

Consultee Comments for Planning Application DC/19/05956

Application Summary

Application Number: DC/19/05956

Address: Land Off Postmill Lane, Fressingfield

Proposal: Outline planning application (all matters reserved) - Erection of up to 18No dwellings and associated new roads, infrastructure and open space.

Case Officer: Vincent Pearce

Consultee Details

Name: Mr Andy Parris

Address: The Stooks, New Street, Fressingfield Eye, Suffolk IP21 5PG

Email: clerk.fresspc@gmail.com

On Behalf Of: Fressingfield Parish Clerk

Comments

Fressingfield Parish Council recommends refusal of this application.

This is a truncated version of an application made in 2017 (1648/17) which the district council refused. The planning inspectorate dismissed an appeal. This application removes from that original application 6 houses which would have been built behind Ladymeade Cottage, a Grade II listed building.

In his assessment, the inspector confirmed that the existent LDP (1998), the Core Strategy (2008) and the Core Strategy Focused Review (2012) do carry weight when making decisions. This is in part due to their resonance with the NPPF.

Using these documents, the inspector concluded that the site in that application was not suitable for new housing. He felt that it conflicted with CS1 and CS2 (Core Strategy and CS Focused Review) and that it did not meet the aims of para 170 of the NPPF, in terms of recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

The site for this proposed development (DC/19/05956) is within the boundaries of that previous application. The site is outside the settlement boundary but does not meet the requirements of paragraph 79 of the NPPF 2019.

At the time of his assessment, the inspector did not feel that Fressingfields Neighbourhood Development Plan was sufficiently advanced to affect his judgements. However, it has now been assessed by an external examiner, had a few minor modifications and will go to a village referendum in late January/early February. Therefore, it should be given material consideration even though at the time of writing this comment, it does not carry statutory weight.

The section of the NDP on housing states that 60 homes could be built during the lifetime of the plan to support its vision of Fressingfield being a good place to live with a welcoming, friendly and cohesive community. It will be a village with a robust and sustainable infrastructure.

The NDP anticipates that the 60 will be made up of homes already given planning permission (51); small windfall sites, not yet identified, within the settlement boundary; and conversions and new development opportunities outside the settlement boundary in accordance with paragraph 79 of the NPPF 2019

60 is 7% more than the minimum figure in BMSDCs draft Local Plan in which Fressingfield is designated a hinterland village.

When the district council considered the previous application, councillors were appalled to hear of how raw sewage would periodically overflow from Fressingfields sewerage system into the street and a local watercourse. This problem has still not been solved: it is getting worse. Steady or heavy rain seems to be the catalyst. (Details are in the SAFE response.) A working group and closer connections with Anglian Water, Suffolk Highways and Suffolk Flood Management have been established.

However, the full causes of the problem, which is a health hazard and a 21st century disgrace, have not yet been identified. Only when that is done can solutions be designed and implemented. Any proposals that try to avoid exacerbating the problem are currently based on incomplete knowledge of the causes. Fressingfield Parish Council believes that only when these problems have been solved should new housing applications be seriously considered.

Put simply, it is not right to expect residents to live in an expanding village where the content of their loo ends up in the street and the local watercourse.

Other key points from the councils planning committee meeting:

The traffic survey submitted with this application was conducted in February which is not a month representative of traffic flow in a village surrounded by agricultural land.

The pedestrian route assessment document makes several subjective judgements about the flow of traffic (low levels of traffic, very light traffic, very light traffic flow). This is based on making an average of a days count over 24 hours which seems unreasonable. Obviously, there will periods of the day/night when there is almost no traffic.

Using these judgement-laden descriptions imply that pedestrians can safely walk along this narrow street (between 4m and 5m wide). This not the case.

The level of traffic flow should be compared to similar situations i.e. hinterland villages.

The route assessments were made according to AWARs guidance which takes no account of the personal safety of children travelling alone and it is presumed that all road users will behave reasonably and responsibly.

The fact that there are no reported road traffic injuries would appear to confirm New Street is a safe route to walk. However, even with current levels of traffic and even when most vehicles

respect the speed limit, it is a threatening journey for most pedestrians. AWARs guidance for assessing pedestrian routes takes no account of the emotional harm caused by a 300m walk on a 4/5m wide street with no pathways and being faced by cars, lorries, tractors with trailers, vans and motorbikes travelling in both directions.

In its report to the district council at the last application (1648/17), Suffolk Highways confirmed that accidents did not need to have occurred to identify a route as dangerous, but ... that weight should be given to observed conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles... (NPPF para 110)

Although measures were proposed to mitigate the dangers likely to occur with an increase in vehicular and pedestrian traffic on routes at the core of the village, the report stated, The measures proposed are the best solution available within the existing constraints (but) they fall short of making the highway safe for pedestrians.

Steve Merry, Transport Policy and Development Manager Growth, Highways and Infrastructure concluded, It is the Highway Authorities opinion that further traffic passing along New Street and/or through Jubilee Corner would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety particularly for vulnerable pedestrians.

There are no public transport links to and from the village.

The claim that 18 houses is a modest number ignores the fact that it effectively doubles the size of the estate.

The only entrance to this estate is close to the busy entrance to the medical centre. The pedestrian access to the medical centre is already difficult due to the lack of footpaths.

Planning permission already exists for 51 houses in the village.

If permission is granted for this new development, it would mean that planning permission had been given to 23% more than the minimum required in BMSDC draft Local Plan.

There are 2 other development applications currently on the table. These would add a further 48 homes to the village. The figure of 117 (51+18+48) is more than double that in the draft Local Plan. The plan has another 16 years to run.

As permission has been granted for 51 houses already the medium-term sustainability of the school is not an issue.

Benefits would accrue to the parish via a CIL allocation.

Speed restriction plans for New Street would be welcome.

Your ref: DC/19/05956/OUT
Our ref: Fressingfield, Land Off Post Mill
Lane IP21 5PJ. Matter No: 60009
Date: 3 January 2020
Enquiries to: Ruby Shepperson
Tel: 01473 265063
Email: ruby.shepperson@suffolk.gov.uk



By e-mail only:

planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

Dear Sian,

Fressingfield: Land Off Post Mill Lane, IP21 5PJ.

I refer to the proposal: Outline Planning Application (all matters reserved) – Erection of up to 18No dwellings and associated new roads, infrastructure and open space. (8No 2 bed, 8No 3 bed and 2No 4 bed houses).

I set out below Suffolk County Council's position, which provides our infrastructure requirements associated with the development proposed.

Summary of infrastructure requirements:

CIL	Education	Capital Contribution
	- Primary	£82,980.00
	- Secondary	£68,214.00
	- Sixth form	£22,738.00
CIL	Libraries improvements	£3,888.00
CIL	Waste	£918.00
S106	Education	
	- Secondary school transport	£14,400.00
S106	Highways	tbc
Total Contribution: £193,138.00		

This letter sets out the infrastructure requirements which arise, most of which will be covered by the district's CIL funding apart a school transport contribution to be secured by S106.

Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018 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.

Community Infrastructure Levy

Mid Suffolk District Council adopted a CIL Charging Schedule On 21st January 2016 and started charging CIL on planning permissions granted from 11th April 2016.

New CIL Regulations were laid before Parliament on 4 June 2019. These Regulations (Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) (England) (No. 2) Regulations 2019) came into force on 1 September 2019 (“the commencement date”). Regulation 11 removes regulation 123 (pooling restriction and the CIL 123 List in respect of ‘relevant infrastructure’).

Site specific mitigation will be covered by a planning obligation and/or planning conditions.

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

- 1. Education.** Paragraph 94 of the NPPF states: ‘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;’

The Department for Education (DfE) publication ‘Securing developer contributions for education’ (April 2019), which should be read in conjunction with the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advice on planning obligations

[revised September 2019]. Paragraph 19 of the DfE guidance states, “We advise local authorities with education responsibilities to work jointly with relevant local planning authorities as plans are prepared and planning applications determined, to ensure that all education needs are properly addressed, including both temporary and permanent education needs where relevant, such as school transport costs and temporary school provision before a permanent new school opens within a development site”.

In paragraph 15 of the DfE guidance ‘Securing developer contributions for education’ it says, “We advise that you base the assumed cost of mainstream school places on national average costs published annually in the DfE school place scorecards. This allows you to differentiate between the average per pupil costs of a new school, permanent expansion or temporary expansion, ensuring developer contributions are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. You should adjust the national average to reflect the costs in your region, using BCIS location factors”.

The most recent scorecard is 2018 and the national average school expansion build cost per pupil for primary schools is £16,596. The most recent (March 2019) BCIS location factor for the East of England, which includes Suffolk, is 100. When applied to the national expansion build cost (£16,596 x 1.00) produces a total of £16,596 per pupil for permanent expansion of primary schools.

The most recent scorecard is 2018 and the national average school expansion build cost per pupil for secondary schools is £22,738. The most recent (March 2019) BCIS location factor for the East of England, which includes Suffolk, is 100. When applied to the national expansion build cost (£22,738 x 1.00) produces a total of £22,738 per pupil for permanent expansion of secondary schools. The DfE guidance in paragraph 16 says, “further education places provided within secondary school sixth forms will cost broadly the same as a secondary school place”.

School level	Minimum pupil yield:	Required:	Cost per place £ (2016/17):
Primary school age range, 5-11:	5	5	£16,596
High school age range, 11-16:	3	3	£22,738
Sixth school age range, 16+:	1	1	£22,738

Total education CIL contributions:	£173,932.00
---	--------------------

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

The proposal will increase the demand for extra capacity, in order to meet anticipated future needs arising from both latent population and housing growth.

The catchment primary school is Fressingfield. Due to this proposal, local plans, and potential approvals the school is expected to exceed capacity. On this basis, a CIL contribution of (5 pupils x £16,596) = £82,980 is sought to improve and enhance provision.

The catchment secondary school is Stradbroke High School. The forecast pupil numbers for Stradbroke High School are expected to increase annually and, in time, exceed capacity due to Local Plans and other potential approvals. On this basis, a CIL contribution of (3 pupils x £22,738) = £68,214 is sought to improve and enhance provision. Land for future expansion is proposed through the emerging Joint Local Plan, under reference LA083.

Thomas Mills High School is the catchment sixth form. It is unable to accommodate potential over-surplus from Stradbroke High School as it is currently exceeding capacity, with no surplus places available for the 1 pupil arising from the development. The forecast shows this situation to worsen in future years, thus overspill from the Stradbroke into Thomas Mills is unsustainable and a CIL contribution of (1 pupil x £22,738) = £22,738 is sought for expansion to the current site.

- a) **School transport contribution** – 3 secondary-age pupils are forecast to arise from the proposed development. Developer s.106 contributions are sought to fund school transport provision for a minimum of five years for secondary-age pupils. Annual school transport cost per pupil is £960. Therefore, contribution is £960 x 3 pupils x 5 years = £14,400 increased by RPI.

School transport S106 contribution:	£14,400.00
--	-------------------

2. **Pre-school provision.** Provision 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.

This matter is in the Fressingfield Ward where there is a surplus of FTEs. This proposal will generate an additional 2 FTEs, but no contribution is sought.

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 further 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 a planning application. This will include travel plan, pedestrian and cycle provision, public transport, rights of way, air quality and highway provision (both on-site and off-site). Requirements will be dealt with via planning conditions and Section 106 agreements as appropriate, and infrastructure delivered to adoptable standards via Section 38 and Section 278.

Suffolk County Council, in its role as a 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 (updated 2019).

Suffolk County Council FAO Sam Harvey will coordinate a response.

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. £3,888 which will be spent on improving services and outreach at Stradbroke Library. A minimum standard of 30 square metres of new library space per 1,000 populations is required. Construction and initial fit out cost of £3,000 per square metre for libraries (based on RICS Building Cost Information Service data but excluding land costs). This gives a cost of (3 x £3,000) = £90,000 per 1,000 people or £90 per person for library space. Assumes average of 2.4 persons per dwelling.

Libraries CIL contribution:	£3,888.00
------------------------------------	------------------

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.

A future CIL funding bid of £918 (£51 per dwelling) will be made to improve Leiston Recycling Centre facilities serving the proposed development.

Waste CIL Contribution:	£918.00
--------------------------------	----------------

- 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.** SCC, as Lead Local Flood Authority, responded on 2 January 2020, see comments by Jason Skilton.
- 9. 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 firefighting which will allow SCC to make final consultations at the planning stage.

10. 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.

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

12. Monitoring Fee. The new CIL Regs allow for charging of monitoring fees. In this respect the county council charges £412 for each trigger point in a planning obligation, payable upon commencement.

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

This development will mitigate its impact by contributing via both s106 and CIL as per the summary table on page 1. Site-specific matters identified by SCC services directly will also need to be secured by way of a planning obligation or planning conditions.

I would be grateful if the above information can be provided to the decision-taker in respect of this planning application and infrastructure mitigation reported fully in the committee report.

Yours sincerely,

Ruby Shepperson
Planning Officer
Growth, Highways & Infrastructure Directorate – Strategic Development

cc Carol Barber, Suffolk CC
Jason Skilton, Suffolk CC
Sam Harvey, Suffolk CC

10 January 2020

Mr Vincent Pearce
Senior Planning Officer
Mid Suffolk District Council
Endeavour House, 8 Russell Rd,
Ipswich, IP1 2BX

Dear Mr Pearce,

**Planning application ref: DC/19/05956 Outline planning application (all matters reserved) -
Erection of up to 18No dwellings and associated new roads, infrastructure and open space.**

Land off Post Mill Lane, Fressingfield

I am writing on behalf of the Suffolk Preservation Society (SPS) to object the above outline planning application for the erection of up to 18 dwellings on a greenfield site on the western edge of the village. This is a revised application DC/17/01648 for 24 dwellings with associated infrastructure which was refused in November 2018 and later dismissed at appeal. SPS objected to the previous application due to the unsustainable location, the disproportionate scale of the development (taken together with other large scale housing schemes) and the impact on the setting of heritage assets.

We note the reasons for refusal and Inspector's decision with regard to the setting of Ladymeade Cottage, a grade II listed building. We welcome the revised proposals and acknowledge that they have had regard to the comments made by both council officers and the Planning Inspector in respect of heritage assets. However we are disappointed that there are now no affordable units included which limits the public benefit provided by the scheme. Notwithstanding the reduction in the scale of the proposed development and the revised layout the SPS continues to object on the following grounds.

Firstly, the emerging Joint Local Plan Preferred Options (July 2019) downgrades Fressingfield from a Primary to a Hinterland Village requiring a lesser quantum of development, recognising that it is fundamentally an unsustainable location which does not enjoy a high level of services or facilities necessary to support a substantial increase in housing growth. Accordingly the evolving policy position in the Joint Local Plan Preferred Options (July 2019) shows a minimum housing requirement for Fressingfield of 56 dwellings over the plan period.

Secondly, Mid Suffolk, as of 3.09.19 (Mid Suffolk District Council Housing Land Supply Position Statement 2019/20 – 2023/24) asserts that the council can demonstrate a 5 year housing

land supply. Therefore, the “tilted balance” presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply and applications should be determined according to the development plan.

Finally, the Fressingfield Neighbourhood Plan (FNP) is at an advanced stage, having been through Examination and is about to go to Referendum in the coming weeks (January 2020). The FNP policy FNP1 allows for 60 dwellings, 51 of which have already been consented. The FNP does not allocate this site for development. The Examiner in her report, at paragraph 53 having considered the proposed site allocations stated that *“I do not consider it necessary for inclusion of additional sites”*. The Neighbourhood Plan has been carefully considered and independently assessed. The views of the parish have been clearly made. Therefore, the policies within the plan must be given considerable weight in the consideration of this case.

Conclusion

In summary, SPS welcomes the reduction in the scale of development to address the harm caused by the development to the setting of Ladymeade Cottage and acknowledges the contribution made by the proposal to housing need generally and the public benefit of no.6 affordable units. However, we remain concerned that the proposal remains disproportionate, relative to the level of growth allocated and planned for in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. If this proposal were to be approved it would prejudice the policy making process by undermining the plan-led approach. Secondly, granting planning permission would undermine community confidence in the plan making process after successful Examination but in advance of a Referendum on that Plan.

The community, through the neighbourhood plan process, has clearly rejected this site for development whilst setting out alternative sites that are capable of contributing towards the housing need in the district. SPS considers that to approve this application would seriously undermine the neighbourhood planning process and we therefore urge that the proposals are yet again refused.

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

Yours sincerely,

Fiona Cairns RTPI IHBC
Director

Cc: Fressingfield Parish Council
Phil Butler, SPS Mid Suffolk District
David Burn, Portfolio Holder, Planning
John Castro, Chair SAFE

From: RM Floods Planning <floods.planning@suffolk.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 January 2020 07:52
To: BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow <planningyellow@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Cc: Sian Bunbury <Sian.Bunbury@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: 2020-01-02 JS Reply Land Off Postmill Lane, Fressingfield Ref DC/19/05956

Dear Sian Bunbury,

Subject: Land Off Postmill Lane, Fressingfield Ref DC/19/05956

Suffolk County Council, Flood and Water Management have reviewed application ref DC/19/05965

The following submitted document[s] have been reviewed and we recommend a **holding objection** at this time:

- Site Location Plan 3325-TD-LW-XX-DRG-AR-1004-A
- Site Indicative Site Plan 3325-TD-LW-XX-DRG-AR-1003-A
- Addendum A to Flood Risk Assessment, Surface and Foul Water Drainage ref SVH/MJH/21647
- Further Additional information requested by Lead Local Flood Authority in respect of application 1648/17/OUT

The reason why we are recommending a holding objection is because the applicant has not submitted a site specific flood risk assessment or a strategy for the disposal of surface water in line with current national and local policy/guidance.

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

1. Submit a updated site specific flood risk assessment
2. Submit a strategy for the disposal of surface water in line with national and local policy and guidance

Kind Regards

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

Suffolk County Council | Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich, Suffolk, IP1 2BX
T: 01473 260411 | <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/planning-waste-and-environment/flooding-and-drainage/>

BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow

Subject: 2020-01-14 JS reply Land Off Postmill Lane, Fressingfield, Ref DC/19/05956

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

Sent: 14 January 2020 09:23

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

Cc: Sian Bunbury <Sian.Bunbury@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>

Subject: 2020-01-14 JS reply Land Off Postmill Lane, Fressingfield, Ref DC/19/05956

Dear Sian Bunbury,

Subject: Land Off Postmill Lane, Fressingfield, Ref DC/19/05956

Suffolk County Council, Flood and Water Management have reviewed application ref DC/19/05965.

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

- Site Location Plan 3325-TD-LW-XX-DRG-AR-1004-A
- Site Indicative Site Plan 3325-TD-LW-XX-DRG-AR-1003-A
- Further Additional information requested by Lead Local Flood Authority in respect of application 1648/17/OUT
- Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water and Foul Water Drainage Strategy Ref 21647a Rev 0

The reason why we are recommending a holding objection is because whilst the applicant has evaluated the predicted surface water flood risk, they have not referenced the historical flooding that effects the parish, which is both surface water and foul water flooding. They applicant has provided a viable method for the disposal of surface water. However, the applicant is looking to utilise a hybrid SuDs system that does not meet the requirement of national and local policy/guidance.

1. Resubmit the flood risk assessment referencing historical flooding of both surface water and foul water within the parish
2. Resubmit the drainage strategy to include reference to the Drinking Water Safeguard Zones (Surface Water) that covers the parish
3. Resubmit the drainage strategy to include reference a indicative layout that shall include a full above ground SuDs system rather than a hybrid system. You shall also demonstrating that there is sufficient space on the site based on Suffolk CC design standards
 - a. unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate
4. Resubmit the drainage strategy to include only one discharge point for the surface water discharge rate no greater than Qbar or 2l/s/ha
5. Resubmit the drainage strategy to include at least two surface water treatment stages as Fressingfield is within a Drinking Water Safeguard Zones (Surface Water)

Kind Regards

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

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

T: 01473 260411 | <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/planning-waste-and-environment/flooding-and-drainage/>

Appendix A to the Suffolk Flood Risk Management Strategy has been updated! If you're involved in the planning, design and construction of new developments this may be of interest to you. You will be expected to comply with this new local guidance. More information can be found here; <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/flooding-and-drainage/guidance-on-development-and-flood-risk/>

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

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

Sent: 08 January 2020 10:17

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

Subject: MSDC Planning Re-consultation Request - DC/19/05956

Please find attached planning re-consultation request letter relating to planning application - DC/19/05956 - Land Off Postmill Lane, Fressingfield, , ,

Kind Regards

Planning Support Team

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

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

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

From: Nathan Pittam <Nathan.Pittam@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 January 2020 12:44
To: Sian Bunbury <Sian.Bunbury@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Cc: BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow <planningyellow@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: DC/19/05956. Land Contamination.

Dear Sian

EP Reference : 270827
DC/19/05956. Land Contamination.
Land at, Post Mill Lane, Fressingfield, EYE, Suffolk.
Outline planning application (all matters reserved) - Erection of up to 18No dwellings and associated new roads, infrastructure and open space.

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



Minimum requirements for dealing with unexpected ground conditions being encountered during construction.

1. *All site works at the position of the suspected contamination will stop and the Local Planning Authority and Environmental Health Department will be notified as a matter of urgency.*
2. *A suitably trained geo-environmental engineer should assess the visual and olfactory observations of the ground and the extent of contamination and the Client and the Local Authority should be informed of the discovery.*
3. *The suspected contaminated material will be investigated and tested appropriately in accordance with assessed risks. The investigation works will be carried out in the presence of a suitably qualified geo-environmental engineer. The investigation works will involve the collection of solid samples for testing and, using visual and olfactory observations of the ground, delineate the area over which contaminated materials are present.*
4. *The unexpected contaminated material will either be left in situ or be stockpiled (except if suspected to be asbestos) whilst testing is carried out and suitable assessments completed to determine whether the material can be re-used on site or requires disposal as appropriate.*
5. *The testing suite will be determined by the independent geo-environmental specialist based on visual and olfactory observations.*
6. *Test results will be compared against current assessment criteria suitable for the future use of the area of the site affected.*
7. *Where the material is left in situ awaiting results, it will either be reburied or covered with plastic sheeting.*
8. *Where the potentially contaminated material is to be temporarily stockpiled, it will be placed either on a prepared surface of clay, or on 2000-gauge Visqueen sheeting (or other impermeable surface) and covered to prevent dust and odour emissions.*
9. *Any areas where unexpected visual or olfactory ground contamination is identified will be surveyed and testing results incorporated into a Verification Report.*
10. *A photographic record will be made of relevant observations.*
11. *The results of the investigation and testing of any suspect unexpected contamination will be used to determine the relevant actions. After consultation with the Local Authority, materials should either be: • re-used in areas where test results indicate that it meets compliance targets so it can be re-used without treatment; or • treatment of material on site to meet compliance targets so it can be re-used; or • removal from site to a suitably licensed landfill or permitted treatment facility.*
12. *A Verification Report will be produced for the work.*

Your Ref:DC/19/05956
Our Ref: SCC/CON/5409/19
Date: 14 January 2020



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: Sian Bunbury

Dear Sian

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
CONSULTATION RETURN: DC/19/05956**

PROPOSAL: Outline planning application (all matters reserved) - Erection of up to 18No dwellings and associated new roads, infrastructure and open space.

LOCATION: Land Off Postmill Lane, Fressingfield

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highway Authority make the following comments:

The previous application for this site was reviewed with 2 other sites within Fressingfield to consider the cumulative impacts from all three developments on the highway. It was considered that the developments proposals would cumulatively give rise to a number of significant road safety concerns which taken in the round, add up to a severe impact in road safety terms:

- The footway network in the core of the village, where most pedestrian trips would need to pass to access the key services in the village, are below acceptable width standards, resulting in pedestrians needing to walk in the road to pass obstructions and opposing pedestrians.
- Some pedestrian crossing points have poor visibility and while traffic speeds are generally quite low, the increase in traffic flow resulting from the cumulative impact of developments in the village, would give rise to an unacceptable increase in risk of conflicts, as some of these would have the potential to result in injury collisions.

In recent appeal for the site, the inspector determined the proposal would not have a harmful effect on highway and pedestrian safety within the village. The report acknowledged the concerns raised with regard to pedestrian safety, however, with low number in accidents in the area, it was considered there is little substantive evidence to demonstrate that the proposal would result in pedestrian and highway safety concerns.

We have reviewed the documentation supplied with this application, the summary of our findings are as follows:

- The estimated total vehicle trips for this application in the AM peak hour is 11 vehicles (average 1 vehicle every 5 minutes) therefore the additional vehicles from the development will not have a severe impact on the surrounding road and junctions.
- There is one slight and injury accident recorded on Laxfield Road/New Street junction.

- There is not a footway linking the site to the centre of the village but there is a footway to Priory Walk which links the back of primary school. The applicant is proposing footway improvements which includes a dropped crossing point at Priory Walk junction.
- This application is proposing a 20mph zone on New Street.

Taking all the above into account, it is our opinion that this development would not have a severe impact (NPPF para 109) therefore we do not object to the proposal.

NOTE - Prior to determination, a speed survey will be required to determine the average speed (20mph zones are only considered if they mean speeds are below 24mph). Also, a traffic and pedestrian survey will be required.

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:

HW 2 - Condition: Before any dwelling is first occupied, the developer shall deliver the footway and highway improvements on New Street in accordance with the approved details except with the written agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

ER 1 - Condition: Prior to commencement of any works, (save for site clearance and technical investigations) 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 in consultation with Local Highway Authority.

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

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

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

B 2 - Condition: Before the development is commenced details of the areas to be provided for storage and presentation of Refuse/Recycling bins shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The approved scheme shall be carried out in its entirety before the development is brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for no other purpose.

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

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
- maintain a register of complaints and record of actions taken to deal with such complaints at the site office as specified in the Plan throughout the period of occupation of the site.

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

NOTES

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

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.

Yours sincerely,

Samantha Harvey

Senior Development Management Engineer

Growth, Highways and Infrastructure



09 January 2020

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

By email only

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/19/05956
Location: Land Off Postmill Lane, Fressingfield
Proposal: Outline planning application (all matters reserved) - Erection of up to 18No dwellings and associated new roads, infrastructure and open space.

Dear Sian,

Thank you for consulting Place Services on the above application.

No objection subject to securing biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures

Summary

We have reviewed the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Impact Assessment (Eco Check Consultancy Ltd, October 2019), The Non-Licensed Great Crested Newt Mitigation Method Statement (Eco Check Consultancy Ltd, November 2017) and Reptile Survey (Eco Check Consultancy Ltd, May 2017) relating to the likely impacts of development on designated sites, Protected Species and 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.

The mitigation measures identified in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Impact Assessment (Eco Check Consultancy Ltd, October 2019), The Non-Licensed Great Crested Newt Mitigation Method Statement (Eco Check Consultancy Ltd, November 2017) and Reptile Survey (Eco Check Consultancy Ltd, May 2017) should be secured and implemented in full, via the provision of a Construction Environmental Management Plan – Biodiversity. This is necessary to conserve and enhance protected and Priority Species.



In addition, we recommended that a Wildlife Sensitive Lighting Scheme should be secured, as a condition of any consent, to avoid impacts to potential roosting, foraging and commuting bats. This should follow the [Guidance Note 8 Bats and artificial lighting](#) (The Institute of Lighting Professionals & Bat Conservation Trust, 2018) and should follow the recommendations within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Impact Assessment. This must demonstrate that provision of warm-white LED lights, which should be a minimum of <3000k. This is necessary as lighting which emits an ultraviolet component or that have a blue spectral content will impact some bat species directly, as well as having a high attraction effects on insects, which may lead in a reduction in prey availability to light sensitive bat species.

We also support the proposed reasonable biodiversity enhancements, which have been recommended to secure measurable net gains for biodiversity, as outlined under Paragraph 170d of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019. The reasonable biodiversity enhancement measures should be outlined within a Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy and should be secured as a condition of any consent, prior to slab level.

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

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. PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT: CONSTRUCTION ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

"A construction environmental management plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, following the details provided within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Impact Assessment (Eco Check Consultancy Ltd, October 2019), The Non-Licensed Great Crested Newt Mitigation Method Statement (Eco Check Consultancy Ltd, November 2017) and Reptile Survey (Eco Check Consultancy Ltd, May 2017).

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.*

i)

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. PRIOR TO SLAB LEVEL: 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) persons responsible for implementing the enhancement measures;*
- e) 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).

3. 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, Isolux drawings 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 us with any queries.

Yours sincerely,

Hamish Jackson GradCIEEM BSc (Hons)

Ecological Consultant

Hamish.Jackson@essex.gov.uk

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

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

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

TO: Sian Bunbury – Planning Officer

From: Julie Abbey-Taylor

Date: 06.01.2020

SUBJECT: DC/19/05956

Location: Land at Postmill Lane, Fressingfield.

Proposal: Proposal – Outline Planning Application- all matters reserved for residential development and associated roads, infrastructure, and open space. Site size is 0.9 ha proposed layout for 18 dwellings.

Consultation Response on Affordable Housing Requirement

Key Points

1. Background Information

- Previous Outline Planning Permission sought for 24 dwellings, refused by MSDC and appeal dismissed in 2019.
- Triggers the obligation under policy H4 for affordable housing and the council will be seeking 35% of the total provision of housing which is for 6 affordable dwellings.

2. Housing Need Information:

2.1 The Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Strategic Housing Market Assessment confirms a continuing need for housing across all tenures and a growing need for affordable housing. The most recent update of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment completed in 2019 confirms **a minimum need of 127 affordable homes per annum for the Mid Suffolk Area.**

2.2 The Council's Choice Based Lettings system currently has circa. **690** applicants registered for the Mid Suffolk area as of October 2019.

2.3 Our 2014 Housing Needs Survey shows that there is a need across all tenures for smaller units of accommodation, which includes accommodation suitable for older people, wishing to downsize from larger privately-owned family housing, into smaller privately-owned apartments, bungalows and houses.

2.4 Open Market Mix: -

- 2 x 2 bed semi-detached houses @ 70.5 sqm
- 1 x 3 bed semi-detached house @ 73.6 sqm
- 1 x 3 bed semi-detached house with garage @ 83.5 sqm
- 3 x 3 bed semi-detached houses @ 84.2 sqm
- 1 x 3 bed detached house with garage @ 102 sqm
- 1 x 3 bed detached house @ 106.6 sqm
- 1 x 4 bed detached house with garage @ 102 sqm
- 1 x 4 bed detached house with garage @ 116 sqm

The mix above equates to 58.3% of the open market homes to be 3 bed houses which compares to 29.3% which the 2019 SHMA recommends as new 3 bed supply within owner occupied tenure.

It would also be appropriate for any open market houses on the site to be designed and developed to meet Building Regs Part M (4) category 2, making these attractive and appropriate for older people.

There is evidence from the 2014 Housing Survey that there is a significant need for smaller homes to be built for first time buyers but also for those older residents seeking to downsize for their last time home. Hence, we would like to see the inclusion of some 2 and 3 bed bungalows or chalet bungalows in the open market offer, in this indicative proposal none are shown as part of the mix which is disappointing.

Other requirements

- **Standard trigger points for the delivery of the affordable housing – this will then be included automatically in the instruction from planning to shared legal services that it needs to be in the S106 agreement as a matter of course.**
 - **(a)** not Occupy or permit Occupation of more than fifty per cent (50%) (rounded up to the nearest whole Dwelling) Market Housing Units in each Phase until fifty per cent (50%) of the Affordable Housing Units for that Phase have been constructed and are ready for Occupation and have been transferred to the Registered Provider; and
 - **(b)** not Occupy or permit Occupation of more than eighty per cent (80%) (rounded up to the nearest whole Dwelling) Market Housing Units in each Phase until all of the Affordable Housing Units for that Phase have been constructed and are ready for Occupation and have been transferred to the Registered Provider
- The council is granted 100% nomination rights to all the affordable units for initial lets and a minimum of 75% on subsequent lets, unless the RP is the Council where 100% nominations will be retained on relets.
 - Adequate parking and secure cycle storage is provided for all affordable homes.
 - The Council will not support a bid for Homes England grant funding on the affordable homes delivered as part of an open market development. Therefore, the affordable units on that part of the site must be delivered grant free.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The location and phasing of the affordable housing units must be agreed with the Council to ensure they are integrated within the proposed development according to current best practice.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• It is preferred that the affordable units are transferred to one of Mid Suffolk's partner Registered Providers – please see www.baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk under Housing and affordable housing for full details. This could include the Council as an RP in its own right.

Julie Abbey-Taylor, Professional Lead – Strategic Housing

BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow

From: Paul Harrison
Sent: 16 January 2020 16:28
To: Vincent Pearce; BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Subject: DC 19 05956 Fressingfield

Vincent

The application follows refusal of 1648/17 and dismissal at appeal. I advised on that proposal that loss of the immediate relationship of the listed Ladymeade Cottage with its rural surroundings was harmful. The Inspector essentially supported this assessment.

In the present application, the site is reduced by omission of land to the rear of the listed building Ladymeade Cottage. This revision in effect removes development to the rear of Ladymeade, overcoming the harmful impact of the previous scheme. In my view the proposal now poses no harm to the setting or significance of the listed building.

I recommend imposing a condition requiring details of landscaping on any permission so that the site's eastern boundary will present a 'soft' edge of rural character. We would defer to the landscape expert on the details of any scheme put forward.

Please treat this email as the Heritage consultation response.

Paul

Paul Harrison

Heritage and Design Officer

T 01449 724677 | 07798 781360

E paul.harrison@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

E heritage@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

W www.babergh.gov.uk | www.midsuffolk.gov.uk



Mid Suffolk District Council
Planning Department
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/F180893
Enquiries to: Water Officer
Direct Line: 01473 260588
E-mail: Fire.BusinessSupport@suffolk.gov.uk
Web Address: <http://www.suffolk.gov.uk>

Date: 09/01/2020

Dear Sirs

Land off Post Mill Lane, Fressingfield IP21 5PJ
Planning Application No: DC/19/05956/OUT
Hydrants are required for this development
(see our required conditions)

I refer to the above application.

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

Access and Fire Fighting Facilities

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

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

Water Supplies

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

Sprinklers Advised

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

Yours faithfully

Water Officer

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service

Enc: Hydrant requirement letter

Copy: Fergus.bootman@larondewright.co.uk

Enc: Sprinkler information

Mid Suffolk District Council
Planning Department
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: Mrs A Kempen
Direct Line: 01473 260486
E-mail: Angela.Kempen@suffolk.gov.uk
Web Address: www.suffolk.gov.uk

Date: 9 January 2019

Planning Ref: DC/19/05956/OUT

Dear Sirs

RE: PROVISION OF WATER FOR FIRE FIGHTING
ADDRESS: Land off Post Mill Lane, Fressingfield IP21 5PJ
DESCRIPTION: 18 Dwellings
HYDRANTS REQUIRED

If the Planning Authority is minded to grant approval, the Fire Authority require 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, or consulted and the conditions not applied, the Fire Authority will require that fire hydrants be installed retrospectively by the developer if the Planning Authority has not submitted a reason for the non-implementation of the required condition in the first instance.

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.

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.

Continued/

OFFICIAL

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

Yours faithfully

Water Officer

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service

OFFICIAL

Created: September 2015

Enquiries to: Fire Business Support Team
Tel: 01473 260588
Email: Fire.BusinessSupport@suffolk.gov.uk



Dear Sir/Madam

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service – Automatic Fire Sprinklers in your Building Development

We understand from local Council planning you are considering undertaking building work.

The purpose of this letter is to encourage you to consider the benefits of installing automatic fire sprinklers in your house or commercial premises.

In the event of a fire in your premises an automatic fire sprinkler system is proven to save lives, help you to recover from the effects of a fire sooner and help get businesses back on their feet faster.

Many different features can be included within building design to enhance safety and security and promote business continuity. Too often consideration to incorporate such features is too late to for them to be easily incorporated into building work.

Dispelling the Myths of Automatic Fire Sprinklers

- Automatic fire sprinklers are relatively inexpensive to install, accounting for approximately 1-3% of the cost of a new build.
- Fire sprinkler heads will only operate in the vicinity of a fire, they do not all operate at once.
- An automatic fire sprinkler head discharges between 40-60 litres of water per minute and will cause considerably less water damage than would be necessary for Firefighters tackling a fully developed fire.
- Statistics show that the likelihood of automatic fire sprinklers activating accidentally is negligible – they operate differently to smoke alarms.

Promoting the Benefits of Automatic Fire Sprinklers

- They detect a fire in its incipient stage – this will potentially save lives in your premises.
- Sprinklers will control if not extinguish a fire reducing building damage.
- Automatic sprinklers protect the environment; reducing water damage and airborne pollution from smoke and toxic fumes.
- They potentially allow design freedoms in building plans, such as increased compartment size and travel distances.
- They may reduce insurance premiums.
- Automatic fire sprinklers enhance Firefighter safety.

- Domestic sprinkler heads are recessed into ceilings and pipe work concealed so you won't even know they're there.
- They support business continuity – insurers report 80% of businesses experiencing a fire will not recover.
- Properly installed and maintained automatic fire sprinklers can provide the safest of environments for you, your family or your employees.
- A desirable safety feature, they may enhance the value of your property and provide an additional sales feature.

The Next Step

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service is working to make Suffolk a safer place to live. Part of this ambition is as champion for the increased installation of automatic fire sprinklers in commercial and domestic premises.

Any information you require to assist you to decide can be found on the following web pages:

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service

<http://www.suffolk.gov.uk/emergency-and-rescue/>

Residential Sprinkler Association

<http://www.firesprinklers.info/>

British Automatic Fire Sprinkler Association

<http://www.bafsa.org.uk/>

Fire Protection Association

<http://www.thefpa.co.uk/>

Business Sprinkler Alliance

<http://www.business-sprinkler-alliance.org/>

I hope adopting automatic fire sprinklers in your build can help our aim of making 'Suffolk a safer place to live'.

Yours faithfully

Mark Hardingham

Chief Fire Officer

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service

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

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

Enquiries to: Gemma Stewart
Direct Line: 01284 741242
Email: Gemma.Stewart@suffolk.gov.uk
Web: <http://www.suffolk.gov.uk>

Our Ref: 2019_05956
Date: 9th January 2020

For the Attention of Vincent Pearce

Dear Mr Isbell

Planning Application DC/19/05956 - Land Off Postmill Lane, Fressingfield: Archaeology

This application lies in an area of archaeological interest recorded in the County Historic Environment Record, with medieval finds located within and adjacent to the proposed development area (FSF 081). The site is also situated to the rear of a street fronted by listed post medieval buildings. As a result, there is potential for the discovery of below-ground heritage assets of archaeological interest at this location and groundworks associated with this proposal will damage or destroy any archaeological deposits that exist.

We have commented on this in recent years. We would recommend that the same archaeological standard condition is placed on the development as was for prior application (1648/17) within the same bounds, that is:

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 Condition 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 (2018).

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 mitigation. In this case, an archaeological evaluation will be required to establish the potential of the site and decisions on the need for any further investigation (excavation before any groundworks commence and/or monitoring during groundworks) will be made on the basis of the results of the evaluation.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Gemma Stewart

Senior Archaeological Officer
Conservation Team

BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow

From: SM-NE-Consultations (NE) <consultations@naturalengland.org.uk>
Sent: 07 January 2020 11:54
To: BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Subject: Consultation DC/19/05956 NE Response

Categories: Katherine

Dear Ms Bunbury,

Application ref: DC/19/05956
Our ref: 304650

Natural England has no comments to make on this application.

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,
Heather Ivinson

Heather Ivinson
Operations Delivery
Consultations Team
Natural England
Hornbeam House, Electra Way
Crewe, Cheshire, CW1 6GJ
Tel: 0300 060 0475

www.gov.uk/natural-england

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

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

From: BMSDC Public Realm Consultation Mailbox <consultpublicrealm@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 January 2020 15:02
To: BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow <planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: MSDC Planning Consultation Request - DC/19/05956

Public Realm note that a similar application for this site was refused planning permission in 2018. Should a decision be made to grant permission for this application the Public Realm Team would required that an adequate level of public open space is achieved within this site.

Regards

Dave Hughes
Public Realm Team

Consultee Comments for Planning Application DC/19/05956

Application Summary

Application Number: DC/19/05956

Address: Land Off Postmill Lane, Fressingfield

Proposal: Outline planning application (all matters reserved) - Erection of up to 18No dwellings and associated new roads, infrastructure and open space.

Case Officer: Vincent Pearce

Consultee Details

Name: Mr Tony Bass

Address: Endeavour House, Ipswich IP1 2BX

Email: tony.bass@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

On Behalf Of: Communities (Major Development)

Comments

I concur with Public realms' response on 2/1/20



Planning Applications – Suggested Informative Statements and Conditions Report

If you would like to discuss any of the points in this document please contact us on 03456 066087, Option 1 or email planningliaison@anglianwater.co.uk

AW Site Reference: 155211/1/0076073

Local Planning Authority: Mid Suffolk District

Site: Land Off Postmill Lane, Fressingfield

Proposal: Outline planning application (all matters reserved) - Erection of up to 18No dwellings and associated new roads, infrastructure and open space

Planning application: DC/19/05956

Prepared by: Pre-Development Team

Date: 27 January 2020

ASSETS

Section 1 - Assets Affected

There are assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within or close to the development boundary that may affect the layout of the site. Anglian Water would ask that the following text be included within your Notice should permission be granted.

Anglian Water has assets close to or crossing this site or there are assets subject to an adoption agreement. Therefore the site layout should take this into account and accommodate those assets within either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this is not practicable then the sewers will need to be diverted at the developers cost under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991. or, in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement, liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the diversion works should normally be completed before development can commence.

The development site is within 15 metres of a sewage pumping station. This asset requires access for maintenance and will have sewerage infrastructure leading to it. For practical reasons therefore it cannot be easily relocated.

Anglian Water consider that dwellings located within 15 metres of the pumping station would place them at risk of nuisance in the form of noise, odour or the general disruption from maintenance work caused by the normal operation of the pumping station.

The site layout should take this into account and accommodate this infrastructure type through a necessary cordon sanitaire, through public space or highway infrastructure to ensure that no development within 15 metres from the boundary of a sewage pumping station if the development is potentially sensitive to noise or other disturbance or to ensure future amenity issues are not created.

WASTEWATER SERVICES

Section 2 - Wastewater Treatment

The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Weybread Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows

Section 3 - Used Water Network

This response has been based on the following submitted documents: Flood risk assessment, surface water and foul water drainage strategy The sewerage system at present has available capacity for these flows. If the developer wishes to connect to our sewerage network they should serve notice under Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991. We will then advise them of the most suitable point of connection. (1) INFORMATIVE - Notification of intention to connect to the public sewer under S106 of the Water Industry Act Approval and consent will be required by Anglian Water, under the Water Industry Act 1991. Contact Development Services Team 0345 606 6087. (2) INFORMATIVE - Notification of intention to connect to the public sewer under S106 of the Water Industry Act Approval and consent will be required by Anglian Water, under the Water Industry Act 1991. Contact Development Services Team 0345 606 6087. (3) INFORMATIVE - Protection of existing assets - A public sewer is shown on record plans within the land identified for the proposed development. It appears that development proposals will affect existing public sewers. It is recommended that the applicant contacts Anglian Water Development Services Team for further advice on this matter. Building over existing public sewers will not be permitted (without agreement) from Anglian Water. (4) INFORMATIVE - Building near to a public sewer - No building will be permitted within the statutory easement width of 3 metres from the pipeline without agreement from Anglian Water. Please contact Development Services Team on 0345 606 6087. (5) INFORMATIVE: The developer should note that the site drainage details submitted have not been approved for the purposes of adoption. If the developer wishes to have the sewers included in a sewer adoption agreement with Anglian Water (under Sections 104 of the Water Industry Act 1991), they should contact our Development Services Team on 0345 606 6087 at the earliest opportunity. Sewers intended for adoption should be designed and constructed in accordance with Sewers for Adoption guide for developers, as supplemented by Anglian Water's requirements.

Section 4 - Surface Water Disposal

The preferred method of surface water disposal would be to a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) with connection to sewer seen as the last option. Building Regulations (part H) on Drainage and Waste Disposal for England includes a surface water drainage hierarchy, with infiltration on site as the preferred disposal option, followed by discharge to watercourse and then connection to a sewer.

From the details submitted to support the planning application the proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets. As such, we are unable to provide comments on the suitability of the surface water management. The Local Planning Authority should seek the advice of the Lead Local Flood Authority or the Internal Drainage Board. The Environment Agency should be consulted if the drainage system directly or indirectly involves the discharge of water into a watercourse. Should the proposed method of surface water management change to include interaction with Anglian Water operated assets, we would wish to be re-consulted to ensure that an effective surface water drainage strategy is prepared and implemented.