

Beacon Planning Ltd 8 Quy Court, Colliers Lane, Stow-cum-Quy, Cambridge, CB25 9AU

T: 01223 810990

E: mail@beaconplanning.co.uk
W: www.beaconplanning.co.uk

Mr Chris Rand St Edmundsbury Borough Council PO Box 122 BURY ST EDMUNDS Suffolk IP33 3YS

4 February 2016

Our ref: JM/14-1092

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Mr Rand,

GREAT WILSEY PARK, WILSEY ROAD, LITTLE WRATTING, SUFFOLK - APP REF: DC/15/2151/OUT

I am writing in response to the letter that your authority has received from Historic England (dated 21 December 2015) regarding the proposed development at the above site. I would like to offer the following comments on Historic England's advice, specifically where they relate to the Cultural Heritage Chapter that Beacon Planning prepared for the ES that supported the application under consideration.

Historic England's letter appears to be broadly supportive of the proposed development, but does consider that the proximity of the development to the Scheduled Monument to the southeast and northwest causes a degree of harm (but acknowledged to be less than substantial) to the significance of this heritage asset. They consider that further mitigation is necessary, particularly in relation to the housing parcels in proximity to the moated site.

It is acknowledged in the Cultural Heritage Chapter that there will be a degree of harm to the setting of the Scheduled Monument, notably from development parcel A5 which lies between the moated site and the Great Field Plantation. However, it should be noted that development in this location has been significantly reduced from that proposed in the diagram attached to the Concept Statement (which provided the parameters and framework for the development of this site as defined in Policy HV4 of the Haverhill Vision 2031). The higher density development parcel to the southwest of the moated site (proposed in the Concept Statement, adopted in



May 2013) has been removed from the submitted parameter plans for the Outline application. The density of the A5 development parcel has also been decreased from the Concept Statement diagram from 'Higher Density' to the lowest category of density proposed for the site (20-25dph) in the submitted parameter plans. Similarly, the outer edge of development parcel A10 (i.e. that which is closest to the moated site) has also been reduced from the 'Higher Density' proposed in the Concept Statement Diagram to a density of 20-25dph in the submitted parameter plans. Significant mitigation has already therefore been undertaken to reduce the potential impact on the Scheduled Monument.

The Masterplan for the site (which was approved in September 2015) describes on p40 that 'The design and layout of these areas [the lowest density areas] will be landscape-led in order to respect the context of the surrounding countryside and nearby villages.' This design approach to these areas has been developed from para 28 of the Concept Statement which notes that 'The areas at the extreme margins adjoining the countryside provide an opportunity for buildings within a landscape setting.' There is adequate steer from these two adopted documents to ensure that at detailed design stage, the development in these areas adjoining the moated site will have an appropriately rural character, avoiding the suburban character that Historic England consider will be inevitable in these areas. The Council have the opportunity to ensure this is not the case without compromising the quantum of development that is necessary to ensure that the development of these parcels remains sustainable. If the housing block were narrowed too much, the resulting plot dimensions would result in a substantial amount of single frontage road which would be detrimental for both the design quality and viability of this part of the development.

Tree belts are an integral part of the vision for the development of this site and, as noted by Historic England, are shown in the diagram attached to the Concept Statement. However, this diagram was indicative only and contained no suggested dimensions for these planting belts. Similarly, although the Masterplan for the site contains no dimensions for these screening belts, their breadth has been considered and are proposed to be in the region of 15m which is typically appropriate for this type of structural planting and has been assessed to be adequate to ensure that development will not be visible once the planting is established. The structural planting will take the form of woodland belts and the species and maturity of specimens can be controlled by the Council to ensure rapid establishment and adequate seasonal cover.

The mitigation of the less than substantial harm arising from the development on the heritage significance of the Scheduled Monument has therefore been carefully considered as part of the design of the masterplan and parameter plans for the Outline application. These have been informed by the Concept Statement and attached diagram adopted by the Council (in addition to numerous background supporting studies undertaken by the client and project team). The Concept Statement and the Haverhill Vision 2031 were both thoroughly consulted upon and numerous stakeholders, including presumably Historic England (then known as English Heritage). The principle of the development has therefore been long established.

If, however, it is still considered that further mitigation of the development is required, it is suggested that some decrease in development parcel A5 may be possible, but this would need to be compensated for by increasing the density of parcels A2 and/or A3 to accommodate the relocated units. It is our view though that this is not necessary and there is significant scope at the detailed design stages to ensure that development and landscaping is appropriate to and further mitigates any residual harm to the setting of the Scheduled Monument.

Yours sincerely,



Jenni Mason Senior Consultant jenni.mason@beaconplanning.co.uk

cc Mr David Grech – Historic Places Adviser, Historic England Ms Kimberley Brown – Principal Planner, Bidwells