

**Philip Isbell**  
Chief Planning Officer – Sustainable Communities

**Babergh District Council**  
Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich IP1 2BX

Website: [www.babergh.gov.uk](http://www.babergh.gov.uk)



---

Ms Sibyl Thomas  
Honeylands  
Mill End Road  
Radwinter  
Saffron Walden  
Essex  
CB10 2TJ

**Please ask for:** Tegan Chenery  
**Your reference:** PPA492705663  
**Our reference:** DC/23/01056  
**E-mail:** [heritage@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:heritage@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk)  
**Date:** 11th April 2023

---

Dear Ms Sibyl Thomas

**Proposal:** Heritage pre app meeting on site with written response - Internal re-ordering. Additional rear and side windows and dormer windows. Rebuild rear lean-to. Demolition of uPVC conservatory. New single storey flat roof extension. Replacement of cementitious external render and interior plaster.

**Location:** 3 Polstead Street, Stoke By Nayland, Colchester, Suffolk CO6 4SA

**Site Meeting Date:** 31/03/2023

Thank you for your request for pre-application advice. I have reviewed the details submitted and provide the following information and advice:

**Site Constraints:**

3 Polstead Street is a Grade II listed building which is known on the National Heritage Listed for England (NHLE) as 'Dickhill Cottage'. The NHLE describes the building as an 18th century timber-framed and plastered house, re-fronted in brick in the late 18th or early 19th centuries, and colour-washed. It is of one-storey with attics, has a three window range with double-hung sashes with glazing bars in flush frames, a tiled roof with two flat headed dormers, and a central large square chimney stack.

There are numerous other listed buildings in close proximity and the building stands with Stoke by Nayland Conservation Area.

**Description of Proposal:**

Heritage pre app meeting on site with written response - Internal re-ordering. Additional rear and side windows and dormer windows. Rebuild rear lean-to. Demolition of uPVC conservatory. New single storey flat roof extension. Replacement of cementitious external render and interior plaster.

**Plans & Documents Considered:**

The plans and documents recorded below are those which have been considered:

---

**Babergh District Council**  
Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich IP1 2BX  
Telephone: (0300) 1234 000  
SMS Text Mobile: (07827) 842833  
[www.babergh.gov.uk](http://www.babergh.gov.uk)

---

**Mid Suffolk District Council**  
Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich IP1 2BX  
Telephone: (0300) 1234 000  
SMS Text Mobile: (07827) 842833  
[www.midsuffolk.gov.uk](http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk)

Site Location Plan 2234.SD.100 ST - Received 02/03/2023  
Plans - Existing 2234/SD/101 - Received 02/03/2023  
Elevations - Existing 2234/SD/102 - Received 02/03/2023  
Plans - Proposed 2234/PD/201 B - Received 02/03/2023  
Elevations - Proposed 2234/PD/202 B - Received 02/03/2023  
Supporting Statement - Received 02/03/2023

**Relevant Planning History:**

B/0045/81/LBC Erection of single storey rear extension.	Granted 04/06/1981
B/0483/81/FUL Erection of single storey extension.	Granted 04/06/1981
B/LB/89/01115 APPLICATION FOR LISTED BUILDING CONSENT - INSTALLATION OF SATELLITE DISH TO REAR OF DWELLING	Granted 16/08/1989
B//91/00366 ERECTION OF A FIRST FLOOR REAR EXTENSION AS AMENDED BY REVISED DRAWING RECEIVED 27.06.91	Granted 02/07/1991
B/LB/91/00365 APPLICATION FOR LISTED BUILDING CONSENT - ERECTION OF FIRST FLOOR REAR EXTENSION AND INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AS AMENDED BY REVISED DRAWING RECEIVED 27.06.91	Granted 02/07/1991

**Relevant Planning Policies:**

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework  
CN01 - Design Standards  
CN06 - Listed Buildings - Alteration/Ext/COU  
CN08 - Development in/near conservation areas

**Officer Assessment:**

This pre-application enquiry relates to various internal and external alterations to the listed building, including alterations to the internal layout, insertion of a staircase, demolition of a lean-to, conservatory structure and shed, erection of a new lean-to and flat roofed extensions, insertion of new openings and replacement of windows, the insertion of rooflights, replacement front door, as well as plaster and render repairs. The issues of the Heritage Team's concern therefore relate to the potential impact of the proposals on the significance of the host listed building, the setting and significance of nearby listed buildings, as well as the character and appearance of the conservation area.

As discussed on site, the principle of many of the works are not opposed. However, I recommend various amendments to the detailed design and scale of elements in order to achieve an acceptable scheme, which I will outline below. Furthermore, some further investigation and evidence will need to be provided in a Heritage Statement to explain the previous alterations carried out and the evolution of the building.

Additional information:

There appears to have been a Listed Building Consent approved in 1981 (B/0045/81/LBC) for a single-storey rear extension, and in 1991 (B/LB/91/00365) for a first floor rear extension. Having had a brief assessment of the microfiche, it appears that the earlier structure, before these works were carried out, was a flat roofed or very shallow mono-pitched roof rear range, apparently with no historic interest. However, the historic OS maps appear to show two projecting elements to the rear of no. 3, and to the interior, as seen on site, there is evidence of historic timber framing, perhaps suggesting re-use of fabric. Therefore, the Heritage Statement provided with any future application should make an assessment of the existing rear ranges and fabric, and clarify how the building has been altered during this period and more recently.

I am currently of the view that the structure is not historic, or has been greatly altered, so it is unlikely to contribute to the building's special interest. Nevertheless, this should be explored in a Heritage Statement for clarity.

Please also provide numerous photos in the Heritage Statement, including detailed schedules of works for any repairs or alterations to the historic range. This can be cross referenced to the drawings, but will be helpful in assessing the impact of the works and their appropriateness.

Amendments:

Having considered the plans in more detail since the site visit, there are several elements which require some amendment before I could support the detail in an application:

Whilst the principle of using the earlier dormer to the rear of the historic range as the point of access to install a staircase to the rear addition, is not opposed, the associated partitioning proposed at first floor in the historic range is not supported. This would create odd proportions within one of the cells and would disrupt the historic planform and appreciation of the space. It would also intersect the historic stack - albeit I note there is no open fireplace expressed in this position. Nevertheless, the arrangement is cumbersome and would not sustain the building's interest. The partition walls should be removed. If this in turn affects the feasibility of the steps over the wall plate, they could be repositioned as a separate staircase within the rear modern range. I would have no concerns in regard to its re-location within the rear extensions.

Clarity should also be provided in regard to the extent of work proposed in this location if the steps are positioned over the wall plate. The existing floor plans show a thick wall at first floor between the historic and modern ranges, adjacent to the bathroom, but the proposed floor plans show this notably reduced. Historic fabric should be retained in situ. Any new openings should have some initial investigations carried out in the area, with photographs taken to provide evidence of the age and interest of the fabric, all which should be included in a Heritage Statement for assessment.

As discussed, there should be an appropriate hierarchy maintained between the historic principal range and the rear additions. In the current proposal, the glazing on the rear additions appears to disrupt that hierarchy, due to its size, so the rear additions would not appear subservient to the historic front. As such, I recommend reducing the size of the glazing to the rear, pitched roof additions, particularly the windows to the north elevation and those in the gable to the east, which should be a two-light window. The additional dormer proposed to the rear should also be omitted. Three dormers would increase the visual prominence and massing of the rear range, and so I recommend a single, conservation rooflight might be a suitable alternative.

However, I have some concerns about the overall number of rooflights which would be present on the building, as already proposed, and their cumulative impact. One rooflight should be removed from the lean-to to the north elevation, and both rooflights removed from the lean-to entrance to the east elevation. This would help to simplify the designs and limit the visual intrusion in the roof slopes. The entrance lean-to would already incorporate a large amount of glazing in elevation, with slender metal frames, allowing ample daylight into this area, so I do not consider these rooflights fundamental to the scheme.

The principle of a contemporary flat roofed extension to the existing modern rear range is not opposed. However, the scale should be reduced. Currently, there is little articulation between the walls and roof of the extension, to the walls of the rear range. The extension should be stepped in more notably, as well as the overall footprint and the finished height reduced, again to help articulate the subservience of this element and to avoid creating an imbalance between the modern additions to the proportions of the historic core. The north elevation of the contemporary extension should also have some form of articulation to help reduce its massing and potentially monolithic form, which is currently shown as a plain, rendered wall. This could either be through vertical timber cladding, or some other form sensitive detailing.

#### Unauthorised works:

On site, it was noted that there appears to have been several unauthorised elements of work carried out, apparently by the previous owners, as there is no Planning history to refer to. These elements include a UPVC conservatory to the east and the insertion of UPVC windows to the rear modern range. I acknowledge that these alterations are going to be rectified in the forthcoming applications, which I welcome, as they will enhance the listed building, subject to appropriate details.

#### Planning:

You may also wish to seek separate pre-app advice from a Planning Officer in regard to any amenity issues, the AONB, and any other planning matters which are relevant to the scheme. You can apply for this via the Local Authority's website:

<https://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/pre-application-advice/>

#### Ecology:

It is also very likely that you will require a Protected Species Survey with your application, particularly in relation to the proposed alterations to the roof structure through the dormer in the historic range. The Local Authority provides guidance on wildlife and habitat, with particular reference to the possible use of the building by bats, which might be useful:

<https://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/development-management/planning-guidance-and-research/ecological-guidance/>

For more information on engaging an Ecologist, please see:

<https://cieem.net/resource/a-householders-guide-to-engaging-an-ecologist/>

#### **Conclusion:**

The principle of the proposals is not opposed, but various amendments to the detailed design are required before an application could be supported by the Heritage Team. Clear evidence of the significance of existing fabric must be provided before its removal or alteration can be supported, in a Heritage Statement, together with detailed schedules of work for clarity.

This advice is informal officer opinion only and made without prejudice to the formal determination of any application. If you want a formal opinion then you will need to make an application with its associated supporting documentation, plans and fee.

All applications will be subject to consultation and publicity and any proposal may be subject to a call-in by a Councillor for determination at Development Control Committee.

### **Application Submission:**

Our Joint Local Validation Checklist sets out the details required for each application and this is available at <http://www.babergh.gov.uk/planning/development-management/apply-for-planning-permission/national-and-local-validation-requirements/>. However, on the basis of the information provided I would particularly draw your attention to the need to provide:

- o Heritage Statement
- o Detailed schedules of work, including photographs and materials specifications.
- o Existing and proposed plans and elevations, including detailed section drawings through junctions - dormer and stair access, lean-to and contemporary extension.
- o Protected Species Survey

This is not an exhaustive list of all documents and information which need to support your application, as mentioned above please consult the Joint Local Validation Checklist.

We recommend that applications are submitted on the Planning Portal, which also provides further advice on making planning applications: <https://www.planningportal.co.uk/>

As part of any application, you will need to submit the appropriate CIL form, which is available on our website.

I hope that this provides useful information with regards to your enquiry. If you have any queries in respect of this letter, or require clarification of issues, please do not hesitate to contact me. If you would like further discussion with regards to the detail of the proposal this would be subject to a charge for further advice, see [www.babergh.gov.uk](http://www.babergh.gov.uk) for further details.

Yours sincerely

**Tegan Chenery** – Senior Heritage Officer  
*on behalf of Philip Isbell – Chief Planning Officer – Sustainable Communities*

Please note that any advice provided by the Council's Officers is informal opinion only and is made without prejudice to any formal determination which may be given in the event of an application being submitted. In particular, it will not constitute a formal response or decision of the Council with regard to any future planning applications, which will be subject to wider consultation and publicity. Although the Case Officer may indicate the likely outcome of a subsequent planning application, no guarantees can or will be given about the decision.

Please also note, responses to pre-application enquiries are only valid for six months from the date of receipt. You should seek confirmation that circumstances have not changed if you are submitting an application outside of this period.