



COMBS PARISH COUNCIL

c/o Tony Bamber, Parish Council Clerk
Adstone, Bildeston Road, Combs, Suffolk IP14 2JZ
Tel: 01449 613255
Email: combsparishcouncil@gmail.com

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

13 March 2019

Dear Sirs

DC/19/00662 Outline Planning Application – Erection of up to 138 dwellings. Land to the east of Poplar Hill

We refer to the above application for outline planning permission and herewith submit our objection on the grounds that the proposed project will not be *sustainable* development.

The subject application is fundamentally the same as DC/18/02380 save that this is for 22 dwellings fewer, with a consequent adjustment to the housing area. The documents submitted by the Proposers are fundamentally the same although some reports have been updated and purport to deal with some of the points of objection we made to that application.

We acknowledge that this country needs more houses, that Mid Suffolk is behind in its five-year stock of developable land, and therefore the restrictive elements of MSDC's existing development plans are deemed to be out of date. We also acknowledge that this parish must play its part in the necessary sustainable development, and that may mean not only embracing appropriate development within our own boundaries but also accepting the inevitable changes when development occurs within our neighbours' boundaries.

The original application (for up to 160 dwellings) was refused for reasons set out in MSDC letter DC/18/02380 dated 26 September 2018, and it seems to us that at least the first three reasons for refusal are not only fundamental to siting any development – never mind an entire housing estate – in this location but also have not been overcome in the present application¹. We trust that MSDC will take the same approach to the present application.

In addition to the reasons why the first application was refused – with particular emphasis on the detriment to the setting of St Mary's Church – we submit that the proposed development is not sustainable for three principal reasons:

¹ Tinkering with layout to improve the view of St Mary's Church is of no consequence; layout will be a 'reserved matter' which, as we are all painfully aware, can be ignored at the Detailed Planning stage.

- A. it will depend for its access to all the facilities that the residents will need on a road system which cannot, at peak times, take much more traffic than it does already before it ceases to function altogether;
- B. its location will diminish the strategic gap between Stowmarket and Combs to an unacceptable and unsustainable level;
- C. the proposed development fails to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of that piece of countryside landscape, and its location will cause substantial harm to the natural environment.

Having set out our arguments in full in our letter dated 6 July 2018 under the original application reference, our points in this letter are in reduced form only.

A. Access between the Site and the facilities of Stowmarket and beyond.

- A.1 In our letter under the original application reference we pointed out that that planning application included and relied on a comprehensive Transport Assessment and a Travel Plan, both of which we considered to be fundamentally defective because they took an unrealistic and over-optimistic view of Poplar Hill as the main arterial route between the development and all the facilities its residents will need. This was principally because those reports failed to address the issue of the bottlenecks caused by parked cars along the residential length of Poplar Hill from its northern end (the junction with Combs Lane) to the top of Poplar Hill (in terms of height above Ordnance Datum Newlyn).
- A.2 Both the new Transport Assessment and the new Travel Plan repeat the same description of the Local Highway Network (at section 3.3 in each case) as before, without any mention at all of the continuous presence of parked cars which effectively turn what those reports describe as *a two-way single carriageway road providing a connection between Combs Ford and Stowmarket to the north, and through to Combs and Moats Tye to the south* into what is in effect a single-lane road.
- A.3 Much is made in the updated Transport Assessment and Travel Plan of the analysis of existing traffic flows at junctions, and predictions for future traffic flows after development, not to mention the concurrence by Highways Department officers in the methodology used. But at no stage is the question of this bottleneck from parked cars addressed.
- A.4 As we pointed out before, what must be taken into account is not merely the traffic along Poplar Hill generated by the proposed development but also the traffic still to be generated by the future completion of the Edgecomb Park/Farriers Road development (MSDC planning reference 1492/15). Some of this traffic will, like the present traffic,

seek to avoid the bottleneck of Poplar Hill by spilling down the residential roads of Verneuil Avenue/Edgecomb Road to the west, and Church Road/Hill Rise/Lavenham Way to the east. The traffic is bad enough as it is; what it will be like in a few years' time when the traffic from an additional 288 homes above what there is now tries to use this local road network, we dread to think.

A.5 It is primarily for that reason that we take great issue with the conclusions set out in the Transport Assessment:

6.9.3 ...the cumulative impact of the development can certainly not be considered 'severe' meaning that according to paragraph 109 of the NPPF ... the development should not be refused on transport grounds.

That conclusion must be defective because it has taken no account whatsoever of the bottleneck of parked cars – an oversight which the Local Highways Authority seem to have succumbed to as well, according to paragraph 6.9.4 of the Transport Assessment.

A.6 We who are daily users of Poplar Hill as an arterial road between our homes and all the facilities of Stowmarket know full well that the Poplar Hill bottleneck will only get worse, and the residual cumulative impacts of the proposed development on the road network would in fact be *severe*. Therefore, we submit, this application should be refused on precisely the grounds provided by paragraph 109 of the NPPF.

B. Maintaining a gap between Combs and Stowmarket

B.1 In our previous letter under the original application reference we set out in some detail why we considered that material gaps between settlements are contemplated with approval by the NPPF and also by the Planning Inspectorate. We do not repeat all that analysis here but we do repeat our contention that, if this development is permitted, it would sound the death knell of Combs as an independent village.

B.2 The adjustment of the southern edge of the proposed development is *de minimis*, a mere trifle, which will in no way prevent the proposed development turning what is at present a viable gap into an unviable one. If nothing else, the south-western corner of the proposed development has not changed, and so the gap between the proposed development and Combs would still be reduced to about 280 metres.

B.3 That the policies in the Stowmarket Area Action Plan 2013 (the SAAP) are deemed by the NPPF to be out of date does not, we submit, render them worthless, as acknowledged by the Applicants in section 4.5 of their Planning Statement. A new Babergh/Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan (the JLP) which will eventually replace it is still in its early stages of being developed and there is nothing in the only existing form of it, the Consultation Document dated August 2017, which gives any meaningful indication of policies that are likely to be adopted and become 'made'. We

therefore agree with the Applicants (Planning Statement, paragraph 4.7.7) that ‘the [JLP] carries no weight’. In the absence of any discernible policies in the forthcoming JLP, therefore, we submit that the SAAP policies are still relevant and should still carry material weight.

- B.4 The Edgecomb Park development secured outline planning permission at least partly because of its sensitivity to SAAP policies 6.22 and 10.2 through the allocation of the south-eastern part of that site (which forms the most visually exposed part of the proposed Site) as Public Open Space. The present proposal seeks to drive a coach and horses through that careful attention to those policies on the grounds that the overall impression created by the Edgecomb Park proposal, carefully conceived and presented, is a matter of detail which are reserved matters, and that, because detailed plans ‘have not been brought forward ... this policy requirement should only be given limited weight’ (Planning Statement, paragraph 4.5.8).
- B.5 We disagree that these policies should ‘only be given limited weight’. On the contrary, the policies preserving this separation between Stowmarket and the outlying villages to the south are there for a reason, and that reason still exists: to prevent casual coalescence. If that policy is to be overturned then it can only be in favour of a policy of coalescence. Such a policy cannot conceivably come into existence if it has not been subject to clear and unequivocal consultation. This policy has never been proposed clearly and unequivocally; therefore it follows that the policy of preventing casual coalescence must still exist.
- B.6 The question then arises whether shifting the Public Open Space from the position set out in the SAAP (and envisaged when outline planning was granted for the Edgecomb Park/Farriers Road development), in its prominent position at the top of Poplar Hill, down to a substantially inferior position under the electricity pylons towards the bottom of the valley, will have any impact on the value of the Site in fulfilling the function of preventing coalescence between Stowmarket and Combs.
- B.7 It seems to us unarguable that it will, if its place is to be taken by a housing estate, for the reasons we set out in paragraph B.4 above. The gap between the clear built-up areas of Stowmarket (Church Road in Combs Ford) and Combs (Prospect Place) is currently about 460 metres at its narrowest. The crucial view is from the perspective of a traveller (whether on foot, bicycle or in a car) leaving the village of Combs at the junction of Park Road, Tannery Road and Poplar Hill, as he or she looks along Poplar Hill to the next settlement: Stowmarket and its suburb (as it is called in the Landscape and View Assessment) of Combs Ford. The view is across a landscape which is in effect a basin formed by an ancient stream – now little more than a ditch. The bed of that stream runs from the crest of the hill north of Combs in an easterly direction for about 500 metres, crosses Poplar Hill at the bottom of a dip known locally as The Slough, and continues for another 150 metres until it joins the stream running northeast towards the Rattlesden River and then into the River Gipping.

- B.8 The significance of this ancient stream is that it has given what would otherwise have been an east-southeast-facing slope a more southerly aspect, creating a small basin, across the contours of which the main arterial road between Combs and Stowmarket (Poplar Hill, southern end) runs. The effect of this is that, as the traveller crosses this basin he sees the whole of it as a single feature.
- B.9 Church Road, some 500 metres distant from the edge of Combs (as seen from the junction of Poplar Hill with Park Road and Tannery Road), is far enough away to define the edge of Combs Ford and gives the perception of being a ridge, although that is only a perception. But at 500 metres distance it is not seen as ‘threatening’.
- B.10 But if development were to spread southeastwards down the very visible slope of this small basin, the effect would be devastating.
- B.11 As noted above, the present separation is 460 metres at its narrowest; but if this development were to be approved that gap would reduce to about 280 metres to the nearest line of houses, the whole spread of the development occupying that critical view of clear, undeveloped land on the southeast-facing slope of the basin.
- B.12 Leaving aside the aesthetic appreciation of this small topographic basin, what is of very substantial concern to us is that if development is allowed to spill over Church Road into this basin, this clear feature will cease to have the effect of a being a sustainable gap between two settlements. Unlike the curate’s egg, this basin will be blighted irredeemably, allowing future planners and planning committees to shrug and say, ‘The harm has already been done’. It is the perception of separation that is important, not just a couple of hundred yards at the bottom of a rolling landscape.
- B.13 The Planning Inspectorate has in the recent past specifically endorsed Local Plans that *‘identify land where development would be inappropriate, for instance because of its environmental significance.’* ... *‘The coalescence of adjoining settlements, caused by development in the largely undeveloped gaps, would clearly have an environmental effect’*, concluding that *‘The principle of such a designated area is therefore in line with national policy’* (PINS/C1760/429/5, page 31, paragraph 191).
- B.14 With reference to the NPPF, in one case the Inspector noted, *‘This [gap] policy, which is broadly restrictive in nature, runs counter to the general national approach to enabling development. However that approach is qualified by the [NPPF] policy that such development should be located in the right place, and that the natural environment should be protected’* (Ref: PINS/C1760/429/5, page 31, paragraph 194).
- B.15 In our view the existing gap between Combs and the edge of Combs Ford is a gap of the right size, and of sustainable character and proportions, for the following reasons:
- The land lies between settlements
 - The land is predominantly undeveloped

- The land is predominantly open
- The land has a coherent land management pattern
- The land has clearly defined boundaries, both in terms of topography and management
- The land includes a public road which provides a transition from one settlement to another
- The individual settlements show a distinctive character/urban form and have a clear urban edge.

To reduce the existing gap to a mere strip towards the bottom of a valley and build on visually prominent land above it would, we fear, destroy its significance as a sustainable barrier to coalescence.

- B.16 Accordingly, we would ask that careful and deep thought be given to the potential social harm should this speculative commercial planning application be approved, risking the independent identity of the village of Combs.

C. Detriment to the Natural Environment

- C.1 Whether the Site should benefit from the protection of paragraph 170(a) of the NPPF we cannot say, but it should not be denied the protection of paragraphs 8(c) and 170(b). Far from *conserving and enhancing the natural environment*, or *recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside*, the proposed development will damage the character of that environment severely and permanently. Paragraph 7.15 of the Applicants' Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) states:

... it is assessed that the landscape character of the Site has the ability ... to absorb change through the introduction of ... residential development...

We profoundly disagree.

- C.2 In a letter dated 26 June 2015, Suffolk County Council's Landscape Development Officer, when assessing this landscape for the Edgecomb Park/Farriers Road development, said this:

...The southernmost part of the site [*which comprises an important portion of the present Site under application*] is in an elevated and visually prominent location. The southernmost part of [that] site also has a weaker relationship with the existing housing. The proposed layout [*ie the Farrier's Road development*] has responded to this by using this area of the site for public open space and not for housing.

C.5 We would ask the Planning Committee to give very considerable weight to the visual prominence of the Site when assessing the adverse impacts on this special and self-contained piece of the natural environment.

Summary and Conclusions

We have no issue with the Applicants' proposition that this proposal should be considered in the context of the presumption at the heart of the NPPF in favour of sustainable development. But this, we maintain, is not *sustainable* development.

The NPPF does not define 'sustainable', but there are pointers in both the 2012 and the 2018 NPPF. The Ministerial Forward to 2012 has this to say:

Sustainable means ensuring that better lives for ourselves doesn't mean worse lives for future generations.

Sustainable development is about change for the better, and not only in our built environment.

The 2018 NPPF says this:

7. ...the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

9. Planning ... decisions should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but in doing so should take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area.

In light of the above guidance in the NPPFs, clogging up Poplar Hill and its associated road systems with 138 more houses-worth of road traffic, on top of the 150 or so still to come from the Farriers Road development, is not 'change for the better', nor does it seem to us to mean a better life for the existing local residents, or for the potential residents, or for future generations of either. We also contend that the residual cumulative impact on the road system would be severe, satisfying the test in paragraph 109 of the NPPF.

If the proposed development were to go ahead we fear that reducing the gap so substantially and changing its character so materially would be the beginning of the end for Combs as an independent village. It may be said that one day whole villages around market towns will inevitably be swallowed up, but if community involvement in town and country planning is to have any meaning, that development must be anticipated and discussed at community level rather than being the unintended consequence of a speculative commercial proposal.

Each of those factors seems to us to take this proposal outside any definition that we understand of 'sustainable'.

If however it is held that the proposed development is after all ‘sustainable’, then we submit that the above two factors together, especially when the detriment to that crucial piece of the natural environment and to the setting of St Mary’s Church is added in the balance, would amount to an impact on the local community so adverse as to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies set out in the Framework taken as a whole.

Yours faithfully

Tony Bamber, Parish Clerk
On behalf of Combs Parish Council

NATURAL ENGLAND'S LOCAL PLANNING CONSULTATION ADVICE FOR DEVELOPMENT WITHIN OR CLOSE TO WOODLAND DESIGNATED SITES

v. August 2017

Natural England's initial screening of this planning application has identified that this proposed development has the potential to adversely affect a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) designated for its woodland interest, i.e. the relevant Impact Risk Zones have been triggered.

The likely impacts arising from the proposal are straightforward to assess with confidence by following the advice notes provided below, and where necessary, requesting further information from the applicant where uncertainties exist. We therefore advise you to review the planning application under consideration, and apply the principles described, as appropriate.

Please note that this advice (where specifically referred to in our consultation response) only applies to development proposals within Essex, Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire, Suffolk and Norfolk planning authorities.

Standing Advice on ancient woodland and veteran trees

Natural England and Forestry Commission have produced [standing advice](#) entitled '*Ancient woodland and veteran trees: protecting them from development*' which outlines what planning authorities should consider for developments near ancient woodland and veteran trees. Advice is given on determining impacts and how to avoid, reduce or compensate for the impacts. Note that planning authorities should refuse planning permission for developments that would lead to loss or deterioration of irreplaceable ancient woodland habitats unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss. This principle is outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 118.

Ancient woodland and veteran trees within the application site

We strongly advise the retention of ancient woodland and veteran trees *within* the application site as they have important roles to perform as local landscape features and possibly as visual screening, as wildlife habitats for woodland species (including NERC Act s41 priority species such as stag beetle) and ecological corridors for mobile species. Depending on the configuration of the proposed development, they may also act as buffers to the designated site.

Larger sites have more options for green infrastructure in general, but we suggest that woodland/veteran trees within the application site are designed into an ecological network / local landscaping which includes connections to other wooded habitat and transitions to semi-natural habitats, such as long grassland.

Reasons for Notification of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)

Background information on SSSIs and their notified interest features can be found on the [Magic map system](#) website. The SSSI citation should be referred to in order to understand the special interest of the SSSI and its sensitivities.

SSSI Impacts which may need to be addressed

(i) Air quality during construction

Best practise measures should be deployed during construction to minimise the likelihood of dust and other airborne pollutants, which in excess can smother leaves and hinder normal photosynthetic functioning of plants.

(ii) Increase in access

Any new access points into the SSSI from adjacent developments should be avoided. If a development shares a boundary with a woodland SSSI, the application should include details of a suitably robust (full height) boundary fence. The SSSI must not be used for access by construction vehicles or storage of materials (even temporarily). For larger sites which may be transferred to a grounds maintenance company, the specification of their responsibilities should include any boundary treatment monitoring and maintenance.

Where public access into the woodland already exists, new housing development is likely to increase visitor pressure to woodland SSSIs, and may result in an increase in impacts such as the trampling of ground flora, and nutrient enrichment from dog waste in particular. General disturbance impacts to other (non-notified) wildlife may also increase. Natural England may provide bespoke advice where in our view these issues are significant for certain SSSIs, either individually or cumulatively, however you may wish to consult with the woodland owner / manager with a view to identifying whether any proportionate developer contribution to specific visitor management measures may be appropriate (such as improved signage, dog bins, path surface treatment etc.).

(iii) Root compaction

An appropriate root protection zone should be clearly marked on plans, and no buildings (or other operations likely to result in soil compaction) should be constructed within this zone. The root protection zone should be in accordance with British Standard BS 5837:2012 '*Trees in relation to design demolition and construction*'. We recommend that the advice of a Tree Officer/professional arboriculturalist is sought where root protection zones may be required.

(iv) Tree surgery works

Trees growing within the SSSI close to the boundary of the application site may also have boughs and branches extending within the red-line boundary. Our advice is that these branches should not be removed or cut back for aesthetic reasons, e.g. to increase light levels to a garden or reduce leaf drop in Autumn, but might be permitted for health and safety reasons. If necessary, the advice of a Tree Officer/professional arboriculturalist should be sought, and a full tree health survey commissioned prior to permission being granted. The site layout may need to be adjusted to take account of both limitations on tree surgery works as well as the root protection zone.

(v) Surface water runoff

During the construction phase, surface water drainage must be directed away from the SSSI, and care should be taken to ensure that contamination does not enter drainage ditches which feed into the SSSI. For the operational phase, SuDS should be used to maximise groundwater infiltration rates where appropriate.

(vi) Foul water disposal

The application should confirm that foul drainage will be to mains sewer. Additional advice may be needed from Natural England if alternative arrangements are proposed. Care should be taken that pollutants do not enter local watercourses feeding the SSSI once development is completed.

(vii) Groundwater changes

Some woodland SSSIs are dependent upon ground-water supplies remaining undisturbed (for example, if there is a significant alder/willow component (wet woodland or carr) within the SSSI). Any activities proposed by the development which might interfere with groundwater supplies, such as increased abstraction, should be assessed as part of the decision-making process.

(viii) Development Buffering

Natural England advises that, notwithstanding any root protection zone required, that a buffer zone of at least 15m between the development and the SSSI should be designed into the layout plan where possible, with the view to ensuring that the SSSI is buffered from any remaining possible impacts (such as increases in lighting and noise), and that the SSSI is sensitively designed into local landscaping. This would also help to reduce anti-social activities, such as fly-tipping.

If the developer requires substantive pre-application advice in addition to that provided above, Natural England advises that the applicant/developer consults Natural England directly, so that they have the opportunity to express an interest in using our chargeable Discretionary Advice Service (DAS).

The first step is for the developer to fill out a simple form, so we can register their interest, and make sure they have the right adviser for their case. Please visit our website (<http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/planningdevelopment/spatialplanning/das/default.aspx>) for more information and a downloadable request form [here](#) .



Historic England

Ms Vanessa Pannell
Mid Suffolk District Council
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich
Suffolk
IP1 2BX

Direct Dial: 01223 582740

Our ref: P001057374

18 April 2019

Dear Ms Pannell

**T&CP (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015
& Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990**

**LAND TO THE EAST OF POPLAR HILL, STOWMARKET, SUFFOLK IP14 2EJ
Application No. DC/19/00662**

Thank you for your letter of 25 March 2019 regarding the above application for planning permission. On the basis of the information available to date, we offer the following advice to assist your authority in determining the application.

Summary

This application seeks outline permission for up to 138 dwellings, public open space, landscaping and access at Land east of Poplar Hill, Stowmarket. The proposed site is currently an agricultural field to the south of Stowmarket. The number of houses proposed has been reduced since a previous application in 2018, but the development would still introduce a large amount of modern housing within the setting of the Church of St Mary which is listed at grade I. Historic England considers that the proposed scheme would have a harmful impact on the significance of St Mary's through development in its setting. Historic England objects to the application as it currently stands due to the harmful impact of the proposed development contrary to the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Historic England Advice

In our advice on the previous application for development of this site (number 2018/2380) we noted how the Church of St Mary stands as a prominent landmark in the rural landscape to the south of Stowmarket which includes the historic settlement of Combs and is clearly visible when approaching Stowmarket along Poplar Hill Road. The church is listed at grade I in recognition of its exceptional level of special architectural and historic interest. It dates from the 14th century with alterations in the 15th and 17th centuries and major restoration works in the 19th century. The tower is late 14th century and is described as 'massive but plain' and is an eye catching feature in the landscape. It is described in Pevsner as 'quite a big church, on its own'. The 1885 OS Map shows St Marys' in a rural setting with open countryside on all sides. However, the expansion of Stowmarket to the south has brought the line of modern development much closer to the north and west boundaries of the church.



Historic England, Brooklands, 24 Brooklands Avenue, Cambridge CB2 8BU
Telephone 01223 58 2749 HistoricEngland.org.uk

Please note that Historic England operates an access to information policy.

Correspondence or information which you send us may therefore become publicly available.





This application proposes the erection of 138 dwellings with public open space, landscaping and access at land east of Poplar Hill which is currently open agricultural land. The proposed development would bring modern development further out into the open countryside surrounding Stowmarket. The proposed development site contributes to the significance of St Marys Church as it reinforces its rural setting. It also forms part of the separation between the two settlements of Stowmarket and Combs. The application is accompanied by a Heritage Statement and Landscape and Visual Appraisal and we have also visited the site and its vicinity. We are of the view that the proposed development would be clearly visible in views both to the church across the valley to the east and from within the churchyard itself. Despite the reduction in the number of housing previously proposed (up to 160 units) the proposed development would still erode the historic rural character of the church by bringing modern development closer to the church. The proposed development would have a harmful impact on the historic significance of the grade I listed church of St Mary through development within its setting.

We appreciate that the northern part of the proposed land is already allocated in the Stowmarket Area Action Plan but this is a smaller portion to the north of the plot. We would not object to development in this area but again express concern if the parcel of land to the northwest boundary of the proposed site were to be a site allocated within the emerging Local Plan. Development in this location could also have the potential to have a harmful impact on the setting of the church through development in its setting.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identifies protection and enhancement of the historic environment as an important element of sustainable development (paragraph 7). Paragraph 193 states that great weight should be given to the heritage asset's conservation and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. In this instance we would stress that asset is grade I listed putting it in the top 2.5% of listed buildings nationally. The NPPF also states that the significance of listed buildings can be harmed or lost by development in their setting (paragraph 194) and that a clear and convincing justification should be made for any harm. Paragraph 196 of the NPPF states that any public benefit deriving from a given development might be weighed against harm to the significance of designated heritage assets by the local planning authority when considering an application. Furthermore, paragraph 200 states that proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to, or better reveal the significance of the heritage assets should be treated favourably.

The proposed scheme would bring modern development further out into the open countryside not only eroding the rural setting of the grade I listed church but also inhibiting the ability to clearly read the two settlements of Stowmarket and Combs as separate. While we consider any development on this site as harmful to the significance of St Mary's Church through development in its setting we would not object to a much reduced scheme within the allocated site of the Stowmarket Area Action Plan. Paragraph 196 states that where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. However, as the application





Historic England

currently stands we would object to the erection of 138 dwellings on the proposed site as it would result in harm to the historic significance to the grade I listed church through development within its setting. We would recommend that your council refuse the application or seek amendments for a much reduced scheme which only includes the allocated site.

Recommendation

Historic England objects to the application on heritage grounds due to the development having a harmful impact on the significance of the grade I listed church of St Marys through development in its setting. We consider that the application does not meet the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraph numbers 7, 193, 194, 196 and 200. In determining this application you should bear in mind the statutory duty of section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

Your authority should take these representations into account in determining the application. If you propose to determine the application in its current form, please inform us of the date of the committee and send us a copy of your report at the earliest opportunity.

Please contact me if we can be of further assistance.

Yours sincerely

Sophie Cattier

Assistant Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas

E-mail: sophie.cattier@HistoricEngland.org.uk



Historic England, Brooklands, 24 Brooklands Avenue, Cambridge CB2 8BU
Telephone 01223 58 2749 HistoricEngland.org.uk

Please note that Historic England operates an access to information policy.

Correspondence or information which you send us may therefore become publicly available.



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

08/03/2019

Dear Gemma,

RE: DC/19/00662 Outline Planning Application (some matters reserved) - Erection of up to 138 dwellings with public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system. Land to the East of Poplar Hill, Stowmarket

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

We previously commented on proposed development of this site under planning application reference DC/18/02380 in our letters of 25th June 2018 and 20th September 2018. We note that this current proposal is for a slightly lower number of dwellings than that previously submitted and that parts of the ecological assessment have been revised following our comments on the previous application. However, we maintain a number of concerns about the potential ecological impacts of the proposed development.

Combs Wood Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)

The application site is located within approximately 500m of Combs Wood Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), the wood is also a Suffolk Wildlife Trust reserve. We note the conclusion in the ecological appraisal report (FPCR, Feb 2019) that as the wood is over 700m from the application site that it is unlikely to be accessed on a daily basis by a significant number of people (paragraph 4.6). The ecological appraisal assesses that the proposed development is likely to result in an additional 32 people a day visiting Combs Wood (paragraph 4.10). This is calculated to be an increase of 6% on the visitor levels currently predicted (paragraph 4.14). The assessment goes on to conclude that such an increase over expected visitor numbers is unlikely to result in a significant impact on the interest features for which Combs Wood is designated.

However, as acknowledged in the paragraph 4.7, the predicted current level of visitors is based on the assumption that all current Stowmarket residents with a dog living within a 2.3-2.6km circular walk of the wood will visit it daily. We consider that this assumption has the potential to significantly downplay the likely increase in visits which could arise as a result of the proposed development. Factors such as distance from the wood, ease of access and attractiveness of walking route will all have an impact on the number of dog walkers currently choosing to visit the site. We therefore consider that the current usage figure calculated using the methodology presented in the report must be considered a maximum. Based on this, it is likely that the number of visitors from the proposed development, which will be closer than much of the existing housing stock used in the calculation, will result in more than a 6% increase. This in turn may result in increased impacts on the wood as a result of greater recreational pressure. Also, notwithstanding the above point, it has not been demonstrated that a 6% increase in daily visitors is not a statistically significant increase.

Paragraph 4.13 of the ecological survey report makes reference to the potential use of other exiting circular walking routes being used to by new residents which would lower the visitor pressure on Combs Wood. Whilst this may be the case, without assessment of the quality of such routes it is not possible to determine how much of an alternative offer they would provide. Also, the report makes reference to the provision of onsite open space with circular walks which will be available, again without any certainty of the habitats proposed in this area it is unclear to what degree they will reduce new recreational pressure on Combs Wood.

Paragraph 175(b) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, Feb 2019) states that “development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted”.

In addition to the above, the mitigation proposed for the development should consent be granted does not include any measures to monitor recreational pressure impacts at Combs Wood or provide remediation if adverse impacts are identified. Notwithstanding the significant concerns set out above, we would expect such monitoring and mitigation measures to be identified and secured (including any necessary financial contributions required) should consent for some level of development be consented at this site.

Priority Habitats and Species

As recognised in the ecological appraisal report, the proposed development would result in the loss of part of a hedgerow assessed as “Important” under the Hedgerow Regulations (1997). The exact degree of loss is unclear from the plans provided in the application, however it is important that the significance of such loss and the degree to which it can be adequately compensated are considered as part of the determination of this application.

Also, the ecological appraisal identifies that the proposed development will result in the loss of nesting habitat for at least two pairs of skylark, a UK Priority species under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act (2006). The appraisal concludes that this loss would be insignificant and therefore no compensation measures are proposed. However, Stowmarket Area Action Plan (AAP) Policy 9.1 (criterion viii) requires that all developments must “implement appropriate mitigation and compensation measures to ensure that there is no net loss in biodiversity in the Stowmarket area”. The uncompensated loss of nesting habitat for skylark would result in the net loss of this species in Stowmarket. Also, the appraisal fails to consider the loss of suitable skylark habitat in-combination with other developments in the area and the impact that this could have on the species.

Conclusion

From the information provided in the application we do not consider that it has been demonstrated that the increase in visitors to Combs Wood SSSI predicted to result from this development will not result in an adverse impact on the wood, or that sufficient mechanisms can be secured to ensure that such impacts do not occur. Also, the proposed development will result in the uncompensated loss of nesting habitat for skylark, contrary to Policy 9.1 of the Stowmarket AAP. We therefore **object** to the application as currently presented.

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

Yours sincerely

James Meyer
Senior Conservation Planner



05 March 2019

Gemma Walker
Mid Suffolk District Council
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich IP1 2BX

By email only

Dear Gemma,

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/19/00662
Location: Land To The East Of Poplar Hill Stowmarket Suffolk IP14 2EJ
Proposal: Outline Planning Application (some matters reserved) - Erection of up to 138 dwellings with public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point from Poplar Hill (re-submission of refused application DC/18/02380).

Thank you consulting Place Services on the above application.

No objection subject to securing mitigation and enhancement measures

Summary

We have reviewed the Ecological Appraisal (FPCR Environment and Design Ltd, February 2018), provided by the applicant, relating to the likely impacts of development on Designated Sites, Protected & Priority species/habitats.

We are satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available for determination.

This provides certainty for the LPA of the likely impacts on Protected and Priority species/habitats and, with appropriate mitigation measures secured, the development can be made acceptable. We also support the reasonable biodiversity enhancements, which should also be secured by a condition of any consent.

This will enable LPA to demonstrate its compliance with its statutory duties including its biodiversity duty under s40 NERC Act 2006.



The ecological mitigation and enhancement measures identified in the Ecological Appraisal (FPCR Environment and Design Ltd, February 2018) should be secured and implemented. This is necessary to conserve Protected and Priority species.

However, we do disagree with the justification provided within the ecological appraisal why compensation measures are not required for Skylarks for this application. Consequently, it is recommended that a Skylark Mitigation Strategy should also be implemented for this application, to compensate for the loss of ground nesting habitats for this Priority species.

The Ecological Appraisal identifies that up to two skylark breeding pairs were likely present within the red line boundary. Therefore, a total of 4 skylark plots (two plots per Skylark territory lost) should be provided within nearby arable land for this application. The plots should follow the methodology for Skylark nest plots following Agri-Environment Scheme option: 'AB4 Skylark Plots' and must be maintained for a minimum period of 10 years.

If an appropriate location for the Skylarks can be provided within land owned by the applicant then this compensation measure can be secured as a condition of any consent. If this cannot be undertaken then the Skylark Plots must be secured via a unilateral legal agreement.

We also note Suffolk Wildlife Trust's previous concerns with this application in regards of the impacts of increased recreation to Combs Wood SSSI. We have assessed the Impact Risk Zones on Magic.defra.gov.uk for this site and have identified that proposed development will trigger consultation with Natural England because it contains more than 100 dwelling. Consequently, we consider that Natural England should be specifically contacted to provide comments on the potential increased visitor numbers to Combs Wood SSSI. At a minimum, we request that promotion to this site should not be provided within any stage of this development.

Impacts will be minimised such that the proposal is acceptable subject to the conditions below based on BS42020:2013.

Submission for approval and implementation of the details below should be a condition of any planning consent.

Recommended conditions:

1. CONCURRENT WITH RESERVED MATTERS: CONSTRUCTION ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

"A construction environmental management plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, prior to commencement of any works.

The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following.

- a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.*



- b) *Identification of “biodiversity protection zones”.*
- c) *Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).*
- d) *The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.*
- e) *The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.*
- f) *Responsible persons and lines of communication.*
- g) *The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.*
- h) *Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.*

The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority”

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

2. CONCURRENT WITH RESERVED MATTERS: SKYLARK MITIGATION STRATEGY

“A Skylark Mitigation Strategy shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority to compensate the loss of two Skylark territories. This shall include the provision of four Skylark nest plots, to be secured by legal agreement or a condition of any consent, in nearby agricultural land, prior to commencement.

The content of the Skylark Mitigation Strategy shall include the following:

- a) *Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed Skylark nest plots;*
- b) *detailed methodology for the Skylark nest plots following Agri-Environment Scheme option: ‘AB4 Skylark Plots’;*
- c) *locations of the Skylark plots by appropriate maps and/or plans;*
- d) *persons responsible for implementing the compensation measure.*

The Skylark Mitigation Strategy shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and all features shall be retained for a minimum period of 10 years.”

Reason: To conserve Priority species allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the NERC Act 2006 (Priority habitats & species)

3. CONCURRENT WITH RESERVED MATTERS: BIODIVERSITY ENHANCEMENT STRATEGY

“A Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy for Protected and Priority species shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The content of the Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy shall 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).*

The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained in that manner thereafter."

Reason: To enhance Protected and Priority Species/habitats and allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority habitats & species).

4. PRIOR TO OCCUPATION: LANDSCAPE AND ECOLOGICAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

"A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to, and be approved in writing by, the local planning authority prior occupation of the development.

The content of the LEMP shall include the following:

- a) *Description and evaluation of features to be managed.*
- b) *Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.*
- c) *Aims and objectives of management.*
- d) *Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives.*
- e) *Prescriptions for management actions.*
- f) *Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period).*
- g) *Details of the body or organization responsible for implementation of the plan.*
- h) *Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.*

The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery. The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme. The approved plan will be implemented in accordance with the approved details."

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

5. PRIOR TO OCCUPATION: WILDLIFE SENSITIVE LIGHTING DESIGN SCHEME

"A lighting design scheme for biodiversity shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall identify those features on site that are particularly sensitive for bats and that are likely to cause disturbance along important routes



used for foraging; and show how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent bats using their territory.

All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the scheme and maintained thereafter in accordance with the scheme. Under no circumstances should any other external lighting be installed without prior consent from the local planning authority.”

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

Please contact me with any queries.

Yours sincerely,

Hamish Jackson BSc (Hons) GradCIEEM MRSB
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.



**Ipswich and East Suffolk
Clinical Commissioning Group**

Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich
Suffolk
IP1 2BX

Email address: planning.apps@suffolk.nhs.uk
Telephone Number – 01473 770000

Your Ref: DC/19/00662

Our Ref: IESCCG/000219/STO

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

28/02/2019

Dear Sirs,

Proposal: Outline Planning Application (some matters reserved) - Erection of up to 138 dwellings with public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point from Poplar Hill (re-submission of refused application DC/18/02380).

Location: Land To The East Of, Poplar Hill, Stowmarket, Suffolk IP14 2EJ

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 Ipswich & East Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).

Background

2. The proposal comprises a development of up to 138 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 is 1 GP practice within a 2km radius of the proposed development, this practice does not have sufficient capacity for the additional growth resulting from this development and 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

High quality care for all, now and for future generations

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.

Premises	Weighted List Size ¹	NIA (m ²) ²	Capacity ³	Spare Capacity (NIA m ²) ⁴
Combs Ford Surgery	8,465	520.62	7,592	-60
Total	8,465	520.62	7,592	-60

Notes:

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 120m² 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 Combs Ford 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.

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

Chris Crisell

Estates Planning Support Officer

Ipswich and East Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group



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/19/00662

Referring to the planning application referenced above, dated 12 February 2019, application for the erection of up to 138 dwellings with public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system and vehicular access point from Poplar Hill, land to the east of Poplar Hill, Stowmarket, Suffolk, IP14 2EJ, 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: 19 February 2019

Name: David Abbott

Position: Spatial Planning Manager

Highways England:

Woodlands, Manton Lane
Bedford MK41 7LW

david.abbott@highwaysengland.co.uk

Annex A

The proposed development is some distance from the Strategic Road Network (SRN). While not insubstantial in scale it is, however, unlikely to result in a severe impact on the SRN. We therefore have no reason to offer any objections in this case.

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: Gemma Walker

Dear Gemma

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

CONSULTATION RETURN: DC/19/00662

PROPOSAL: Outline Planning Application (some matters reserved) - Erection of up to 138 dwellings with public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point from Poplar Hill (re-submission of refused application DC/18/02380).

LOCATION: Land to the East of Poplar Hill Stowmarket IP14 2EJ

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:

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:

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 Poplar Hill adjacent to the site is 43.3mph and the required visibility for the access on the highway can be met.
- the site is likely to generate 71 two-way trips in the AM peak hour and 71 trips in the PM peak hour which is acceptable in this location (approx. 1.2 cars per minute).
- There are records of 2 slight injury accidents on Poplar Hill.
- There has been 15 accidents over the past 5 years on the Ipswich Road/Needham Road/Poplar Hill junction however, there is no pattern to suggest that highway layout or design were a contributory factor.
- The proposed emergency/pedestrian access off Church Road provides connectivity to the local amenities for cyclists and pedestrians.
- The catchment primary school is 0.9 miles and the high school is 1.8 miles from the site; both with continuous footway links.

- The closest bus stops are 0.2 miles from the centre of the site and is within walking distance.

There are no unacceptable impacts on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network (NPPF para 109) therefore, SCC as the LHA does not object to the proposal.

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:

V1 - Condition: Before the access is first used visibility splays shall be provided as shown on Drawing No. P18010-001E with an X dimension of 2.4m and a Y dimension of 106m & 119m 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.

Reason: To ensure vehicles exiting the drive would have sufficient visibility to enter the public highway safely and vehicles on the public highway would have sufficient warning of a vehicle emerging in order to take avoiding action.

AL10 - Condition: Before the development is commenced, details of the access and associated works, (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 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.

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.

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.

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.

TP1 - Condition: Prior to the occupation of any dwelling the Travel Plan dated February 2019 and its requirements must be implemented in full.

Reason: In the interest of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF, and policies SO3 and S06 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2008) and Core Strategy Focused Review (2012)

TP2 - Condition: Within one month of the first occupation of any dwelling, the occupiers of each of the dwellings shall be provided with a Residents Travel Pack (RTP) in accordance with the requirements identified in the Travel Plan. Not less than 3 months prior to the first occupation of any dwelling, the contents of the RTP shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority and shall include walking, cycling and bus maps, latest relevant bus and rail timetable information, car sharing information, personalised travel planning and a multi-modal travel voucher.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF, and policies SO3 and S06 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2008) and Core Strategy Focused Review (2012)

TP3 - Condition: On occupation of the 100th dwelling a revised (or Full) Travel Plan must shall be submitted for the approval in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with the highway authority, which is based on the Travel Plan (dated February 2019). This Travel Plan must contain the following:

- Baseline travel data based upon the information provided in the Transport Assessment and the residents living on the site, with suitable measures, objectives and targets identified targets to reduce the vehicular trips made by residents across the whole development, with suitable remedial measures identified to be implemented if these objectives and targets are not met
- The full contact details of a suitably qualified Travel Plan Coordinator to implement the Travel Plan
- A commitment to monitor the Travel Plan annually on each anniversary of the approval of the Full Travel Plan and provide the outcome in a revised Travel Plan to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for a minimum period of five years, or one year after occupation of the final dwelling (whichever is the longest duration) using the same methodology as the baseline monitoring
- A suitable marketing strategy to ensure that all residents on the site are engaged in the Travel Plan process
- A Travel Plan budget that covers the full implementation of the Travel Plan
- A copy of a residents travel pack that includes a multi-modal voucher to incentivise residents to use sustainable travel in the local area

The approved Travel Plan measures shall be implemented in accordance with a timetable that shall be included in the Travel Plan and shall thereafter adhered to in accordance with the approved Travel Plan.

Reason: In the interest of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF, and policies SO3 and S06 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2008) and Core Strategy Focused Review (2012)

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

Public Transport

There are bus stops that serve the community on Poplar Hill. The transport team would like the applicant to liaise with the Bus Operators and consider the option of bus routes 88/89 diverting into the development and provide bus stops with shelters and RTPI screens within the site. If the route does not divert, a contribution of approx. £5,000 is required to construct or improve bus stops nearby.

Travel Plan

Also as Suffolk County Council (as Highway Authority) is identified in the Travel Plan as the organisation to audit the Travel Plan a Travel Plan Evaluation and Support Contribution of £1,000 per annum for a minimum of five years, or one year after occupation of the final dwelling (whichever is the longest duration) will be required by Suffolk County Council through a Section 106 Agreement to ensure it has suitable financial resource to oversee this discretionary service. This is permitted under Section 93 of the 2003 Local Government Act, Section 3 of the 2011 Localism Act, and in accordance with the outcomes of the recent Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government Developer Contributions Consultation. Failure to pay this contribution is likely to lead to failure with the Travel Plan, as Suffolk County Council will not be adequately resourced to oversee the implementation, monitoring and target setting requirements with the Travel Plan. A full breakdown of how the contribution will be spent can be submitted on request of Mid-Suffolk District Council or the Applicant.

Suffolk County Council can also produce the Travel Pack on behalf of the applicant if a suitable Section 106 contribution and obligations can be secured. Full wording for the proposed Section 106 obligations can be supplied at a later date if planning permission is granted.

The requirement for a Travel Plan is justified under National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 108, which states that in assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:

- appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location
- safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and
- any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.

Paragraph 111 requires that all developments that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed.

Other relevant paragraphs include 102, 103 and 110 as well as the “Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements” section of the 2014 Planning Practice Guidance.

In addition, a decent quality Travel Plan will support Strategic Objectives SO3 and SO6 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2008) and Core Strategy Focused Review (2012).

Yours sincerely,

Samantha Harvey

Senior Development Management Engineer

Growth, Highways and Infrastructure

Your ref: DC/19/00662
Our ref: Stowmarket – land to the east of
Poplar Hill 00058115
Date: 14 February 2019
Enquiries: Neil McManus
Tel: 07973 640625
Email: neil.mcmanus@suffolk.gov.uk

Mrs Gemma Walker,
Growth & Sustainable Planning,
Mid Suffolk District Council,
Endeavour House,
8 Russell Road,
Ipswich,
Suffolk,
IP1 2BX

Dear Gemma,

Stowmarket: land to the east of Poplar Hill – developer contributions

I refer to the proposal: outline planning application (some matters reserved) – erection of up to 138 dwellings with public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point from Poplar Hill (re-submission of refused application DC/18/02380).

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. The risk here is that individual developer-led applications are granted planning permission without proper consideration being given to the cumulative impacts on essential infrastructure including highway impacts and school provision.

The District Council Joint Local Plan consultation document (Regulation 18) was published on 21 August 2017. The merits of this development proposal must be considered against this emerging document, plus other local planning policies and the NPPF. It is suggested that consideration should be had to the published call for sites submission document (April 2017) – with an initial consideration by the District's planning policy team set out in the SHELAA (August 2017). The SHELAA identifies sites considered with potential capacity for future development and sites which have been discounted.

This letter sets out the infrastructure requirements which arise, most of which will be covered by CIL apart from site specific mitigation.

Whilst most infrastructure requirements will be covered under Mid Suffolk District Council's Regulation 123 list of the CIL charging schedule it is nonetheless the Government's intention that all development must be sustainable as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). On this basis, the County Council sets out below the infrastructure implications with costs, if planning permission is granted and implemented.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 56 sets out the requirements of planning obligations, which are that they must be:

- a) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- b) Directly related to the development; and,
- c) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

The County and District Councils have a shared approach to calculating infrastructure needs, in the adopted Section 106 Developers Guide to Infrastructure Contributions in Suffolk.

Mid Suffolk District Council adopted their Core Strategy in September 2008 and Focused Review in December 2012. The Core Strategy includes the following objectives and policies relevant to providing infrastructure:

- Objective 6 seeks to ensure provision of adequate infrastructure to support new development; this is implemented through Policy CS6: Services and Infrastructure.
- Policy FC1 and FC1.1 apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development in Mid Suffolk.

The Mid Suffolk Stowmarket Area Action Plan (SAAP) was adopted in 2013 and Policy 11.1 covers Developer Contributions to Infrastructure Delivery.

The emerging Joint Local Plan contains policy proposals that will form an important tool for the day to day determination of planning application in both districts. Infrastructure is one of the key planning issues and the Infrastructure chapter (page 65, Babergh & Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan: Consultation Draft – August 2017) states that the Councils fully appreciate that the delivery of new homes and jobs needs to be supported by necessary infrastructure, and new development must provide for the educational needs of new residents.

The Joint Local Plan proposals include:

- a) All new development should be supported by, and have good access to, all necessary infrastructure. Planning Permission will only be granted if it can be demonstrated that there is, or will be, sufficient infrastructure capacity to support and meet all the necessary requirements arising from the proposed development (Page 67, Babergh & Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan: Consultation Draft – August 2017).
- b) A draft policy is similarly drafted to address education provision as follows: Development must be supported by provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified to serve the needs arising from new development (Page 67, Babergh & Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan: Consultation Draft – August 2017).

Under Strategic policies in paragraph 20 of the NPPF it says “Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision (in line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development) for:

c) community facilities (such as health, education and cultural infrastructure).”

Under Decision-making in paragraph 38 of the NPPF it says “Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.”

In determining applications paragraph 48 of the NPPF says “Local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- a) the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- b) the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- c) the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).”

Community Infrastructure Levy

Mid Suffolk District Council adopted a CIL Charging Schedule on 21 January 2016 and charges CIL on planning permissions granted after 11 April 2016. Regulation 123 requires Mid Suffolk to publish a list of infrastructure projects or types of infrastructure that it intends will be, or may be, wholly or partly funded by CIL.

The current Mid Suffolk 123 List, dated January 2016, includes the following as being capable of being funded by CIL rather than through planning obligations:

- Provision of passenger transport
- Provision of library facilities
- Provision of additional pre-school places at *existing* establishments
- Provision of primary school places at *existing* schools
- Provision of secondary, sixth form and further education places
- Provision of waste infrastructure

As of 06 April 2015, the 123 Regulations restrict the use of pooled contributions towards items that may be funded through the levy. The requirements being sought here would be requested through CIL, and therefore would meet the new legal test. It is anticipated that the District Council is responsible for monitoring infrastructure contributions being sought.

The details of the impact on local infrastructure serving the development is set out below and will form the basis of a future CIL bid for funding:

1. Education. The revised NPPF says in paragraph 94, 'It is important 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. They should:

- a) give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools through the preparation of plans and decisions on applications; and
- b) work with schools promoters, delivery partners and statutory bodies to identify and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted.'

Furthermore, the NPPF at paragraph 104 states: 'Planning policies should:

- a) support an appropriate mix of uses across an area, and within larger scale sites, to minimise the number and length of journeys needed for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities;'

SCC anticipates the following **minimum** pupil yields from a development of 138 dwellings, namely:

- a) Primary school age range, 5-11: 34 pupils. Cost per place is £12,181 (2018/19 costs).
- b) Secondary school age range, 11-16: 24 pupils. Cost per place is £18,355 (2018/19 costs).
- c) Secondary school age range, 16+: 5 pupils. Costs per place is £19,907 (2018/19 costs).

The local schools are Combs Ford Primary (catchment school and 2nd nearest to the proposed development), Trinity Church of England Voluntary Aided Primary School (nearest), Abbot's Hall Community Primary School (3rd nearest), and Stowmarket High School. All 3 primary schools are within 2 miles walking distance from the proposed development.

Based on existing forecasts, SCC will have no surplus places available at the local schools. On this basis, at the primary school level a future CIL funding bid of at least £414,154 (2018/19 costs) will be made and at the secondary school level a future CIL funding bid of at least £540,055 (2018/19 costs) will be made.

2. Pre-school provision. Education for early years should be considered as part of addressing the requirements of the NPPF Section 8: 'Promoting healthy and safe communities'

The Childcare Act 2006 places a range of duties on local authorities regarding the provision of sufficient, sustainable and flexible childcare that is responsive to

parents' needs. Local authorities are required to take a lead role in facilitating the childcare market within the broader framework of shaping children's services in partnership with the private, voluntary and independent sector. Section 7 of the Act sets out a duty to secure funded early years provision of the equivalent of 15 hours funded education per week for 38 weeks of the year for children from the term after their third birthday until they are of compulsory school age. The Education Act 2011 places a statutory duty on local authorities to ensure the provision of early education for every disadvantaged 2-year-old the equivalent of 15 hours funded education per week for 38 weeks. The Childcare Act 2016 places a duty on local authorities to secure the equivalent of 30 hours funded childcare for 38 weeks of the year for qualifying children from September 2017 – this entitlement only applies to 3 and 4 years old of working parents.

From these development proposals SCC would anticipate up to 22 pre-school children arising which is equivalent to 13 FTE places, at a cost per FTE place of £8,333.

This proposed development is in the Stowmarket South ward, where there is an existing surplus of places.

3. Play space provision. This should be considered as part of addressing the requirements of the NPPF Section 8: 'Promoting healthy and safe communities.' A key document is the 'Quality in Play' document fifth edition published in 2016 by Play England.

4. Transport issues. Refer to the NPPF 'Section 9 Promoting sustainable transport'.

A comprehensive assessment of highways and transport issues will be required as part of the planning application. This will include travel plan, pedestrian & 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 as appropriate, and infrastructure delivered to adoptable standards via Section 38 and Section 278. Suffolk County Council FAO Sam Harvey will coordinate this.

Paragraph 102 of the NPPF says Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that:

- a) the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed;
- b) opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised – for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated;
- c) opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued;
- d) the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account – including appropriate opportunities for

avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains;
and

- e) patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places.

Paragraph 104 says that planning policies should provide for high quality walking and cycling networks and supporting facilities such as cycle parking (drawing on Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans).

Paragraph 109 says development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

Paragraph 110 says applications for development should:

- a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use;
- b) address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport;
- c) create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards;
- d) allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles; and
- e) be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.

Paragraph 111 says that all developments that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed.

A planning obligation or planning conditions will cover site specific matters.

Suffolk County Council, in its role as local Highway Authority, has worked with the local planning authorities to develop county-wide technical guidance on parking which replaces the preceding Suffolk Advisory Parking Standards (2002) in light of new national policy and local research. It has been subject to public consultation and was adopted by Suffolk County Council in November 2014.

5. Libraries. Refer to the NPPF Section 8: 'Promoting healthy and safe communities'.

The libraries and archive infrastructure provision topic paper sets out the detailed approach to how contributions are calculated. A CIL contribution of £216 per dwelling is sought i.e. £29,808, which will be spent on enhancing provision at the nearest 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.

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.

Household Waste and Recycling Centre – Old Bury Road, Stowmarket IP14 1JQ: Already at capacity and significantly challenged. Current issues are:

- Footprint (m2) is small for number of visitors and tonnages received
 - Restricted parking space for visitors to utilise and access all recyclables containers
 - Restricted number of containers on site
 - No available space to add material streams to recycle or add reuse facility
- Traffic queuing at busy times due to challenging access arrangements
 - Access off the highway is from one way only
- Complaints regarding queues and noise
- No available land around current site to expand
- Site closes for safety reasons when containers are exchanged

SCC has a project underway to identify a new HWRC site for the Stowmarket catchment area. Likely cost of a new HWRC is between £3m and £5m. This is a priority site in the Waste Infrastructure Strategy and it is hoped that budget will be identified for this purpose. However, the Waste Service would expect CIL contributions of £110 per household from any significant development in this area. In this case a sum in the region of £15,180 would be applicable.

- 7. Supported Housing.** Section 5 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, needs to be considered in accordance with paragraphs 61 to 64 of the NPPF.

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 LPAs housing team to identify local housing needs.

- 8. Sustainable Drainage Systems.** Section 14 of the NPPF seeks to meet the challenges of climate change, flooding and coastal change. Paragraphs 155 – 165 refer to planning and flood risk and paragraph 165 states: 'Major developments should incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate. The systems used should:

- a) take account of advice from the lead local flood authority;
- b) have appropriate proposed minimum operational standards;
- c) have maintenance arrangements in place to ensure an acceptable standard of operation for the lifetime of the development; and
- d) where possible, provide multifunctional benefits.'

In accordance with the NPPF, when considering a major development (of 10 dwellings or more), sustainable drainage systems should be provided unless demonstrated to be inappropriate.

A consultation response will be coordinated by Suffolk County Council FAO Jason Skilton.

- 9. Ecology, landscape & heritage.** These are matters for Mid Suffolk District Council to consider and address. In terms of good design, it is suggested that consideration should be given to incorporating suitable roosting and nesting boxes within dwellings for birds and bats, as well as providing suitable biodiversity features including plants to attract & support insects, reptiles, birds & mammals.

10. Health impact assessment. An assessment of the likely impact of the development proposals on local health infrastructure, facilities and funding will need to be undertaken, in conjunction with a methodology to be agreed with NHS England.

11. Fire Service. Any fire hydrant issues will need to be covered by appropriate planning conditions. SCC would strongly recommend the installation of automatic fire sprinklers. The Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service requests that early consideration is given during the design stage of the development for both access for fire vehicles and the provisions of water for fire-fighting which will allow SCC to make final consultations at the planning stage.

12. Superfast broadband. This should be considered as part of the requirements of the NPPF Section 10 'Supporting high quality communication'. 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 improving 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.

13. Legal costs. SCC will require an undertaking from the applicant for the reimbursement of its reasonable legal costs associated with work on a S106A for site specific mitigation, whether or not the matter proceeds to completion.

14. The above information is time-limited for 6 months only from the date of this letter.

The above will form the basis of a future bid to Mid Suffolk District Council for CIL funds if planning permission is granted and implemented.

Yours sincerely,

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

cc Carol Barber, Suffolk County Council
Sam Harvey, Suffolk County Council
Floods Planning, Suffolk County Council

Your ref: DC/19/00662
Our ref: Stowmarket – land to the east of
Poplar Hill 00058115
Date: 20 February 2019
Enquiries: Neil McManus
Tel: 07973 640625
Email: neil.mcmanus@suffolk.gov.uk

Mrs Gemma Walker,
Growth & Sustainable Planning,
Mid Suffolk District Council,
Endeavour House,
8 Russell Road,
Ipswich,
Suffolk,
IP1 2BX

Dear Gemma,

Stowmarket: land to the east of Poplar Hill – developer contributions

I refer to the proposal: outline planning application (some matters reserved) – erection of up to 138 dwellings with public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point from Poplar Hill (re-submission of refused application DC/18/02380).

This letter provides an update to the consultation response set out in my letter dated 14 February 2019 in respect of pre-school matters.

From these development proposals SCC would anticipate up to 22 pre-school children arising which is equivalent to 13 FTE places, at a cost per FTE place of £8,333.

This proposed development is in the Stowmarket South Ward, where there is an existing deficit of places. On this basis, a future CIL funding bid of at least £108,329 (2018/19 costs) will be made to Mid Suffolk District Council.

Yours sincerely,

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

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

Sent: 25 March 2019 12:50

To: BMSDC Planning Area Team Blue <planningblue@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>

Cc: Gemma Walker <Gemma.Walker@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>

Subject: 2019-03- Land To The East Of, Poplar Hill, Stowmarket, Suffolk IP14 2EJ Ref DC/19/00662

Dear Gemma Walker,

Subject: Land To The East Of, Poplar Hill, Stowmarket, IP14 2EJ Ref DC/19/00662

Suffolk County Council, Flood and Water Management have reviewed application ref DC/19/00622.

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

- Site Location Plan (No reference)
- Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy Ref 881399-R3(01)-FRA Issue 03

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. Further infiltration testing on the site in accordance with BRE 365 and the use of infiltration as the means of drainage if the infiltration rates and groundwater levels show it to be possible;
 - c. 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} or 2l/s/ha for all events up to the critical 1 in 100 year rainfall events including climate change as specified in the FRA;
 - d. 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;
 - e. 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;
 - f. 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;
 - g. 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:

- i. Method statements, scaled and dimensioned plans and drawings detailing surface water management proposals to include :-
 1. Temporary drainage systems
 2. Measures for managing pollution / water quality and protecting controlled waters and watercourses
 3. Measures for managing any on or offsite flood risk associated with construction
- h. Details of the maintenance and management of the surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The scheme shall be fully implemented as approved.

Reasons: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage and disposal of surface water from the site for the lifetime of the development. To ensure the development does not cause increased flood risk, or pollution of watercourses or groundwater. To ensure clear arrangements are in place for ongoing operation and maintenance of the disposal of surface water drainage.

<https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/flooding-and-drainage/guidance-on-development-and-flood-risk/construction-surface-water-management-plan/>

2. 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 2010 in order to enable the proper management of flood risk with the county of Suffolk.

<https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/flooding-and-drainage/flood-risk-asset-register/>

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 2017
- 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 1991
- Any works to a main river may require an environmental permit

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

Our Ref: 19_01282
Your Ref: DC/19/00662

20 March 2019

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: Outline Planning Application (some matters reserved) - Erection of up to 138 dwellings with public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point from Poplar Hill (re-submission of refused application DC/18/02380) at Land to the East of Poplar Hill Stowmarket Suffolk IP14 2EJ.

Please be aware that the site has been screened as being near to the Internal Drainage District (IDD) of the East Suffolk IDB which is a Member Internal Drainage Board (IDB) of the Water Management Alliance. Please see our website (https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/ESIDB_Index_plan.pdf) for detailed mapping of each Board's District. In order to avoid conflict between the planning process and the relevant Board's regulatory regime and consenting process please be aware of the following:

We note that due to unsuitable ground conditions, the applicant is not able to discharge their surface water through the use of infiltration features. Therefore the applicant intends to discharge to an existing watercourse adjacent to the site boundary. The proposed development will require land drainage consent in line with the Board's byelaws (specifically byelaw 3). Any consent granted will likely be conditional, pending the payment a surface water development contribution fee, calculated in line with the Board's charging policy. This policy is available using the following link https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/WMA_Table_of_Charges_and_Fees.pdf.

Whilst the consenting process as set out under the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the aforementioned Byelaws are separate from planning, the ability to implement a planning permission may be dependent on the granting of these consents. As such we strongly recommend that any application to discharge is made to the board prior to determination of the planning application.

Yours sincerely,

Jessica Nobbs
Flood and Water Officer
Water Management Alliance



Mr R Pipe (Chairman) Mr J Foskett (Vice-Chairman)

Mr P J Camamile (Chief Executive)



Cert No. GB11990

Cert No. GB11991

Dear Gemma

Public Rights of Way Response

Thank you for your consultation, and please accept my apologies for the late 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.

Footpath 43 Stowmarket is recorded adjacent to the south eastern border of the proposed development area, and within the blue edged land marked as also being controlled by the applicant.

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

Kind regards

Alexandra Maher
Green Access Officer

Rights of Way and Access Team
Suffolk Highways
Suffolk County Council
Phoenix House, 3 Goddard Road, Ipswich, IP1 5NP
Tel: 01473 264769
Mobile: 07543 237698

www.suffolk.gov.uk



www.discoversuffolk.org.uk www.suffolkwalkingfestival.co.uk



Growth, Highways and Infrastructure
Bury Resource Centre
Hollow Road
Bury St Edmunds
Suffolk
IP32 7AY

Philip Isbell
Corporate Manager - Development Manager
Planning Services
Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich IP1 2BX

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

Our Ref: 2018_02380
2019_00662

Date: 20th May 2019

For the Attention of Gemma Walker

Dear Mr Isbell

Planning Application DC/18/02380 and DC/19/00662 – Land east of Poplar Hill, Stowmarket: Archaeology

This site is located in an area of very high archaeological potential, as recorded on the County Historic Environment Record. Roman and medieval archaeological remains were identified during archaeological investigations immediately to the north-west (COM 041) and large scatters of finds dating from the Mesolithic to post-medieval periods have been located in the immediate vicinity (COM 25 and 045). The Grade I medieval church of St Mary (COM 012) is situated to the east, as well as associated medieval and post-medieval earthwork remains (COM 007, 009 and 010). Historic mapping also records this land parcel as mill field, suggesting the presence of a mill either within or in close proximity to the development area (COM 090). This site is also an area that is topographically favourable for early occupation, overlooking a tributary of the Rattlesden River. Geophysical survey at the site identified a number of anomalies with the potential to be archaeological in origin. A first phase of low-level trial trenched evaluation, primarily aiming to characterise the geophysical survey anomalies, identified a number of archaeological features, potentially of prehistoric date, as well as finds dated from the prehistoric to the post-medieval periods, although some of the anomalies were demonstrated to be non-archaeological in origin. On the basis of the initial evaluation results and the fact that much of the site has yet to be subject to trial trenched evaluation, there is high potential for additional archaeological remains to be present within the site which could be damaged or destroyed by development.

Taking into account the results of the geophysical survey and first phase of trial trenched evaluation, we would advise that 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 199), 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, a second phase of 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/>

Historic England have provided advice regarding the impact of development proposals upon the setting of the Grade I listed church and SCCAS would support that this requires careful assessment given the significance of this heritage asset.

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

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

Fire Business Support Team
Floor 3, Block 2
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich, Suffolk
IP1 2BX

Your Ref:
Our Ref: FS/F221400
Enquiries to: Water Officer
Direct Line: 01473 260588
E-mail: Fire.BusinessSupport@suffolk.gov.uk
Web Address: <http://www.suffolk.gov.uk>

Date: 13/02/2019

Dear Sir/Madam

Land off Poplar Hill, Stowmarket IP14 2EJ
Planning Application No: DC/19/0062/OUT

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 firefighting, 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. Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service recommends that proper consideration be given to the potential life safety, economic, environmental and social benefits derived from the provision of an

OFFICIAL

automatic fire sprinkler system. (Please see sprinkler information enclosed with this letter).

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 firefighting 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

Water Officer

Water Officer
Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service

c.c. Gladman
Gladman House
Alexandria Way
Congleton
CW12 1LB

Enc. Sprinkler Letter

Mid Suffok District Council
Endeavour House
Russell Road
Ipswich
IP1 2BX

Fire Business Support Team
Floor 3, Block 2
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich, Suffolk
IP1 2BX

Your Ref:
Our Ref: ENG/AK
Enquiries to: Water Officer
Direct Line: 01473 260588
E-mail: Fire.Businesssupport@suffolk.gov.uk
Web Address: www.suffolk.gov.uk

Date: 13 February 2019

Planning Ref: DC/19/00662/OUT

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: PROVISION OF WATER FOR FIRE FIGHTING
ADDRESS: Land off Poplar Hill, Stowmarket IP14 2EJ
DESCRIPTION: 138 Dwellings
NO: HYDRANTS POSSIBLY REQUIRED:

If the Planning Authority is minded to grant approval, the Fire Authority will request that adequate provision is made for fire hydrants, by the imposition of a suitable planning condition at the planning application stage.

If the Fire Authority is not consulted at the planning stage, the Fire Authority will request that fire hydrants be installed retrospectively on major developments if it can be proven that the Fire Authority was not consulted at the initial stage of planning.

The planning condition will carry a life term for the said development and the initiating agent/developer applying for planning approval and must be transferred to new ownership through land transfer or sale should this take place.

Fire hydrant provision will be agreed upon when the water authorities submit water plans to the Water Officer for Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service.

Where a planning condition has been imposed, the provision of fire hydrants will be fully funded by the developer and invoiced accordingly by Suffolk County Council.

OFFICIAL

Until Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service receive confirmation from the water authority that the installation of the fire hydrant has taken place, the planning condition will not be discharged.

Should you require any further information or assistance I will be pleased to help.

Yours faithfully

Water Officer

Water Officer
Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEMORANDUM

TO: Gemma Walker – Area Manager Planning
From: Julie Abbey-Taylor, Professional Lead – Housing Enabling
Date: 01.03/2019

SUBJECT: - Application Reference: DC/19/00662

Proposal: Application for Outline Planning permission for erection of up to 138 dwellings on land east of Poplar Hill, Stowmarket.

Key Points

1. Background Information

A development proposal for up to One hundred and thirty-eight (138) dwellings on land east of Poplar Hill, Combs, Stowmarket. The previous application for 160 dwellings was refused in 2018.

This is an open market development and offers 48 affordable housing units on the site which = 35%.
--

2. Housing Need Information:

2.1 The Ipswich Housing Market Area, Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SMHA) document, updated in 2017, confirms a continuing need for housing across all tenures and a growing need for affordable housing. A new SHMA is currently being written but outcomes are not available at the time of this consultation.

2.2 The 2017 SHMA indicates that in Mid Suffolk there is a need for **94 new affordable homes per annum**.

2.3 Furthermore, by bedroom numbers the affordable housing mix should equate to:

Ref2 Estimated proportionate demand for affordable new housing stock by bedroom number	
Bed Nos	% of total new affordable stock
1	46%

2	36%
3	16%
4+	2%

2.4 This compares to the estimated proportionate demand for new housing stock by bedroom size across all tenures.

Estimated proportionate demand for all tenure new housing stock by bedroom number	
Bed Nos	% of total new stock
1	18%
2	29%
3	46%
4+	6%

2.5 The Council's 2014 Suffolk Housing Needs Survey shows that there is high demand for smaller homes, across all tenures, both for younger people, who may be newly forming households, and also for older people who are already in the property-owning market and require different, appropriate housing, enabling them to downsize. Affordability issues are the key drivers for this increased demand for smaller homes.

2.6 The Council's Choice Based Lettings system currently has circa **730** applicants registered for affordable housing in Mid Suffolk at January 2019.

2.7 The Council's Choice Based Lettings system currently has circa 350 applicants registered for affordable housing, who are seeking accommodation in Stowmarket as at 2019. This site is a S106 planning obligation site so the affordable housing provided will be to meet district wide need hence the **730** applicants registered is the important number.

3. Preferred Mix for Open Market homes.

Inclusion of 2 and 3 bed bungalows/ chalet bungalows

At least 25% 2 bed roomed houses/flats

Some 4 bed roomed but the rest to be 3 bed roomed houses.

Open market housing mix needs to demonstrate how this site will contribute to the provision of housing for older people as Mid Suffolk has an increasing ageing population.

- The **2014 Suffolk Housing Survey** shows that, across Mid Suffolk district:
 - 12% of all existing households contain someone looking for their own property over the next 3 years (mainly single adults without children). The types of properties they are interested in are flats / apartments, and smaller terraced or semi-detached houses. Although this is not their first preference, many accept that the private rented sector is their most realistic option.

- 25% of households think their current property will not be suitable for their needs in 10 years' time.
- 2 & 3 bed properties are most sought after by existing households wishing to move.
- Suitable housing options for more elderly people are less available within the current housing stock. 6% of all households have elderly relatives who may need to move to Suffolk within the next 3 years.

4. Preferred mix for Affordable Housing

4.1 The most recent information from the Mid Suffolk's Council's Housing Register shows circa.350 applicants registered who have a connection to Stowmarket.

4.2 48 of the proposed dwellings on the development will be for affordable housing.

The mix for a total of 48 dwellings we would require is the following: -

Rented 36 dwellings: -

4 x 1 bed 2-person flats @ 50 sqm
 4 x 2 bed 4-person flats @ 70 sqm
 4 x 2 bed 3-person bungalows @ 61 sqm
 2 x 2 bed 4-person bungalows @ 70 sqm
 16 x 2 bed 4-person houses @ 79 sqm
 6 x 3 bed 5-person houses @ 93 sqm

Shared ownership 12 dwellings: -

8 x 2 bed 4-person houses @ 79 sqm
 4 x 3 bed 5-person houses @ 93 sqm

The above mix is requested and to be included in the S106 agreement.

5. Other requirements for affordable homes:

- Properties must be built to current Nationally Described Space standards as published March 2015. Paragraph 9.16 states that the properties do meet this standard although no floor areas have been provided.
- The council is granted 100% nomination rights to all the affordable units on all first lets and that all allocations are made through the Choice-based lettings system known as Gateway to Homechoice
- Adequate parking provision is made for the affordable housing units and inclusion of cycle storage/sheds.

Julie Abbey-Taylor, Professional Lead – Housing Enabling

Dear Gemma

EP Reference : 255423

DC/19/00662. Land Contamination

Land To The East Of, Poplar Hill, STOWMARKET, Suffolk, IP14 2EJ.

Outline Planning Application (some matters reserved) - Erection of up to 138 dwellings with public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point from Poplar Hill etc

Many thanks for your request for comments in relation to the above application. Having reviewed the application I can confirm that I have no objection to the proposed development from the perspective of land contamination. I would only request that the LPA are contacted in the event of unexpected ground conditions being encountered during construction and that the below minimum precautions are undertaken until such time as the LPA responds to the notification. I would also advise that the developer is made aware that the responsibility for the safe development of the site lies with them.

Kind regards

Nathan

Nathan Pittam BSc. (Hons.) PhD

Senior Environmental Management Officer

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils – Working Together

Email: Nathan.pittam@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

Work: 07769 566988 / 01449 724715

websites: www.babergh.gov.uk www.midsuffolk.gov.uk

From: Andy Rutson-Edwards <Andy.Rutson-Edwards@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 February 2019 11:24
To: Gemma Walker <Gemma.Walker@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Cc: BMSDC Planning Area Team Blue <planningblue@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: DC/19/00662

EH Ref: WK/000255425

APPLICATION FOR OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION - DC/19/00662 Proposal: Outline Planning Application (some matters reserved) - Erection of up to 138 dwellings with public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point from Poplar Hill (re-submission of refused application DC/18/02380).

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

In line with the comments made by EH on the previous application, the overall noise levels in the locality remain similar therefore comments made here are in line with the previous consultation response:

The Noise Assessment Report submitted with this application, prepared by Noise Consultants Ltd (Doc Ref: NJ1024A/1/F5) dated 28th January 2019, demonstrates that with standard double-glazing and trickle ventilation to the proposed dwellings, there should not be significant adverse impacts on the occupiers. I would advise, however, that the recommended mitigation measure of ensuring that amenity areas fronting Poplar Hill are located no closer than 15m from the carriageway edge, is controlled by condition.

The application site is close to existing residential dwellings and for this reason there is a risk of loss of amenity during the construction phase of the development. I would, therefore, recommend that a construction management plan be required by means of condition.

Such a plan shall include details of operating hours (which shall be limited to 08.00hrs – 18.00hrs Monday – Friday, 09.00hrs – 13.00hrs on Saturdays, with no working to take place on Sundays, Public or Bank Holidays. Deliveries should also be limited to these hours), 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, waste removal, temporary buildings and boundary treatments, dust management, noise management and litter management during the construction phase of the development. Thereafter, the approved construction plan shall be fully implemented and adhered to during the construction phase, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Note: the Construction Management Plan shall cover both 'site clearance' and the construction phase of the above development and there shall be no burning of waste.

Lighting At this stage it is not possible to adequately assess the impact of lighting from the proposed development. It is, therefore, recommended that a condition be attached to any permission requiring full details of the scheme of lighting including a polar luminance diagram based on vertical luminance at the site boundary and at the nearest residential properties if these will be affected.

Regards

Andy

Andy Rutson-Edwards, MCIEH AMIOA
Senior Environmental Protection Officer

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council - Working Together

Tel: 01449 724727

Email andy.rutson-edwards@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

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

From: Nathan Pittam <Nathan.Pittam@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 February 2019 14:37
To: Gemma Walker <Gemma.Walker@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Cc: BMSDC Planning Area Team Blue <planningblue@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: DC/19/00662. Air Quality

Dear Gemma

EP Reference : 255490
DC/19/00662. Air Quality
Land To The East Of, Poplar Hill, STOWMARKET, Suffolk, IP14 2EJ.
Outline Planning Application (some matters reserved) - Erection of up to 138 dwellings with public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point from Poplar Hill etc

Many thanks for your request for comments in relation to the above application from the perspective of air quality. Having reviewed the air quality assessment from AQC I can confirm that I am in agreement with the findings of the assessment that the likelihood of the development adversely impacting on the existing good air quality is low and as such I have no objection to the proposed development from the perspective of air quality.

For details regarding how Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils approaches Air Quality including current reports and data, please view our website at <https://www.babergh.gov.uk/environment/air-quality/>. It should be noted that any documentation submitted in relation to a planning application should be sent directly to the Development Management Team and not the Environmental Protection Team as this may lead to delays in the planning process

Kind regards

Nathan

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

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils – Working Together

Email: Nathan.pittam@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk
Work: 07769 566988 / 01449 724715
websites: www.babergh.gov.uk www.midsuffolk.gov.uk

Dear Sir/Madam

It is acknowledged that the application is for outline permission but 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.

It is disappointing that the only reference to the topic of energy/climate change/carbon emissions is paragraph 5.8.1 which confirms the development will meet building regulation standards. For such a significant development it is hoped that forethought is given to this topic and measures offered to mitigate impact.

Our recommendation is refusal of permission but should permission be granted we request a condition is imposed which requires:

Before works extend beyond foundation level an Energy Strategy detailing how the development can secure the required energy efficiency and sustainability standards of the Local Planning Authority shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved Energy Strategy and shall not commence above ground level until full Design Stage calculations under the National Calculation Method have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority demonstrating that the development is capable of achieving the required standard in accordance with the approved Energy Strategy, and any subsequent approved revisions.

The document should clearly set out the unqualified commitments the applicant is willing to undertake on the topics of energy and water conservation, CO2 reduction, resource conservation, use of sustainable materials and provision for electric vehicles.

Clear commitments and minimum standards should be declared and phrases such as 'where possible, subject to, where feasible' must not be used.

Evidence should be included where appropriate demonstrating the applicants previous good work and standards achieved in areas such as site waste management, eg what recycling rate has the applicant achieved in recent projects to show that their % recycling rate commitment is likely.

Guidance can be found at the following locations:

<https://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/environment/environmental-management/planning-requirements/>
<https://www.babergh.gov.uk/environment/environmental-management/planning-requirements/>

Iain Farquharson

Senior Environmental Management Officer
Babergh Mid Suffolk Council

BB01449 724878 / 07860 827027

//iain.farquharson@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

Consultation Response Pro forma

1	Application Number	DC/19/00662	
2	Date of Response	05/03/2019	
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 conditions	
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>Ensure that the development is suitable for a 32 tonne Refuse Collection Vehicle to manoeuvre around attached are the vehicle specifications.</p>  <p>OLYMPUS - 8x4MS Wide - Euro 6 - Smo</p> <p>Wheeled bin presentation points are required to be plotted on a map for approval and placed at the edge of the curtilage or proposed bin store.</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	Meet the conditions in 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.

Gemma

Please refer to my comments for previous application DC/18/02380.

Regards

David

David Pizzey FArborA

Arboricultural Officer

Tel: 01449 724555

david.pizzey@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

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

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils – Working Together

The Stowmarket Society

Planning Services
Mid Suffolk District Council
Endeavour House
Russell Road
Ipswich
IP1 2BX

3 March 2019

Dear Sirs

DC/18/00662 | Outline Planning Application- Erection of up to 138 No. dwellings with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system and creation of new vehicular access. | Land To The East Of Poplar Hill Stowmarket

The Stowmarket Society would like to register its objection to this proposal.

Over recent years, much thought has been given into finding sites which are suitable for accommodating the expansion of Stowmarket. This site has been considered as part of that process, and rejected as inappropriate. Nothing has changed recently which could alter that conclusion.

As with the previous application on this site (ref 18/02380) one of our greatest concerns about the development is the impact that it would have on the setting of the Grade 1 Listed Combs Parish Church. The setting of a Listed Building can be much more than just the small patch of land which forms its immediate surroundings. In the case of Combs Church, it includes its air of remoteness on a valley side, with the backdrop of historic Combs Wood in views to the church across open fields from Combs Village, and local roads and footpaths. While the previous application contained no indication of the form that development might take, this application does include an illustrative site layout, consideration of which has confirmed our view that development of this site will result in a fundamental change in the character of the area, and profoundly degrade the setting of a nationally important Listed Building.

Yours faithfully

J Pattle - Secretary
The Stowmarket Society, 19 Bond Street, Stowmarket, IP14 1HR

4 March 2019

Ms Gemma Walker
Senior Planning Officer
Mid Suffolk District Council
Endeavour House
8 Russell Rd
Ipswich, IP1 2BX

Dear Ms Walker

DC/19/00662 Outline Planning Application (some matters reserved) - Erection of up to 138 dwellings with public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point from Poplar Hill. Land to the East of Poplar Hill Stowmarket IP14 2EJ

I am writing on behalf of the Suffolk Preservation Society (SPS) to object to the planning application for up to 138 dwellings on a greenfield site which is outside, but adjoining, the current physical limit of Stowmarket. This is an amended version of refused application DC/18/2380 incorporating a reduction from 160 to 138 dwellings and a slightly reduced site area. SPS strongly objected to the previous application as the site is elevated, of a high scenic value and makes a significant contribution to the setting of St Mary's Church, a grade I listed building. Furthermore, the site forms a strategic gap between Stowmarket and the village of Combs and its development would give rise to coalescence of these two quite distinct settlements.

This revised application does not address the reasons for refusal of the previous application; namely the impact on the setting of the church and the character of the landscape. Moreover the indicative site layout reveals that in order to achieve the revised site boundaries all the proposed landscaped areas within the site have been removed. We therefore continue to object to the revised scheme and the reasons raised within our representation against the previous application are relevant:

Landscape Impact

The site is identified as Rolling Valley Claylands typology in the Suffolk Landscape Characterisation Study (SCC 2011). It is characterised by gentle valley sides with smaller fields in arable use. Ancient woodland on the upper fringes of the valley and isolated churches are notable features of this landscape type. The Babergh Mid Suffolk Landscape Guidance (2015) specifies that *new development within this landscape character is likely to have significant impact on both the character and visual amenity of valley floor and valley side*. The aim of the guidance seeks to retain, enhance and restore this distinctive landscape and settlement character and the key design principles which should inform decision making relating to this typology state that *Due to the rolling landscape, development in this area is considered to have significant visual impact. All development must take into*

*consideration the cultural historic importance of this area and the potential visual impact on conservation areas. It is therefore clear that the site has a high landscape quality and demonstrates a historic, cultural and visual value that must be fully recognised in the decision making process in accordance with para. 170 of the NPPF which requires the planning system to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by seeks to *protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.**

Heritage Impact

Simon Knott in his highly respected website Suffolk Churches, 2010 describes St Mary's Church as *a perfect example of a 15th century Suffolk church in all its glory. And goes on to describe it as being on the edge of the housing estate but the setting is otherwise profoundly rural: you reach it along a doglegging lane from the top of Poplar Hill and the last few hundred yards is along a narrow track which ends in the wide graveyard. The church is set on low ground, hills rising away to the north and south and the effect, on looking down at it, is of a great ship at rest in harbor. He concludes Both artistically and historically this is probably the most important church in All East Anglia.*

In its undeveloped form, the site currently makes a very strong positive contribution to the wider agrarian setting of St Mary's church. The church has an elevated position at the top of the valley side and is encircled by mature trees. The church sits remotely and in a commanding position and provides a focal point in the landscape. Its setting makes a very strong contribution to its significance by virtue of its elevated and detached position. The sovereignty of the church and its dominion over the parish is clearly demonstrated by this strategic siting. Its imposing scale and positioning within the landscape clearly communicates the power of the medieval church and the role that it played in society.

The Babergh Mid Suffolk Heritage and Sensitivity Assessment report, (March 2018) prepared by Place Services on behalf of the councils to inform the Site Allocations process and to form part of the evidence base of the Joint Local Plan states that while the outer areas of Stowmarket are considered to be of low susceptibility to change there are small areas of higher value on the outskirts of the settlement including several farmsteads and the grade I listed church at Combe Hall. It states *The assessments highlighted a number of important asset types which were both of high value and highly susceptible to change. These include churches and hall manors...and moated sites and historic farm complexes set within a wider agricultural landscape. The assessment concludes that Many of the higher status assets, particularly churches have been sited on high points in the landscape and were deliberately intended to be visible in log views throughout the wider landscape. This gives these assets large settings, which make an important contribution to their value and both their extent and value of their wider landscape setting will be integral consideration in considering proposed site allocations.*

The setting of the church has already been eroded to some degree by post war development which has encroached along the valley sides and results in a level of harm to the appreciation of the church. This is especially evident from views within the churchyard. Nevertheless, the tide of development has to date been restricted to the north, but any further development further south would fundamentally erode the qualities that make such a strong contribution to the appreciation of the church and its landscape setting.

National, Local Policy and Historic England Guidance

As one of the few statutory considerations in the planning process, heritage assets are afforded statutory protection under Section 66(1) of the Planning (LBCA) Act 1990. This statutory duty

requires the decision maker to afford *special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the listed building*. This includes the contribution to its significance made by its setting. The NPPF gives clear advice on when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the heritage asset's conservation, including sustaining significance (paragraph 193).

Historic England guidance amplifies this advice in Setting of Heritage Assets - Good Practice Advice in Planning, Note 3, Second Edition (2017). The guidance explains that setting is the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral (NPPF, Annex 2: Glossary). It confirms that *The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places* and goes on to explain that *Settings of heritage assets which closely resemble the setting at the time the asset was constructed or formed are likely to contribute particularly strongly to significance*. Therefore, SPS considers that the setting makes a very important contribution to the significance of the listed building and must be afforded considerable weight in assessing this application for further development which would irrevocably destroy it.

Coalescence

The site is within the area covered by the 2013 Stowmarket Area Action Plan which affirms that an acceptable degree of separation between Stowmarket and surrounding villages should be safeguarded (para 6.5) and that the importance of maintaining the separate identity of Combs and Stowmarket is a key issue. It states that *The need to control the visual impact of any development in this area will remain paramount, and development must limit any impact on the visual appearance on the skyline and respect its very rural setting*. (para 6.42). We note that Policy 6.20 Land of Farriers Road and Poplar Hill allocates a small part of this site for residential development, at the north end of the site, close to the boundary of the built up part of Church Road, but crucially is identified as informal open space for recreational purposes. The policy also identifies the need to protect the landscape and maintain the separation between Stowmarket and Combs, including provision of strategic advanced planting and structural landscaping and the need to protect the impact on the skyline of any development that takes place on the ridgeline along Poplar Hill. The submitted application fails to recognise the landscape sensitivity of the site and the importance of it as a strategic gap between Stowmarket and Combs.

Conclusion

SPS acknowledges that in order to deliver the significant levels of growth as set out in the Core Strategy Focused Review, further housing delivery in Stowmarket requires some well-considered greenfield development. Moreover Mid Suffolk District Council does not have a sufficient housing land supply currently in place and therefore there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. However, we would refer to para. 11 of the NPPF which explains that this means *"granting permission unless: any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits"*.

In this case the environmental harm associated with the revised proposal; impacting on the landscape character, views and wider setting of the church and erosion of the gap between the town and village of Combs continue to be of such a magnitude that they materially outweigh the public benefits of contributing to housing supply in the district. The site has not been allocated for housing development, is not included in the 2017 SHELAA and it is contrary to the Stowmarket Area Action Plan (2013). Therefore this application should be refused.

We trust you will find these comments helpful in the consideration of this application.

Yours sincerely,

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

Ward Councillor – Nick Gowrley, Gerard Brewster and David Whybrow
Heritage Team
Stowmarket Town Council
Chairman Combs Parish Council
Stowmarket Society
Phil Butler - SPS Mid Suffolk District
RAID – Residents Against Increasing Development Combs/Stowmarket