

..... Assington Road BURES CO8 5JX

Comment submitted date: Fri 13 Apr 2018

See Document Tab 10.04.2018

Mrs Clare Frewin White Horse House Cuckoo Hill Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5JH

Comment submitted date: Thu 12 Apr 2018

OBJECTION

In add. to 04/04/2018, 12/04/2018 & docs. dated 27.03.2018 & 06.04.2018 Michael Harman, Holmes & Hill Solicitors. White Horse House is part of the boundary to the site & mentioned throughout the original application No: B/14/01103. Grade II listed the development of the site greatly affects its environs. The plans available to us on the BDC website during public consultation on the original application 3368.18 Rev. E received 13/11/14. highlight 11.6m from our boundary to house plot 6. The houses have been built 3m approx 30% closer to our house. Confirmed by the plans included in the current application. We have discovered in 2015 plans were amended after the period of public consultation but before the committee meeting Feb '15 to 3368.18 Rev. G received 27/1/15. Rev G has only available to public March 2018.

(FI Dec 2014 we tried to contact Case officer via emails, phone calls, messages. With no response we sent our comment via Cllr Cartlidge.)

Current plans confirm new positions, the site has been moved towards Cuckoo Hill & distance from our boundary to plot 6 reduced by 3m.

This is a significant change with a huge impact on our house, we were not notified of the changes at any stage 2015 to date. It is unclear from the BDC website if comments made by English Heritage & BDC Heritage advisors were made in respect of Rev. E or Rev. G. We were not consulted, it seems unlikely other statutory consultees were either.

This issue is heightened as possible future Permitted Dev up to 4m does not require planning permission. The concern re. distance between the original houses & new houses is applicable our neighbours.

Other LA have clear guidelines re position of new houses & existing properties:

http://www.wrexham.gov.uk/english/planning_portal/lpg_notes/lpg21.htm (Wales) req. min 22m+ twice any vertical difference.

Other LA have broadly similar.

A distance of 8.5m is not practical or acceptable confirmed by the damage already sustained to our property.

Comment submitted date: Thu 12 Apr 2018

James & Clare Frewin

OBJECTION

In addition to comment submitted 04/04/2019 and two documents dated 27.03.2018 & 06.04.2018 from Michael Harman, Holmes and Hill Solicitors.

I wish to highlight the serious issues re pedestrians access. We raised this as a concern with the original application. In 2014/15 we received absolute confirmation from James Cartlidge then Cllr verbally and in email from his discussion with Alex Scott (case officer) that a pathway to enable safe pedestrian access from the new houses inc our garden gate to Cuckoo Hill would be included. To our disbelief when the application was approved it was not included. I have asked many times but still do not know why or how the application could be approved without safe pedestrian access.

There is still no provision in this new application for residents in the new housing to safely walk to Cuckoo Hill; they would be on the narrow access road or busy garage forecourt. Our garden pedestrian gate opens out into the access road, this has been in daily use for over 58 years. Since building work started it has been blocked with parked vehicles and on 3 occasions since since Aug. 2017 I have opened the gate into moving traffic, with the gate being clipped by a vehicle.

As highlighted in the the SCC document <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/assets/planning-waste-and-environment/planning-and-development-advice/Suffolk-Design-Guide-Shape-of-Development-Highways.pdf> sections 3.6 Road widths for Residential Areas and 3.8 Cycleways and Pedestrian Routes "Minor routes will provide access from groups of dwellings to major routes a minimum width of 3m will be required."

Comment submitted date: Wed 04 Apr 2018

James & Clare Frewin

OBJECTION

Please refer to Document dated 27.03.2018 from Michael Harman, Holmes and Hill Solicitors.

From site plans changing after the public consultation ended in 2015 to no enforcement action being taken to date it is unbelievable the situation we find ourselves in. Bures needs affordable housing, sympathetic to the listed properties in the area, this site provides neither. The increased height of the roof pitches of the new houses dominate the skyline having an impact across the village and due to the closer position of houses to our boundary we have personally lost all privacy on the north of our house and the whole garden is completely overlooked. The vehicle access to the site isn't suitable and our garden access is now straight onto a busy road. Our concerns were ignored in 2015 and with no enforcement action taken to date it seems Babergh have no control over what is built where.

Mr Alan Beales 1 Friends Field Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5LH

Comment submitted date: Thu 12 Apr 2018

Highways Letter

Your Ref: B/14/01103/FUL

Our Ref: 570345315

Amended Plan Layout 182008

Planning Application B/14/01103

Planning Application DC/18/00929

With the erection of a new boundary fence by Pilgrims Garage from their property down to the pavement, this seriously undermines the measurements taken by the Highways Authority for safe access in/out of this new Development. Their measurements are no longer valid, as the site line has changed in respect to the Plan Layout and Suffolk County Council Reference DC 101A.

The Highways Authority letter quotes;

1 AL 3

Condition: The new vehicular access shall be laid out and completed in all respects in accordance with Drawing No. 3368/18/F as submitted and made available for use prior to first occupation of the property. Thereafter the access shall be retained in the specified form.

I submit the vehicular access to this Development no longer conforms to the Highways requirements and consequently the current Planning Application should not be approved.

Comment submitted date: Tue 03 Apr 2018

Also See Document Tab 03.04.18

This Development is totally unacceptable in its present form and totally destroys the appearance of our Victorian neighbourhood, The "White Horse" to its front, dates back to the early 1800's and is a Grade 2 Listed Building.

Looking across to the "White Horse" from Friends Field, it is dwarfed by the Plot 6 roofline towering above to its rear, with an excess height of nearly 2 metres.

This is the result of the entire property being raised, due to the change in the ground level.

The same applies to No's 6 and 7 Cuckoo Hill, also being dwarfed by Plot 5 to their rear.

It beggars belief that Babergh Building Control did not put a stop on this Development, when multiple lorry loads of hardcore were being delivered to the site back in October 2017. It was blatantly obvious the ground level was being raised.

I have now sent in a "Freedom of Information" request to Babergh asking for all the dates that a Building Control Inspector visited the site during the past 9 months.

The Developer has completely disregarded the laws that govern planning and the planning committee and worst of all, utter contempt for the damage he has inflicted on neighbouring properties.

The Developer has carried on regardless constructing these properties, knowing full well he is in contravention of the agreed plans.

He is obviously playing by his own set of rules:- "Its too late to stop me now"

Why have Babergh ignored what is a blatant breach of the Planning Rules during the past 6 months or more.

What does concern me deeply, is that Babergh will take the easy option and possibly levy a punitive fine on the Developer to make life easy for both parties..

A fine would be a travesty of justice and it will not remedy the grotesque situation that he has inflicted upon the neighbourhood.

In conclusion, Babergh must reject these revised plans and take enforcement action against the Developer, even to the extent of having these properties demolished and rebuilt to the required specifications

Mrs Carol Walters Byron House St Edmunds Lane Bures St Mary Sudbury Suffolk CO8 5JJ

Comment submitted date: Thu 12 Apr 2018

Carol & Andy - Byron House, St Edmunds Lane.

OBJECTION TO AMPLIFICATION

Please refer to Document dated 06.04.2018 from

Michael Harman, Holmes and Hills Solicitors.

Two main points:

1. Agent's letter and associated submitted annotated drawing 1271.21E contradict.

2. We do not find helpful, particularly during the consultation/re-consultation process, comments made by CEO Babergh Council Arthur Charvonia "It is usual practice to allow development which is NOT considered to result in undue harm to the locality in which it is situated to be regularised through the planning process."

We interpret this comment to show complete bias to the developer, Stemar.

Comment submitted date: Sun 01 Apr 2018

Carol & Andy - Byron House, St Edmunds Lane

OBJECTION

Please refer to Document dated 27.03.2018 from Michael Harman, Holmes and Hill Solicitors.

It has been clear from the outset that Babergh Council Planning are unable to manage planning control in a competent manner regarding this particular development. Numerous errors have been made and continue to be made without diligent enforcement action being taken. As council tax payers we would expect a better service supporting the community of this village to ensure that National Planning Policy is upheld.

..... BURES GREEN BURES CO8 5JU

Comment submitted date: Wed 11 Apr 2018

We strongly object to the application for variation of condition 2 of the planning permission regarding the houses currently being constructed on the old Slaughterhouse site on Cuckoo Hill, Bures.

Planning regulations have been disregarded by the builder, who is now seeking retrospective permission for houses which do not fit into the conservation area and have detrimental impact on neighbouring properties, including a listed building, and on the local business of Pilgrim's Garage. The roof heights are above those agreed and dominate the surrounding houses and local

area.

Planning rules should be followed by everyone. In this case, the developer has not complied with the planning permission and therefore this application should be rejected. If not, Babergh is failing in its duty to local residents and its responsibility to respond to their genuine concerns.

More generally we were already concerned about the vehicular access and potential for additional parking on Cuckoo Hill, and the lack of low cost housing as part of the development.

We would like to be reassured that in this case local residents' reasonable objections are now heard and acted on.

Tricia and Martin Gilbey

.....

Comment submitted date: Tue 10 Apr 2018

Not Available

..... **Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5JH**

Comment submitted date: Tue 10 Apr 2018

See Document Tab 05.04.18

..... **Town Hill St Edmunds Lane Bures St Mary Sudbury CO8 5LA**

Comment submitted date: Mon 09 Apr 2018

See Documents tab 04.04.18

..... **Henny Road Lamarsh CO8 5EU**

Comment submitted date: Sat 07 Apr 2018

I strongly object to this application, on two grounds.

Firstly, as numerous residents of the village have clearly said, it would permit an intrusive development within a conservation area, depriving neighbours of their rights to privacy and light and crowding a listed building. The properties clearly dominate the skyline in a very unwelcome way.

Secondly, granting the application would validate the developer's attitude of "ask forgiveness, not permission", and that cannot be acceptable. Retrospective planning permission should not be extended to major deviations from approved plans, such as changing the position of the property on the plot, or changing the height by a whole 2 metres.

The application should be refused and if necessary the properties should be demolished. Allowing it to remain would set a very poor example to other developers and make a mockery of views of the local residents.

..... **Cuckoo Hill Bures St. Mary Suffolk CO8 5JH**

Comment submitted date: Fri 06 Apr 2018

See Document Tab 03.04.18

..... **Normandie Way Bures CO8 5BE**

Comment submitted date: Thu 05 Apr 2018

Having visited the site and studied latest submitted plan I doubt that it will be possible to meet the requirements for access as detailed in the letter from Martin Egan, (County Highway comments, 8th January 2015) unless there is a degree of cooperation and agreement between the builder and neighbours, especially the garage proprietor. As fulfilment of the listed conditions is a prerequisite for occupation might it be a good idea to organise an early meeting between all the people concerned to ensure the scheme, as described, is achievable?

I am concerned about the impact that the new building on Plot Six will have on the Grade Two Listed White Horse House, and to a lesser extent the impact that the buildings on Plots One/Two and Plot Five will have on their neighbours, because of building height and proximity.

I have compared the original plan (2014) with the plan submitted with this application and although no distance is marked on the latter it seems, by measurement, that the building on Plot Six has moved closer to White Horse House by over 2.3 metres. This, coupled with the similar increase in height, means that the house, as built, is actually 3.25 metres distant from the planned location. (By Pythagoras). The result is that the occupants of Plot Six will have clear views from various windows into the rear rooms of White Horse House and its environs whilst the occupants of White Horse House will have unobstructed views of ceilings in the Plot Six property. If Planners are minded to allow the new build to remain would it be possible for the building on Plot Six to have windows repositioned, or all rear widows to have obscure glass permanently fitted to bottom hinged openings and fixed panes at internal eye level or less?

I would be very sad to see any new building dismantled but if it were replaced by a sympathetically designed single storey building it might find wider Public acceptance.

..... **Normandie Way Bures Suffolk CO8 5BE**

Comment submitted date: Thu 05 Apr 2018

See Document Tab 03.04.18

..... **New Cut BURES CO8 5DG**

Comment submitted date: Thu 05 Apr 2018

See Document Tab 03.04.18

..... **Friends Field Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5LH**

Comment submitted date: Thu 05 Apr 2018

See Document Tab 03.04.18

..... **Friends Field Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5LH**

Comment submitted date: Thu 05 Apr 2018

See Documents tab 29.03.18

..... **Normandie Way Bures Hamlet SUFFOLK CO8 5BE**

Comment submitted date: Thu 05 Apr 2018

We strongly object,
The developers of this site have not adhered to terms of planning application.
The building are too high and too close to listed buildings.
The vehicle access is not workable.
They have been put up with total disregard to the neighbours and surrounds.
Spoiling our village yet again!!

..... **Nayland Road Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5BL**

Comment submitted date: Thu 05 Apr 2018

Tha houses as now almost completed are much closer to cuckoo hill and there fore to existing properties than in the plans that had been registered. In addition to this the levels are considerably higher than the plans showed. These two factors- proximity and height - have made for an intolerable imposition on neighbouring existing houses and the Pillgrims Garage.
I object most strongly to people who ignore indeed reidicule the correct planning process and worse still seriously upset the local community.

..... **Nayland Road Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5BX**

Comment submitted date: Thu 05 Apr 2018

I strongly object to the application for variation in the planning of the six houses on the old slaughter house site cuckoo hill Bures. The builder has exceeded the original planned height by 2metres and 4metres closer to neighbouring property which is a grade 2 listed building. This is a conservation area and the height of the dwellings towers high above neighbouring properties thus blotting the landscape and beautiful views. I am most concerned as to how the developer has contravened the original plans without Babergh planning department doing the required checks to ensure regulations are followed. This appears to be a backhanded way to increase the plot size of the houses thus increasing their value and lining the pocket of the developer/builder however the surrounding properties have been so affected by the eyesore, it will inevitably decrease their value. This just should NOT be allowed. Planning departments are always very keen to ensure private homeowners keep strictly to the rules and regulations if erecting an extension etc and would be told to pull the building down if it exceeded the original planned height or width..where is the fairness? Unfortunately I don't have any trust in Babergh planning department having seen this development. The houses should be pulled down forthwith. There is a need for low cost housing but the builder I understand was allowed to pay to have the clause removed that requires inclusion of low cost housing. My only conclusion is that it would devalue the larger houses on the site. THIS IS SO UNFAIR UNJUST AND UTTERLY DECEITFUL. This whole situation needs the biggest publicity possible to expose the wrongdoings.....blame has to be pointed at the planning department for not doing their job properly in monitoring the development more closely. I would like to see justice done.

..... **Maltings Close Bures CO8 5EJ**

Comment submitted date: Wed 04 Apr 2018

To whom it may concern,

The dwellings that have been built behind White Horse House are surely failing building regulations and at risk of damage to a grade 2 listed building.

They are to close to the grade 2 listed building, which could cause damage to said building, surely also blocking out substantial light to both the house and garden, whilst also over looking this property, therefore not giving any privacy.

Please at what stage did a planning officer agree that the new houses that are being built were correct? (Position and height).

..... **Sudbury Road Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5JP**

Comment submitted date: Wed 04 Apr 2018

With regards to new properties on the site of the Slaughter House, Cukoo Hill, Bures.
I wish to object about the above development. I feel the new buildings are way to tall and overwhelm the area. From what I understand the buildings were build taller then planning permission allowed. New buildings seeme very close to the lovely old cottages in front of the development and overlook them. I'm shocked the development was allowed at all as it doesn't fit into the character of the village. Also I'm concerned about the acces to the propoities which is shared with the Pilgrims garage. I'm a regural user of the garage and I can see it will cause lots of disruption to the business and parking issues to. I feel this development was allowed to go ahead without any consideration to the residents and businesses near by.

..... **High Street Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5HZ**

Comment submitted date: Wed 04 Apr 2018

I have watched the houses go up on this plot and wondered why such houses were allowed under planning. The houses can be seen throughout the village and have been built near to historic, listed buildings. I have recently learnt that the houses have been built higher than their plans. Significantly higher! If these buildings are allowed to be completed then they will damage the esthetics of the village forever. It will also send a message to future developers that it doesn't matter what is approved as they can ignore the plans.

..... **High Street Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5HZ**

Comment submitted date: Wed 04 Apr 2018

I am objecting to this development. There has been little to no enforcement from the planning department. Due to this these buildings have been built to close to adjacent listed buildings and could affect the structural integrity of these buildings. They have also been built a lot higher than the plans have allowed. These houses are not fit for a village with listed building near by as this spoils the look of the village. This new development is making a mockery of the current planning rules and regulations, if this development is aloud to carry on in this way then it is setting a presadence to any new developer to build what ever they want where ever they want with no consequences and at the cost to the surrounding area and community.

..... **Cordell Road Long Melford Sudbury Suffolk CO10 9ET**

Comment submitted date: Wed 04 Apr 2018

Am at a loss to know why you would build only a few metres from a Grade II listed building for one thing. more importantly for the Frewin family they have lost a wonderful view from their back garden and are now overlooked. They have three young children who will play at the back of course so have lost their privacy and safety. How could you be so indifferent to families that have

lived there several years? Even if they could move their property would be reduced in value. I am astounded with the cold heartedness of this council.

..... **Friends Field Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5LH**

Comment submitted date: Wed 04 Apr 2018

The overall height of the properties is now in excess of what was originally granted in February 2015, in some cases in excess of one metre. I cannot see the point in having planning procedures if they are going to be ignored in this way. The new properties are very imposing and extremely close to existing buildings. They must considerably affect the view and the light to the rear of these existing properties.

..... **Lamarsh Hill Bures Hamlet CO8 5EH**

Comment submitted date: Wed 04 Apr 2018

I think it is absolutely disgraceful that the developer/builders have completely ignored the planning permission agreed by the council and built these properties too high! Why has a site inspector not gone along and checked up on this? Why have these properties been allowed to be marketed prior to approval? In my opinion, the properties should not have been approved in the first place. They are not in keeping with other properties within the immediate vicinity (Victorian/Edwardian/Georgian). They are too modern looking and stick out like a sore thumb. They have squeezed too many houses into a small area. There is only enough room for one car per house and any visitors will have to park on Cuckoo Hill aggravating the residents living there and cars travelling up the hill. These houses should not have been approved and should be torn down. The developer should resubmit plans for a smaller development with housing in keeping with the surrounding area with enough parking for its residents and visitors. Bures is an area of outstanding beauty and should be treated as such.

..... **Sudbury Road Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5JT**

Comment submitted date: Wed 04 Apr 2018

I object to this application, most strongly.

My understanding is that the planning permissions originally sought and granted have not been followed, yet it is not the District Council who have called this out but local residents ! Is that really the way the process works or should the District Council have done more to intervene ? Please do let me know.

Whilst I appreciate that there is a process to consider subsequent planning amendments post initial approval, the scale of deviation from plan and impact on local residents is far beyond any reasonable tolerance. If the Planning Committee disagree with that statement, they really need to define and publish what an acceptable tolerance is, so that such information is in the public domain and is clear to all parties. Again, can you please ensure I am copied into all correspondence in that regard.

The only remedy available, therefore, is for the retrospective application to be rejected and to require the applicant to develop the site in accordance with the original permission.

Planning laws are there to protect people from inconsiderate development, not to endorse cavalier behaviour, and granting this application would render the whole planning process utterly pointless.

..... **Bridge St Bures CO8 5AD**

Comment submitted date: Wed 04 Apr 2018

The developers of this site have disregarded the terms of the planning application. I object to their current application to gain retrospective consent for the houses being built as their height and position has a detrimental impact on the adjacent listed properties. The attitude of the developer appears to be, "it's too late now to change it as they are built." If this flagrant breach of planning is permitted then the whole village is at risk of this happening time and time again.

..... **Maltings close Bures CO8 5ej**

Comment submitted date: Wed 04 Apr 2018

I am writing to object strongly to the above development.

In my view the development has not been built with a sympathetic view to the surrounding conservation area.

How has the developer been allowed to build the property so close to a listed building, and without complying to the approved planning application?

There has obviously been no site visit from Babergh District Council/Building Regulation, or the officer would have seen the building in question, was not being constructed as per agreed plans.

My family were refused a single storey side extension along a private driveway. The main reason for the refusal was that the extension would have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area. Now surely this development will have a detrimental impact on its surrounding area.

..... **Normandie Way Bures CO8 5BE**

Comment submitted date: Wed 04 Apr 2018

I strongly object to the new properties that have been built. They are too high and closer to a neighbouring house than they should be. How has this been allowed to happen?! I feel it's very unfair and sad that the council seems to have just turned a blind eye to what has been going on even though concerns have been raised several times. There is a reason you have to get planning permission so there should be consequences should it not be adhered to!! I'm sure if I were to dismiss planning permission on my house and built what I wanted the council would soon step in and put a stop to it! Appears all rather underhand to me!

The new houses are also totally out of character in the village and do not fit in with the surrounding area. They have been put up without any consideration to the residents or our lovely village. And that is what we are, a village!! We are not a town.

I sincerely hope action will be taken and the right and moral decision will be made.

Regards

Gemma Norton

..... **Nayland Road Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5BL**

Comment submitted date: Wed 04 Apr 2018

The developers of this site have consistently and blatantly disregarded the terms of the planning application. I object most strongly to their current application to gain retrospective consent for the houses being built at a level which impacts in a totally unacceptable way on neighbouring properties. The closest property on Cuckoo Hill is a listed property, White Horse House. The impact of these houses can be seen from every area of the village. The application states that their roofline should not exceed that of neighbouring properties. The positions of the houses on the plot differ from those on the permitted plan. This again has a serious detrimental impact on the neighbourhood.

The planning authority Should have checked the Building Regulation documents for this development and acted accordingly. The developer Has taken an 'I'll get away with it' attitude from the start.

..... **Colchester road Bures Bures Co8 5ae**

Comment submitted date: Wed 04 Apr 2018

Totally wrong that these houses were ever allowed to be built, and now they are higher and further forward is disgraceful. Planning should not be passed. The impact it has made to the surrounding houses and the garage has clearly not been taken in to account.

..... **Upper East Street Sudbury Suffolk CO10 1UB**

Comment submitted date: Wed 04 Apr 2018

As a frequent visitor to Bures, I was shocked to see how the development of The Slaughter House and land adjacent to Cuckoo Hill has taken shape. Speaking to local residents, I was disappointed to learn that the new builds are 1.7m taller and 4m closer then originally stated and are clearly towering above the existing properties, which are also listed. Although I understand we are in a housing crisis, we should endeavour to ensure that we preserve areas of natural beauty and history. The immediate impact this will have on the residents adjacent to this delvelopment will be a significant drop in the value of their homes, reduced access and parking, increased traffic flow on a small country road and the constant feeling of being overlooked by the new dwellings. The stress and upset this development has caused the local residents is heartbreaking to hear, the complete disregard by the developer to take into account the natural beauty of the area and impact on the residents is disrespectful and unacceptable. Taking all of this into account, I therefore strongly object to this development.

..... **Pebmarsh CO9 2LZ**

Comment submitted date: Tue 03 Apr 2018

The houses in question are considerably higher than the surrounding buildings and are quite imposing. People are not against development just the manner in which it is done and that it is sympathetic to the area. When you drive up Friends Field the roof tops of these new houses are very visible and must cause privacy and light issues for those houses in front of them. In addition, it's a real shame as they are not in keeping with the village at all.

..... **Normandie Way Bures Hamlet Bures CO8 5BE**

Comment submitted date: Tue 03 Apr 2018

The more i see of these hideous houses the more i must object. They are overpowering and out keeping with our village. I also am fearful of the increase in parking and traffic around the entrance to the development and the junction with Friends Field. As these houses only have one parking space pwr dwelling i anticipate increases in parking in the immediate area. So we will have increased congestion at the Friends Field junction and the Sudbury Road/Cuckoo Hill junction. I have to ask if anybody from planning has actually visted this site.

Furthermore I looked at the list of people who have objected and notice there are people NOT listed who I know have sent in objections. Why is this?

Comment submitted date: Mon 19 Mar 2018

Bures and environs are quite rightly being considered as areas of outstanding natural beauty. Obviously someone has not told the planners if they agreed to these monstrosities. They are a carbuncle, a grossly out-of proportion insult to our village. From cursory inspection they are far too high to be two bedroom dwelling and it looks like they have been built too near existing buildings or has somebody not bothered to measure. And as for access and egress well that is going to be a constant problem. Were the planners not aware that there is a working garage, a highly successful one, right at the entrance to the site? As a member of the village community I want to see us grow and cater for all but apparently the developer has paid his 'thirty silver coin' and made sure there is no social housing for the less advantaged members of our society. Somebody, desperate to make 'a quick buck' has pulled the wool over someone's eyes.

..... **Normandie Way Bures CO8 5BE**

Comment submitted date: Tue 03 Apr 2018

Well what a mess the developers/council have made of this one!!

Before I found out that the developers had flouted the original planning granted in February 2015, I walked past this development and thought how awful it looked due to the height of the properties and the close proximity to the older houses.

As for the right of way being past the local garage, ludicrous comes to mind!!

Any development in a beautiful rural village should be painstakingly planned and it should complement/ nestle/blend with the existing buildings.

The residents have had undue stress/expense/virtually zero communication from anyone and this is totally unacceptable.

If the developers manage to get away with this then it leaves an open door for many others and where will that leave villages? In tatters of course!!

I ABSOLUTELY OBJECT TO THIS VARIATION TO CONDITION 2 AND BELIEVE THAT THESE HOUSES SHOULD BE PULLED TO THE GROUND AND THE DEVELOPERS MADE TO KEEP TO WHAT WAS ORIGINALLY AGREED!!

..... **Normandie Way Bures CO8 5BE**

Comment submitted date: Tue 03 Apr 2018

This whole development is an eyesore and should not have been considered for housing.

Firstly, the access is via the local garage which is totally unsuitable.

Secondly, Cuckoo Hill is aesthetically pleasing which will not be the case if these houses are allowed.

Thirdly, where was the Council/Planning Team when these builds commenced!! Probably now in excess of 2 metres higher than they should be, protruding way up into the sky and looming dangerously over the current beautiful houses already in situ.

This is a total flout of planning rules which has been exacerbated by Babergh not responding to any of the local resident concerns from the outset. How this has happened I do not know.

The stress/expense that has been incurred by the local residents is unacceptable.

I totally OBJECT to this Variation to Condition 2 and the developers should absolutely NOT have this granted!!

Our rural villages should be left alone by all Councils/
if they are not going to concede to the rules in place and any development should be sympathetic to its surroundings always!

..... **Farm Cottages Cuckoo Hill Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5LD**

Comment submitted date: Tue 03 Apr 2018

I was born in Bures St Mary and continued to live there for all but two of my 72 years. In that time I have seen much growth and development in the village and am pleased to say it has been both sympathetic in terms of houses which fit nicely in with the existing old houses and has provided some much needed affordable housing. This new development on the site of the old slaughter house provides neither of these. The houses are far too tall and dominate the immediate area. They are an insult in a conservation area and I am disappointed that the planners employed by Babergh have been so lax as to allow the development to continue when it was clearly not complying with the plans. I have so personally witnessed clear breaches of health and safety during the building. I manage Beville's Estate which borders the properties.

..... **Colchester Road Bures CO8 5AE**

Comment submitted date: Tue 03 Apr 2018

I wish to object to this Variation of condition 2 of planning permission B/14/01103 as amplified by submission of covering letter from agent dated 23/3/18 and annotated Proposed Setting Out and Landscaping Plan (1471.21E) and Existing Site Survey Plan (1471.06) all received 26/3/18. | The Slaughter House And Land Adjacent Cuckoo Hill Bures St Mary Suffolk.

Under the original planning decision, the reason for Condition 2 is given as "Reason - For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning of the development".

The Babergh District Council and Mid Suffolk District Council Joint Local Planning Enforcement Plan Version 1.0, 16.03.2015 - 2.2 it states (one of the reasons) that the councils establish the following objectives for implementing this plan "To uphold planning law and local planning policy and to ensure that the credibility of the planning system is not undermined;". On the basis that the builder has continued with the building and marketing of these properties, it appears that the council has completely lost control, and therefore, credibility of the planning system.

The development is in a Conversation area which should mean that proper controls should be implemented and the perceived failure to do so in this case has resulted in houses built that tower over the neighbouring buildings and, in particular, the Grade 2 listed building White Horse House.

I believe that to grant this permission will cause irreparable harm to the visual amenity of Bures St Mary's conservation area and the original plans must be enforced.

..... **The Paddocks Bures CO8 5DF**

Comment submitted date: Tue 03 Apr 2018

We wish to object to this application. These properties have been built about 2 metres too high, a breach of the planning application. The site was not cleared properly and why was this not checked by Babergh. The property behind White Horse House (which is Grade II listed) has been built too close to the boundary. The distance should have been 11 metres and is only 7 metres. These buildings now tower over White Horse House and surrounding properties, affecting both their privacy and property value. Why was this not picked up by Babergh and corrected through normal site inspections.

The neighbours have made frequent complaints, why have these been ignored. I am sure a private individual building their own property would not have been allowed to flout the rules like this in a conservation area.

..... **Cuckoo Hill Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5JH**

Comment submitted date: Tue 03 Apr 2018

I am writing to object to the 6 two storey buildings at The Slaughter House And Land Adjacent, Cuckoo Hill, Bures St Mary, Suffolk. Re DC/18/00929

I feel the application should be declined.

Reasons being; The buildings have been constructed differently to the planning granted.

The buildings have been built nearer to my house (ie nearer South), than they should have been which has an impact on privacy, view and sunlight.

They have also been built at a higher level than permission to do so. This has been confirmed by Babergh planning.

The buildings are not "in keeping" with the village. The buildings are significantly more imposing than the buildings around the neighbourhood. Moreover very imposing from the aspect of my house. I can directly look into the upstairs of the house directly behind my house.

The houses will block sunlight to my house and outside area which will impact on my daily living. The buildings are a complete

eyesore from my house and surrounding houses.

I appreciate that sustainable housing is to be addressed, but in my opinion, this could have been done without building houses in a manner where permission was not granted and in a manner in keeping with the surrounding houses and village.

I strongly believe these issues should be addressed and the application declined.

..... **Sudbury Road Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5JL**

Comment submitted date: Tue 03 Apr 2018

Pat and Basil Pilgrim - OBJECTION

We have lived in our house for 62 years, and now we are completely overlooked by these huge houses looming over our property.

One of our greatest pleasures is to sit in our back garden in the sunshine during the Summer months, this we now feel will not be a very pleasant time for us now, as the height of these too high houses will invade our privacy. We have had to buy blinds to our windows facing this new development, as we are now so overlooked.

My husband was a builder all his life and always complied to Building rules and regulations, how this developer can do what he is doing is incomprehensible to us.

We feel the developer has shown no regard whatsoever to the neighbouring properties and this certainly will not be an asset to our Village.

We strongly object to this application and hope the right decision will be made.

..... **Church Square Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5BS**

Comment submitted date: Mon 02 Apr 2018

The council has received numerous warnings about this development and should never have allowed it to progress to this stage. If planning permission, for an increase in height, is granted this would send the wrong message to both the community and the industry.

..... **Farm Cottages Cuckoo Hill Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5LD**

Comment submitted date: Sun 01 Apr 2018

The total lack of compliance to the original plans is in my opinion a gross demonstration of arrogance and disrespect for the people of Bures and Babergh District Council by the builder. If there is not strong action taken and these offensive buildings are not drastically reduced in size in line with the original plans, then we should question the point of employing planning enforcement officers at all. How long is going to be before a developer puts in plans to Babergh for a bungalow and builds a sky scraper in a conservation area without challenge?

..... **High Street Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5HZ**

Comment submitted date: Sun 01 Apr 2018

Whilst I understand the need for a moderate increase in the housing available within Bures, I am alarmed by the disregard the developer of the Old Slaughter House site, has had to the original approved application in terms of the height of the buildings. This site is located within the Bures Conservation area and is adjacent to a listed property. I feel that this retrospective planning application, if approved, would have a significant detrimental effect on the local street scene and would effect the quality of life for those living directly next to the site.

The development now has a very dominant feel over the very old (and some more modern) houses along cuckoo hill. These houses give the charm and beauty to our lovely village.

I am shocked how a developer can proceed with the building of these properties when this application is outstanding regarding the increased height of the new houses.

I feel that by granting the developer retrospective planning permission will set a precedent to other developers in the area that this is the way to behave by having no regard for the people or environment around them.

To be clear, I am objecting to this application to alter the height of the buildings.

..... **Cuckoo Hill Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5JH**

Comment submitted date: Sun 01 Apr 2018

This development should have been lower than us on the existing site minimising the impact on us and surrounding properties. However, as groundwork began we noticed the site level was being raised and Babergh were notified at that time.

The developers have admitted to raising the site by up to 1.7m. A considerable amount. The Council appear to be taking their word for it as they are unable to give a definitive answer as to what the original level was. We now have a large house towering over us with its windows, which are much higher than originally planned, looking into every aspect of our home. The quality of life of other residents surrounding the site has also been severely affected by the height and close proximity of these properties.

This site has been deliberately raised, it wasn't an error and since this application was registered, work has continued on site and there has been an open sale day before the 6th April deadline for these comments and the decision on the variation application. This developer has shown total disregard for the permission granted but evidently has complete confidence that his application will be passed.

These houses were always going to be out of character for the area. Having passed the plans the Council should have been vigilant and ensured the consent was adhered to through their site inspections. This site has been built up to a level that is surely unacceptable purely to reduce the costs by not transporting spoil away.

If these properties are allowed to remain in their present form, it would suggest that the Planning Department is unfit for purpose. The Council has a duty of care to the residents in the area and this Variation Application should be refused.

..... **Beaumont Close Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5FL**

Comment submitted date: Sun 01 Apr 2018

I strongly object to this application because the houses that have been put up are placed higher and closer than original planning permissions were granted for. They now overwhelm the original listed buildings and do not fit in with the look of the area.

I believe that due to these houses and the building it has affected the roads around Bures and the garage especially. Due to the site entrance, public are having to now step onto a road from the garage and white horse house due to the lack of safe and appropriate foot path from their gates and own entrances.

..... **The Paddocks Bures CO8 5DF**

Comment submitted date: Sat 31 Mar 2018

I object to this application on the grounds that the houses already erected are far too large for the site and dwarf listed buildings nearby. There is insufficient parking on site which means the local roads will become even more congested.

Also I cannot understand how planning permission can be granted for an application which has been submitted for properties already built which do not meet the specification of the previous approved application. If an individual built a property which was not to the agreed planning spec they would have to demolish or alter it. This whole process generates a feeling of malpractice.

..... **station hill bures CO8 5DD**

Comment submitted date: Fri 30 Mar 2018

I would like to strongly object to the current development at the former Old Slaughter House site in Bures.

Firstly I fully understand that this is a Brownfield site and is an ideal location for an appropriate, suitable and sustainable development.

However the current development is extremely overbearing and is portraying a negative impact against the surrounding character properties and indeed the wider village. This is especially prevalent in relation to the high pitched roofs that now totally dominate the immediate area.

It appears to me that the developer has 'ridden rough shot' over the local community and disregarded any planning directives.

It has become quite apparent (as per other previous comments) that the developer has exceeded his specifications with regards to the original plans. Even if the developer complied with the original plan and had built them accordingly, myself and the majority of local residents are laymen, and can't always see from architects plans / drawings what impact the development may have for the village and in particular the neighbouring properties. Without this knowledge we are relying on the so called 'professionals' within the planning department to ensure this is the case!

For any future village development local residents should be able to see a scale model, they can then actually visualise the impact any development will have on the local area.

Time and time again when I read any village feedback it requests: 'if development is to take place, please ensure it is in keeping with the existing village architecture'. Does this ever happen?

A good example of an unobtrusive and appropriate development very close by is Pilgrims Court, Cuckoo Hill. Why couldn't a similar blueprint be mirrored on the Old Slaughter House site? Or was the Slaughter House site built with maximum profit in mind?

I also note that originally Social housing should have been incorporated into the site, what happened to this?

In a nutshell local residents and in particular neighbouring properties rely on the local authority enforcing compliance of any development in the interest of the village. This doesn't seem to have happened from the original conception through to the current noncompliance, this will only lead to worry and alarm for any future development within Bures.

..... **The Paddocks Bures Suffolk CO85DF**

Comment submitted date: Fri 30 Mar 2018

I object for the following reasons:

They are too high and that seems to be over looked by the council.

They do not fit with the aesthetics of the village.

The access will be a constant issue, as well as there isn't enough parking for the properties on the site.

..... **Nayland Road Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5BY**

Comment submitted date: Fri 30 Mar 2018

Whilst I agree with brownfield sites being developed for housing, I wholeheartedly disagree with planning consent and permissions being ignored and developers deciding to change plans as they wish. These houses are a complete eye sore and do not at all fit in with the surrounding buildings. Not only that, I'm aware of at least 3 plots that do not conform to the planning in either their location or height. Plot 6 looms over White horse house and is considerably closer to its boundary than designed in the planning, harming their quality of life and thus the value of their property. If these regulations have been so blatantly flaunted, we can only guess as to where else on this site that has happened. The site is unsuitable for such a large development and access and parking issues have and will always be a problem, putting at risk a local business and increasing congestion on an already strained piece of road. Taking all this into consideration, it still stands as a fact that these houses have been built with

aspects that have ignored the planning regulations and thus action needs to be taken. If we allow this kind of disregard for the rules, it will be expected for everyone. We must expect fair treatment of all persons putting in planning application and i would expect nothing less for a neighbour who built his extension too high.

..... **Wyatts Lane Little Cornard Sudbury Suffolk CO10 0NT**

Comment submitted date: Fri 30 Mar 2018

Hi I work in bures looking after old people and I was quite taken back when I saw the houses which were allowed to be built on that ground they are hideous they don't go with the type of houses in the village I can't understand how u could of let this planning permission go ahead they over shadow the poor house next to the garage I have my car done in the garage have done for the last 15 yrs and never have I had as much trouble trying to drive into the garage due to all the lorries blocking the forecourt and the danger of builders vehicles coming in and out not looking we're they are going and I have worries about the cars that will be there with the people who move into the houses as it's already dangerous trying to get up past there we're are they expected to park u need to look into this problem before someone gets hurt with all the vehicles using the road

..... **Colchester Road Bures CO8 5AE**

Comment submitted date: Fri 30 Mar 2018

I have worked at Pilgrims Garage for the last 15 years and I strongly object to the current development of the old slaughter house. These house are far too tall and do not blend with the surrounding cottage styled homes. They are certainly not sympathetic to the listed buildings, especially plot number 6 that now towers over the white horse house. I do not feel that permission should be granted on the current plans. the developer seems to have wilfully ignored the planning policy in the hope that this would be acceptable. This must not set a precedence for future buildings works carried out in the babergh district. The current access onto the development is not adequate to support the new traffic these buildings will create. Access into and out of Pilgrims Garage has now become incredibly dangerous. Looking at these plans I do not feel there is adequate parking provided, which in turn will cause overflow onto adjacent roads which already suffer with overflow parking. I must say that I strongly object to this application and hope that the right decision will be made. I do not feel that this current development will be an asset to the village and environment and does not compliment it in anyway!

Comment submitted date: Thu 29 Mar 2018

Not Available

..... **Corporal Lillie Close Sudbury Suffolk CO10 2TL**

Comment submitted date: Fri 30 Mar 2018

Whilst I do not live in Bures I am a keen conservationist and walker. On a recent walk through the village of Bures I noticed a large building overshadowing the old Slaughter House. I then discovered that six houses are to be built on the land behind these beautiful houses. I have also discovered that planning consent, ie the height of the new builds and distance from the existing houses has been broken! What are Babergh's Planning Department doing? Today I find the houses are up for sale - an utter disgrace. Is this deal done and dusted or is the Planning Department going to step in to save us all, especially the occupiers of the older houses, from such a blot on the landscape?

..... **Cuckoo Hill Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5LD**

Comment submitted date: Fri 30 Mar 2018

I am very concerned at the blatant disregard for planning rules on this site. What is the point of obtaining planning permission if developers can use loopholes to then just do what they want and treat the local community with no respect whatsoever. We all want fair play in life and understand that new homes must be built but I would like to think that the council is doing things in the best interests of the community and not the best interests of the developers who will soon move on and leave the consequences of their actions behind. Please come and have a look and decide if you would be happy with this development behind your house.

..... **Tawneys Ride Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5DB**

Comment submitted date: Fri 30 Mar 2018

The complete disregard to planning constraints is a massive concern. The houses are oversized and closer to the boundary than agreed. This must not go unnoticed and action should be taken.

..... **Cuckoo Hill Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5JH**

Comment submitted date: Thu 29 Mar 2018

See Documents tab 21.03.18

..... **Cuckoo Hill Bures St Mary Suffolk CO8 5JH**

Comment submitted date: Thu 29 Mar 2018

See Documents tab 29.03.18

..... **St Edmunds Lane Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5LA**

Comment submitted date: Thu 29 Mar 2018

See Documents tab 29.03.18 (2)

..... **Pikes Marsh Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5AQ**

Comment submitted date: Thu 29 Mar 2018

See Documents tab 28.03.18

..... **St Edmunds Lane Sudbury Road Bures St Mary Suffolk CO8 5JN**

Comment submitted date: Thu 29 Mar 2018

See Documents tab 27.03.18

..... **Bocking End Braintree Essex CM7 9AJ**

Comment submitted date: Thu 29 Mar 2018

See Document tab 27.03.18 and 06.04.18

..... **The Croft Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5JB**

Comment submitted date: Thu 29 Mar 2018

See Documents tab 26.03.18

..... **Friends Field Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5LH**

Comment submitted date: Thu 29 Mar 2018

See Documents tab 26.03.18

..... **Church Square Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5AB**

Comment submitted date: Thu 29 Mar 2018

See Documents tab 19.03.18

..... **4th Floor 88 Wood Street London EC2V 7QT**

Comment submitted date: Thu 29 Mar 2018

See Documents tab 19.03.18

..... **Croftside Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5LL**

Comment submitted date: Wed 28 Mar 2018

I am objecting to the application on the basis that it is an abuse of due process.

The original application was submitted and passed in the face of local objection but the decision was made in accordance with due process and accepted by all, including the objectors.

The developer has now wilfully built the properties in contravention of the permission granted, with the intention of seeking retrospective permission, believing it certain to be granted, due to the fait accompli of the houses having been built.

This has been from the outset a deliberate ploy to circumvent planning law, as the developer will be only too aware that the application would have been rejected had it been based upon the buildings as they have been constructed. Grounds for rejecting such an original application would have included:

- the new properties nearest Cuckoo Hill would be too close to the existing houses and over overlook the existing properties to such an extent that the floor level of the new properties would be at head height of the existing ones and the loss of privacy almost total;
- The visual impact of buildings constructed to such a height would be completely out of character of the surrounding properties; and
- The setting of a listed building would be significantly adversely affected.

The developers approach shows contempt for the law, contempt for the planning committee, contempt for the contiguous properties - including the listed building - and contempt for the people living there. The only remedy available to the people affected by this blight is for the retrospective application to be rejected and to require the applicant to develop the site in accordance with the original permission.

Planning laws are there to protect people from inconsiderate development, not to endorse and acquiesce in the contemptuous behaviour of developers and granting this application would render the whole planning process utterly pointless.

..... **St Edmunds Lane Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5LA**

Comment submitted date: Tue 27 Mar 2018

Planning rules and regulations are meant to apply to everyone equally and we rely on our local councils to maintain this social contract. In this case, the rules that were agreed when permission to build was granted, have been ignored seemingly in the hope of presenting a 'fait accompli'

Planning must enforce the rules in this case, or change the rules for the rest of us without exception.

..... **Brook House Water Lane Bures CO85DE**

Comment submitted date: Tue 27 Mar 2018

See Document Tab 09.04.18

..... **Lamarsh Road Bures CO8 5EW**

Comment submitted date: Tue 27 Mar 2018

It concerns me that developers feel they can have a total disregard for planning permission as well as the misery they inflict on neighbours, with parking and noise. As well as this, to now be left with buildings towering over neighbouring houses and much closer than agreed beggars belief.

We are hoping to have Dedham Vale conservation area of outstanding beauty extended to Bures and Lamarsh - therefore, it is even more important that our villages are protected from this sort of careless development.

..... **Claypits Avenue Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5DA**

Comment submitted date: Tue 27 Mar 2018

The domineering presence of the houses is instantly apparent from the road and utterly out of character to the listed buildings they now dwarf. If the rules on altering listed buildings are so strict I do not understand why whole developments can be built on top of them and get away with changing plans continually

I have attempted to visit the area at weekends only to find the builders continuing with a deafening racket and covering every possible place to park. Their disregard for the community is deeply saddening. This was confirmed as I overheard the developer boast he'd "paid off having social housing". I hope our village is open to all sectors of society and would have thought Babergh held such views too?

=====

..... **Sudbury Road Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5JS**

Comment submitted date: Tue 27 Mar 2018

Regarding the building work currently underway at the rear of White Horse House, 5 Cuckoo Hill, Bures St Mary, we are very concerned about this development and its effect on the surrounding properties. It is obvious that the height of ALL buildings on this site have exceeded the permitted levels and in order for this to have happened the ground level has been raised to such an extent that the thresholds of the doors on the new buildings are some 2 metres higher than the original application - which we

believe was NOT approved by BDC. Also, it is quite obvious that the footprint of all the houses has now been altered so that they are much nearer the existing dwellings.

Regarding access to this site, we take it that traffic will enter and depart from between Pilgrims Garage and White Horse House. As there has been a side entrance gate in the fence leading onto this access road from White Horse House for more than 50 years and is still in use, what safety factors has been built into this new development bearing in mind the traffic will now service this small estate?

We would also like to know why, in 2009, having completed a garage/carport on our property, we were instructed to remove the new roof and slate tiles and raise the pitch by approximately 6 inches as, apparently, the pitch was 'too shallow' according to BDC. The slate tiles were deemed 'not compatible' even though our neighbouring house has a slate tiled roof. In order to change this roof we had sell the slate tiles, at a loss - purchase replacement pantiles and have all the roof trusses replaced at a cost of almost £3,000.

As we were compelled to raise the height of our roof by 6 inches due to planning enforcement how can 6 new dwellings so close to a listed building with a roof height difference of over 2 metres not have the planning enforcement applied?

..... **Croftside Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5LL**

Comment submitted date: Tue 27 Mar 2018

I strongly oppose this planning proposal. This development is totally at odds with the houses surrounding it. The roof line across the site has been raised to a ridiculous and obtrusive level. I understand that it has been independently confirmed that the roof pitch of the houses on plots 1, 2 and 6 have increased by over 2 metres. This is in a Conservation Area and virtually on top of a listed property (in fact I believe it is also now considerably closer to it than originally agreed) and has a negative impact on all local residents.

I find it shocking that the site developers have such disregard for the planning authority process, it seems their attitude is to do as they please now, and hope that by the time anyone notices it will be too late to change anything! I am of the opinion that a lack of action to resolve these issues now would set a precedent allowing anyone seeking planning permission in the future to disregard any legitimate restrictions.

..... **Nayland Road Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5BX**

Comment submitted date: Tue 27 Mar 2018

This building development has been a shambles from the word go. Laziness from the main contractor has resulted in the building not being erected at the correct height or even in the correct place!! No consideration has been given to the neighbors with regards to parking, access on and off the site, over looking their houses, The building themselves not in keeping with neighbouring buildings. Etc etc. There has been numerous accounts of the builders being rude to residents. Also they are now not having social housing on the development which is yet another negative. If no action is taken against this developer it is highlighting the fact developers can get away with whatever they want. Which is ridiculous. The biggest problem with out a doubt is the over looking building of the house in front of the site. I really feel for these poor residents. Not only for the monstrosity places almost 5 meters closer to their house than it should of been. But because of the devaluation of their house due to the said building over looking so much.

..... **Sudbury Road Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5JP**

Comment submitted date: Mon 26 Mar 2018

The visual impact of the houses has increased through the levels of the development not being to the agreed plan. This is totally unacceptable and destroys the character of the neighbourhood which is one of low level mainly Victorian buildings.

The development is now overbearing and out-of-scale with the surroundings, in a Conservation area and directly adjacent to a Listed property (White Horse House).

Whilst I appreciate that developments will be constructed within tolerances to the original approved plans, I understand that at least 50% of the plots on site have been constructed with their roof pitch in excess of 2 metres taller than originally approved.

As an owner of a Listed property I am aware of the need for strict adherence to planning approvals, particularly required to preserve our heritage and the character of our area.

I strongly oppose this planning proposal. Such a significant disregard to planning authority, on a plot in such close proximity to historic buildings, cannot be tolerated.

..... **High Street Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5LG**

Comment submitted date: Mon 26 Mar 2018

I object to this variation to the original planning application on the following grounds -

1. Design, Layout and Appearance of the Proposal. - The original plan which permission was granted on has not been adhered to by the builders and the increased size of the properties does not fit in with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development is now too dominant due to the substantial increase in height of the houses.

2. Size of Housing Unit - the housing units have increased in size from the original planning permission that was granted. This has a detrimental effect on existing neighbouring houses with loss of light, over shadowing and loss of privacy.

3. Creation of Precedent - If the Planning Department allow a developer to ignore plans and actually build houses in excess of the proportions granted and then on the submission of a retrospective planning variation (which appears limited in information), they then grant this variation, I believe a precedent will be created. This will allow the correct planning procedures to be circumvented.

..... **Cuckoo Hill Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5JH**

Comment submitted date: Sun 25 Mar 2018

Consultee Comments for Planning Application DC/18/00929

Comments

I objected to this plan when the application was first made.

The divergence from the agreed plan by the developer has exacerbated the adverse effects caused by this development which are:

- An increase in the impact on the residential amenity of neighbours caused by increased overlooking and loss of privacy.
- An increase in height of the houses has led to an increased visual impact, such that it has had a large detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding neighbourhood which is comprised mainly of low level Victorian Houses.
- The scale and density of the development is such that it is unsympathetic to the surrounding Conservation Area and listed properties such as White Horse House.

As such this development does not meet points i) and ii) of Policy CS15: Implementing Sustainable Development in Babergh.

Furthermore, as previously stated in my objections when to application was first made, as the adjoining land owner. The vehicular entrance to the site from Cuckoo Hill is not capable of being implemented, as the sight lines required by highways encroach on land controlled by myself and not the developer which is currently used for vehicular parking.

Therefore, I am strongly opposed to this Planning Application.

Please note I still retain copies of the original Planning Applications and objections raised by myself. I am more than happy to provide copies of these upon request.

..... Cuckoo Hill Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5JH

Comment submitted date: Sun 25 Mar 2018

The height of the new developments and the close proximity of the new dwellings to each other and the existing victorian houses are totally out of character with the neighbourhood. They are very imposing.

The height of the new dwellings affects our view over the stour valley and evening sunset.

With the prospect of significant further developments on the Essex side of Bures, I hope an example is made of the Developer. Bures deserves better. Communities and Councils need to ensure they are not walked over by developers, who are trying to cut corners.

..... Sudbury Road Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5JW

Comment submitted date: Sun 25 Mar 2018

Also See Document Tab 16.03.18

In my view the developer cut costs by not clearing the site, this now means the houses are on a raised ground level (confirmed by the new application) and (in my opinion) positioned closer to Cuckoo Hill. BDC are yet to confirm their view of the height but the developer stated a 1.7m increase in height in Jan. BDC opened an enforcement case re height 6/10/17 but we are not aware of any action taken. I don't think it is right when people do not hold them self with the rules and regulations, and just do what they want, and being very arrogant, I also don't understand that the council did not checked all this. And it will be very wrong if they receiving permission, for this enormous atrocities. And I intend to take it further if you're decision is not the right one for our great village.

And I really hope you take this matter very seriously, and not just walk over it.

..... Cuckoo Hill Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5JH

Comment submitted date: Sat 24 Mar 2018

this development does not appear to be as planned. height and distance to neighbours boundaries are not as per the site and house plans.

..... High Street Bures St Mary Bures Suffolk CO8 5JG

Comment submitted date: Fri 23 Mar 2018

See Document Tab 15.03.18