Sent:** 13 January 2016 15:16  
**To:** Rebecca Biggs; Sue Clements  
**Cc:** Carol Clarke; Bron Curtis  
**Subject:** RE: 4372/15

Hi Rebecca

This is only 3 houses, but, 14 bedrooms, so potentially 28 people, which if large families will mean a big increase in need for children's play areas at that end of the village.

There is no play area in Wingfield at the moment, but there is a possible project to create an area near the Common/castle. There is currently no 106 allocation for play. There is some existing S106 monies for village hall and sports facilities, which are outside of the parish, but only from one scheme, so no pooling restriction. So a sports and village hall facility contribution should also apply.

The Common would not normally be in scope for S106, but there could be a project to improve access, which might be felt to be appropriate.

Regards

**Nigel Brett**

Communities - Health & Wellbeing Officer,  
People Directorate,

Mid Suffolk and Babergh District Council

Telephone: 01449 724643; 01473 825764

Email: [nigel.brett@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:nigel.brett@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk)

[www.midsuffolk.gov.uk](http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk)

An estimated **800,000**  
people in England feel lonely.

*Can you spot the signs?*

Visit: [www.healthysuffolk.org.uk](http://www.healthysuffolk.org.uk)



**Rebecca Biggs**

---

**From:** Dawn Easter  
**Sent:** 26 February 2016 09:21  
**To:** Rebecca Biggs  
**Cc:** David Benham  
**Subject:** 4372/15- Castle Farm Barns

**Categories:** Red Category

These barns are located in a relatively isolated part of the district with access along minor roads only. There is little demand for commercial floor space in Wingfield as there are business centres nearby in Stradbroke and Scole plus the large industrial area at Eye Airfield. Any commercial activity in these barns would need to have restrictions on the amount and type of traffic generated, their hours of operation and noise levels to reflect those in place at Wingfield Barns venue nearby.

The only possible commercial use for these buildings would be for offices, but the cost of conversion and lack of demand would make this unviable. I am, therefore, of the opinion that that the barns are unsuitable for employment use.

Dawn Easter  
Economic Development Officer  
Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils – Working Together  
tel 01449 724635  
[www.midsuffolk.gov.uk](http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk) [www.babergh.gov.uk](http://www.babergh.gov.uk)

**Rebecca Biggs**

---

**From:** Louise Barker  
**Sent:** 25 January 2016 15:53  
**To:** Rebecca Biggs  
**Subject:** Commuted Sum - Castle Farm - Wingfield

Hi Becky

I've now looked at this in a bit more detail and based it on a 2 bed affordable house. The housing need has changed since the last calculation and the results are £86,010.

I've checked this with Julie and this is the amount we are recommending.

Have they requested a viability assessment?

Regards

Lou

Louise Barker  
**Housing Development Officer – Strategic Housing**  
**Mid Suffolk & Babergh District Councils Working Together**

Direct dial: 01449 724787

Email: [louise.barker@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:louise.barker@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk)

Websites: [www.midsuffolk.gov.uk](http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk) and [www.babergh.gov.uk](http://www.babergh.gov.uk)



**Rebecca Biggs**

---

**From:** Paul Harrison  
**Sent:** 14 January 2016 08:51  
**To:** Rebecca Biggs; Planning Admin  
**Subject:** FW: LAND AND BUILDINGS AT CASTLE FARM, VICARAGE ROAD, WINGFIELD, IP21 5RB

**Categories:** Red Category

**From:** Nicolaas Joubert [<mailto:historicbuildings.haa@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** 13 January 2016 23:49  
**To:** [rebecca.biggs@westsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:rebecca.biggs@westsuffolk.gov.uk)  
**Cc:** Paul Harrison  
**Subject:** LAND AND BUILDINGS AT CASTLE FARM, VICARAGE ROAD, WINGFIELD, IP21 5RB

Dear Ms. Biggs,

Re: Application No 2471/15 & 2472/15

On behalf of my clients Mr. & Mrs. Lyndon-Stanford, I would like to take the opportunity to register their objection to the proposed application validated on December, 15th 2015.

They have previously raised an objection to a similar proposal in 2006 ref; Application Nos. 1296/06/FUL and 1379/06. Although the current planning application reflects an improved scheme, the impact of the proposed development will have a detrimental impact on the buildings and the setting of the adjacent Grade I Listed Wingfield Castle. This view was also strongly expressed by Historic England;

'The effect on the setting and significance of Wingfield Castle from the proposed development falls within the remit of Historic England to advise the Council, although the effect on the farm buildings and particularly the long barn would also be profound. Proposals to convert the farm to residential use have been made before and we have long expressed concern regarding this in terms of its impact on the character of the barns and the setting of the Grade I listed Castle. Conversion to residential use is usually considered to be the most damaging of the potential range of new uses for agricultural buildings because of its impact on their historic character, features and their setting. The requirements for modern residential use, both in terms of the fabric of the barns and change to their immediate surroundings could remove much of the essential character of the farmstead and affect the established visual relationship between the Castle and farmstead. This relationship is a vital part of both its character and that of the setting of the Castle.'

Further;

'The NPPF also states that the significance of listed buildings can be harmed or lost by alteration to them or development in their setting (paragraph 132) and that the conservation of heritage assets (in this case Wingfield Castle and the farm buildings) is a core principle of the planning system (paragraph 17). Furthermore, paragraph 137 states that proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to, or better reveal the significance of the heritage assets should be treated favourably.'


Although the conversion of historic farm buildings to residential use are acceptable in circumstance where; they are no longer functional in their historic use and a conversion will not have a detrimental impact on the heritage asset's character, appearance and setting it is preferred to explore an alternative which will have the least impact. My clients have offered to purchase the barn and its associated buildings to ensure

that they are repaired and retained within their historical setting of the Grade I Wingfield Castle. This is the best option to ensure the preservation of the setting and conservation of the historical 19th century model farmstead for future generations.

The supporting documentation for this objection was lodged with Mid-Suffolk County Council in 2006. If further copy is required, please do not hesitate to contact me on 07717533498 or alternatively by email as shown above.

Yours sincerely,  
Nicolaas Joubert, MSc Building Conservation.





**Nicolaas Joubert (MSc.)**  
*Historic Buildings Consultant*

10 Bishops Croft,  
 Barningham,  
 Bury St. Edmunds  
 Suffolk  
 IP31 1BZ

**On behalf of:**

**Mr. & Mrs. Lyndon-Stanford**  
 Wingfield Castle  
 Wingfield,  
 Suffolk  
 IP21 5RB

**Ms Rebecca Biggs**  
 Mid Suffolk District Council  
 131 High Street  
 Needham Market  
 Ipswich  
 Suffolk  
 IP6 8D

22 January 2015

**Reference:** Planning Applications Numbers 4372/15 and 4373/15.

On behalf of Mr. & Mrs. Lyndon-Stanford, and in my qualified capacity as a historic buildings specialist, I object strongly to the above mentioned proposed development. Our objection and concerns are upheld by the following parties to name a few:

- Historic England – David Eve
- SPAB - Elaine Byrne
- Suffolk Preservation Society – Richard Ward (DipTP MRTPI)
- Prof. David Watkin (University of Cambridge, Dept. Of History and Art)
- Prof. Rob Liddiard (University of East Anglia)
- Prof. Maurice Howard
- Tim Knox (Head of the Fitzwilliam Museum)

*Statements by the above mentioned parties are available on request.*

### **Setting of the Listed Buildings**

As demonstrated in the listing particulars, Appendices A & B, Wingfield Castle and its historically associated farm buildings are of significant historical interest. The Medieval Grade 1 listed castle and the collection of post-medieval farm buildings within the setting of this nationally important building form a group. The farm buildings have been designated as a Grade II historical asset, and the historical value of this group of farm buildings were clearly demonstrated by Leigh Alston in his Historic Building Record published by the Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service. Below is an extract from his report:

***'Despite the extent of its alterations in the mid-19th century the Tudor barn is still an imposing and nationally important example of its type. Its scale and external decoration was designed to extend the width and visual impact of the gatehouse when approaching from the south, and it forms part of a rare late Elizabethan 'seigniorial landscape' reflecting the status of one of East Anglia's most important families. It remains of vital importance to the historic context and integrity of the grade I-listed castle, and accordingly, in my view, merits listing at grade II\*. The refurbishment of circa 1860 is of historic interest in itself as part of a well-preserved 'model' farm in the latest fashion of its day, and illustrates the wealth of the Flixton Hall estate to which it belonged.'***

Prof. Rob Liddiard has carried out extensive research on the castle and its setting during a research project in 2009. In a subsequent letter dated 28<sup>th</sup> August 2015 he stated:

***'The close proximity of the long barn and castle, as well as the invisibility between them, adds considerably to the historical importance of the whole. Wingfield is one of the few places in East Anglia where such an arrangement can still be seen on the ground.'***

Both my associate Philip Aitkens (Historic Buildings Consultant) and I have assessed the castle and its setting during this project and on separate occasions. We are very concerned about the significant impact posed by a development to the farm buildings and to the historic setting of Wingfield Castle.

The farm buildings will require a large investment to repair and recover. Conversion to dwellings is generally considered as the most financially viable option to recover such investments. This should be a last resort as such conversions could have a very damaging impact on the fabric, setting and character of these buildings. Where an alternative use can be found, particularly; storage, commercial use or continued agricultural use, there is no justification for the conversion of such heritage assets to dwellings. Mr. & Mrs. Lyndon-Sandford have offered such an alternative which will not only preserve the very significance of the buildings but will also enhance the setting of the castle and farm buildings (paragraph 137, NPPF).

Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states that any impact on a heritage asset requires a clear and convincing justification. The substantial historical significance of the setting and heritage assets which will be negatively affected by the proposed scheme calls the justification for the proposed development into question.

Yours sincerely,  
J. Nicolaas Joubert MSc.

## Appendix A Grade I listed Wingfield Castle

### Listed Buildings Description

Remains of fortified manor house. Late C14, for Michael de la Pole, who was granted licence to crenellate in 1384. An irregular rectangle on plan, surrounded by a moat. Only the south curtain wall is intact, with a fine gatehouse, not quite central, and polygonal corner bastions. Flint rubble with stone dressings. Red brick embattlements, mostly rebuilt. Below the parapet a string course with gargoyles. Lancet and loop windows to ground floor, 2-light Decorated-style windows above. Gatehouse has 3-storey polygonal corner towers with flushwork panelling at the base. Outer entrance has moulded segmental pointed arch, dying into the impost. Moulded inner arch with original gates and wicket gate. In the jambs are square panels with the Wingfield and de la Pole arms and a portcullis groove. To courtyard a 4-centred arch. Inside the gateway 4 doorways with 2-centred arches. Evidence for vaulted roof. First-floor guardroom has original fireplace with stone buttresses terminating in corbels carved as human heads. 2-storey curtain walls; on the inner side there are several fireplaces and a piscina where living rooms and the chapel once stood. Foundations of the missing curtain walls and bastions can be traced. The present house is built into the remains of the west curtain wall, probably on the site of the castle great hall, part of which it may incorporate. Mid C16, with at least 2 phases of C17 alteration. An impressive range some 40m long. Part rubblework, colourwashed or plastered, part timber framed to the upper floor, with good C16 exposed close studding to the east. Roof plaintiled to east, glazed black pantiled to west. 2 storeys and attic. Various mullioned and mullion and transom windows: some original, others of later date and some C20 copies of C16 work. Fine diamond-leaded glazing with many stained glass panels, much of it old but all inserted C20 from elsewhere. 2-storey rubblework entrance porch: 4-centred arch, the hoodmould supported on stops carved with falcons, the crest of the Jernyngham family to whom the castle was granted in 1544. Above the entrance an oblong niche surrounded by guilloche work. Original doorframe and door. To north of porch a 3-storey stair tower: square, with splayed angles to ground and first floor. To the west a massive external stack with 4 octagonal shafts, 2 having moulded brick embellishment; star caps. 3 other external stacks, one with rebuilt octagonal shafts. Later axial stacks. Interior has a number of good 4-centre arched brick fireplaces. Main ground floor room has ovolo-moulded ceiling beams of c.1600. In the kitchen a blocked late C14 opening to the moat with a moulded arch. Fine C16 plain oak newel stair in 2 flights. Large first floor room with plain barrel ceiling. Much C17 work, especially partitioning. Mid C16 roof with clasped purlins and arched wind braces. The detached buildings within the line of the curtain walls are not included in the listing.

## Appendix B

### Grade II listed Long barn with fold yards and cartshed/granary with other outbuildings at Wingfield Castle Farm

#### Listed Buildings Description

Long barn with fold yards and cartshed/granary with other outbuildings. c.1550 and later C19. Red brick and timber-framed with weatherboarding. Pantile roofs. Long barn of 11 bays has 3 fold yards and ancillary buildings projecting southwards and a further outbuilding on the east end. The mid C16 barn has a ground floor underbuilt in brick in the later C19 when the main posts were probably cut, but retains the first floor of close-studded timber-frame with mid rail, jowled posts, wall plates and tie beams. Some curved and cranked wind bracing remains. The end bays are floored and were originally probably for stabling on the ground floor. Most of the main frame is of chamfered timbers with ogee stops and is very similar to the framing in the residential range of the adjacent Wingfield Castle (q.v.), which was built shortly after 1544. The roof is later C19 as are the rest of the buildings. Standing south of the fold yards is the 3-bay cartshed with granary over and a further single-storey outbuilding attached to east.

These C16 and C19 farm buildings are of special interest in themselves and form part of a very significant group both visually and historically with Wingfield Castle which stands close by to the northwest. The barn is almost certainly contemporary with the Tudor part which was built by Sir Henry Jerningham shortly after he was granted the castle in 1544. This unusually long barn must have been the principal estate farm barn and the framing is of the high quality which one would associate with such a barn.

The main barn with the survival of the whole first floor of fine framing of the main estate barn of the Jerninghams and the C19 attached fold yards and adjacent cartshed/granary building make up with it a good example of a later C19 farmstead as well. The buildings are of special architectural and historic interest and are part of a very significant group. The group value with the Castle is very significant both visually, since these buildings have a close visual relationship, and historically. The group makes up part of the early Tudor estate complex resuscitated after the Jerninghams took over the estate following the fall of the de la Pole family (Earls of Suffolk) who built the castle in the late C14. The main barn of such an estate was normally sited where the present building stands to one side of the base court which in the case of Wingfield Castle was to the east away from the residential part of the castle which in the south-west corner.

In size the barn compares with the examples at Framsdon hall (12 bays), Winston Hall Farm and Roydon Hall (10 bays). In date there is also the comparison with the barn at nearby Wingfield College (q.v.) dated to c.1527. Suffolk moated manors and their farmsteads are very important in a national context and the early Tudor period appears to be one of expanding crop volumes leading to large barns being built. This one is also of interest in that part was floored with probably stabling below.