Mr. P Isbell  
Acting Chief Planning Officer – Growth & Sustainable Planning  
Mid Suffolk District Council  
Endeavour House  
8 Russell Road  
Ipswich IP1 2BX  

30th January 2019

Dear Mr. Isbell,

Re: Planning Application DC/18/03547 – Submission of details under outline planning permission 4963/16 relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale pursuant to condition 3, for up to 250 dwellings, open space and associated infrastructure on land west of Ixworth Road @ land west of Ixworth

Case Officer: Alex Scott  
Reason(s) for re-consultation: Amended drawings received by the Local Planning Authority on 8th January 2019.

The Parish Council, having considered this application at its Planning Committee Meeting on 23rd January 2019, following an earlier meeting with representatives with Persimmon Homes would like to confirm that it continues to object to this application in its current form.

Whilst it is appreciated that some minor amendments have been made in direct response to comments submitted by residents directly affected by this application, it feels that very little regard has been taken of the substantive comments made by not only the Parish Council, the Thursdon Neighbourhood Plan Team but also other consultees.

The Parish Council would also like to comment on the very late engagement process carried out by Persimmon Homes LLP with little or no contact with the Parish Council until detailed proposal had been submitted thereby removing the opportunity for constructive discussions to be had prior to submission. It is disappointed that the applicants have failed to engage sufficiently with the Parish Council or taken effective note of the workings of the Thurston Neighbourhood Plan which is now in its six-week Regulation 16 Consultation on the Thurston Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2036.

In summary the Parish Council still has the following concerns:

- Overall the Parish Council is concerned that there is an urban feel to the design which neither complements nor enhances the village. The designs being offered are a stock house type common to Persimmon which has failed to respect not only the character and appearance of Thurston but also that of Suffolk.
- Bungalows – whilst it is noted that there is an increase in bungalows from 2 to 4 bungalows, the Parish Council is disappointed to note that, according to Persimmon Representatives, MSDC’s Officers have stated that the cumulative need for dwellings of this type is now satisfied for the village with the cumulative numbers from all five developments coming forward. The Parish Council, given the demography of the village, and Mid Suffolk in general, does not agree that the need will be satisfied and would like the evidence for such a statement to be ascertained.
- Landscaping details – the Parish Council would like to see a more substantial northern boundary buffer zone especially if a hoggings surface is to be provide as this will form a strong and effective boundary and lessen the impact from the countryside into the development. For an effective boundary at this point the Parish Council would like to ensure that there is a minimum 8-10 metre boundary of mixed native species of hedging and tree. Furthermore the Parish Council would like to see additional planting outside the boundary to strengthen existing planting.

- Internal landscaping details - the Parish Council is also concerned at the treatment of existing trees which appear to have been removed from the plan overall. Given the location of the site it would suggest that more appropriate soft landscaping to the street scene and public open spaces be accommodated to create a strong green infrastructure and attractive outlook from properties.

- Parking – it is noted that parking in a number of cases has been removed from the front of houses which is expected to be offset by the increase in visor parking. There is however a concern that this will lead to more on street parking to access individual houses. The representatives from Persimmon at the meeting on 23rd January 2019, stated that SCC Highways Department did not want parking in courtyards to the rear and the Parish Council would like to request that this statement be verified.

- Garages – it is felt that the number are still insufficient in size and again there is a concern that where garages are integrated they cannot be counted as parking spaces, as such there is an paucity of garages specified on the proposal. The Parish Council questions whether the proposal for garaging is in conformity with SCC Parking Standards Guidance.

- With regards to play provision the Parish Council has stated on previous submissions that it feels this site is most suited to the provision of facilities that would be of a more adventurous type aimed at those that are 12+. It still maintains that the open space to the south western part of the development is suitable for such a facility as it is located within reasonable walking distance of the majority of the units within the development scheme as well as those nearby. Such a facility will be of a demonstrable recreational or amenity value and should be multi-functional. Notwithstanding this requirement there should also be the provision of play equipment such as a LAP or LEAP located within other public open space areas of the development. It is acknowledged that the developer has also suggested a possible gym trail along the PRoW route. The Parish Council seeks reassurance that the provision of suitable play equipment for the whole site will be satisfied through constructive engagement with the developer.

- The Parish Council is disappointed that, according to Persimmon Homes LLP in its meeting of 23rd January 2019, there appears to be little or no support for proposals that will assist with the Thurston Neighbourhood Plan’s aspiration for connectivity within the village which includes those areas for development that have outline planning permission – (pages 54-57 of the full plan which can be found at: https://thurstonparishcouncil.uk/thurston-neighbourhood-plan-ndp/ ). The Parish Council is keen to ensure that there are safe cycling routes in the village. It had mentioned that it would like to see the Public Right of Way (PRoW) within the centre of the site upgraded to a cycle route which will assist with integrating the PRoW within the development as well as providing a safe movement route from the westerly part of the village with key service functions including the new site of the primary school. At the recent meeting with Persimmon, it was stated that SCC Highways Department had objected to this proposal as it did not want a cycleway where the PRoW passes through the site as there was a need to retain the rural aspect of the PROW. Given that the PRoW is now passing through the development, the Parish Council would be keen to explore the upgrading of this route to allow for alternative sustainable modes of transport to be fully explored.

In summary the Parish Council refers you to its previous submission dated 30th August 2018 and wishes to register its continuing objection to this scheme.

Yours sincerely,

Victoria S Waples

V. S. Waples, BA(Hons), CiLCA
Clerk to the Council
Dear Alex

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
CONSULTATION RETURN: DC/18/03547

PROPOSAL: Submission of details under outline planning permission 4963/16 relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale pursuant to condition 3, for up to 250 dwellings, open space and associated infrastructure.

LOCATION: Land to the west of Ixworth Road Thurston 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:

The latest planning layout supplied for this application is acceptable in terms of highway safety. There are a number of minor highway design changes required for the site but these can be addressed during the Section 38 agreement with the SCC as the Highway Authority.

CONDITIONS

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.

B 2 - Condition: Before the development is commenced details of the areas to be provided for storage and presentation 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.

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.

HGV CONSTRUCTION - Condition: Before the development hereby permitted is commenced a Construction Management Plan shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Construction of the development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved plan. The Construction Management Plan shall include the following matters:

- haul routes for construction traffic on the highway network and monitoring and review mechanisms.
- provision of boundary hoarding and lighting
- details of proposed means of dust suppression
- details of measures to prevent mud from vehicles leaving the site during construction
- details of deliveries times to the site during construction phase
- details of provision to ensure pedestrian and cycle safety
- programme of works (including measures for traffic management and operating hours)
- parking and turning for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
- loading and unloading of plant and materials
- storage of plant and materials

Reason: In the interest of highway safety to avoid the hazard caused by mud on the highway and to ensure minimal adverse impact on the public highway during the construction phase.

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.

Yours sincerely,

Samantha Harvey
Senior Development Management Engineer
Growth, Highways and Infrastructure
Dear Sir/Madam

Thank you for your consultation dated 10 January 2019. The updated amendments are unlikely to have any further impact on the strategic road network. Our original response may therefore remain in place.

Yours faithfully
Connor Adkins

Connor Adkins
Highways England
Dear Alex

EP Reference: 247059
DC/18/03547. Land Contamination.
Land to the west of, Ixworth Road, Thurston, BURY ST EDMUNDS, Suffolk.
Submission of details under outline planning permission 4963/16 relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale pursuant to condition 3, for up to 250 dwellings, open space and associated infrastructure.

Many thanks for your request for comments in relation to the above submission. I can confirm that I have no comments to make.

Kind regards

Nathan

Nathan Pittam  BSc. (Hons.) PhD
Senior Environmental Management Officer

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils – Working Together
Hi Alex,

Proposal: Submission of details under outline planning permission 4963/16 relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale pursuant to condition 3, for up to 250 dwellings, open space and associated infrastructure.

Location: Land To The West Of, Ixworth Road, Thurston, Suffolk

Many thanks for your request for comments in relation to the above application.

Having reviewed the application I can confirm that Environmental Protection has no objection to the proposed development.

Subject to the following conditions:

I recommend the developer submit a Construction Environmental Management Plan outlining the following:

- Noise management responsibilities and measures
- Monitoring and auditing procedures
- Complaints response procedures
- Community liaison procedures

The measures and procedures within the statement shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority and only those construction measures and procedures agreed shall be implemented by the developer.
The site preparation and construction works, including road works, shall be carried out between the hours of:

08:00 to 18:00 Mondays to Fridays

08:00 - 13.30 Saturdays

No times during Sundays, Public or Bank Holidays without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

(If ‘quiet work activities’ are permitted outside these hours I recommend they do not involve the use of generators, machinery and vehicles in external areas of the site).

No generators to be used in external areas on the site outside the hours of:

08:00 to 18:00 Mondays to Fridays

08:00 - 13.30 Saturdays

No times during Sundays, Public or Bank Holidays

The Local Planning Authority shall be provided with three days notice prior to any extended concrete pour taking place outside the agreed hours of construction for agreement that the works can proceed.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the area.
Any waste material arising from site demolition, preparation and construction works shall not be burnt on site but shall be kept securely in containers for removal to prevent escape into the environment.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the area.

No demolition preparation or construction works shall commence until a scheme for the mitigation of possible nuisance caused by dust has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the area.

No security lights or floodlights shall be erected on site without the submission of details to, and written approval from, the Local Planning Authority to ensure a lighting environment of low district brightness at residential properties.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the area.

Thanks

Peter

Peter Chisnall
Environmental Protection Officer

Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Councils - Working Together

t: 01449 872247
m: 07543237715
e: peter.chisnall@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

www.babergh.gov.uk www.midsuffolk.gov.uk
Dear Alex

EP Reference : 247052
DC/18/03547. Air Quality.
Land to the west of, Ixworth Road, Thurston, BURY ST EDMUNDS, Suffolk.
Submission of details under outline planning permission 4963/16 relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale pursuant to condition 3, for up to 250 dwellings, open space and associated infrastructure.

Many thanks for your request for comments in relation to the above notification. I can confirm that I have no comments to make.

Kind regards

Nathan

Nathan Pittam  BSc. (Hons.) PhD
Senior Environmental Management Officer

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils – Working Together
Sir/Madam

The information received to date does not address sustainability issues therefore we have no comment

Regards

Iain Farquharson
Senior Environmental Management Officer

Babergh Mid Suffolk Council
Subject: Land To The West Of, Ixworth Road, Thurston, Suffolk Ref DC/18/03547

Suffolk County Council, Flood and Water Management have reviewed application ref DC/18/03547

The following submitted documents have been reviewed and we recommend maintaining our holding objection at this time:

- Planning Layout Ref 981-P-100
- Landscape Masterplan ref JBA 16/053-03 Rev A
- Detailed Hard and Soft Landscaping Proposals for POS Ref JBA 16/053-01 A

The reason why we are recommending maintain a holding objection is because the applicant has still not supplied sufficient detail of the landscaping of the SuDs features, specifically the attenuation lagoon. The planting of the lagoon should be done in a manner that support and encourages local species. This point was also raised by Places Services in their letter dated the 24th May 2018.

The point below detail the action required in order to overcome our current objection:

1. Detail landscaping design and planting details of the SuDs features (cross and long sections, including specific planting details

Kind Regards

Jason Skilton
Flood & Water Engineer
Flood & Water Management
Growth, Highways & Infrastructure

Suffolk County Council I Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich, Suffolk, IP1 2BX

***Appendix A to the Suffolk Flood Risk Management Strategy has been updated! If you’re involved in the planning, design and construction of new developments this may be of interest to you. You will be expected to comply with this new local guidance. More information can be found here; https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/flooding-and-drainage/guidance-on-development-and-flood-risk/***
Please find attached planning re-consultation request letter relating to planning application - DC/18/03547 - Land To The West Of, Ixworth Road, Thurston, Suffolk

Kind Regards

Planning Support Team

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

Babergh District Council and Mid Suffolk District Council (BMSDC) will be Data Controllers of the information you are providing. As required by the Data Protection Act 2018 the information will be kept safe, secure, processed and only shared for those purposes or where it is allowed by law. In some circumstances however we may need to disclose your personal details to a third party so that they can provide a service you have requested, or fulfil a request for information. Any information about you that we pass to a third party will be held securely by that party, in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018 and used only to provide the services or information you have requested. For more information on how we do this and your rights in regards to your personal information and how to access it, visit our website.
From: Planning Liaison <planningliaison@anglianwater.co.uk>
Sent: 14 January 2019 12:23
To: BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow <planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: MSDC Planning Re-consultation Request - DC/18/03547

Dear Sir/Madam,

The reserved matters does not relate to matters relevant to Anglian Water so we will not be providing comments at this time.

Please contact us should you wish to highlight any specific issues or discuss this consultation further.

Mike
Pre-Development Advisor
Anglian Water Services Limited
Thorpe Wood House, Thorpe Wood, Peterborough, Cambridgeshire, PE3 6WT
Telephone: 0345 606 6087 option 1

https://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developers/pre-development.aspx

AWARDS: Computing Cloud Excellence Awards 2018: Most innovative Cloud based product or service of the year.

-----Original Message-----
From: planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk
Sent: 10 January 2019 14:11
To: Planning Liaison
Subject: MSDC Planning Re-consultation Request - DC/18/03547

*EXTERNAL MAIL* - Please be aware this mail is from an external sender - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

Please find attached planning re-consultation request letter relating to planning application - DC/18/03547 - Land To The West Of, Ixworth Road, Thurston, Suffolk

Kind Regards

Planning Support Team
MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

TO: Alex Scott – Senior Planning Officer

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

Date: 11th September 2018.

SUBJECT: Reserved Matters application for Residential Development at land west of Ixworth Road, Thurston for 250 dwellings application DC/18/03547.

Consultation Response on Affordable Housing Requirement

Key Points

1. Background Information:
   - A development of 250 dwellings.
   - This development triggers Local Plan Amended Policy H4 and therefore up to 35% affordable housing would be required on this site.
   - Based on 250 dwellings 87 units of affordable housing would be sought. 87 affordable units have been included in the Design and Access statement submitted by Persimmon Homes for this site so is policy compliant.

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. 780 applicants registered for the Mid Suffolk area as of June 2018.

   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. The location of the affordable dwellings within the Reserved Matters application have been distributed across the site, however, all the clusters range from 20 – 23 dwellings – our guidance included at Outline stage was for no more than 15 dwellings together in one place. The cluster on the south of the development there are 44 affordable dwellings in one part of the site, and even though there are a mix of affordable tenures here, it would have been preferable to have seen a wider distribution of the AH dwellings so that they are not so concentrated on this part of the development.
2.6. Our 2014 Housing Needs Survey shows that there is a need across all tenures for smaller units of accommodation, which includes accommodation suitable for older people, wishing to downsize from larger privately-owned family housing, into smaller privately-owned apartments, bungalows and houses.

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

3. Affordable Housing Requirement for Thurston:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordable Housing Requirement</th>
<th>35 % of units = 87 affordable units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Split – 60% Rent &amp; 40 % Intermediate e.g. New Build Homebuy accommodation, intermediate rent, shared ownership or starter homes.</td>
<td>Affordable Rent = 53 units All rented units will be let as Affordable Rent Tenancies Intermediate = Shared Ownership = 24 units Intermediate = Starter Homes = 10 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Breakdown Rented Units</td>
<td>General Needs Affordable Dwellings:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 12 x 1 bed 2-person houses @ 50.9 sqm – these are too small and should be 58 sqm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 32 x 2 bed 4-person houses @ 70.7 sqm – these need to be 79 sqm to comply with NDSS. Persimmon have not said if they are for 3 or 4 persons, but we would need them to be 4 persons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 9 x 3 bed 5-person houses @ 81 sqm – these need to be 93 sqm to comply with NDSS. Persimmon have not said if they are for 4 or 5 persons, but we would need them to be for 5 persons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total = 53 ART’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Detailed Breakdown Intermediate Units

#### General Needs Shared Ownership dwellings:
- **18 x 2B 4P Houses @ 70.7sqm** - these need to be 79 sqm to comply with NDSS. Persimmon have not said if they are for 3 or 4 persons, but we would need them to be 4 persons.
- **6 x 3B 5P Houses @ 81 sqm** - these need to be 93 sqm to comply with NDSS. Persimmon have not said if they are for 4 or 5 persons, but we would need them to be for 5 persons.

Total = 24

#### Starter Home Dwellings: -
- **4 x 2B4P flats @ 69.95 sqm** – size OK
- **6 x 3B5P houses @ 70.7 sqm** – too small would ideally need to be 93 sqm but a minimum of 85 sqm. Alternatively, to change them to all 2 bed 4-person houses at a size of 76 – 79 sqm which would make them more affordable to first time buyers.

Other requirements

Properties must be built to current Homes England requirements and NDSS.

The council is granted 100% nomination rights to all the affordable units on first lets and at least 75% on relets.

Starter Homes will be covered by Starter Homes regulations.

Adequate parking provision is made for the affordable housing units.

It is preferred that the affordable units are transferred to one of Mid Suffolk’s partner Registered Providers – please see [www.midsuffolk.gov.uk](http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk) under Housing and affordable housing for full details.

### 4.0 Comment on open market mix proposed.

4.1 The property mix for the open market dwellings are all houses, and mainly 3, 4 and 5 bed houses, with 21 of these as 5 bed houses. There are 19 x 2 bed houses which is to be welcomed but we really needed to see some **2 and 3 bed bungalows** on this site to offer some housing choices to older people seeking level access housing and accommodation to down-size to. The principle of development has already been agreed but the range of available dwellings to meet the needs of our demographic profile in the district and specifically Thurston is lacking.

**Julie Abbey-Taylor, Professional Lead – Housing Enabling.**
25 January 2019

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/18/03547
Location: To The West Of Ixworth Road Thurston Suffolk
Proposal: Submission of details under outline planning permission 4963/16 relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale pursuant to condition 3, for up to 250 dwellings, open space and associated infrastructure.

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

I have reviewed the Amended detailed Hard and Soft Landscape Proposals (James Blake, November 2018). This indicates the locations of a Schwegler Eco Barn Owl Nest Box and a Schwegler type 2TF Kestrel Nest Box and Three Schwegler Bat box type 2F.

It is considered that the details of proposed biodiversity enhancements are not sufficient for an application of this scale. The Ecological Constraints and Opportunities Plan (Enims, March 2016) also recommended additional ecological enhancements throughout the development. This included bird nest boxes, a reptile hibernacula, landscape buffering and native species planting on the boundary edges. In addition, Suffolk Wildlife Trusts comments have highlighted that this scheme could include Swift and that Hedgehog Friendly fencing should be implemented throughout the development by creating 13cm by 13cm holes in the bases of fences and walls, or by using soft landscaping boundaries.

Therefore, it is recommended the further ecological enhancements are required for this application and it advised that the details of these enhancements should include the following:

a) Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed enhancement measures;
b) detailed designs to achieve stated objectives;
c) locations of proposed enhancement measures by appropriate maps and plans;
d) timetable for implementation demonstrating that works are aligned with the proposed phasing of development;
e) persons responsible for implementing the enhancement measures;
f) details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance (where relevant).

We also feel it would be beneficial to have details of the planting scheme to ensure that appropriate plant species have been recommended within the landscape design.

Please contact us with any further queries.

Yours sincerely,

Hamish Jackson GradCIEEM BSc (Hons)
Junior Ecological Consultant
Place Services at Essex County Council
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.
For the attention of: Alex Scott

Ref: DC/18/03547 - Land to the West of, Ixworth Road, Thurston, Suffolk

Thank you for re-consulting us on the submission of details under outline planning permission 4963/16 relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale pursuant to condition 3, for up to 250 dwellings, open space and associated infrastructure.

This letter sets out our recommendations relating to the revised layout and landscape detailing.

At present, we recommend the holding objection remains on the application as many of our previous recommendations have not been address. These include the following:

1) More detailed hard and soft landscape plans have been submitted for the public open space (POS) (Drawing Ref: JBA 16/053-01 to 05). However, we need to see details for the whole site. Previously we recommended that trees under private ownership were relocated onto the highway to enable them to be under the maintenance contract of the future management company. Instead it seems that all 'street' trees have been removed, and all landscape assets are located within the open space. This is insufficient considering the sites edge of settlement location and existing landscape character.

2) The Planning and Design Statement submitted states “teen play equipment (12+ adventure play), with no desire for further LAP or LEAP provision. From further discussions, it was felt that this could be accommodated within the south-western area of Public Open Space, and could include wire and/or solid climbing structures, zip wires, etc.” This has still not been addressed. If this is not being included, then justification needs to be given.

3) It is recommended that a larger landscape buffer is located on the northern boundary of the development. As it stands, the development will be visible from both Mill Lane and Ixworth Road as you approach Thurston from the north. Due to its settlement edge location and countryside landscape character we would expect the buffer to be wider with an accompanying tree and shrub belt to soften the edge and improve the vista aesthetic.

4) It was previously advised that details of boundary treatments were provided. The detailed hard and soft landscape proposal for POS (Drawing ref: JBA 16/053-03) does not show the western boundary of the development; plots adjacent to existing dwellings have been covered by tree pit details. We would expect the existing vegetation to remain, along with additional hedgerow planting and trees to be included were appropriate.

5) We welcome the implementation of a raised table at the PRoW junction. However, there is no indication of a change of surface treatment. This needs to be specified.
6) Plot boundaries that meet the public realm should be proposed as brick walls instead of close board fencing. This should be complemented by soft landscaping, preferably in the form of trees, shrubs and plants rather than grass verges.

7) There are a large number of long alley-like back garden accesses proposed (Plot 17, 70, 186 and others). It would be advised that internal passageways between terraced units are proposed instead to reduce distances and the likelihood of refuse bins being left on street boundaries.

8) All shared surface (Tertiary Street) boundaries are bounded by timber knee rails. POS access points should be provided along these to allow residents easy access to the space.

We still have concerns regarding the parking layout and house types proposed and would recommend an urban designer is consulted to provide comment.

In the event that approval of this application is forthcoming then the following reserved matters conditions should be considered:

1. **ACTION REQUIRED PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT: ADVANCED PLANTING**
   Before any works commence on site, details of advance planting shall be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Implementation shall be carried out prior to any other construction work and in accordance with an implementation timetable agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

2. **ACTION REQUIRED PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT: LANDSCAPE MANAGEMENT PLAN.**
   No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority a landscape management plan for a minimum of 10 years. Both new and existing planting will be required to be included in the plan.

3. **ACTION REQUIRED PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT: LANDSCAPING SCHEME.**
   No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatment for the site, which shall include any proposed changes in ground levels and also accurately identify spread, girth and species of all existing trees, shrubs and hedgerows on the site and indicate any to be retained, together with measures for their protection which shall comply with the recommendations set out in the British Standards Institute publication BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction. The soft landscaping plan should include plant species, quantity, location and sizes of the proposed planting. The plans should clearly show the position of new fencing and gates in relation to existing and proposed planting. Tree pit details will also need to be provided for the different planting environments proposed i.e. planted in hard landscaping, close to road boundaries and within the public open space (POS).

If you have any queries regarding the above matters, please let me know.

Kind regards,

Ryan Mills  BSc (Hons) MSc CMLI
Landscape Consultant
Telephone: 03330320591
Email: ryan.mills@essex.gov.uk

Place Services provide landscape advice on behalf of Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils. Please note: This letter is advisory and should only be considered as the opinion formed by specialist staff in relation to this particular matter.
Dear Alex,

RE: DC/18/03547 Submission of details under outline planning permission 4963/16 relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale pursuant to condition 3, for up to 250 dwellings, open space and associated infrastructure. Land to The West of Ixworth Road, Thurston

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

**Ecological Enhancements**
Planning permission 4963/16 included condition 7 which secured the provision of ecological enhancements on the site, in line with the recommendations made in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) report (Enims, March 2016). However, the current reserved matters application does not appear to include details of how or where these enhancement measures will be incorporated into the development. We recommend that a plan is provided detailing the locations of the ecological enhancements, along with a timetable for their provision.

In addition to the measures identified in the original PEA, we also recommend that ecological enhancement measures for the site include integrated nesting boxes for swifts and hedgehog friendly garden boundaries. Swift nesting opportunities can be included through the use of swift nest bricks built into suitable building elevations. Hedgehog friendly garden boundaries can be achieved either by creating 13cm by 13cm holes in the bases of fences and walls, or by using soft landscaping boundaries.

**Landscaping Proposals**
The proposed development offers the opportunity to create new green corridors, however the Landscaping Masterplan (drawing ref. JBA 16/053-03) provided appears to include little in the way of such provision. In particular, the opportunity to create a green corridor along the western side of the site, linking the proposed attenuation area and public open space to the wider countryside has been missed. Whilst we acknowledge that the broad amount of housing to be developed on the site has been set through the Outline planning consent, we recommend that the overall landscaping plan is revisited to ensure that opportunities to create meaningful green corridors through the site are maximised. Such green corridors would also complement the ecological enhancements identified above.

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

Yours sincerely

James Meyer
Senior Conservation Planner
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 Footpath 18 is recorded through the proposed development area.

Whilst we do not have any objections to this proposal, 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.suffolkpublicrightsofway.org.uk

Jennifer Green
(Working hours - Monday to Wednesday)
Rights of Way and Access
Growth, Highways and Infrastructure, Suffolk County Council
Suffolk Highways, Phoenix House, Goddard Road, Ipswich, IP1 5NP

Tel: 01473 264266

-----Original Message-----
From: planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk <planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 January 2019 14:09
To: Highways PROW Planning <PROWplanning@suffolkhighways.org>
Subject: MSDC Planning Re-consultation Request - DC/18/03547

Please find attached planning re-consultation request letter relating to planning application - DC/18/03547 - Land To The West Of, Ixworth Road, Thurston, Suffolk

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

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

For more information on how we do this and your rights in regards to your personal information and how to access it, visit our website.
Mr Alex Scott
Babergh Mid Suffolk District Council
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich
Suffolk
IP1 2BX

Direct Dial: 01223 582711
Our ref: W: P00958580

11 January 2019

Dear Mr Scott

& Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990

LAND TO THE WEST OF IXWORTH ROAD, THURSTON, SUFFOLK
Application No. DC/18/03547

Thank you for your letter of 10 January 2019 regarding further information on the
above application for planning permission. On the basis of this information, we do not
wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist
conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.

It is not necessary for us to be consulted on this application again, unless there are
material changes to the proposals. However, if you would like detailed advice from us,
please contact us to explain your request.

Yours sincerely

Joanne Robinson
Business Officer
E-mail: Joanne.Robinson@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Further to the advice previously provided for this scheme on 9/8/18, archaeological evaluation and mitigation has now been completed, with no further on site work to be completed. We therefore no longer have any objection to the above RM application being granted.

Archaeological reporting is still outstanding however, although this is covered by condition 24 of outline planning consent 4963/16.

Should conditions also need to be applied to this RM application, we would suggest that permission now only needs to be granted with a single archaeological condition:

'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 planning permission 4963/16 and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition'.

Best wishes,
Rachael

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

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

Tel.:01284 741232
Mob: 07595 089516
Email: rachael.abraham@suffolk.gov.uk

Website: http://www.suffolk.gov.uk/culture-heritage-and-leisure/suffolk-archaeological-service/
Suffolk Heritage Explorer: www.heritage.suffolk.gov.uk Twitter Page: www.twitter.com/SCCArchaeology
Proposal: Submission of details under outline planning permission 4963/16 relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale pursuant to condition 3, for up to 250 dwellings, open space and associated infrastructure.

Location: Land To The West Of , Ixworth Road, Thurston, Suffolk

1. I refer to your consultation letter on the above 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 West Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).

2. The proposal comprises a development of up to 250 residential dwellings, which is likely to have an impact of 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 are No GP practices within a 2km radius of the proposed development, there is a GP practice closest to the proposed development and this is within circa 5km. This practice does have sufficient capacity for the additional growth resulting from this
development but cumulative development growth in the area would see a need to expand the current practice. 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. The primary healthcare services directly impacted by the proposed development and the current capacity position is shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: Summary of capacity position for healthcare services closest to the proposed development.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Premises</th>
<th>Weighted List Size (^1)</th>
<th>NIA (m(^2))(^2)</th>
<th>Capacity (^3)</th>
<th>Spare Capacity (NIA m(^2))(^4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mount Farm Surgery</td>
<td>12,713</td>
<td>920.72</td>
<td>13,427</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The weighted list size of the GP Practice based on the Carr-Hill formula, this figure more accurately reflects the need of a practice in terms of resource and space and may be slightly lower or higher than the actual patient list.

2. Current Net Internal Area occupied by the Practice.

3. Based on 120m\(^2\) per 1750 patients (this is considered the current optimal list size for a single GP within the East DCO) Space requirement aligned to DH guidance within “Health Building Note 11-01: facilities for Primary and Community Care Services”

4. Based on existing weighted list size.

6. 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 by way of extension, refurbishment or reconfiguration at Mount Farm Surgery, servicing the residents of this development, would be sought from the CIL contributions collected by the District Council.

7. 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 extend the above mentioned surgery. Should the level of growth in this area prove this to be unviable, the 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

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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.

Yours faithfully

Chris Crisell
Estates Planning Support Officer
West Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group
Dear Alex,

Thurston: land west of Ixworth Road – reserved matters application

I refer to the proposal: submission of details under outline planning permission 4963/16 relating to appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale pursuant to condition 3, for up to 250 dwellings, open space, and associated infrastructure.

I have no comments to make on the above reserved matters planning application other than the proviso that the terms of the existing planning obligation dated 09 July 2018 remains in place. For information, Suffolk County Council holds an option agreement for up to 4.4 hectares of land identified for education use which was included as part of the outline planning permission under reference 4963/16.

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

Yours sincerely,

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

cc Sam Harvey, Suffolk County Council
Floods Planning, Suffolk County Council
Suffolk Archaeological Service
Dear Alex Scott

Thank you for your consultation on the attached application.

St Edmundsbury Borough Council has no comments to make on this Reserved Matters application.

Regards

Pete White
Dear Alex,

Thank you for notifying me about the re-consultation for the residential development at Land to the West of Ixworth Road in Thurston. Having reviewed the documents submitted, I can confirm that I have no comment to make at this stage.

Kind regards

Chris Ward
Travel Plan Officer
Transport Strategy
Strategic Development - Growth, Highways and Infrastructure
Suffolk County Council
Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich, IP1 2BX

-----Original Message-----
From: planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk <planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 January 2019 14:09
To: Chris Ward <Chris.Ward@suffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: MSDC Planning Re-consultation Request - DC/18/03547

Please find attached planning re-consultation request letter relating to planning application - DC/18/03547 - Land To The West Of , Ixworth Road, Thurston, Suffolk

Kind Regards

Planning Support Team

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

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

Heritage does not wish to offer comment on this application.

Please treat this email as the Heritage consultation response.

Paul

Paul Harrison
Heritage and Design Officer
T 01449 724677 | 07798 781360
E paul.harrison@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk
E heritage@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk
W www.babergh.gov.uk | www.midsuffolk.gov.uk
Thank you for your email.

We are returning this consultation without comment because we have checked the application and it is not clear why we have been consulted. Please find attached a consultation checklist which explains when to consult us.

If, after reconsideration, you still need us to comment on this planning application, please specify why. For discharge of conditions applications; we only comment on conditions that we have recommended. If you wish to re-consult us please tell us which condition we recommended.

If you confirm why we have been appropriately consulted, our 21 day statutory consultation period will start. If not, we will take no further action.

We have adopted this approach because we are currently receiving large numbers of inappropriate consultations. These significantly reduce the time and staff resources we have to provide you with timely statutory consultation responses.

Kind Regards

Liam

Liam Robson
Sustainable Places Planning Advisor – East Anglia Area (East) Environment Agency | Iceni House, Cobham Road, Ipswich, Suffolk, IP3 9JD

liam.robson@environment-agency.gov.uk
External: 020 847 48923 | Internal: 48923

National Customer Contact Centre: 03708 506506 (Weekday Daytime calls may cost 8p plus up to 6p per minute from BT Weekend Unlimited. Mobile and other providers’ charges may vary.)

Do your future plans have environmental issues or opportunities? Speak to us early!

If you are planning a new project or development, we want to work with you to make the process as smooth as possible. We offer a tailored advice service with an assigned project manager giving you detailed and timely specialist advice. Early engagement can improve subsequent planning and permitting applications to you and your clients’ benefit. More information can be found on our website here.
To: Ipswich, Planning <planning.ipswich@environment-agency.gov.uk>
Subject: MSDC Planning Re-consultation Request - DC/18/03547

Please find attached planning re-consultation request letter relating to planning application - DC/18/03547 - Land To The West Of, Ixworth Road, Thurston, Suffolk

Kind Regards

Planning Support Team

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

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

This message has been scanned and no issues were discovered.

To report this email as SPAM, please forward it to spam@forcepoint.com Information in this message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender immediately, delete it and do not copy it to anyone else.

We have checked this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check any attachment before opening it.
We may have to make this message and any reply to it public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or for litigation. Email messages and attachments sent to or from any Environment Agency address may also be accessed by someone other than the sender or recipient, for business purposes.

To report this email as SPAM, please forward it to spam@forcepoint.com