

Comments for Planning Application DC/20/2254/HH

Application Summary

Application Number: DC/20/2254/HH

Address: 4 Reeds Buildings Bury St Edmunds IP33 1HU

Proposal: Householder application - a. front porch b. rear two-storey extension

Case Officer: Olivia Luckhurst

Customer Details

Name: Mr Matthew Hughes

Address: 5 Reeds Buildings, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk IP33 1HU

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Plan queries

Comment: Affect on local area

Featured in the 1861 census our row is a quaint, quirky, unique terrace. It's full of character & its flat, undeveloped, north facing upper façade of soft, traditional pastels can be seen from the busy cycleway of Cotton Ln, allotments & water meadows beyond. Even as far as the railway past the River Lark, 400m off. Indeed, visitors to our historic town can see the homely, uniform, upper storey line of our historic dwellings, as a preserved, undeveloped sight loved for over a century. For residents the north is their main entry, as it's used for the car. The flush exterior of the upper frontage of our notable terrace is a homely sight, cherished by residents for generations.

Any 1st floor extension would cut the terrace line, spoil the character & destroy the row's charm as seen by countless residents, passers-by, allotment holders & train users over the decades. Such a protrusion would be unsightly & the excrescence be very conspicuous & out of character for the area.

Planners have wisely rejected upper floor projects for the row in the past & residents understand this & only developed on the ground floor around the line of existing fences. So far NO 1st floor additions have been made to Reeds Buildings or 97-105 Northgate which has similar heritage pedigree.

The new roof would be perpendicular to the existing roof & its ridge will neither match the current top ridge's height nor the fascia. It is not in sympathy with & will destroy the row's unbroken upper line & character. Its undesirable large scale detracts from the appearance of the flat terrace. An addition would establish precedent to the approval of other 1st floor extensions to the progressive detriment of the character of the area around the yard.

Established aesthetics must be preserved for future generations to enjoy.

A longer, ground floor extension similar to no10 would achieve the desired living area without destroying the terrace line. This should be pursued & current idea rejected.