

PLANNING APPLICATION FOR OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION – DC/17/06326

Proposal: Outline Planning Application. Demolition of existing buildings and construction of residential development (110 dwellings), conversion of existing public house to a flexible use of A1 (retail), A3 (Cafe), A4 (Public House) and D1 (Community Space/Day Nursery), public open space, drainage infrastructure and vehicular access.

Location: Crown Farm, The Street, Weybread. IP21 5TP

Objection - Weybread Parish Council wishes to lodge a strong objection to the number of dwellings (110) proposed for this application. If approved this would result in a 60% increase in the number of properties in the whole of the parish and 175% increase in the number of properties on The Street. Additionally, Weybread Parish Council would ask for the following comments to be taken into consideration:

FINANCIAL VIABILITY:

We challenge the economic arguments put forward to justify such a big development. The large cost to decontaminate the site seems excessive and even if a large problem exists, this cost should be paid by the polluter business, and not by the justification of more building plots

BROWN FIELD/ GREEN FIELD:

Weybread Parish Council strongly objects to development on the Green Field Land.

- This land is not in the current or proposed new council structure plan for development. The Greenfield land on the Crown Chicken site has been growing arable crops until ownership passed to Cranswick; indeed it was last cropped with wheat in autumn 2016 and was registered with, & received payment from, the governments Rural Payments Agency.

VILLAGE ASSETS:

Weybread Parish Council believes the developers should offer some assets for the village – currently only St Andrew’s Church and the Village Hall are considered village assets. The church will be sufficient to meet the needs of additional parishioners but the current village hall will not. The size of the current village hall limits the number of occupants.

Conversion of the public house is not considered an asset as it will entail volunteers to run the various options suggested. If nobody is willing to volunteer, the public house will simply be an empty building owned by Crown Chicken

Therefore we would ask that under any Section 106 agreement with the council that the greenfield land on the west of the proposed site not be housing but be gifted as open space, playing field , with new village hall.

PUBLIC HOUSE CONVERSION TO A1, A2, A3, A4 AND D1/ACCESS:

Whatever the flexible use decision made on the former Crown Public House it requires sufficient curtilage around it to make it successful and allow sufficient car parking space to avoid on road parking which should include disabled parking spaces at the front of the building. Safe access must be assured, especially if the conversion includes a Day Nursery.

Other than these points, there is no objection to the proposed uses.

INFRASTRUCTURE/MEDICAL CENTRE/SCHOOL/BROADBAND:

It is understood that due to the overspill of primary school aged children from Harleston (as the result of extensive house building in the town), the Reception Class at Fressingfield school – the nearest primary school to Weybread – is now closed for new intake.

Medical Centres in both Fressingfield and Harleston are full
Local employment is limited therefore better Broadband provision must be assured for those wishing or needing to work from home.

HIGHWAYS/TRANSPORT:

Apart from one bus per week (to Harleston/Norwich and return) there is no public transport serving Weybread.

There is concern that the considerably increased number of vehicles exiting the site onto The Street would become a safety issue due to the fact that there are no proposed pavements at the site exit, no cycle lane and no provision for a safe stopping place for the School Bus. The Parish Council would propose the creation of a pavement along the front of the site to the Crown Pub and provision of a bus stop off the main highway.

We request these safety issues are reviewed and given due consideration

SEWERAGE:

There is concern the current sewerage system may be too old and fragile to take extra sewerage from the development and also that proposed in Fressingfield.

SURFACE WATER:

Surface water drainage from the Crown Chicken site is limited to a 300mm pipe that leaves the site and travels in an easterly direction (not NNW as per the Plandescil Flood Risk Assessment). This 300mm pipe goes underground for in excess of 250m; it crosses the road and passes through residential property before reaching an open ditch network to the east. This network takes, in addition to the Crown Chicken site, water from 15 residential properties and 40+ hectares of under drained agricultural land up hill and to the south of the proposed site

ENVIRONMENTAL/ECOLOGICAL:

We believe the study carried out was not substantial enough and was carried out at the wrong time of the year when ponds and ditches were dry. It is common knowledge that there are frequent sightings of crested newts and bats – plural – not just one bat as mentioned in the survey.

We request this point is noted.

HISTORICAL/ARCHEOLOGICAL:

Weybread is situated on a Roman Road.

Many artefacts have been found locally and actual specimens are displayed at The Paddocks, Church Road.

GRADE II LISTED BUILDINGS:

Greystone House and Fir Tree Farm are both adjacent to the proposed site

It is the general opinion of Weybread Parish Councillors that some limited development in Weybread could re-generate the village and it's community. With this in mind the plans and proposals of this application have been fully reviewed and we request that these resultant comments and observations be taken into consideration.

Your Ref:DC/17/06326
Our Ref: 570\CON\3128\18
Date: 7 December 2018



All planning enquiries should be sent to the Local Planning Authority.

Email: planning@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

The Planning Department
MidSuffolk District Council
Planning Section
1st Floor, Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich
Suffolk
IP1 2BX

For the attention of: Alex Scott

Dear Alex

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

CONSULTATION RETURN: DC/17/06326

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing buildings and construction of residential development (110 dwellings), conversion of existing public house to a flexible use of A1 (retail), A3 (Cafe), A4 (Public House) and D1 (Community Space/Day Nursery), public open space, drainage infrastructure and vehicular access.

LOCATION: Crown Farm, The Street, Weybread, Suffolk

ROAD CLASS:

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highway Authority recommends that any permission which that Planning Authority may give should include the conditions shown below:

COMMENTS

The NPPF focuses on the importance of promoting sustainable transport and give priority to public transport, pedestrian and cycle movements. We have concerns regarding the number of trips created by the development. Although the transport Assessment shows the net increase compared to the sites previous use causes no intensification, at present there are limited means of sustainable transport for this site.

- There is a limited bus service in Weybread; insufficient for a mode of transport for commuting for work, travelling to further education or medical appointments, therefore, there will be a great reliance on the private car.
- The catchment primary school is approximately 2 miles and the secondary school is approx. 12 miles from the site. As there is no safe walking route to school, there will be a need to provide transport for school pupils.
- SCC Community Transport Team were unable to identify any suitable measures that would benefit the Mid-Suffolk Connecting Communities service in the wider area.

We have reviewed the Transport Assessment and the data supplied with this application, the summary of our findings are as follows:

The maximum 85%ile speed recorded on The Street adjacent to the site is 37mph and the required visibility for the access on the highway can be met.

The estimated total additional vehicle trips in the AM peak hour is 11 vehicles and PM peak hour is 23 vehicles (compared to previous site use) therefore the additional vehicles from the development will not have a severe impact on the surrounding road and junctions.

There is one slight and injury accident recorded on The Street therefore there are no specific highway safety concerns in the vicinity of the site.

The proposed mitigation for additional footway construction improves access to the north of the village for cyclists and pedestrians.

Taking all the above into account, it is our opinion that this development should not be prevented or refused on highways grounds as there are no unacceptable impacts on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would not be severe (paragraph 109 NPPF). However, SCC does not consider this site as a sustainable location from a transport policy perspective.

CONDITIONS

Should the Planning Authority be minded to grant planning approval the Highway Authority in Suffolk would recommend they include the following conditions and obligations:

V 1 - Condition: Before the access is first used visibility splays shall be provided as shown on Drawing No. 17047-010B with an X dimension of 2.4m and a Y dimension of 90m and thereafter retained in the specified form. Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 2 Class A of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no obstruction over 0.6 metres high shall be erected, constructed, planted or permitted to grow within the areas of the visibility splays.

ER 1 - Condition: Before the development is commenced, details of the estate roads and footpaths, (including layout, levels, gradients, surfacing and means of surface water drainage), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that roads/footways are constructed to an acceptable standard.

ER 2 - Condition: No dwelling shall be occupied until the carriageways and footways serving that dwelling have been constructed to at least Binder course level or better in accordance with the approved details except with the written agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory access is provided for the safety of residents and the public.

P 2 - Condition: Before the development is commenced details of the areas to be provided for the [LOADING, UNLOADING,] manoeuvring and parking of vehicles including electric vehicle charging points and secure cycle storage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be carried out in its entirety before the development is brought into use and shall be retained thereafter and used for no other purpose.

Reason: To enable vehicles to enter and exit the public highway in forward gear in the interests of highway safety.

B 2 - Condition: Before the development is commenced details of the areas to be provided for storage of Refuse/Recycling bins shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be carried out in its entirety before the development is brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for no other purpose.

Reason: To ensure that refuse recycling bins are not stored on the highway causing obstruction and dangers for other users.

D 2 - Condition: Before the development is commenced details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority showing the means to prevent the discharge of surface water from the development onto the highway. The approved scheme shall be carried out in its entirety before the access is first used and shall be retained thereafter in its approved form.

Reason: To prevent hazards caused by flowing water or ice on the highway.

NOTES

The Local Planning Authority recommends that developers of housing estates should enter into formal agreement with the Highway Authority under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 relating to the construction and subsequent adoption of Estate Roads.

The works within the public highway will be required to be designed and constructed in accordance with the County Council's specification. The applicant will also be required to enter into a legal agreement under the provisions of Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 relating to the construction and subsequent adoption of the highway improvements. Amongst other things the Agreement will cover the specification of the highway works, safety audit procedures, construction and supervision and inspection of the works, bonding arrangements, indemnity of the County Council regarding noise insulation and land compensation claims, commuted sums, and changes to the existing street lighting and signing.

S106 CONTRIBUTIONS

Section 106 contribution is required for Suffolk County Council to provide the following mitigation on behalf of the developer:

Design, print and delivery of Resident Travel Packs for each dwelling - £1600
Resource for SCC School Travel Plan engagement with Fressingfield Primary School - £6000
Total S106 - £7600 (£70 per dwelling) Index linked

The developer is to appoint a Travel Plan Coordinator to implement the Plan on their behalf, with the Highway and Local Planning Authority monitoring the Travel Plan implementation and Suffolk County Council Road Safety Team will engage with the primary school.

Yours sincerely,

Samantha Harvey
Senior Development Management Engineer
Growth, Highways and Infrastructure



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/17/06326

Referring to the planning application referenced above, dated 9 January 2018, application for the demolition of existing buildings and construction of residential development, conversion of existing public house to a flexible use of retail, café, public house and community space/day nursery, public open space, drainage infrastructure and vehicular access, Crown Farm, The Street, Weybread, IP21 5TP, 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~~ is not relevant to this application.¹

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

Signature:

Date: 15 January 2018

Name: David Abbott

Position: Spatial Planner

Highways England:

Woodlands, Manton Lane

Bedford MK41 7LW

david.abbott@highwaysengland.co.uk



Alex Scott
Mid Suffolk District Council
Planning Department
131, Council Offices High Street
Needham Market
Ipswich
IP6 8DL

Our ref: AE/2018/122408/02-L01
Your ref: DC/17/06326
Date: 17 August 2018

Dear Alex

OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION. DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (110 DWELLINGS), CONVERSION OF EXISTING PUBLIC HOUSE TO A FLEXIBLE USE OF A1 (RETAIL), A3 (CAFE), A4 (PUBLIC HOUSE) AND D1 (COMMUNITY SPACE/DAY NURSERY), PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, DRAINAGE INFRASTRUCTURE AND VEHICULAR ACCESS.

CROWN FARM , THE STREET, WEYBREAD , IP21 5TP

Thank you for re-consulting us on this application. We have reviewed the submitted report from Mark Bassett dated 9 July 2018 and are satisfied that the development will be connecting to mains foul drainage. We are therefore removing our holding objection.

We request that the conditions, as outlined in our previous letter referenced AE/2018/122408/01-L01 and dated 26 January 2018, on groundwater and contaminated land are included should permission be granted.

We trust this information is useful.

Yours sincerely

**Miss Charlie Christensen
Planning Adviser**

BABERGH/MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chief Planning Control Officer For the attention of: Alex Scott

FROM: Nathan Pittam, Environmental Protection Team DATE: 12.1.18

YOUR REF: DC/17/06326: EH - Land Contamination

SUBJECT: : Outline Planning Application. Demolition of existing buildings and construction of residential development (110 dwellings), conversion of existing public house to a flexible use of A1 (retail), etc (see remarks)

Address: Edwards & Blake Ltd @ Crown Farm, Crown Farm, The Street,
Weybread, DISS, IP21 5TL.

Please find below my comments regarding contaminated land matters only.

The Environmental Protection Team has no objection to the proposed development, but would recommend that the following Planning Condition be attached to any planning permission:

Proposed Condition: Standard Contaminated Land Condition (CL01)

No development shall take place until:

- 1. A strategy for investigating any contamination present on site (including ground gases, where appropriate) has been submitted for approval by the Local Planning Authority.*
- 2. Following approval of the strategy, an investigation shall be carried out in accordance with the strategy.*
- 3. A written report shall be submitted detailing the findings of the investigation referred to in (2) above, and an assessment of the risk posed to receptors by the contamination (including ground gases, where appropriate) for approval by the Local Planning Authority. Subject to the risk assessment, the report shall include a Remediation Scheme as required.*
- 4. Any remediation work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Remediation Scheme.*
- 5. Following remediation, evidence shall be provided to the Local Planning Authority verifying that remediation has been carried out in accordance with the approved Remediation Scheme.*

Reason: To identify the extent and mitigate risk to the public, the wider environment and buildings arising from land contamination.

It is important that the following advisory comments are included in any notes accompanying the Decision Notice:

“There is a suspicion that the site may be contaminated or affected by ground gases. You should be aware that the responsibility for the safe development and secure occupancy of the site rests with the developer.

Unless agreed with the Local Planning Authority, you must not carry out any development work (including demolition or site preparation) until the requirements of the condition have been met, or without the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority.

The developer shall ensure that any reports relating to site investigations and subsequent remediation strategies shall be forwarded for comment to the following bodies:

- *Local Planning Authority*
- *Environmental Services*
- *Building Inspector*
- *Environment Agency*

Any site investigations and remediation strategies in respect of site contamination (including ground gases, where appropriate) shall be carried out in accordance with current approved standards and codes of practice.

The applicant/developer is advised, in connection with the above condition(s) requiring the submission of a strategy to establish the presence of land contaminants and any necessary investigation and remediation measures, to contact the Council's Environmental Protection Team.”

Nathan Pittam
Senior Environmental Management Officer

BABERGH/MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEMORANDUM

TO: Development Control.

For the attention of: Alex Scott.

FROM: Ray Bennett, Environmental Protection Team.

DATE: 19.01.18

Environmental Health-Noise/Odour/Light/Smoke.

YOUR REF: DC/17/06326.

SUBJECT: Demolition of existing buildings and construction of residential development (110 dwellings), conversion of existing public house to a flexible use of A1 (retail), A3 (Cafe), A4 (Public House) and D1 (Community Space/Day Nursery).

ADDRESS: Crown Farm The Street Weybread IP21 5TP.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment of the above planning application.

Whilst I have no objection in principle to this application, I do have some concerns about the likelihood of loss of amenity to surrounding residential dwellings during the demolition and construction phases of the development and I would recommend the following conditions:

1. Hours of work.

All works and ancillary operations, which are audible at the site boundary, or at such other place as may be agreed with the Council, shall be carried out only between the hours of 8am and 6pm on Mondays to Fridays and between the hours of 9am and 1pm on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays and Bank Holidays. Deliveries/collections shall only be made during these hours.

Reason – To minimise detriment to nearby residential amenity.

2. Construction Management Plan.

No development shall commence until a construction management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The construction management plan shall include details of:

- Operating hours (to be as above).
- Means of access, traffic routes, vehicle parking and manoeuvring areas (site operatives and visitors).
- Loading and unloading of plant and materials.
- Wheel washing facilities.
- Lighting.
- Location and nature of compounds and storage areas (including maximum storage heights) and factors to prevent wind-whipping.
- Waste storage and removal.
- Temporary buildings and boundary treatments.
- Dust management measures.
- Noise and vibration management (to include arrangements for monitoring, and specifically for concrete breaking and any piling) and;
- Litter management during the construction phases of the development.

Thereafter, the approved construction plan shall be fully implemented and adhered to during all phases of the development, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Note: The applicant should have regard to BS 5228:2009 Code of Practice of Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites.

Reason – To minimise detriment to nearby residential amenity.

1. Smoke.

During any ground works/demolition/construction no burning of materials on the site.

Reason – To minimise detriment to nearby residential amenity.

3. Light.

Any external lighting associated with the development both during construction and as part of the proposal shall be kept to the minimum necessary for the purposes of security and site safety and shall prevent upward and outward light radiation.

Reason – To minimise detriment to nearby residential amenity.

4. Planned Play Area.

It is noted that the proposed scheme includes a planned play area (LEAP). It is unclear at this stage what if any play equipment is to be installed. Should the Outline application be granted, details of any play equipment should be described in a future Full application.

Reason – To minimise detriment to future residential amenity.

5. Conversion of Existing Public House.

Should the Outline application be granted, details of any extraction/ventilation, air conditioning or other machinery should be described in a future Full application.

Reason – To minimise detriment to nearby present and future residential amenity.

Thank you

Ray Bennett
Environmental Protection officer

From:Iain Farquharson
Sent:Mon, 12 Feb 2018 13:10:10 +0000
To:BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Subject:M3 224995. MSDC Planning Consultation Request - DC/17/06326

Dear Sir/Madam

While we do not object to the propped use of the site and it is acknowledged that the application is for outline permission but considering the number of dwellings proposed some consideration of this topic area is expected. This council is keen to encourage consideration of sustainability issues at an early stage so that the most environmentally friendly buildings are constructed and the inclusion of sustainable techniques, materials, technology etc can be incorporated into the scheme without compromising the overall viability.

As these items have not been addressed the recommendation is refusal, should the planning department consider setting conditions to ensure the development meets its environmental obligations the following is suggested.

Before any development is commenced a Sustainability & Energy Strategy must be provided detailing how the development will minimise the environmental impact during construction and occupation (as per policy CS3) including details on environmentally friendly materials, construction techniques minimisation of carbon emissions and running costs and reduced use of potable water (suggested maximum of 105ltr per person per day). Details as to the provision for electric vehicles should also be included. This document shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

Regards

Iain Farquharson

Senior Environmental Management Officer
Babergh Mid Suffolk Council

BB01449 724878 / 07860 827027
[//iain.farquharson@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:iain.farquharson@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk)

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

From: planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk [<mailto:planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>]
Sent: 08 January 2018 16:06
To: Environmental Health <Environmental@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: MSDC Planning Consultation Request - DC/17/06326

Please find attached planning consultation request letter relating to planning application - DC/17/06326 - Crown Farm , The Street, Weybread , IP21 5TP

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.

From: RM Floods Planning

Sent: 03 August 2018 09:13

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

Cc: Alex Scott <Alex.Scott@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>

Subject: 2018-08-03 JS Reply Crown Farm , The Street, Weybread , IP21 5TP Ref DC/17/06326

Dear Alex Scott,

Subject: Crown Farm , The Street, Weybread , IP21 5TP Ref DC/17/06326

Suffolk County Council, Flood and Water Management have reviewed application ref DC/17/06326

The following submitted documents have been reviewed and we recommend approval of this application subject to conditions.

- Site Location Plan Ref 16-L27-PL503
- Existing Site Plan Ref 16-L27-PL502
- Weybread Masterplan Ref 7758-L-01
- Flood Risk Assessment & Surface Water Drainage Strategy Ref 22708 Rev 0
- A Phase I Desk Study Report Ref MSH/17.382/PhaseI
- Letter from Freeths 9th July 2018 ref MBA/2003/2129287/1
- o Appendix B- Drainage Response

We propose the following condition in relation to surface water drainage for this application.

1. Concurrent with the first reserved matters application(s) a surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The scheme shall be in accordance with the approved FRA and include:
 - a. Dimensioned plans and drawings of the surface water drainage scheme;
 - b. If the use of infiltration is not possible then modelling shall be submitted to demonstrate that the surface water runoff will be restricted to Q_{bar} rate of 7.3l/s for all events up to the critical 1 in 100 year rainfall events including climate change as specified in the FRA;

- c. Modelling of the surface water drainage scheme to show that the attenuation/infiltration features will contain the 1 in 100 year rainfall event including climate change;
 - d. Modelling of the surface water conveyance network in the 1 in 30 year rainfall event to show no above ground flooding, and modelling of the volumes of any above ground flooding from the pipe network in a 1 in 100 year climate change rainfall event, along with topographic plans showing where the water will flow and be stored to ensure no flooding of buildings or offsite flows;
 - e. Topographical plans depicting all exceedance flowpaths and demonstration that the flows would not flood buildings or flow offsite, and if they are to be directed to the surface water drainage system then the potential additional rates and volumes of surface water must be included within the modelling of the surface water system;
 - f. A detailed landscaping plan for the ponds/wetland for the surface water drainage system
2. The scheme shall be fully implemented as approved.

Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage and disposal of surface water from the site for the lifetime of the development.

3. Concurrent with the first reserved matters application(s) details of the implementation, maintenance and management of the surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure clear arrangements are in place for ongoing operation and maintenance of the disposal of surface water drainage.

4. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until details of all Sustainable Urban Drainage System components and piped networks have been submitted, in an approved form, to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for inclusion on the Lead Local Flood Authority's Flood Risk Asset Register.

Reason: To ensure all flood risk assets and their owners are recorded onto the LLFA's statutory flood risk asset register as per s21 of the Flood and Water Management Act.

5. No development shall commence until details of a Construction Surface Water Management Plan (CSWMP) detailing how surface water and storm water will be managed on the site during construction (including demolition and site clearance operations) is submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The CSWMP shall be implemented and thereafter managed

and maintained in accordance with the approved plan for the duration of construction. The approved CSWMP and shall include:

- a. Method statements, scaled and dimensioned plans and drawings detailing surface water management proposals to include :-
 - i. Temporary drainage systems
 - ii. Measures for managing pollution / water quality and protecting controlled waters and watercourses
 - iii. Measures for managing any on or offsite flood risk associated with construction

Reason: To ensure the development does not cause increased flood risk, or pollution of watercourses in line with the River Basin Management Plan

Informatives

- Any works to a watercourse may require consent under section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991
- Any discharge to a watercourse or groundwater needs to comply with the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2003
- Any discharge of surface water to a watercourse that drains into an Internal Drainage Board catchment may be subject to payment of a surface water developer contribution
- Any works to lay new surface water drainage pipes underneath the public highway will need a section 50 license under the New Roads and Street Works Act

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

Consultation Response Pro forma

1	Application Number	DC/17/06326 Crown Chicken Ltd, Crown Farm, The Street, Weybread	
2	Date of Response	09/02/2018	
3	Responding Officer	Name:	Karolien Yperman
		Job Title:	Heritage and Design Officer
		Responding on behalf of...	Heritage Team
4	Summary and Recommendation (please delete those N/A) Note: This section must be completed before the response is sent. The recommendation should be based on the information submitted with the application.	<p>The Heritage Team considers that the proposal would cause</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No harm to the setting of a designated heritage asset because the proposed residential development might mitigate some of the negative effects of the existing factory on the setting of the grade II listed building. 	
5	Discussion Please outline the reasons/rationale behind how you have formed the recommendation. Please refer to any guidance, policy or material considerations that have informed your recommendation.	<p>The proposal relates to an outline planning application for the construction of a residential development of 110 houses after the demolition of the existing buildings on the site of Crown Farm. The heritage concern relates to the impact of this development on the setting of the adjacent grade II listed Graystone House.</p> <p>The Crown Farm structures, as well as the fencing around the back of the property, have effectively cut off the connection of the listed building to the farmland further to the south. The setting of Graystone House could today be defined as; neighbouring properties to the west and north, a row of tall trees which allow for some views to factory and garage structures on Crown Farm to the east, and a timber panelled fence on top of a slope to the south. The western, northern and southern boundaries of Graystone House would not be impacted by the proposed development. The eastern boundary of Graystone House is currently negatively affected by existing garage structures built very close to the property line.</p> <p>The Heritage Team considers that demolishing the existing factory buildings and developing the site for residential use could have a positive effect on the setting of the listed building, as the current structures on the Crown Farm site are built too close to, and imposing on, the setting of Graystone House. A full planning</p>	

Please note that this form can be submitted electronically on the Councils website. Comments submitted on the website will not be acknowledged but you can check whether they have been received by reviewing comments on the website under the application reference number. Please note that the completed form will be posted on the Councils website and available to view by the public.

		application would be subject to the use of appropriate scale and design for the proposed dwellings, as any new development should reflect the typology of the existing buildings in the area.
6	Amendments, Clarification or Additional Information Required (if holding objection) If concerns are raised, can they be overcome with changes? Please ensure any requests are proportionate	
7	Recommended conditions	

Please note that this form can be submitted electronically on the Council's website. Comments submitted on the website will not be acknowledged but you can check whether they have been received by reviewing comments on the website under the application reference number. Please note that the completed form will be posted on the Council's website and available to view by the public.



Consultation Response Pro forma

1	Application Number	DC/17/06326 – Crown Chicken, Weybread	
2	Date of Response	22 February 2018	
3	Responding Officer	Name:	Delia Cook/Clare Free
		Job Title:	Economic Development Officers
		Responding on behalf of...	Economic Development Team
4	Recommendation (please delete those N/A) Note: This section must be completed before the response is sent. The recommendation should be based on the information submitted with the application.	<p>The applicant has met with Mid Suffolk Economic Development Team from initial project proposal, these meetings, including pre-application discussions with Planning DM, have been very helpful to understand requirements of both the applicant and the local community regarding eventual redevelopment of this rural employment site.</p> <p>The Economic Development Team therefore support redevelopment of this site subject to the discussion items listed below.</p>	
5	Discussion Please outline the reasons/rationale behind how you have formed the recommendation. Please refer to any guidance, policy or material considerations that have informed your recommendation.	<p>Retention of employment on this rural site would be our preference.</p> <p>From instigation of this re-development proposal the applicant has undertaken valuable community engagement. However, the responses from local residents to this application indicate continuing concerns regarding volume of residential development proposed for the site.</p> <p>Therefore, we consider that a revised site development plan with fewer residential units, additional community facilities and enhanced on-site employment provision would ensure a more sustainable development.</p>	
6	Amendments, Clarification or Additional Information Required (if holding objection) If concerns are raised, can they be overcome with changes? Please ensure any requests are proportionate	<p>We would support additional discussions with applicant (or their agents) as suggested below prior to recommendation to Committee</p> <p>Employment retention Request that applicants review the employment land review undertaken by Bidwells (attached to the application). The focus of this review appears to be premises of 50,000 sq ft plus. Initial enquiries undertaken by Economic Development Team, and communicated to the applicant, indicated most demand in this area would be for smaller serviced office space and serviced B1/B2 type premises up to 10,000 sq ft.</p>	

Please note that this form can be submitted electronically on the Councils website. Comments submitted on the website will not be acknowledged but you can check whether they have been received by reviewing comments on the website under the application reference number. Please note that the completed form will be posted on the Councils website and available to view by the public.

		<p>There are many sole traders located within rural areas, that are difficult to contact, these small businesses frequently require move on space close to their existing base. The Economic Development Team would be happy to work with the applicant engaging with various business mentoring services and other organisations to obtain more detailed information regarding this sector and their current business aspirations.</p> <p>Community Engagement Revision of the proposed site layout to provide a focal point for the development - possibly a centrally located 'village green' and good quality adjacent premises with potential for a community run business – shop, and/or café, exhibition space etc. complimenting existing uses within community centre.</p>
7	Recommended conditions	<p>It is recommended that any employment use is compatible with residential as enabling development is expected to be required for the scheme viability.</p> <p>In addition we would recommend that amenity of both business and residential are considered in any final design.</p>

Please note that this form can be submitted electronically on the Councils website. Comments submitted on the website will not be acknowledged but you can check whether they have been received by reviewing comments on the website under the application reference number. Please note that the completed form will be posted on the Councils website and available to view by the public.

From: Ryan Mills, Landscape Consultant [<mailto:Ryan.Mills@essex.gov.uk>]
Sent: 14 August 2018 13:21
To: Alex Scott
Cc: Landscape
Subject: Fw: MSDC Planning Re-consultation Request - DC/17/06326

Hi Alex,

I'm just emailing in reference to the Crown Farm application and the re-consultation we received.

Although we agree with the agent that our consultation response suggests there are no concerns 'in principle' to a development on the site, we do however feel it is necessary for a landscape strategy to be produced. This would set out the landscape principles for any future development, proposed at reserved matters stage. This could be part of a design code document or a standalone document that is prepared and submitted as part of a planning condition on the outline permission. Would you consider doing something like this? or would you rather it form part of the outline or reserved matters applications?

Kind regards,

Ryan Mills
Landscape Consultant at Place Services.



21 August 2018

Alex Scott
Mid Suffolk District Council
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich IP1 2BX

By email only

Dear Alex,

Thank you for requesting advice on this application from Place Services' ecological advice service. This service provides advice to planning officers to inform Mid Suffolk District Council planning decisions with regard to potential ecological impacts from development. Any additional information, queries or comments on this advice that the applicant or other interested parties may have, must be directed to the Planning Officer who will seek further advice from us where appropriate and necessary.

Application: DC/17/06326

Location: Crown Farm The Street Weybread IP21 5TP

Proposal: Outline Planning Application. Demolition of existing buildings and construction of residential development (110 dwellings), conversion of existing public house to a flexible use of A1 (retail), A3 (Cafe), A4 (Public House) and D1 (Community Space/Day Nursery), public open space, drainage infrastructure and vehicular access.

Thank you for re-consulting Place Services on the above application.

We have reviewed the report addressing Mid Suffolk's Consultee comments (Freeths LLP, July 2018), provided by the applicant. This includes the provision of a Great Crested Newt Working Method Statement (FPCR, July 2018), which has been completed as a response to Suffolk Wildlife Trusts comments (February 2018).

We have reviewed the Great Crested Newt Working Method Statement (FPCR, July 2018). This includes appropriate mitigation measures to ensure that the likelihood of Great Crested Newts being affected during the construction phase will be minimalised.

Consequently, we recommend the following condition to be secured via an amendment of the proposed condition provided within Place Services initial comments (January 2018):

1. CONCURRENT TO RESERVED MATTERS: COMPLIANCE WITH RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ECOLOGICAL REPORT

"All ecological mitigation and enhancement measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in the Ecological Appraisal (FPCR, December 2017) and Great Crested Newt Working Method Statement (FPCR, July 2018) as already submitted with



the planning application and agreed in principle with the local planning authority prior to determination.”

Reason: To allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the Habitat Regulations 2017, the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 as amended and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority habitats & species)

The planning officer has also questioned the necessity of an EPS Licence being secured via condition. We highlight that the condition wording related to submission of a copy of the EPS licence is one of the model conditions in BS42020:2013. This Code of Practice was compiled by the British Standards Institute and the model conditions agreed by the Planning Inspectorate and the Natural England representative on the BSI working group. The BSI working group have recently reviewed the need for this decision and have decided to wait until after Brexit before they decide. Until then this condition provides certainty to the LPA that an EPS licence has been secured and that scheme does not require a condition of consent to secure implementation of the necessary mitigation contained within the licence.

To clarify, there is a need for all relevant planning conditions to be discharged before a licence can be applied for (not all conditions relevant to ecological matters) so a prior to commencement condition is what was intended, on determination of reserved matters.

Please contact us with any queries.

Yours sincerely,

Hamish Jackson GradCIEEM BSc (Hons)

Junior Ecological Consultant

Hamish.Jackson@essex.gov.uk

Place Services provide ecological advice on behalf of Mid Suffolk District Council

Please note: This letter is advisory and should only be considered as the opinion formed by specialist staff in relation to this particular matter.

Alex Scott
Planning Department
Mid Suffolk District Council
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich, IP1 2BX

20/08/2018

Dear Alex,

RE: DC/17/06326 Demolition of existing buildings and construction of residential development (110 dwellings), conversion of existing public house to a flexible use. Crown Farm, The Street, Weybread

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

We note the additional information provided by the applicant (letter from Freeths of 9th July 2018) partly in relation to our letter of 8th February 2018. This includes a Great Crested Newt Method Statement (FPCR), detailing the proposed construction mitigation methods for this species. Whilst the methods proposed appear to follow industry good practice, we query whether the Method Statement was prepared following the report of great crested newts adjacent to the site (our e-mail of 24th May 2018) and has taken this into account?

We also note that it is proposed to dispose of surface water from the site via a ditch connection to Weybread Pits. Whilst it is understood that any discharge would be at an attenuated rate, the pits are designated as a County Wildlife Site (CWS) and we are therefore concerned about the potential for discharge of surface water from the development to result in an adverse impact on the CWS. Although there appears to be a reasonable distance between the application site and Weybread Pits, we query what measures will be put in place to ensure that potentially contaminated surface water cannot reach the CWS? Also, we query whether any potential ecological impacts on the ditch, resulting from increased flows, have been assessed?

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

Yours sincerely

James Meyer
Senior Conservation Planner

From:Consultations (NE)
Sent:Fri, 19 Jan 2018 10:08:15 +0000
To:BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Subject:DC-17-06326 Consultation Response

Application ref: DC/17/06326
Our ref: 236166

Dear Sir/Madam

Natural England has no comments to make on this application.

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

www.gov.uk/natural-england

We are here to secure a healthy natural environment for people to enjoy, where wildlife is protected and England's traditional landscapes are safeguarded for future generations.

In an effort to reduce Natural England's carbon footprint, I will, wherever possible, avoid travelling to meetings and attend via audio, video or web conferencing.

Natural England offers two chargeable services - the Discretionary Advice Service, which provides pre-application and post-consent advice on planning/licensing proposals to developers and consultants, and the Pre-submission Screening Service for European Protected Species mitigation licence applications. These services help applicants take appropriate account of environmental considerations at an early stage of project development, reduce uncertainty, the risk of delay and added cost at a later stage, whilst securing good results for the natural environment.

For further information on the Discretionary Advice Service see [here](#)

For further information on the Pre-submission Screening Service see [here](#)

This email and any attachments is intended for the named recipient only. If you have received it in error you have no authority to use, disclose, store or copy any of its contents and you should destroy it and inform the sender. Whilst this email and associated attachments will have been checked for known viruses whilst within the Natural England systems, we can accept no responsibility once it has left our systems. Communications on Natural England systems may be monitored and/or recorded to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes.

From: David Pizzey
Sent: 12 January 2018 12:04
To: Alex Scott
Cc: BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Subject: DC/17/06326 Crown Farm , The Street, Weybread

Alex

I have no objection in principle to this proposal subject to it being undertaken in accordance with the protection measures outlined in the accompanying arboricultural report. Although a small number of trees are proposed for removal these are generally of limited amenity value and/or poor condition and their loss will have negligible impact on the appearance and character of the local area. If you are minded to recommend approval of the application we will also require a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement, Tree Protection Plan and monitoring schedule in order to help ensure the measures referred to are implemented effectively. This information can be dealt with under condition.

Please let me know if you require any further input.

Regards

David

David Pizzey FArborA
Arboricultural Officer
Tel: 01449 724555
david.pizzey@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk
www.babergh.gov.uk and www.midsuffolk.gov.uk
Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils – Working Together

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

TO: Alex Scott – Senior Planning Officer

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

Date: 20th February 2018

SUBJECT: Outline Planning permission for demolition of existing buildings and construction of 110 dwellings, conversion of existing public house and other uses, public open space, drainage infrastructure and vehicular access at Crown Farm, The Street, Weybread.

Consultation Response on Affordable Housing Requirement Key Points

1. Background Information:

- A development of 110 dwellings.
- This development triggers Local Plan Amended Policy H4 and therefore up to 35% affordable housing would be required on this site.
- Based on 110 dwellings 38 units of affordable housing would be sought. However due regard needs to be taken to the location of this site and access to public transport, school and amenities.

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. 980 applicants registered for the Mid Suffolk area.

2.4. It is considered good practice not to develop a large number of affordable dwellings in one location within a scheme and therefore it is recommended that no more than 15 affordable dwellings should be located in any one part of the development.

2.5. 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.

2.6 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 Walsham Le Willows:

<p>3.1 Affordable Housing Requirement</p>	<p>35 % of units = 38 affordable units – on-site provision is not considered to be the best option in this instance due to the limited public transport, access to local facilities and amenities.</p> <p>An Affordable Housing Commuted sum will be sought in lieu of on-site affordable housing provision.</p> <p>Calculated amount is based on the property mix profile we would have required if on-site provision secured. Mix if on site is detailed at 3.3 and 3.4: -</p> <p>Total Commuted sum if averaged out across 38 rented and shared ownership dwellings = £76,142.28 per dwelling, but would require the correct calculated amount per property type. <u>This is a total of £2,893,406.73</u></p>
<p>3.2 Tenure Split – 75% Rent & 25 % Intermediate e.g. New Build Homebuy accommodation, intermediate rent, shared ownership.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>3.3 Detailed Breakdown Rented Units</p>	<p><i>Rented = 28 dwellings</i> 4 x 1 bed 2-person flats @ 50 sqm 6 x 2 bed 4-person flats @ 70 sqm 2 x 2 bed 4-person bungalows @ 70 sqm 12 x 2 bed 4-person houses @ 79 sqm 4 x 3 bed 5-person houses @ 93 sqm</p>
<p>3.4 Detailed Breakdown Intermediate Units</p>	<p><i>Shared Ownership = 10 dwellings</i> 7 x 2 bed 4-person houses @ 79 sqm 3 x 3 bed 5-person houses @ 93 sqm</p>
<p>Other requirements</p>	<p>35% of commuted sum to be paid on completion of 20th open market home, 70% of commuted sum by the completion of the 65th open market dwelling and the remainder by the completion of the 90th open market dwelling</p>

4.0 Open Market Mix

The open market mix should reflect the needs as shown from the Suffolk Housing Survey 2014. The population of Suffolk is ageing and so there is a need for housing supply to be suitable for older people wishing to downsize and well as for younger people trying to get on the housing ladder. Therefore, we would like to see the inclusion of some 2 bed roomed bungalows or chalet bungalows that would reflect demand in the local area.

Number of Bedrooms (Occupied Households)				
None	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed +
0 (0%)	13 (7.0%)	46 (24.6%)	70 (37.4%)	58 (31.0%)
Mid Sflk Avg = 0.1% England Avg = 0.2%	Mid Sflk Avg = 6.0% England Avg = 11.8%	Mid Sflk Avg = 25.0% England Avg = 27.9%	Mid Sflk Avg = 40.4% England Avg = 41.2%	Mid Sflk Avg = 28.5% England Avg = 18.9%

From the table above, it can be seen that there is already a large percentage of properties that are 3 and 4 bed + properties which amounts to 68.4% of the existing properties in Weybread. There is a significant need for smaller units of accommodation and particularly 2 bed dwellings.

Julie Abbey-Taylor, Professional Lead – Housing Enabling.



Consultation Response Pro forma

1	Application Number	DC/17/06326	
2	Date of Response	29/01/18	
3	Responding Officer	Name:	Hannah Bridges
		Job Title:	Waste Management Officer
		Responding on behalf of...	Waste Services
4	Recommendation (please delete those N/A) Note: This section must be completed before the response is sent. The recommendation should be based on the information submitted with the application.	No objection subject to condition	
5	Discussion Please outline the reasons/rationale behind how you have formed the recommendation. Please refer to any guidance, policy or material considerations that have informed your recommendation.	<p>Scale maps of the development are required before full comments can be given as the roads will need to be suitable for a 32tonne dustcart to manoeuvre on, attached is the vehicle specification for your reference. The degree of the angles to the road bends to be sufficient for a 32tonne refuse collection vehicle to turn around marked on the map as point 1 and 2.</p> <p>The wheeled bin presentation points need included on the plans to ensure they are suitable.</p> <p>The road construction must be suitable for a 32tonne RCV and the private and shared drives be clearly marked.</p>	
6	Amendments, Clarification or Additional Information Required (if holding objection) If concerns are raised, can they be overcome with changes? Please ensure any requests are proportionate		
7	Recommended conditions	Please meet the points within the discussion.	

Please note that this form can be submitted electronically on the Councils website. Comments submitted on the website will not be acknowledged but you can check whether they have been received by reviewing comments on the website under the application reference number. Please note that the completed form will be posted on the Councils website and available to view by the public.

Midlands and East (East)
Swift House
Hedgerows Business Park
Colchester Road
Chelmsford
Essex CM2 5PF
Email address: kerryharding@nhs.net
Telephone Number – 0113 824 9111

Your Ref: DC/17/06326
Our Ref: NHSE/MIDS/17/06326/KH

Planning Services
Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils
Endeavour House
Russell Road
Ipswich, IP1 2BX

06 February 2018

Dear Sirs,

**Outline Planning Application. Demolition of existing buildings and construction of residential development (110 dwellings), conversion of existing public house to a flexible use of A1 (retail), A3 (Cafe), A4 (Public House) and D1 (Community Space/Day Nursery), public open space, drainage infrastructure and vehicular access.
Crown Farm, The Street, Weybread, IP21 5TP.**

1. I refer to your consultation letter on the above outline planning application and advise that, following a review of the applicants' submission the following comments are with regard to the Primary Healthcare provision on behalf of NHS England Midlands and East (East) (NHSE), incorporating Ipswich and East Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).

Background

2. The proposal comprises a development of 110 residential dwellings, which is likely to have an impact on the NHS funding programme for the delivery of primary healthcare provision within this area and specifically within the health catchment of the development. NHS England would therefore expect these impacts to be fully assessed and mitigated by way of a developer contribution secured through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Review of Planning Application

3. There is 1 main GP practice within a 3km radius of the proposed development, Fressingfield surgery (including its branch at Stradbroke). This GP practice does not have sufficient capacity for the additional growth resulting from this development and known cumulative development growth in the area. Therefore a developer contribution, via CIL processes, towards the capital funding to increase capacity within the GP Catchment Area would be sought to mitigate the impact.

Healthcare Impact Assessment

4. The intention of NHS England is to promote Primary Healthcare Hubs with co-ordinated mixed professionals. This is encapsulated in the strategy document: The NHS Five Year Forward View.
5. This development is not of a size and nature that would attract a specific Section 106 planning obligation. Therefore a proportion of the required funding for the provision of increased capacity and range of services within the existing healthcare premises servicing the residents of this development, by way of reconfiguration, refurbishment or extension, would be sought from the CIL contributions collected by the District Council.
6. Although, due to the unknown quantities associated with CIL, it is difficult to identify an exact allocation of funding, it is anticipated that any funds received as a result of this development will be utilised to reconfigure or extend the above mentioned surgeries. Should the level of growth in this area prove this to be unviable, options of relocation of services would be considered and funds would contribute towards the cost of new premises, thereby increasing the capacity and service provisions for the local community.

Developer Contribution required to meet the Cost of Additional Capital Funding for Health Service Provision Arising

7. In line with the Government's presumption for the planning system to deliver sustainable development and specific advice within the National Planning Policy Framework and the CIL Regulations, which provide for development contributions to be secured to mitigate a development's impact, a financial contribution is sought.
8. Assuming the above is considered in conjunction with the current application process, NHS England would not wish to raise an objection to the proposed development.
9. NHS England is satisfied that the basis of a request for CIL contributions is consistent with the Regulation 123 list produced by Mid Suffolk District Council.

NHS England and the CCG look forward to working with the applicant and the Council to satisfactorily address the issues raised in this consultation response and would appreciate acknowledgement of the safe receipt of this letter.

Yours faithfully

Kerry Harding
Head of Estates

Resource Management
Bury Resource Centre
Hollow Road
Bury St Edmunds
Suffolk
IP32 7AY

Philip Isbell
Corporate Manager - Development Manager
Planning Services
Mid Suffolk District Council
131 High Street
Needham Market
Ipswich IP6 8DL

Enquiries to: Rachael Abraham
Direct Line: 01284 741232
Email: Rachael.abraham@suffolk.gov.uk
Web: <http://www.suffolk.gov.uk>

Our Ref: 2017_06326
Date: 16th January 2018

For the Attention of Alex Scott

Dear Mr Isbell

Planning Application DC/17/06326 – Crown Farm, The Street, Weybread: Archaeology

This site lies in an area of archaeological potential recorded on the County Historic Environment Record, fronting on to the line of a Roman Road (CRT 019). Remains relating to Medieval occupation, including evidence for at least two kilns (WYB 006, 015 and 055), are recorded in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development site, along with extensive scatters of medieval finds (WYB 004, 005, 008, 020, 051). As a result, there is high potential for the discovery of below-ground heritage assets of archaeological importance within this area, and groundworks associated with the development have the potential to damage or destroy any archaeological remains which exist.

There are no grounds to consider refusal of permission in order to achieve preservation *in situ* of any important heritage assets. However, in accordance with the *National Planning Policy Framework* (Paragraph 141), any permission granted should be the subject of a planning condition to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage asset before it is damaged or destroyed.

In this case the following two conditions would be appropriate:

1. No development shall take place within the area indicated [the whole site] until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work has been secured, in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme of investigation shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

- a. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
- b. The programme for post investigation assessment

- c. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording
- d. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
- e. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
- f. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.
- g. The site investigation shall be completed prior to development, or in such other phased arrangement, as agreed and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

2. No building shall be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed, submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under part 1 and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition.

REASON:

To safeguard archaeological assets within the approved development boundary from impacts relating to any groundworks associated with the development scheme and to ensure the proper and timely investigation, recording, reporting and presentation of archaeological assets affected by this development, in accordance with Core Strategy Objective SO 4 of Mid Suffolk District Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2008) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

INFORMATIVE:

The submitted scheme of archaeological investigation shall be in accordance with a brief procured beforehand by the developer from Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service, Conservation Team.

I would be pleased to offer guidance on the archaeological work required and, in our role as advisor to Mid Suffolk District Council, the Conservation Team of SCC Archaeological Service will, on request of the applicant, provide a specification for the archaeological work required at this site. In this case, an archaeological evaluation will be required to establish the potential of the site and decisions on the need for any further investigation (excavation before any groundworks commence and/or monitoring during groundworks) will be made on the basis of the results of the evaluation.

Further details on our advisory services and charges can be found on our website: <http://www.suffolk.gov.uk/archaeology/>

Please do get in touch if there is anything that you would like to discuss or you require any further information.

Yours sincerely,

Rachael Abraham

Senior Archaeological Officer
Conservation Team

OFFICIAL

~~~~~

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service

Mid Suffolk District Council

Planning Department

Endeavour House

Russell Road

Ipswich

IP12BX

Fire Business Support Team

Floor 3, Block 2

Endeavour House

8 Russell Road

Ipswich, Suffolk

IP12BX

Your Ref:

Our Ref:

Enquiries to:

Direct Line:

E-mail:

Web Address:

FS/F180075

Angela Kempen

01473 260588

Fire.BusinessSupport@suffolk.gov.uk

<http://www.suffolk.gov.uk>

Date: 15/0112018

Dear Sirs

Crown Farm, The Street. Weybread IP21 5TP

Planning Application No: DC/17/06326

I refer to the above application.

The plans have been inspected by the Water Officer who has the following comments to make.

#### Access and Fire Fighting Facilities

Access to buildings for fire appliances and firefighters must meet with the requirements specified in Building Regulations Approved Document B, (Fire Safety), 2006 Edition, incorporating 2010 and 2013 amendments Volume 1 - Part B5, Section 11 dwelling houses, and, similarly, Volume 2, Part B5, Sections 16 and 17 in the case of buildings other than dwelling houses. These requirements may be satisfied with other equivalent standards relating to access for fire fighting, in which case those standards should be quoted in correspondence.

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service also requires a minimum carrying capacity for hard standing for pumping/high reach appliances of 15/26 tonnes, not 12.5 tonnes as detailed in the Building Regulations 2000 Approved Document B, 2006 Edition, incorporating 2010 and 2013 amendments.

#### Water Supplies

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service recommends that fire hydrants be installed within this development on a suitable route for laying hose, i.e. avoiding obstructions. However, it is not possible, at this time, to determine the number of fire hydrants required for fire fighting purposes. The requirement will be determined at the water planning stage when site plans have been submitted by the water companies.

/Continued

We are working towards making Suffolk the Greenest County. This paper is 100% recycled and made using a chlorine free process.

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

Consultation should be made with the Water Authorities to determine flow rates in all cases.

Should you need any further advice or information on access and fire fighting facilities, you are advised to contact your local Building Control in the first instance. For further advice and information regarding water supplies, please contact the Water Officer at the above headquarters.

Yours faithfully

~k>~

Mrs A Kempen

Water Officer

Copy: Mr P LeGrys, Stanfords, the Livestock Market, Wyncolls Road, Colchester C04

9HU

Enc: Sprinkler information

We are working towards making Suffolk the Greenest County. This paper is 100% recycled and made using a chlorine free process.

OFFICIAL

**From:**RM PROW Planning

**Sent:**Thu, 15 Feb 2018 16:27:28 +0000

**To:**BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow;BMSDC Planning Area Team Green;BMSDC Planning Area Team Blue

**Subject:**DC/17/06326 | Outline Planning Application. Crown Farm The Street Weybread IP21 5TP

**For The Attention of: Alex Scott**

## **Public Rights of Way Response**

Thank you for your consultation concerning the above application.

Government guidance considers that the effect of development on a public right of way is a material consideration in the determination of applications for planning permission and local planning authorities should ensure that the potential consequences are taken into account whenever such applications are considered (Rights of Way Circular 1/09 – Defra October 2009, para 7.2) and that public rights of way should be protected.

*Public footpaths 14 and 18 run adjacent to the north west and south east of the proposed development area providing access to the wider countryside to the west and in the case of FP 18, a link to The Street. The masterplan does not provide sufficient good linkages to these rights of way.*

*The outline masterplan shows a pedestrian link from the site onto Footpath no 14 on the north-west boundary, providing a link onto the Street (B1116). However, this public footpath is not actually available on the ground at the Street due to it being mapped within a pond and hence the link from the site would not make a connection to The Street. An alternative link should be provided from The Street possibly via a green corridor or by an alternative route back to the Street.*

*Public footpath 18 is adjacent to the south east boundary of the site and there should be a link from the site onto this footpath. This would enable a short circular walk from The*

*Street using public footpath no18, the greenspace within the site and the green corridor link back to the Street and to the countryside to the west.*

The following informative notes apply.

## **Informative Notes**

The granting of planning permission is separate to any consents that may be required in relation to Public Rights of Way, including the authorisation of gates. These consents are to be obtained from the Public Rights of Way & Access Team at Suffolk County Council, as the Highway Authority.

**To apply to carry out work on the Public Right of Way or seek a temporary closure**, visit <http://www.suffolkpublicrightsofway.org.uk/home/temporary-closure-of-a-public-right-of-way/> or telephone 0345 606 6071.

**To apply for structures, such as gates, on a Public Rights of Way**, visit

<http://www.suffolkpublicrightsofway.org.uk/home/land-manager-information/> or telephone 0345 606 6071.

1. Nothing should be done to stop up or divert the Public Right of Way without following the due legal process including confirmation of any orders and the provision of any new path. If you wish to build upon, block, divert or extinguish a public right of way within the red lined area marked in the application, an order must be made, confirmed, and brought into effect by the local planning authority, using powers under s257 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. In order to avoid delays with the application this should be considered at an early opportunity.

2. The alignment, width, and condition of Public Rights of Way providing for their safe and convenient use shall remain unaffected by the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Rights of Way & Access Team; any damage resulting from these works must be made good by the applicant.
  
3. Under Section 167 of the Highways Act 1980 any structural retaining wall within 3.66 metres of the Public Right of Way with a retained height in excess of 1.37 metres must not be constructed without the prior approval of drawings & specifications by Suffolk County Council. The process to be followed to gain approval will depend on the nature and complexity of the proposals. Applicants are strongly encouraged to discuss preliminary proposals at an early stage, such that the likely acceptability of any proposals can be determined, and the process to be followed can be clarified.

Construction of any retaining wall or structure that supports the Public Right of Way or is likely to affect the stability of the right of way may also need prior approval at the discretion of Suffolk County Council.

4. If the Public Right of Way is temporarily affected by works which will require it to be closed, a Traffic Regulation Order will need to be sought from Suffolk County Council.
  
5. The applicant must have private rights to take motorised vehicles over the Public Right of Way. Without lawful authority it is an offence under the Road Traffic Act 1988 to take a motorised vehicle over a Public Right of Way other than a byway. We do not keep records of private rights and suggest a solicitor is contacted.

- **Public footpath** – only to be used by people **on foot**, or using a mobility vehicle.
  
- **Public bridleway** – in addition to people on foot, bridleways may also be used by someone on a **horse** or someone riding a **bicycle**.
  
- **Restricted byway** – has similar status to a bridleway, but can also be used by a ‘non-motorised vehicle’, for example a **horse and carriage**.
  
- **Byway open to all traffic (BOAT)** – can be used by **all vehicles**, including motorised vehicles as well as people on foot, on horse or on a bicycle. In some cases, there may be a Traffic Regulation Order prohibiting forms of use.

6. Public Rights of Way & Access is not responsible for maintenance and repair of the route beyond the wear and tear of normal use for its status and it will seek to recover the costs of any such damage it is required to remedy.
  
7. There may be other public rights of way that exist over this land that have not been registered on the Definitive Map. These paths are either historical paths that were never claimed under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, or paths that have been created by public use giving the presumption of dedication by the land owner whether under the Highways Act 1980 or by Common Law. This office is not aware of any such claims.

More information about Public Rights of Way can be found at [www.suffolpublicrightsofway.org.uk](http://www.suffolpublicrightsofway.org.uk)

Regards

**Jennifer Green**

**Rights of Way and Access**

Growth, Highways and Infrastructure, Suffolk County Council

Phoenix House, Goddard Road, Ipswich, IP1 5NP

 (01473) 264266 |  [PROWPlanning@suffolk.gov.uk](mailto:PROWPlanning@suffolk.gov.uk) |   
<http://publicrightsofway.onesuffolk.net/> | [Report A Public Right of Way Problem Here](#)

For great ideas on visiting Suffolk's countryside visit [www.discoverysuffolk.org.uk](http://www.discoverysuffolk.org.uk)

**Suffolk Highways** | Phoenix House, Goddard Road, Ipswich, IP1 5NP

T: 01473 264266 | M: [Jennifer.green@Suffolk.gov.uk](mailto:Jennifer.green@Suffolk.gov.uk) | [www.suffolk.gov.uk/highways](http://www.suffolk.gov.uk/highways)

Your ref: 17/06326/OUT  
Our ref: 00050555  
Date: 12 February 2018  
Enquiries to: Peter Freer  
Tel: 01473 264801  
Email: [peter.freer@suffolk.gov.uk](mailto:peter.freer@suffolk.gov.uk)

Alex Scott  
Growth & Sustainable Planning,  
Mid Suffolk District Council,  
Endeavour House,  
8 Russell Road,  
Ipswich, Suffolk,  
IP1 2BX

Dear Alex,

**Re: Weybread: Crown Farm, The Street – developer contributions.**

I refer to Outline Planning Application - Demolition of existing buildings and construction of residential development (110 dwellings), conversion of existing public house to a flexible use of A1 (retail), A3 (Cafe), A4 (Public House) and D1 (Community Space/Day Nursery), public open space, drainage infrastructure and vehicular access.

Weybread was designated as a Countryside Village in the adopted Core Strategy (2008) due to the limited services and facilities within the village. The village is formed of two linear settlements; Weybread Street, where the proposal is situated, and Weybread Church. In the emerging Local Plan the proposed settlement hierarchy for Weybread is a Hinterland Village. There is a pavement between the two parts of the village, but it is unclear exactly what services and facilities are still available in the village considering this proposal includes the conversion of the existing public house. Therefore it is expected that this development will be predominantly car dependent.

Paragraph 55 of the NPPF is clear that new housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities, and isolated new homes in the countryside should be avoided unless there are special circumstances. In promoting sustainable development in rural areas, the NPPF therefore seeks to ensure that new residential development should not be detached from being part of a viable and vibrant rural community, where there would be access to day to day facilities without the need to travel. The proposed development would not accord with paragraphs 17 and 55 of the NPPF due to its isolated location in respect of accessibility and sustainable transport. The proposal would also conflict with Policy FC1 and FC1.1 of the Core Strategy Focused Review, in which there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. These policies do not directly affect the supply of housing and as such can continue to be given weight.

On this point I refer the District Council to the Planning Appeal (APP/W3520/W/16/3159634) – Land adjacent to Cherry Tree Close, Yaxley, Suffolk, IP23 8DH – where limited services and transport inefficiencies weighed heavily against the proposal for 15 dwellings and the appeal was dismissed based on a non-sustainable location. In order to achieve sustainable development, the NPPF identifies that economic, social and environmental gains must be sought jointly and simultaneously.

In the Yaxley appeal decision the Inspector concluded in paragraph 34 that “However, I have found that the site would not represent a rural exception site and the social and environmental harm I have identified in respect of its isolation from services and facilities would be significant.” The County Council’s view is that 110 dwellings in this rural location of Weybread would give rise to greater social and environmental harm than that identified by the Inspector in the Yaxley scheme for 15 dwellings.

The District Council Joint Local Plan consultation document (Regulation 18) was published on 21 August 2017. The site is not one of the potential development sites submitted as part of the emerging joint Local Plan. The merits of this development proposal must be considered against this emerging document, plus other local planning policies and the NPPF.

The catchment primary school is Fressingfield Church of England V.C. Primary School. The location of the site proposal is 1.9 miles away from the school and there is no safe walking/cycling route and therefore fails to satisfy NPPF para 38. The County Council would be expected to fund school transport costs arising which would be unsatisfactory when it is striving to reduce Home to School Transport, which in 2017-2018 is budgeted for £29.4m, at this time of reduced Public Sector funding.

Section 508A of the Education Act 1996 places a general duty on the County Council to promote the use of sustainable travel and transport. The Act defines sustainable modes of travel as those that the local authority considers may improve the physical well-being of those who use them, the environmental well-being of all or part of the local authority’s area or a combination of the two.

The Department for Education’s guidance on the above duty states that it should have a broad impact, including providing health benefits for children and their families, through active journeys, such as walking and cycling. It can also bring significant environmental improvements, through reduced levels of congestion and improvements to air quality to which children are particularly vulnerable.

Consideration needs to be given to the applications for planning permission in Fressingfield and surrounding locality. Ideally, the County Council would like to see a plan-led approach to housing growth in the locality, which would also identify the infrastructure requirements based on cumulative growth. There are

currently five applications for planning permission on sites in Fressingfield. One of these applications has been granted (4410/16), one has received committee resolution to approve (3872/16), and the remaining three are undetermined (1432/17, 1648/17 and 1449/17). These applications add up to 254 dwellings (65 pupils arising).

The existing catchment primary school site is at capacity. Early internal calculations conclude that it is possible to expand the school from 140 places to 200 places (95% capacity to allow for mid-year flexibility). The identified applications for planning permission in Fressingfield, if approved and implemented, would take up these surplus places after expansion however it is unlawful to reserve school places in this way. Therefore should this development be also approved and implemented there will not be enough places for all of the children generated from the growth currently being proposed in the School's catchment as set out in the following table.

| MSDC ref | Locaion                   | Type       | Dwelling | Primary pupils | Status               |
|----------|---------------------------|------------|----------|----------------|----------------------|
| 3872/16  | School Lane Fressingfield | Outline PP | 18       | 5              | Committee resolution |
| 4410/16- | New Street, Fressingfield | Outline PP | 28       | 7              | Granted              |
| 1432/17  | Land Off John Shepherds   | Outline PP | 99       | 25             | Undetermined         |
| 1648/17  | Land Off Postmill Lane    | Outline PP | 24       | 6              | Undetermined         |
| 1449/17  | Land Off Stradbroke Rd    | Outline PP | 85       | 22             | Undetermined         |
|          |                           | Total      | 254      | 65             |                      |
| 17/06326 | Weybread, Crown Farm      | Outline P  | 110      | 28             | App                  |

As there is no safe footway to the catchment school and the potential for no places at the catchment school the alternative would be to transport pupils, including children as young as five, to alternative schools. Transporting very young children to alternative primary schools could have health and social implications as children would get less exercise and leave earlier/arrive later home, compared to children attending their local school. Developer funding of transport provision would not overcome these disbenefits and would not be in perpetuity.

### **I set out the impact arising from the development on SCC services in Appendix 1.**

Regarding the conversion of existing public house to a flexible use such as a nursery – SCC's evidence shows that there are more places than children in the area. Therefore there is no need currently for another provision in the ward of Fressingfield.

## Summary

We currently forecast to have no surplus places at the Sixth Form High School however this can be addressed via a future bid for CIL funding. The application site is remote from services and we will have no primary school places available within statutory safe walking distance. It would not be sustainable to bus children as young as five around the district. Developer funding for school transport would not be in perpetuity and would not overcome the other disbenefits of transporting pupils. It is considered that it will be possible to expand the catchment primary school, and although it is not possible to designate places, more sustainable development would be from development abutting Fressingfield's settlement boundary where children could walk to school.

If this proposed development is granted planning permission this situation is going to be wholly unsatisfactory from education point of view and in County Council's view this scale growth in such a remote location is not sustainable.

It is recognized that the District Council faces an issue about identifying adequate housing land. The County Council considers that it is a matter for the District Council to balance the needs for the release of new housing sites with the risks associated with the emergence of a possibly unsustainable pattern of school provision. In this context it leaves it to the District Council to draw the planning balance considering these and all other relevant matters.

Yours sincerely,

*P J Freer*

Peter Freer MSc MRTPI  
Senior Planning and Infrastructure Officer  
Growth, Highways and Infrastructure - Strategic Development

cc Neil McManus, SCC  
Sam Harvey, SCC  
Steve Merry, SCC  
Sarah Hammond, SCC  
Carol Barber, SCC

Attachment to covering email - Yaxley Appeal Decision  
APP/W3520/W/16/3159634.

## Appendix 1 – infrastructure impact arising from development proposal.

The details of specific contribution requirements related to the proposed scheme are set out below:

- 1. Education.** NPPF paragraph 72 states ‘The Government attaches great importance to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education’.

The NPPF at paragraph 38 states ‘For larger scale residential developments in particular, planning policies should promote a mix of uses in order to provide opportunities to undertake day-to-day activities including work on site. Where practical, particularly within large-scale developments, key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties.’

The local catchment schools are Fressingfield Primary School, Stradbroke High School and Thomas Mills High School.

SCC anticipates the following minimum pupil yields from a development of 17 dwellings, namely:

- a) Primary school age range, 5-11: 27 pupils. Cost per place is £12,181 (2017/18 costs).
- b) Secondary school age range, 11-16: 20 pupils. Cost per place is £18,355 (2017/18 costs).
- c) Secondary school age range, 16+: 4 pupil. Costs per place is £19,907 (2017/18 costs).

Based on existing forecasts SCC will have no surplus places available at the catchment primary school. The primary school can be expanded however the additional places will not provide for this development and the current applications in Fressingfield. A minimum CIL funding bid of **£328,887** (2017/18 costs) would be sought if other development in the catchment was not approved and this application was approved. However it is clear that there are not enough places to support all of the applications for planning permission currently being considered in the catchment.

Should the application be recommended for approval, as there is no safe route to walk to the primary school the county council will be required to fund school transport costs arising which are estimated at £950 per annum per pupil. Should the District be minded to approve this development SCC will require a school transport contribution secured by planning obligation of **£179,550**. This would need to be secured by a S106 planning obligation.

There are surplus places available at the catchment secondary school, but for sixth form provision, a minimum CIL funding bid of at least **£79,628** (2017/18 costs) will be sought.

## **2. Pre-school provision.**

This development falls within the ward of Fressingfield and there is a predicted surplus of 79 places in September 2017. Considering this with the applications being determined in Fressingfield there will be sufficient spaces available to accommodate the children arising from the development.

## **3. Play space provision.** Play space provision. Consideration will need to be given to adequate play space provision. A key document is the 'Quality in Play' document fifth edition published in 2016 by Play England.

## **4. Transport issues.** The NPPF at Section 4 promotes sustainable transport. A comprehensive assessment of highways and transport issues is required as part of any planning application. This will include travel plan, pedestrian and cycle provision, public transport, rights of way, air quality and highway provision (both on-site and off-site). Requirements will be dealt with via planning conditions and Section 106 agreements as appropriate, and infrastructure delivered to adoptable standards via Section 38 and Section 278. This has been co-ordinated by Sam Harvey of Transport Strategy, Strategic Development, SCC.

In its role as Highway Authority, Suffolk County Council has worked with the local planning authorities to develop county-wide technical guidance on parking in light of new national policy and local research. This was adopted by the County Council in November 2014 and replaces the Suffolk Advisory Parking Standards (2002). The guidance can be viewed at

<https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/assets/planning-waste-and-environment/planning-and-development-advice/2015-11-16-FINAL-2015-Updated-Suffolk-Guidance-for-Parking.pdf>

## **5. Libraries.** The libraries and archive infrastructure provision topic paper sets out the detailed approach to how contributions are calculated. Should the District Council be minded to approve the application a CIL contribution of £216 per dwelling is sought i.e. **£23,760**, which will be spent on enhancing provision at Stradbroke library. A minimum standard of 30 square metres of new library space per 1,000 populations is required. Construction and initial fit out cost of £3,000 per square metre for libraries (based on RICS Building Cost Information Service data but excluding land costs). This gives a cost of (30 x £3,000) = £90,000 per 1,000 people or £90 per person for library space Assumes average of 2.4 persons per dwelling. Refer to the NPPF 'Section 8 Promoting healthy communities'.

## **6. Waste.** All local planning authorities should have regard to both the Waste Management Plan for England and the National Planning Policy for Waste when

discharging their responsibilities to the extent that they are appropriate to waste management. The Waste Management Plan for England sets out the Government's ambition to work towards a more sustainable and efficient approach to resource use and management.

Paragraph 8 of the National Planning Policy for Waste states that when determining planning applications for non-waste development, local planning authorities should, to the extent appropriate to their responsibilities, ensure that:

- New, non-waste development makes sufficient provision for waste management and promotes good design to secure the integration of waste management facilities with the rest of the development and, in less developed areas, with the local landscape. This includes providing adequate storage facilities at residential premises, for example by ensuring that there is sufficient and discrete provision for bins, to facilitate a high quality, comprehensive and frequent household collection service.

SCC requests that waste bins and garden composting bins should be provided before occupation of each dwelling and this will be secured by way of a planning condition. SCC would also encourage the installation of water butts connected to gutter down-pipes to harvest rainwater for use by occupants in their gardens.

- 7. Supported Housing.** Section 6 of the NPPF seeks to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes. Supported Housing provision, including Extra Care/Very Sheltered Housing providing accommodation for those in need of care, including the elderly and people with learning disabilities, may need to be considered as part of the overall affordable housing requirement. Following the replacement of the Lifetime Homes standard, designing homes to Building Regulations Part M 'Category M4(2)' standard offers a useful way of meeting this requirement, with a proportion of dwellings being built to 'Category M4(3)' standard. In addition we would expect a proportion of the housing and/or land use to be allocated for housing with care for older people e.g. Care Home and/or specialised housing needs, based on further discussion with the Mid Suffolk housing team to identify local housing needs.
- 8. Sustainable Drainage Systems.** Section 10 of the NPPF seeks to meet the challenges of climate change, flooding and coastal change. National Planning Practice Guidance notes that new development should only be considered appropriate in areas at risk of flooding if priority has been given to the use of sustainable drainage systems. Additionally, and more widely, when considering major development (of 10 dwellings or more), sustainable drainage systems should be provided unless demonstrated to be inappropriate.

On 18 December 2014 the secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Mr Eric Pickles) made a Ministerial Written Statement (MWS) setting out the Government's policy on sustainable drainage systems. In accordance with the MWS, when considering a major development (of 10

dwelling or more), sustainable drainage systems should be provided unless demonstrated to be inappropriate. The MWS also provides that in considering:

*“local planning authorities should consult the relevant lead local flood authority on the management of surface water; satisfy themselves that the proposed minimum standards of operation are appropriate and ensure that there are clear arrangements in place for ongoing maintenance over the lifetime of the development. The sustainable drainage system should be designed to ensure that the maintenance and operation requirements are economically proportionate.”*

The changes set out in the MWS took effect from 06 April 2015.

**9. Archaeology.** Please refer to Rachel Abraham’s letter dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2018.

**10. Fire Service.** The Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service requests that early consideration is given to access for fire vehicles and provision of water for fire-fighting. The provision of any necessary fire hydrants will need to be covered by appropriate planning conditions.

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) seek higher standards of fires safety in dwelling houses and promote the installation of sprinkler systems and can provide support and advice on their installation.

**11. Superfast broadband.**

SCC would recommend that all development is equipped with high speed broadband (fibre optic). This facilitates home working which has associated benefits for the transport network and also contributes to social inclusion, it also impacts educational attainment and social wellbeing, as well as impacting property prices and saleability.

As a minimum, access line speeds should be greater than 30Mbps, using a fibre based broadband solution, rather than exchange based ADSL, ADSL2+ or exchange only connections. The strong recommendation from SCC is that a full fibre provision should be made, bringing fibre cables to each premise within the development (FTTP/FTTH). This will provide a network infrastructure which is fit for the future and will enable faster broadband.

**12. Legal costs.** SCC will require an undertaking for the reimbursement of its own legal costs, whether or not the matter proceeds to completion.

**13. Time Limits.** This information is time-limited for 6 months only from the date of this letter.

**Sent:** 25 January 2018 13:31

**To:** BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow

**Subject:** ENQ/2018/0060 - Planning Consultation Request for application DC/17/06326

Good Afternoon,

Regarding the consultation request for application DC/17/06326; We have no additional comments to make at this stage.

Kind Regards

Peter Kerrison

Planning Technician

t 01508 533793 e [pkerrison@s-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:pkerrison@s-norfolk.gov.uk) [www.south-norfolk.gov.uk](http://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk)



INVESTORS  
IN PEOPLE

Platinum  
Until 2020

LGO Awards  
2018  
FINALIST



Little Hall Market Place  
Lavenham Suffolk CO10 9QZ  
Telephone (01787) 247179  
Fax (01787) 248341  
email [sps@suffolksociety.org](mailto:sps@suffolksociety.org)  
[www.suffolksociety.org](http://www.suffolksociety.org)

12 February 2018

Alex Scott, Planning Officer  
Mid Suffolk District Council  
Endeavour House, 8 Russell Rd  
Ipswich, IP1 2BX

Dear Mr Scott,

**Application ref: DC/17/06326 Outline. Demolition of existing buildings and construction of residential development (110 dwellings), conversion of existing public house to a flexible use of A1 (retail), A3 (Cafe), A4 (Public House) and D1 (Community Space/Day Nursery), public open space, drainage infrastructure and vehicular access. Crown Farm The Street Weybread IP21 5TP**

I am writing on behalf of the Suffolk Preservation Society ('the Society') to register our objection to the outline planning application for 110 dwellings at Weybread. The Society fully supports the redevelopment of brownfield land for residential use but has serious concerns regarding the excessive number of dwellings proposed in this small village and the significant proportion of greenfield land to be developed. Furthermore the Society is disappointed to note that there are no affordable houses proposed which would directly benefit the local community.

#### **Five Year Housing Land Supply in Mid Suffolk**

The Annual Monitoring Report (June 2017) states that MSDC cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply. Central to the NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development and in the absence of a 5 year housing land supply *relevant policies for the supply of housing* within the local plan are considered to be out of date (para. 49). Proposals should be supported (para 14) unless *any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole: or specific policies... indicate development should be restricted.*

Whilst we do not dispute the lack of a 5 year housing land supply in Mid Suffolk, the Supreme Court judgment (Suffolk Coastal DC v Hopkins Homes Ltd, 10 May 2017) was clear that the NPPF is guidance, and therefore is a material consideration within the determination of planning applications; however it does not displace the statutory primacy of the development plan under Section 38(6) of the 2004 Planning Act. The Supreme Court judgment concluded that the purpose of para. 49 is to trigger a 'tilted balance' towards sustainable development under para. 14 whilst the weight to be given to development plan policies remains a matter of planning judgment.

We trust that these representations are of assistance in the consideration of this application.

Yours sincerely,

**Bethany Philbidge, BSc (Hons) MSc (Town Planning)**  
**Planning Officer**

Cc: Chairman, Weybread Parish Council  
Phil Butler - SPS Mid Suffolk District  
Ward Councillor