

9 June 2011

Philip Isbell Esq
Lead professional
Planning Department
Mid Suffolk District Council
High Street
Needham Market
IP6 8DL

For the attention of Ms Bronwen Curtis, Planning Officer

Dear Mr Isbell,

**Planning application ref:1569.11 – Land at Wood Farm, Stonham Road, Crowfield
Erection of 5 No. 1 bed holiday-let units. Non-compliance with condition 13
planning consent ref: 1611/10**

1. I am writing to submit representations on behalf of the Suffolk Preservation Society ('the society'). This application is sited adjacent to Wood Farmhouse, a grade II listed building with associated listed granary. The setting of these listed buildings and the wider character and appearance of the countryside is of concern to the Society.
2. In principle, the revision of the re-design of the units is recommended as those approved previously were considered alien and incongruous and wholly inappropriate to the rich architectural traditions of High Suffolk. The Society believes that in order to be successful in this location, any such development should seek to create a cohesive group that visually replicates or reinterprets the form of a traditional farmstead with a hierarchy of building types set around a communal yard.
3. The Society is concerned that the submitted drawings are of a lamentably low quality (little more than rough sketches) and do not even include internal layouts or upper floor plans. In addition, in terms of the layout within the site, no attempt at 'place-making' is apparent with the units scattered seemingly at random around the former paddock area and set at jaunty angles. This is more redolent of a 1960's suburban estate than a traditional farmstead grouping. We suggest that a cohesive group or family of buildings more tightly grouped about a central yard area would be more appropriate in this sensitive rural location adjacent to listed buildings.
4. In terms of the design of the units, we do recognise that the applicant is now seeking to create a more convincing group that reflects the types of structures usually encountered in a farmstead group. This is to be welcomed and encouraged. However, the elevational treatment is naïve and poorly rendered. The excessive use of roof lights

detracts from the appearance of the units and is wholly avoidable. For example, in the case of unit B ('cart shed' type structure) the use of a full width glazed screen set behind the posted frontage could provide more than adequate lighting to obviate the requirement for roof lights. Such roof lights are considered overpowering on such a modest building form. We suggest that your conservation officer advises the applicant to improve the layout and detailed design of the proposed units.

5. Regrettably, in the present form the Society must formally object to the scheme that does not conform with 'saved' local plan policies GP1, HB1, CL1, RT16, and RT19 due to the inappropriate layout and design of the current scheme.

5. The Society requests that this representation is reported in full to the members of the Planning Control Committee and not summarised, both as a reflection of the brevity of the letter and the Society's position as the sole countywide amenity body representing a broad membership.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Simon Cairns', with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Simon Cairns
MRTPI IHBC
Director