

Consultee Comments for Planning Application DC/18/03111

Application Summary

Application Number: DC/18/03111

Address: Land North Of Chilton Leys Brooke Way Stowmarket IP14 1UH

Proposal: Submission of Details (First) under Outline Planning Permission 5007/16 for Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for 175 dwellings, including affordable housing, associated hard and soft landscaping and infrastructure, foul water pumping station, provision of new electricity sub-station and inclusion of layby parking for 12 spaces adjacent to the school site.
Case Officer: John Pateman-Gee

Consultee Details

Name: Mrs Peggy Fuller

Address: 86 Forest Road, Onehouse, Stowmarket, Suffolk IP14 3HJ

Email: peggy.onehousepc@btinternet.com

On Behalf Of: Onehouse Parish Clerk

Comments

Councillors support the application with the following conditions:

That landscaping is in place by the end of 2018 to allow trees to establish prior to commencement of building work to reduce the visual impact.

Landscaping continues from the top of phase 2 to the proposed bus gateway

phase 1 should be completed before work commences on phase 2.

The quantity of affordable housing does not meet the 35% required for a development of this size.

DC/18/03111

That no objection be raised to the grant of planning consent, however, the Town Council would like to make comment in respect of the following:

- i) That adequate early landscaping treatment is carried out with regard to the Pauper's Graves;
- ii) That the planned footpaths and cycle paths are of a good standard in order to prevent conflict between pedestrians and cyclists;
- iii) That the garages planned as part of this development will only be used for the parking of vehicles;
- iv) That the electric car charging ports will be attached to the back wall of the garages; and
- v) That a Landscape Management Plan is drawn up to prevent a burden being placed upon Mid Suffolk District Council with regard to public open spaces and the play area.

The Town Council would like to express disappointment that no details have been forthcoming with respect to the planned school and would wish to see plans coming forward in the near future in order that undue pressure is not placed upon the town's existing schools as a result of this phase of development.



Developments Affecting Trunk Roads and Special Roads

Highways England Planning Response (HEPR 16-01)

Formal Recommendation to an Application for Planning Permission

From: Martin Fellows
Operations (East)
planningee@highwaysengland.co.uk

To: Mid Suffolk District Council

CC: growthandplanning@highwaysengland.co.uk

Council's Reference: **DC/18/03111**

Referring to the planning application referenced above, dated 13th July 2018 Submission of Details (First) under Outline Planning Permission 5007/16 for Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for 175 dwellings, including affordable housing, associated hard and soft landscaping and infrastructure, foul water pumping station, provision of new electricity sub-station and inclusion of layby parking for 12 spaces adjacent to the school site. Land North Of Chilton Leys, Brooke Way, Stowmarket, IP14 1UH notice is hereby given that Highways England's formal recommendation is that we:

- a) offer no objection;
- ~~b) recommend that conditions should be attached to any planning permission that may be granted (see Annex A — Highways England recommended Planning Conditions);~~
- ~~c) recommend that planning permission not be granted for a specified period (see Annex A — further assessment required);~~
- ~~d) recommend that the application be refused (see Annex A — Reasons for recommending Refusal).~~

Highways Act Section 175B is not relevant to this application.¹

¹ Where relevant, further information will be provided within Annex A.

Signature:

Date: 18/07/2018

Name: David Abbott

Position: Spatial Planner

Highways England:

Woodlands, Manton Lane

Bedford MK41 7LW

david.abbott@highwaysengland.co.uk

From: Jonathan Duck
Sent: 12 September 2018 11:40
To: John Pateman-Gee <John.pateman-Gee@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Cc: BMSDC Planning Area Team Blue <planningblue@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: DC/18/03111 Land North of Chilton Leys, Stowmarket

Hello John,

The Heritage Team has the following comments to make in regard to the details submitted to discharge the various conditions at the above.

The dwelling types are a pastiche of traditional domestic architecture, but in most cases their forms are not unacceptable. However, on drawing ref.no. 20824/SS there are several dwellings (including plots 18, 112, 115, 171, 172, though there may be more) which appear to feature brick facades and, inexplicably, rendered gables over a pentice board above first floor. This is contrived and despite, no doubt, an occasional example in the county of a similar detail that one may be able to point to, it cannot be argued to reinforce local distinctiveness – and as such the Heritage Team does not support the detail. Far more appropriate would be the use of brick cladding over the entire structures.

On residential properties, the use of a Marley fibre plank cladding might briefly reference low status, later C18th and earlier C19th timber framed and clad cottages, of which the district has various examples. However, in this situation, it appears entirely at odds with the general scale and architectural language proposed in the development. Unfortunately, it is reflective of the identikit palette of materials used by developers across the country. It diminishes the local distinctiveness of the place generally and reinforces a bland, insipid architecture, instead of being innovative or locally distinct. The Heritage Team does not support its use.

The remainder of the materials and details supplied are not unacceptable.

Joff

Dr Jonathan Duck BSc (Hons) MSc PgDip IHBC FRSA

Heritage and Design Officer

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils - Working Together

tel: 01449 724677 | 07860 827042

email: jonathan.duck@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

web: www.babergh.gov.uk www.midsuffolk.gov.uk

John Pateman-Gee
Planning Department
Mid Suffolk District Council
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich, IP1 2BX

13/08/2018

Dear John,

RE: DC/18/03111 Submission of Details (First) under Outline Planning Permission 5007/16 for Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for 175 dwellings. Land North of Chilton Leys, Brooke Way, Stowmarket

Thank you for sending us details of this application, we have the following comments:

We note the proposed ecological enhancements (drawing no. CSA/2833/165 Rev A) and are pleased to see that these include measures for bats, swifts, house sparrows and hedgehogs, as well as landscaping planting which could benefit a wider suite of species. We would however recommend that swift boxes are installed in greater numbers than the 5 proposed (for example 2 or 3 boxes per dwelling). Also, the buildings proposed for single hole house sparrow boxes could instead be fitted with swift boxes to increase the number of such boxes available.

With regard to the proposed hedgehog holes, again we support the inclusion of these but query why they are not present for all gardens?

If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely

James Meyer
Senior Conservation Planner

From:Consultations (NE)
Sent:23 Jul 2018 09:53:34 +0100
To:BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Subject:DC-18-03111 Consultation Response

Application ref: DC/18/03111
Our ref: 252590

Dear Sir/Madam

Natural England has no comments to make on these reserved matters.

Natural England has not assessed this application for impacts on protected species. Natural England has published [Standing Advice](#) which you can use to assess impacts on protected species or you may wish to consult your own ecology services for advice.

Natural England and the Forestry Commission have also published standing advice on [ancient woodland and veteran trees](#) which you can use to assess any impacts on ancient woodland.

The lack of comment from Natural England does not imply that there are no impacts on the natural environment, but only that the application is not likely to result in significant impacts on statutory designated nature conservation sites or landscapes. It is for the local planning authority to determine whether or not this application is consistent with national and local policies on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may be able to provide information and advice on the environmental value of this site and the impacts of the proposal to assist the decision making process. We advise LPAs to obtain specialist ecological or other environmental advice when determining the environmental impacts of development.

We recommend referring to our SSSI Impact Risk Zones (available on [Magic](#) and as a downloadable [dataset](#)) prior to consultation with Natural England. Further guidance on when to consult Natural England on planning and development proposals is available on gov.uk at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/local-planning-authorities-get-environmental-advice>

Yours faithfully

Matthew Dean
Consultations
Natural England
Hornbeam House, Electra Way
Crewe Business Park
Crewe, Cheshire CW1 6GJ

tel 0300 060 3900
email consultations@naturalengland.org.uk

Your ref: DC/18/03111
Our ref: Stowmarket – land north of Chilton
Leys Brooke Way 00043115
Date: 17 July 2018
Enquiries to: Neil McManus
Tel: 07973 640625
Email: neil.mcmanus@suffolk.gov.uk

Mr John Pateman-Gee,
Growth & Sustainable Planning,
Mid Suffolk District Council
Endeavour House,
8 Russell Road,
Ipswich,
Suffolk,
IP1 2BX

Dear John,

Stowmarket: land north of Chilton Leys Brooke Way – reserved matters application

I refer to the proposal: submission of details (first) under outline planning permission 5007/16 for appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale for 175 dwellings, including affordable housing, associated hard and soft landscaping and infrastructure, foul water pumping station, provision of new electricity sub-station and inclusion of layby parking for 12 spaces adjacent to the school site.

I have no comments to make on the above reserved matters planning application other than the proviso that the terms of the existing S106A remains in place.

I have copied this letter to colleagues who deal with highway matters, drainage and archaeology who may have comments to make on the reserved matters application.

Yours sincerely,

Neil McManus BSc (Hons) MRICS
Development Contributions Manager
Growth, Highways & Infrastructure Directorate – Strategic Development

cc Sam Harvey, Suffolk County Council
Floods Planning, Suffolk County Council
Suffolk Archaeology Service

From: Rachael Abraham
Sent: 08 August 2018 13:09
To: John Pateman-Gee <John.pateman-Gee@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: DC/18/03111- Chilton Leys RM application 1

Hi John,

Further to my previous email below, I have been sent a survey plan showing the extent of the moat surrounding Shepherd's Farm (attached).

The attenuation ponds are situated a suitable distance from this earthwork site, however, my main concern is the easement that runs immediately adjacent to the western side of the house and moat.

However if the developers and their contractors are away that the moat mustn't be disturbed during development and it can be fenced off until works are completed to avoid any accidental disturbance, then this should ensure the protection of the earthwork and we wouldn't object to the RM plans.

Best wishes,

Rachael

Rachael Abraham B.A. (Hons), M.A.
Senior Archaeological Officer

Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service,
Bury Resource Centre,
Hollow Road,
Bury St Edmunds,
IP32 7AY



© Archaeology South-East		Land at Chilton Leys Stowmarket	Fig.
Project Ref: 180030	05 - 2018	Site plan : Area A landscape survey	
Report Ref:	Drawn by: NG		

From:Nathan Pittam
Sent:17 Jul 2018 16:14:37 +0100
To:John Pateman-Gee
Cc:BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Subject:DC/18/03111. Air Quality

Dear John

EP Reference : 245679

DC/18/03111. Air Quality

Land North of Chilton Leys, Bury Road, STOWMARKET, Suffolk.

Submission of Details (First) under Outline Planning Permission 5007/16 for Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for 175 dwellings, including affordable housing, associated hard etc (remarks).

Many thanks for your request for comments in relation to the above submission from the perspective of air quality. I can confirm that I have no comments to make with respect to this consultation as nothing submitted relates to local air quality management.

Kind regards

Nathan

Nathan Pittam BSc. (Hons.) PhD

Senior Environmental Management Officer

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils – Working Together

From:Nathan Pittam
Sent:17 Jul 2018 16:07:55 +0100
To:John Pateman-Gee
Cc:BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Subject:DC/18/03111. Land Contamination.

Dear John

EP Reference : 245678

DC/18/03111. Land Contamination.

Land North of Chilton Leys, Bury Road, STOWMARKET, Suffolk.

Submission of Details (First) under Outline Planning Permission 5007/16 for Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for 175 dwellings, including affordable housing, associated hard etc (remarks).

Many thanks for your request for comments in relation to the above submission from the perspective of land contamination. I can confirm that I have no comments to make with respect to this consultaiton as nothing submitted relates to land contamination.

Kind regards

Nathan

Nathan Pittam BSc. (Hons.) PhD

Senior Environmental Management Officer

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils – Working Together

From: Philippa Stroud

Sent: 07 August 2018 11:37

To: BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow <planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>; BMSDC Planning Mailbox <planning@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>

Cc: John Pateman-Gee <John.pateman-Gee@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>

Subject: DC/18/03111 Land North of Chilton Leys, Brooke Way, Stowmarket - EH Other Issues

WK/245682

APPLICATION FOR RESERVED MATTERS - DC/18/03111

EH – Noise/Odour/Light/Smoke

Proposal: Submission of Details (First) under Outline Planning Permission 5007/16 for Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for 175 dwellings, including affordable housing, associated hard and soft landscaping and infrastructure, foul water pumping station, provision of new electricity sub-station and inclusion of layby parking for 12 spaces adjacent to the school site.

Location: Land North Of Chilton Leys, Brooke Way, Stowmarket, IP14 1UH

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above application for reserved matters.

I have no comments regarding the above and note that details regarding construction management will be submitted in due course as part of a separate discharge of conditions application.

Regards,

Philippa Stroud

Senior Environmental Protection Officer

Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Councils - Working Together

t: 01449 724724

e: Philippa.Stroud@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

www.babergh.gov.uk www.midsuffolk.gov.uk

From:RM Floods Planning

Sent:23 Jul 2018 09:50:21 +0100

To:BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow

Cc:John Pateman-Gee

Subject:2018-08-07-23 JS reply Land North Of Chilton Leys, Brooke Way, Stowmarket, IP14 1UH Ref DC/18/03111 - RM

Dear John Patemann-Gee,

Subject:- Land North Of Chilton Leys, Brooke Way, Stowmarket, IP14 1UH Ref DC/18/03111 - Reserved Matters

Suffolk County Council, Flood and Water Management have reviewed application ref DC/18/03111.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with Cannon Flood Risk Assessment Ref CCE/J971/FRAP2-04 October 2016 and all recommendations the report contains in

its entirety and shall be thereafter maintained as approved.

Kind Regards

Jason Skilton

Flood & Water Engineer, Flood & Water Management

Growth, Highways and Infrastructure

Suffolk County Council

Endeavour House, 8 Russell Rd, Ipswich, Suffolk IP1 2BX

Telephone: 01473 260411

Email: jason.skilton@suffolk.gov.uk

Website: www.suffolk.gov.uk

-----Original Message-----

From: planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk <planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>

Sent: 13 July 2018 12:11

To: RM Floods Planning <floods.planning@suffolk.gov.uk>

Subject: MSDC Planning Consultation Request - DC/18/03111

Please find attached planning consultation request letter relating to planning application - DC/18/03111
- Land North Of Chilton Leys, Brooke Way, Stowmarket, IP14 1UH

Kind Regards

Planning Support Team

Emails sent to and from this organisation will be monitored in accordance with the law to ensure compliance with policies and to minimize any security risks. The information contained in this email or any of its attachments may be privileged or confidential and is intended for the exclusive use of the addressee. Any unauthorised use may be unlawful. If you receive this email by mistake, please advise the sender immediately by using the reply facility in your email software. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this email that do not relate to the official business of Babergh District Council and/or Mid Suffolk District Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Babergh District Council and/or Mid Suffolk District Council.

Babergh District Council and Mid Suffolk District Council (BMSDC) will be Data Controllers of the information you are providing. As required by the Data Protection Act 2018 the information will be kept safe, secure, processed and only shared for those purposes or where it is allowed by law. In some circumstances however we may need to disclose your personal details to a third party so that they can provide a service you have requested, or fulfil a request for information. Any information about you that we pass to a third party will be held securely by that party, in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018 and used only to provide the services or information you have requested.

For more information on how we do this and your rights in regards to your personal information and how to access it, visit our website.

Subject:FW: 175 Dwellings North of Chilton Leys (Ref: DC/18/03111) - Police Design Out Crime Comments

From: Andrew Garnham - TW East Anglia

Sent: 21 September 2018 12:15

To: Kemp, Phil

Cc: James Bailey; Catherine Pollard

Subject: RE: 175 Dwellings North of Chilton Leys (Ref: DC/18/03111) - Police Design Out Crime Comments

Dear Phil – thank you for such a thoughtful email and great feedback – we try our best at TWEA and its great that we can all work together.

Kind Regards

Andrew Garnham | Planning Co-ordinator | Taylor Wimpey East Anglia

Castle House, Kempson Way, Bury St Edmunds, IP32 7AR

t: 01284 773800 | f: 01284 773860 | e: andrew.garnham@taylorwimpey.com

Taylor Wimpey East Anglia is a division of Taylor Wimpey UK Limited

Think before you print!

From: Kemp, Phil [<mailto:Phillip.Kemp@suffolk.pnn.police.uk>]

Sent: 21 September 2018 12:11

To: Andrew Garnham - TW East Anglia <Andrew.Garnham@taylorwimpey.com>

Subject: RE: 175 Dwellings North of Chilton Leys (Ref: DC/18/03111) - Police Design Out Crime Comments

Hello Andrew Many thanks for arranging our meeting, which I have to say I too found very, very helpful and I greatly appreciate all the assistance you have given in not only so thoroughly explaining the project and the problems it has entail and I take on board the matters you raised.

Do you mind if for convenience I reply to your very thorough email below, by adding my comments to it in red, I hope that is okay with you

1. Flying freehold plot 157 – a PIR light will be installed under the drive-thru. (Much appreciated and that is a big help, I realise there is little other alternative available)

Rear courtyard parking – The fencing around the rear car court behind plot 157 has been amended to show 1.5m high close board fence with 0.3m high trellis above and a private lighting column has been provided. (Again I realise that parking is a problem and that in order to prevent every householder having to drive out their drive and onto the road network a solution was made to have courtyard parking. I appreciate the compromise with the lighting, which will help enormously and the willingness to look at incorporating active windows in as many of these areas as possible to overlook the courtyard, along with 1.5m fencing topped up with 300mm trellis rather than the standard 1.8m close boarded, to again allow home owners to be able to have an active view of their cars parked in these rear courtyards, so again whilst you know I don't like rear courtyard parking, thank you for the compromise and at least bringing in forms of surveillance and reassurance for anyone lawfully using that area, to make them feel safer).

2. Rear courtyard parking – private lighting columns / lighting bollards have been added to the following car-courts plots; 12-14, 36-40, 77-80, 81-87 & 148-157. Boundary treatments have also been revised to show 1.5m high close board fence and 0.3m high trellis above. (As previously mentioned I realise the design is limited in how it can devise these parking courts, so again I appreciate the introduction of further column lighting and the close boarded fencing reduced to 1.5m, with 300mm trellis in order to allow homeowners surveillance for their parked vehicles).
3. Garages / driveways – A PIR light will be fitted to plots with garages to illuminate the driveways. Windows have been added to the side elevations of the following plots to add natural surveillance of side parking (plots; 16,21,22,25,26,28,52,57,96,116,118,123,124,127 & 128).

Boundary treatments have also been amended to 1.5m high close board fencing with trellis above (where possible). (Again already mentioned by myself in paras 2 and 3, so much appreciated as a suitable compromise).

4. (Please refer to comments under 1.2) (again already mentioned in paras 2 & 3 as a suitable and appreciated compromise)
5. (Please refer to comments under 1.2) (again already mentioned in paras 2, 3 & 4 as a suitable compromise)
6. (Please refer to comments under 1.2) (again already mentioned in paras 2,3,4, & 5 as suitable compromise)
7. I can confirm that the rear access serving plot 80 is fully enclosed and securely gated and within the ownership of plot 80 only. (Many thanks much appreciated)
8. I can confirm that plots 82 – 86 have their main primary elevations overlooking this space - I have also included a lighting column in this space. (Many thanks much appreciated)
9. There is a secure gate at the entrance to the rear access as well as 2 further individual gates once inside which serve plots 85 & 86. When viewed from the car park this will appear as one secured access and not open / communal. (Many thanks for clarifying that, much appreciated)
10. I have now placed a secure gate at the entrance - there is only a very short section of the access which is shared – the majority is enclosed and owned by plot 104. There are secure gates to the gardens of plots 103 & 104. (thank you much appreciated)
11. The rear access to plot 129 has now been revised and there is a secure side access to the side of plot 129 garage – therefore this plot no longer needs to access through the garage. (Excellent many thanks again much appreciated)

12. I have now placed a secure gate at the entrance of the access and can confirm plots 158,159 & 160 have secure gates to their gardens. The boundary treatment is 1.5m close board fence with 0.3m trellis above. (Great many thanks much appreciated)

13. (Please refer to the comment above) (Noted and many thanks for clarifying that)

14. I can confirm the primary front elevation of plot 66 is overlooking this space - as does plot 95. (My apologies for not picking up on that in the first place and I appreciate the clarification and that you very kindly positioned these two properties the way you did in the first place, to allow for surveillance for the sub station and help reduce the risk of ASB in the area. Many thanks for that)

15. As discussed – at present the cycle path is to be adopted by the district council and no lighting has been proposed. (I have to say whilst I realise this is not your fault, I am disappointed with this bearing in mind it is a focal path and should be well used, what with going by the proposed school, but I understand if that is their policy)

16. I can confirm the footpaths are designed to SCC highway standards with approved sizes. (That is great and again will help in making users feel safe and hopefully reduce the fear of people passing by one another's personal body space)

17. Noted. (Many thanks)

18. Noted. (Many thanks)

Once again my thanks for your excellent understanding of the police principals in Secure By Design and reducing the fear and possibility of crime at the outset. I wish more designers were as helpful as your company have been and in particular yourself and Mr Dan Humphries

Many thanks Phil

Phil Kemp

Designing Out Crime Officer (DOCO)

Western and Southern areas

Bury St Edmunds Police Station

Suffolk Police

RayneGate Street

Bury St Edmunds

IP33 2AP

Suffolk Police via 101 Ext 4141

From: Andrew Garnham - TW East Anglia [<mailto:Andrew.Garnham@taylorwimpey.com>]

Sent: 19 September 2018 15:51

To: Kemp, Phil

Cc: Mark Russell (Mark.Russell@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk); John Pateman-Gee (John.pateman-Gee@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk); James Bailey (jamesbailey@boyerplanning.co.uk); Catherine Pollard (catherinepollard@boyerplanning.co.uk)

Subject: FW: 175 Dwellings North of Chilton Leys (Ref: DC/18/03111) - Police Design Out Crime Comments

Importance: High

Good Afternoon Phil,

Thank you for meeting with me on Monday 18th – I think we can both agree it was very beneficial and I am pleased we have been able to address your comments.

As discussed – I have listed below all of the items which we have agreed to (please note I have responded to these as laid out in your letter).

I have also attached the revised planning layout and boundary treatments plan which further confirms these changes.

1. Flying freehold plot 157 – a PIR light will be installed under the drive-thru. (Much appreciated and that is a big help, I realise there is little other alternative available)

Rear courtyard parking – The fencing around the rear car court behind plot 157 has been amended to show 1.5m high close board fence with 0.3m high trellis above and a private lighting column has been provided. (Again I realise that parking is a problem and that in order to prevent every householder having to drive out their drive and onto the road network a solution was made to have courtyard parking. I appreciate the compromise with the lighting, which will help enormously and the willingness to look at incorporating active windows in as many of these areas as possible to overlook the courtyard, along with 1.5m fencing topped up with 300mm trellis rather than the standard 1.8m close boarded, to again allow home owners to be able to have an active view of their cars parked in these rear courtyards, so again whilst you know I don't like rear courtyard parking, thank you for the compromise and at least bringing in forms of surveillance and reassurance for anyone lawfully using that area, to make them feel safer).

2. Rear courtyard parking – private lighting columns / lighting bollards have been added to the following car-courts plots; 12-14, 36-40, 77-80, 81-87 & 148-157. Boundary treatments have also been revised to show 1.5m high close board fence and 0.3m high trellis above. (As previously mentioned I realise the design is limited in how it can devise these parking courts, so again I appreciate the introduction of further column lighting and the close boarded fencing reduced to 1.5m, with 300mm trellis in order to allow homeowners surveillance for their parked vehicles).
3. Garages / driveways – A PIR light will be fitted to plots with garages to illuminate the driveways. Windows have been added to the side elevations of the following plots to

add natural surveillance of side parking (plots; 16,21,22,25,26,28,52,57,96,116,118,123,124,127 & 128).

Boundary treatments have also been amended to 1.5m high close board fencing with trellis above (where possible). (Again already mentioned by myself in paras 2 and 3, so much appreciated as a suitable compromise).

4. (Please refer to comments under 1.2) (again already mentioned in paras 2 & 3 as a suitable and appreciated compromise)
5. (Please refer to comments under 1.2) (again already mentioned in paras 2, 3 & 4 as a suitable compromise)
6. (Please refer to comments under 1.2) (again already mentioned in paras 2,3,4, & 5 as suitable compromise)
7. I can confirm that the rear access serving plot 80 is fully enclosed and securely gated and within the ownership of plot 80 only. (Many thanks much appreciated)
8. I can confirm that plots 82 – 86 have their main primary elevations overlooking this space - I have also included a lighting column in this space. (Many thanks much appreciated)
9. There is a secure gate at the entrance to the rear access as well as 2 further individual gates once inside which serve plots 85 & 86. When viewed from the car park this will appear as one secured access and not open / communal. (Many thanks for clarifying that, much appreciated)
10. I have now placed a secure gate at the entrance - there is only a very short section of the access which is shared – the majority is enclosed and owned by plot 104. There are secure gates to the gardens of plots 103 & 104. (thank you much appreciated)

11. The rear access to plot 129 has now been revised and there is a secure side access to the side of plot 129 garage – therefore this plot no longer needs to access through the garage. (Excellent many thanks again much appreciated)

12. I have now placed a secure gate at the entrance of the access and can confirm plots 158,159 & 160 have secure gates to their gardens. The boundary treatment is 1.5m close board fence with 0.3m trellis above. (Great many thanks much appreciated)

13. (Please refer to the comment above) (Noted and many thanks for clarifying that)

14. I can confirm the primary front elevation of plot 66 is overlooking this space - as does plot 95. (My apologies for not picking up on that in the first place and I appreciate the clarification and that you very kindly positioned these two properties the way you did in the first place, to allow for surveillance for the sub station and help reduce the risk of ASB in the area. Many thanks for that)

15. As discussed – at present the cycle path is to be adopted by the district council and no lighting has been proposed. (I have to say whilst I realise this is not your fault, I am disappointed with this bearing in mind it is a focal path and should be well used, what with going by the proposed school, but I understand if that is their policy)

16. I can confirm the footpaths are designed to SCC highway standards with approved sizes. (That is great and again will help in making users feel safe and hopefully reduce the fear of people passing by one another’s personal body space)

17. Noted. (Many thanks)

18. Noted. (Many thanks)

I would be grateful if you could please acknowledge receipt of this email – and confirm that we have now addressed your comments accordingly.

Kind Regards

Andrew Garnham | Planning Co-ordinator | Taylor Wimpey East Anglia

Castle House, Kempson Way, Bury St Edmunds, IP32 7AR

t: 01284 773800 | f: 01284 773860 | e: andrew.garnham@taylorwimpey.com

Taylor Wimpey East Anglia is a division of Taylor Wimpey UK Limited

Think before you print!

From: Andrew Garnham - TW East Anglia

Sent: 05 September 2018 09:50

To: 'Phil.Kemp@suffolk.pnn.police.uk' <Phil.Kemp@suffolk.pnn.police.uk>

Cc: 'Norton, Jacqueline' <Jacqueline.Norton@suffolk.pnn.police.uk>; James Bailey
(jamesbailey@boyerplanning.co.uk) <jamesbailey@boyerplanning.co.uk>

Subject: 175 Dwellings North of Chilton Leys (Ref: DC/18/03111)

Importance: High

Dear Phil,

Thank you for commenting on our application for 175 dwellings at land North of Chilton Leys (Ref: DC/18/03111) – I would like to arrange a meeting to discuss these in person and would be grateful if you could please provide me with some dates of your availability over the next week or so.

In advance of a meeting I have provided a summary of responses to the comments you have made which I hope you will find satisfactory.

Taylor Wimpey Design Response;

1. Flying freehold – we are happy to provide PIR lighting to BS standards as suggested to the undercroft and we can also look to provide lighting bollards to the rear car court.

The boundary treatment around the car court can be revised to 1.5m high close board fence with 0.3m trellis above, however we are unable to provide gates as the Housing Association are reluctant to take on additional management costs.

2. The provision of rear parking courts has been reduced as much as possible. However it has not been possible to design them out completely as a number of plots are located of the central spine road which is a designated local distributor road

And therefore does not permit cars approaching the road in reverse gear or permit direct plot access. We are happy to provide lighting to rear car courts where its felt beneficial as well as provide suitable boundary treatment in the form of 1.5m close board fence with 0.3m trellis above.

3. In order to achieve the required standard of parking spaces it has been necessary to sit the garages further back behind the building line. We have provided parking to the front of the plots where ever possible – but we cannot provide this everywhere as it would result in a car dominated street scene. We have reviewed the layout are able to provide additional windows to side elevations of dwellings to aid natural surveillance – I can confirm the following plots; 16, 21, 22, 25, 26, 28, 52, 57, 96, 116,118, 123,124, 127 & 128.

4. Please refer to the comments under point 1.2.

5. Please refer to the comments under point 1.2.

6. Please refer to the comments under point 1.2.

7. I can confirm that the rear access serving plot 80 is fully enclosed and securely gated and within the ownership of plot 80 only.

8. We are unable to move the parking spaces serving plots 81,82 & 87 to the front as we are not allowed direct access parking off the main highway. I can confirm this parking area will be lit and there are windows on the first floor of the coach house on plot 82 which will offer natural surveillance.
9. There is a secure gate at the entrance to the rear access as well as 2 further individual gates once inside which serve plots 85 & 86. When viewed from the car park this will appear as one secured access and not open / communal.
10. I have now placed a secure gate at the entrance - there is only a very short section of the access which is shared – the majority is enclosed and owned by plot 104. There are secure gates to the gardens of plots 103 & 104.
11. The rear access serving plot 129 is via a personnel door off the garage fully enclosed within the boundary of plot 129.
12. I have now placed a secure gate at the entrance of the access and can confirm plots 158,159 & 160 have secure gates to their gardens. The boundary treatment is 1.5m close board fence with 0.3m trellis above.
13. I can confirm that a secured gate will be placed at the entrance to each rear access and each plot will have its own garden gate.
14. The location of the pump station has been agreed with Anglian Water as part of the Flood Risk Assessment submitted with the outline so we are unable to re-position this. However I can confirm that the main house elevation of plot 66 over looks this space as does plot 95.
15. The cycle path surrounding the POS is to be offered up for adoption to BMSDC – the details of which are yet to be agreed and approved by BMSDC – at which point lighting of footpaths can be discussed.

16. The footpaths are designed to SCC highway standards with approved sizes.

17. Noted.

18. Noted.

I trust the above is of assistance and I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind Regards

Andrew Garnham | Planning Co-ordinator | Taylor Wimpey East Anglia

Castle House, Kempson Way, Bury St Edmunds, IP32 7AR

t: 01284 773800 | f: 01284 773860 | e: andrew.garnham@taylorwimpey.com

Taylor Wimpey East Anglia is a division of Taylor Wimpey UK Limited

Think before you print!

This e-mail and its attachments are confidential and intended solely for the attention and use of the named addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient, you may not disclose, copy, distribute or retain this message or any part of it without the prior permission of the sender. If you have received this in error please inform the sender and immediately delete the message.

Use of your personal information

Taylor Wimpey takes data protection very seriously and the privacy notice that will apply to our use of your personal information can be found at <https://imsva91-ctp.trendmicro.com:443/wis/clicktime/v1/query?url=www.taylorwimpey.co.uk%2fprivacy%2dp>

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

TO: John Pateman-Gee – Yellow Team Area Manager

From: Julie Abbey-Taylor, Professional Lead – Housing Enabling

Date: 20.8.2018

SUBJECT: DC/18/03111

Proposal: Submission of details under Outline planning permission 5007/16 for 175 dwellings, including affordable housing, associated hard and soft landscaping and infrastructure, foul water pumping station, provision of new electricity sub-station and inclusion of 12 spaces for parking for adjacent school.

Consultation Response on Affordable Housing Requirement

Key Points

1. Background Information

- A development of 175 dwellings has been submitted as phase 2 for this site
- Outline planning permission was granted.
- 20% affordable housing was approved by Planning Committee – for phase 2 this equates to 35 dwellings.
- The tenure of the affordable dwellings was set out in the outline application.

2. Housing Need Information:

2.1 The Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Strategic Housing Market Assessment confirms a continuing need for housing across all tenures and a growing need for affordable housing. The most recent update of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, completed in 2017 confirms **a minimum need of 94 affordable homes per annum.**

2.2 The most recent version of the SHMA specifies an affordable housing mix equating to 41% for 1 bed units, 40% 2 bed units, 16% 3 bed units and 3% 4+ bed units. Actual delivery requested will reflect management practicalities and existing stock in the local area, together with local housing needs data and requirements.

2.3 The Council's Choice Based Lettings system currently has circa. 770 applicants registered for the Mid Suffolk district area.

2.4 The location of most of the affordable homes in this phase are located around the centre of the site, adjacent to the proposed convenience store and within close walking distance to the new primary school. This is considered to be a suitable location for the affordable homes in this phase.

2.6 With regard to the open market housing on the site it is noted that the current proposal is to provide a range of dwelling types and sizes. Our 2014 Housing

Needs Survey shows that there is a need across all tenures for smaller units of accommodation, which includes accommodation suitable for older people, wishing to downsize from larger privately-owned family housing, into smaller privately-owned apartments, bungalows and houses.

2.7 It would also be appropriate for any open market apartments and smaller houses on the site to be designed and developed to Lifetime-Homes standards, making these attractive and appropriate for older people.

3. Affordable Housing Requirement for Stowupland:

Affordable Housing Requirement	<p>35 % of units = 35 affordable units</p> <p>The affordable housing will be made available to meet district wide need.</p>
<p>Tenure Split - 75% Rent & 25 % Intermediate e.g. New Build Homebuy accommodation, intermediate rent or shared ownership.</p>	<p>Affordable Rent = 10 units All rented units will be let as Affordable Rent Tenancies</p> <p>Shared ownership = 11 units</p> <p>Discounted Market sale = 14 units</p> <p>The above split was approved in the outline permission 5007/16.</p>
Detailed Breakdown Rented Units	<p>General Needs affordable rented in the form of:</p> <p>Of the total 35 affordable homes, only 10 are proposed for rent which equates to 30% of the overall provision which is as approved in the outline permission.</p> <p>However, they are provided as all 2 bed flats and 1 FOG's (this latter being for 3-person not 4 persons as we require) Again there are no unit sizes provided, but any 2 bed 4-person flat should be 70 sqm in accordance with NDSS.</p>

Detailed Breakdown Intermediate Units

General Needs Shared Ownership dwellings:

11 dwellings in total.

3 x 2 bedroom 4-person houses @79 sqm - there is no indication of the size of these units, but we would require them to be NDSS compliant at 79 sqm. Total provided is insufficient and needs to be changed to 7 x 2bed 4-person houses

8 x 3 bedroom 5-person houses – no indication of the size these are proposed at but should be NDSS compliant at 93 sqm. The number provided should reduce to 4 x 3bed 5-person houses

Required mix = 7 x 2 bed 4-person houses @ 79 sqm and 4 x 3 bed 5-person houses @ 93 sqm

Discounted Market Sale units:

14 dwellings in total. These have been proposed as: -

8 x 2 bed houses – no space standards have been provided but should be compliant with NDSS and suitable for 4 persons. **Number to be increased to 10 in total.**

6 x 3 bed houses - no space standards have been provided but should be compliant with NDSS and suitable for 5 persons. **Number to be reduced to 4 in total.**

Other requirements

- Properties must be built to Nationally Described Space Standards as published March 2015.
- The council is granted 100% nomination rights to all the affordable units for initial lets and 75% on relets.
- The Shared Ownership properties must have an 80% staircasing bar, to ensure they are available to successive occupiers as affordable housing in perpetuity. Discounted Market Sale units to have a covenant included to ensure that upon resale, the dwellings will continue to be sold at 80% open market sale value.
- The Council will not support a bid for Homes England grant funding on the affordable homes delivered as part of an open market development. Therefore, the affordable units on that part of the site must be delivered grant free.
- The location and phasing of the affordable housing units must be built using materials to ensure that they are tenure blind.
- On larger sites, the affordable housing should not be placed in groups of more than 15 units and should not be accessed off separate roads or cul-de-sacs.
- Adequate parking provision is made for the affordable housing units
- It is required that the affordable units are transferred to one of the Council's partner Registered Providers.
- An Affordable Housing Nomination Agreement must be entered in to between the Council and the RP for the affordable rented and shared ownership dwellings.

4. Comments on the Open Market Mix proposed

For phase 2 the open market mix consists of a total of 140 dwellings: -

11 x 2 bed houses + 2 x 2 bed FOG's = 7.43%

84 x 3 bed houses – a mix of detached and semi-detached = 48%

28 x 4 bed houses = 16%

15 x 5 bed houses = 8.57%

Of the open market provision only 7.43% are smaller 2 bedroomed dwellings which is lower than the percentage of smaller properties that we need to be securing for sale to reflect the picture of general housing needs within the district and contrary to the amount specified in the 2017 SHMA of xx%. The provision of 5 bed houses could be replaced with the provision of 3 bed bungalows which would meet the open market need far more effectively. The data shows that some 35.1% of new owner-occupied housing in the Ipswich HMA should be three-bedroom homes, with 27.0% being two-bedroom units, 28.7% should have four or more bedrooms and 9.2% one-bedroom accommodation.

Therefore, the number of 2 beds is vastly under-provided and the number of 3 beds is over-provided against the relative percentages in the most recent SHMA.

The plan labelled Housing Distribution Layout does not show any bungalows on this phase. With the ageing demographics within Mid Suffolk It is very disappointing that there have not been any age-specific properties proposed on this site. Whilst I understand this issue around land take for bungalows, the high demand for such dwellings means that there is a price premium for such properties. I would request that the mix is amended to see some 2 and 3 bed bungalows to provide a better mix and provide more choice for a range of purchasers across different age groups.

Julie Abbey-Taylor
Professional Lead – Housing Enabling