

From: [Philip Isbell](mailto:Philip.Isbell@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk)
To: e.manero@health-link.org.uk
Cc: [John and Pam Castro](#); [Robert Carmichael](#)
Subject: RE: Application dc/19/05956 Post Mill Lane Fressingfield
Date: 01 March 2021 16:36:28
Attachments: [image003.png](#)

Dear Elizabeth

I acknowledge receipt of your email. Thank you for your and Johns time on Friday. I do hope that this has clarified some of the matters about which you had complained.

As regards your comments below I respectfully suggest I must politely "agree to disagree".

Your comments will be placed in our Tabled late papers for the record. Having made our recommendation, on the record, the committee forum is the right place for the matter to be debated now.

Regards

Philip Isbell
Chief Planning Officer
Sustainable Communities
Mid Suffolk & Babergh District Councils - Working Together
Tel. 07740179172
Email: Philip.Isbell@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk



The Public Sector Transformation Awards

-
-
-

From: e.manero@health-link.org.uk <e.manero@health-link.org.uk>
Sent: 01 March 2021 16:01
To: Philip Isbell <Philip.Isbell@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Cc: John and Pam Castro <john@jpcastro.co.uk>
Subject: FW: Application dc/19/05956 Post Mill Lane Fressingfield

 **EXTERNAL EMAIL: Don't click any links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Click [here](#) for more information or help from Suffolk IT**

Dear Mr Isbell – many thanks for your time last week. It was a very useful meeting. During the meeting I touched on the relevance of the FNDP's policy FRESS3 on infrastructure deficits and thought it might be useful just to sum this up ahead of the 3rd, as that application was not itself the subject of the meeting. FRESS3 is clearly relevant to this application: *'New development will*

only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that sufficient supporting infrastructure (physical, medical, educational, green and digital) is available to meet the needs of that development. Where an infrastructure deficit currently exists, new development should not exacerbate that deficit. Where the need for new infrastructure is identified to meet the needs of that development, developments should provide or support the delivery of it in order to enhance the quality of life for the community.'

We believe that application DC/19/05956 breaches this policy and will cause harm because (1) there are existing infrastructure deficits and (2) the development would exacerbate them so severely and the harm would not be amenable to conditioning or CIL:

(1) Evidence of infrastructure deficits on both highways and sewers:

- The **first current infrastructure deficit, on highways infrastructure**, is evidenced by the observed conflicts in the current baseline level of road hazards described in my attached email to SCC Highways, exacerbated by the cumulative impact of the 55 houses approved but not yet built. The applicant has failed to show that this deficit will not be exacerbated and the mitigations do not address it as the deficit is derived from lack of road space and poor visibility. A single quote from one of the 87 (out of 104, or 84%) respondents to the SAFE 2020 road safety survey (attached to the email to SCC Highways) sums up the current infrastructure deficit: *"I have always feel unsafe on New Street because cars, lorries, buses, farm vehicles can come along at any time and if caught out in one of the many spots where there is no pavement it is very scary. I have to crisscross the road to get to the safety of grass strips or driveways to avoid being stuck at one of several blind spots and places where walls and fences abut the road. When there are passing vehicles or parked cars blocking the road it is extremely stressful. Walking is meant to be healthy and relaxing, but this is an obstacle course with intimidating big vehicles and passing cars, and the adrenaline is flowing. You never can be sure if a driver will see you and slow down in time around a blind spot or against an abutting wall or fence. This is also true for bicycling. The WHOLE of New Street is dangerous because towards Wingfield there are hedges up against the road and covered ditches along with foot high banks of vegetation."* New St is the street that will be most affected by this development as it leads off the site.
- The **second current infrastructure deficit on sewerage system infrastructure** is copiously evidenced by the reports of sewage egress with photographic evidence in support, the existence of a working group set up by Anglian Water with the PC to resolve the matter with no success, and the Environment Agency data. 123

(2) Exacerbation of harm arising from these deficits, as a result of this development:

- It will **exacerbate the highways deficit** by increasing vehicular traffic (taking up more road space and reducing visibility further to the particular detriment of vulnerable pedestrians) and the mitigations will not address either of these issues, and by increasing the numbers of pedestrians who will be subject to those hazards
- It will **exacerbate the sewerage system deficit** by sending more sewage into the system so that sewage egress will occur more often with more sewage egressing on each occasion, because there will be even less capacity than now to take the existing volumes of excess surface water (accepting that surface water generated by the new development will not go into the sewer)

Hope this is helpful and many thanks again for your time in discussing our complaints about the 25th November meeting.

Elizabeth Manero