

I have no objection in principle to this application as there appears to be little conflict between the development, based upon the Layout Plan, and any significant trees/hedges on site. The Tree Survey provides an accurate assessment of the trees and although a small number are proposed for removal these are generally of limited amenity value and/or poor condition; all important (category A & B) trees are scheduled for retention.

If you are minded to recommend approval of the scheme we will require additional information including a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan in order to ensure appropriate protection measures for trees scheduled for retention. Ideally this should be submitted as part of the application but can be dealt with under condition if necessary.

Regards

David

**David Pizzey**  
Arboricultural Officer



**From:** James Buckingham  
**Sent:** 04 November 2016 15:15  
**To:** John Pateman-Gee  
**Subject:** FW: Consultation on Planning Application 4242/16

Dear Planning,

I refer to your consultation on the above application and the 'Environmental Desk Study, ref 12998, October 2016' submitted in support of the application.

I can confirm that the likelihood of contamination adversely impacting on the proposed development is low and as such I have no objections to raise with respect to land contamination. I would only request that we are contacted in the event of unexpected ground conditions being encountered during construction and that the developer is made aware that the responsibility for the safe development of the site lies with them.

Regards,

**James Buckingham**, MCIEH CEnvH  
Corporate Manager – Sustainable Environment  
**Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council - Working Together**  
Tel: 01449 724705  
Email: [james.buckingham@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:james.buckingham@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk)  
[www.babergh.gov.uk](http://www.babergh.gov.uk) [www.midsuffolk.gov.uk](http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk)



Your ref: 4242/16  
Our ref: Mendlesham – land north-west of  
Mason Court (Old Engine Meadow) 00048353  
Date: 31 October 2016  
Enquiries to: Neil McManus  
Tel: 01473 264121 or 07973 640625  
Email: [neil.mcmanus@suffolk.gov.uk](mailto:neil.mcmanus@suffolk.gov.uk)

Mr John Pateman-Gee,  
Planning Services,  
Mid Suffolk District Council,  
Council Offices,  
131 High Street,  
Needham Market,  
Ipswich,  
Suffolk,  
IP6 8DL

Dear John,

**Mendlesham: land north-west of Mason Court (Old Engine Meadow) – developer contributions**

I refer to the outline planning application for the erection of 28 dwellings including access.

Whilst most infrastructure requirements will be covered under Mid Suffolk'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.

Site specific matters will be covered by a planning obligation or planning conditions.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 204 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 will charge CIL on planning permissions granted from 11th April 2016. Mid Suffolk are required by Regulation 123 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 6th 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 specific contribution requirements related to the proposed scheme are set out below:

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

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

SCC anticipates the following **minimum** pupil yields from a development of 28 dwellings, namely:

- a. Primary school age range, 5-11: 6 pupils. Cost per place is £12,181 (2016/17 costs).
- b. Secondary school age range, 11-16: 5 pupils. Cost per place is £18,355 (2016/17 costs).
- c. Secondary school age range, 16+: 1 pupil. Costs per place is £19,907 (2016/17 costs).

The local catchment schools are Mendlesham County Primary School and Stowupland High School.



Based on existing forecasts SCC will have no surplus places available at the catchment primary school. On this basis SCC will seek CIL funding for at least £73,086 (2016/17 costs) to mitigate the impact of the development.

Based on existing forecasts SCC will have no surplus places available at the catchment secondary school. On this basis SCC will seek CIL funding for at least £111,682 (2016/17 costs) to mitigate the impact of the development.

The scale of contributions is based on cost multipliers for the capital cost of providing a school place, which are reviewed annually to reflect changes in construction costs. The figures quoted will apply during the financial year 2016/17 only and have been provided to give a general indication of the scale of contributions required should residential development go ahead. The sum will be reviewed at key stages of the application process to reflect the projected forecasts of pupil numbers and the capacity of the schools concerned at these times.

Clearly, local circumstances may change over time and I would draw your attention to paragraph 12 where this information is time-limited to 6 months from the date of this letter.

2. **Pre-school provision.** Refer to the NPPF 'Section 8 Promoting healthy communities'. It is the responsibility of SCC to ensure that there is sufficient local provision under the Childcare Act 2006. Section 7 of the Childcare Act sets out a duty to secure free early years provision for pre-school children of a prescribed age. The current requirement is to ensure 15 hours per week of free provision over 38 weeks of the year for all 3 and 4 year-olds. The Education Bill 2011 amended Section 7, introducing the statutory requirement for 15 hours free early years education for all disadvantaged 2 year olds. From these development proposals SCC would anticipate up to 3 pre-school pupils.

This development is in the Mendlesham Ward where there is the following early years provision:

Mendlesham Pre School, offering 52 places: It is predicted that from September 2017 there will be a deficit of places in this Ward. Therefore a full CIL contribution of £18,273 would be sought in this matter.

Please note that the early years pupil yield ratio of 10 children per hundred dwellings is expected to change and increase substantially in the near future. The Government announced, through the 2015 Queen's Speech, an intention to double the amount of free provision made available to 3 and 4 year olds, from 15 hours a week to 30.

3. **Play space provision.** Consideration will need to be given to adequate play space provision. A key document is the 'Play Matters: A Strategy for Suffolk', which sets out the vision for providing more open space where children and young people can play. Some important issues to consider include:

- a. In every residential area there are a variety of supervised and unsupervised places for play, free of charge.



- b. Play spaces are attractive, welcoming, engaging and accessible for all local children and young people, including disabled children, and children from minority groups in the community.
- c. Local neighbourhoods are, and feel like, safe, interesting places to play.
- d. Routes to children's play spaces are safe and accessible for all children and young people.

4. **Transport issues.** Refer to the NPPF 'Section 4 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. This will be coordinated by Suffolk County Council FAO Christopher Fish.

Bus stop improvements. There are a couple of bus routes which go along Chapel Road and thus pass this site as well as the Health Centre, but there are no official stops here. On the basis of encouraging modal shift as highlighted in the NPPF a contribution of £5,000 is required to provide new bus stops which would be secured by way of a site specific planning obligation.

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.** The libraries and archive infrastructure provision topic paper sets out the detailed approach to how contributions are calculated. A contribution of £216 per dwelling is sought i.e. £6,048, 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  $(30 \times £3,000) = £90,000$  per 1,000 people or £90 per person for library space. Assumes average of 2.4 persons per dwelling. Refer to the NPPF 'Section 8 Promoting healthy communities'.
6. **Waste.** All local planning authorities should have regard to both the Waste Management Plan for England and the National Planning Policy for Waste when discharging their responsibilities to the extent that they are appropriate to waste management. The Waste Management Plan for England sets out the Government's ambition to work towards a more sustainable and efficient approach to resource use and management.

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

- *New, non-waste development makes sufficient provision for waste management and promotes good design to secure the integration of waste*



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

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

7. **Supported Housing.** In line with Sections 6 and 8 of the NPPF, homes should be designed to meet the health needs of a changing demographic. Following the replacement of the Lifetime Homes standard, designing homes to the new 'Category M4(2)' standard offers a useful way of fulfilling this objective, 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 local planning authority's housing team to identify local housing needs.
8. **Sustainable Drainage Systems.** Section 10 of the NPPF seeks to meet the challenges of climate change, flooding and coastal change. National Planning Practice Guidance notes that new development should only be considered appropriate in areas at risk of flooding if priority has been given to the use of sustainable drainage systems.

On 18 December 2014 the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Mr Eric Pickles) made a Ministerial Written Statement (MWS) setting out the Government's policy on sustainable drainage systems. In accordance with the MWS, when considering a major development (of 10 dwellings or more), sustainable drainage systems should be provided unless demonstrated to be inappropriate. The MWS also provides that, in considering planning applications:

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

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

A consultation response will be coordinated by Suffolk County Council FAO 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 fire-fighting which will allow SCC to make final consultations at the planning stage.

- 10. Superfast broadband.** Refer to the NPPF paragraphs 42 – 43. 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 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.

- 12.** 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.

I would be grateful if the above information can be presented to the decision-taker.

Yours sincerely,

Neil McManus BSc (Hons) MRICS  
Development Contributions Manager  
Strategic Development – Resource Management

cc Carol Barber, Suffolk County Council  
Christopher Fish, Suffolk County Council  
Floods Planning, Suffolk County Council





Environment  
Agency

John Pateman-Gee  
Mid Suffolk District Council  
Planning Department  
131, Council Offices High Street  
Needham Market  
Ipswich  
IP6 8DL

Our ref: AE/2016/120992/01-L01  
Your ref: 4242/16

Date: 14 November 2016

Dear Mr Pateman-Gee

**APPLICATION FOR OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION (INCLUDE ACCESS ONLY) FOR THE ERECTION OF 28 DWELLINGS LAND TO NORTH WEST OF, MASON COURT (KNOWN AS OLD ENGINE MEADOW), MENDLESHAM**

Thank you for your consultation received on 25 October 2016. We have inspected the application, as submitted, and are raising a holding objection on flood risk grounds.

**Flood Risk**

Our maps show the site lies within fluvial Flood Zone 3a defined by the 'Planning Practice Guidance: Flood Risk and Coastal Change' as having a high probability of flooding. The proposal is for 28 residential dwellings, which are classified as 'more vulnerable' development, as defined in Table 2: Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Therefore, to comply with national policy the application is required to pass the Sequential and Exception Tests and be supported by a site specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).

We have reviewed the submitted FRA, referenced REF: 120/2012/2 1401 FRA and dated August 2016, and consider it does not comply with the requirements set out in the Planning Practice Guidance, Flood Risk and Coastal Change, Reference ID: 7-030-20140306. It does not, therefore, provide a suitable basis for assessment to be made of the flood risks arising from the proposed development. In particular, the submitted FRA fails to:

1. Demonstrate the location of the development in comparison to Flood Zones 2 and 3.
2. Used the Sequential Approach in the siting of the development.



3. Consider the requirement for flood emergency planning including flood warning and evacuation of people for a range of flooding events up to and including the extreme event.
4. Correctly calculate the expected flood depths on site and within the building
5. Provide Finished Floor Levels above the design level with climate change
6. Provide the model for verification

### **Overcoming our Objection**

1. Provide an overlay map showing the proposed development against the Flood Zones.
2. Sequentially site the development in Flood Zone 1 if possible, then Flood Zone 2 then Flood Zone 3.
3. The applicant should include a Flood Emergency Plan detailing the actions to take before, during and after a flood.
4. The applicant needs to compare the flood levels with the site levels and building levels to determine the potential flood depths.
5. Please see the advice to applicant section
6. Submit the model for verification

The applicant can overcome our objection by submitting an FRA that covers the deficiencies highlighted above and demonstrates that the development will be safe will not increase risk elsewhere. If this cannot be achieved we are likely to maintain our objection to the application. Production of an FRA will not in itself result in the removal of an objection.

We ask to be re-consulted with the results of the FRA. We will provide you with bespoke comments within 21 days of receiving formal re-consultation. Our objection will be maintained until an adequate FRA has been submitted.

We have included a factsheet with our response, which sets out the minimum requirements and further guidance on completing an FRA is available on our [website](#).

If you are minded to approve the application contrary to this advice, we request that you contact us to allow further discussion and/or representations from us in line with the [Town and Country Planning \(Consultation\) \(England\) Direction 2009](#).

### **Advice to applicant**

#### **Submission of modelling**

In order for us to fully assess the outputs of the modelling carried out by the applicant it will be necessary for this modelling to be submitted to us. This can be submitted via a share file system or by submission hard drive. However, our following advice should be taken into account before submission of modelling.

#### **Climate change**

The FRA states that the peak flows are based on a 1 in 50 year return period. This



is not a standard design event to assess fluvial flooding. We would wish to see the design event for the development based on the outcome of the 1% (1 in 100) CC and 0.1% (1 in 1000) CC peak flows and levels.

Assess the impact of climate change using appropriate climate change allowances. In this instance, according to 'Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances', the allowances that should be assessed are the Higher Central (35% increase in peak flow) & Upper End (65% increase in peak flow).

For more vulnerable developments in flood zone 3, the higher central (35%) and upper end (65%) allowances over a 100 year lifetime should be used. It is important to assess a range of risk using more than one allowance. The extent, speed and depth of flooding shown in the assessment should be used to determine the flood level for flood risk mitigation measures. Where assessment shows flood risk increases steadily and to shallow depths, it is likely to be more appropriate to choose a flood lower in the range. Where assessment shows flood risk increases sharply due to a 'cliff edge' effect caused by, for example, sudden changes in topography or defences failing or overtopping, it is likely to be more appropriate to choose a flood level higher in the range.

The 'higher central' climate change allowance is our minimum benchmark for flood risk mitigation. If possible the development should be designed to be safe through raised floor levels in the 65% climate change allowance. If this is not possible then robust justification should be provided, and the development should be designed to be safe through raised floor levels in the 35% allowance and the safety and sustainability of the development should be assessed for the 65% and managed through flood resilient/resistant construction measures to the satisfaction of the Local Council.

#### Finished floor levels

The submitted FRA in 'Section 2.4 states 'The minimum floor level of any habitable element will be plus 300mm above adjacent relevant peak flow levels.' The FRA is not clear about whether this includes an allowance for climate change. This information will be required to set finished floor levels in Meters AOD.

The development as proposed could be subject to floodwater entering properties in a 1% (1 in 100) annual probability event with climate change. Finished floor levels for the proposed development must be set 300 millimetres above the 1% (1 in 100) annual probability with climate change flood level. This is to protect the proposed development and its users from flooding. This is in line with the requirements of Paragraphs 059 and 060 of the Planning Practice Guidance, which advises that there should be no internal flooding in 'more vulnerable' developments from a design flood (1% (1 in 100) annual probability inclusive of climate change).

#### Site access/Egress

Section 5.1 of the FRA states 'The proposal, access and egress routes although zoned to be within fluvial flood risk areas, it will be easily within the scope of the proposals to remove all associations with flood risk.' This has not yet been



demonstrated within the submitted information.

During a flood, the journey to safe, dry areas completely outside the 1% (1 in 100) annual probability event with climate change floodplain would involve crossing areas of potentially fast flowing water. Those venturing out on foot in areas where flooding exceeds 100 millimetres or so would be at risk from a wide range of hazards, including for example unmarked drops, or access chambers where the cover has been swept away.

Safe access and egress routes should be assessed in accordance with the guidance document Defra/EA Technical Report FD2320: Flood Risk Assessment Guidance for New Development.

Where safe access cannot be achieved an emergency flood plan that deals with matters of evacuation and refuge should demonstrate that people will not be exposed to flood hazards. The emergency flood plan should be submitted as part of the FRA and will need to be agreed with yourselves.

#### Flood Zone mapping

At this location the Dove has a catchment area less than 3km upstream of the site and therefore may not have been assessed for the purpose of the flood map. Therefore, there may be other areas near to the site where fluvial flood risk is equivalent to Flood Zone 3 or Flood Zone 2.

Our published maps have a Jflow outline of flood zone 2 and 3 from the main river element only of the Dove therefore Flood zone 2 and 3 that is mapped in the vicinity of the development is likely to relate to Jflow outlines from the downstream section of the Dove. Jflow outlines are only indicative and do not provide sufficient accuracy for sequential site consideration.

The NaFRA includes flooding from all rivers with a catchment size greater than 3 km<sup>2</sup>, and all flooding from the sea (both along the open coast and tidal estuaries). Smaller rivers are included in the assessment where they fall within the area that could be affected by an extreme flood (0.1% chance in any year). It does not include other forms of flooding such as from highway drains, sewers, overland flow or rising groundwater.

#### Surface Water Attenuation Basin

We are no longer the statutory consultee for surface water so have not reviewed this element of the application in detail. Having said this, we have noted that the surface water attenuation pond is located very close to the Dove, which is an ordinary watercourse immediately adjacent to the development and then becomes Main River to the north of the development. An attenuation feature in this location could be at risk of fluvial flooding, especially if the new climate change allowances are considered. This could impact its ability to function in a fluvial flood event. It should also be noted that this is located in the areas of flooding shown on the Updated Map for Surface Water in the 1 in 30 year outline.



## **Environmental Permitting Regulations – Informative**

The applicant may need an environmental permit for flood risk activities if they want to do work in, under, over or within 8 metres (m) from the river and from any flood defence structure or culvert of the Dove, designated a 'main river'.

The EPR are a risk-based framework that enables us to focus regulatory effort towards activities with highest flood or environmental risk. Lower risk activities will be excluded or exempt and only higher risk activities will require a permit. Your proposed works may fall under an either one or more of the below:

- 'Exemption,
- 'Exclusion',
- 'Standard Risks Permit'
- 'Bespoke permit.

New forms and further information can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits>. Anyone carrying out these activities without a permit where one is required, is breaking the law.

Please contact our National Customer Contact Centre to assess which category your proposed works fall under. They will then be able to tell you the classification of your application, the fee associated with your application, and how to proceed forward. They can be contacted by email: [floodriskactivity@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:floodriskactivity@environment-agency.gov.uk)

Please note the development in its current form would be unlikely to be granted a permit for the reasons highlighted in our objection.

## **Informative - Ordinary Watercourse Consent**

It is noted that the watercourse is being modified, and the main access route to and from the development for all of the properties crosses the watercourse and the area at highest risk of flooding. It should be considered if this is appropriate. As the Dove is an ordinary watercourse it falls under the jurisdiction of the Lead Local Flood Authority, Suffolk County Council. We recommend you contact Suffolk County Council to discuss this element of the works as you may require consent from them to install this structure. The alterations are upstream of a Main River, so the LLFA may require a Water Framework Directive assessment to be submitted for both the modifications to the watercourse and access route across the watercourse.

We trust this advice is useful.



Yours sincerely

**Miss Eleanor Stewart**  
**Sustainable Places - Planning Advisor**

Direct dial 020 8474 8097

Email [planning.ipswich@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:planning.ipswich@environment-agency.gov.uk)

cc Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy





Environment  
Agency

John Pateman-Gee  
Mid Suffolk District Council  
Planning Department  
131, Council Offices High Street  
Needham Market  
Ipswich  
IP6 8DL

Our ref: AE/2016/120992/02-L01  
Your ref: 4242/16  
Date: 21 December 2016

Dear Mr Pateman-Gee

**APPLICATION FOR OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION (INCLUDE ACCESS ONLY) FOR THE ERECTION OF 28 DWELLINGS. LAND TO NORTH WEST OF, MASON COURT (KNOWN AS OLD ENGINE MEADOW), MENDLESHAM**

Thank you for your consultation received on 28 November 2016. We have inspected the modelling, as submitted, and are maintaining our objection on flood risk grounds.

**Flood Risk**

The submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), dated November 2016 and referenced 120/2012/1401/3, and accompanying modelling look at climate change based on the 2% (in 50 year) Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP). This is incorrect.

As advised in our previous letter referenced AE/2016/120992/01-L01, climate change modelling for peak river flows should be based on the 1% (1 in 100 year) AEP plus a 35% and 65% allowance for climate change.

The applicant has included our guidance for Climate Change for Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Authorities. The introduction on page 4 of this document states that it is 'specifically intended for projects or strategies seeking Government Flood & Coastal Erosion Risk Management Grant in Aid (FCERM GiA)' rather than for planning applications.

Page 9 of the above guidance document states:

'The information provided in Table 2 is derived for changes to river flow likelihood of a 1 in 50 (2%) chance of occurring in any year. For extrapolation of these projections to less likely events the research suggested that the regional allowances are likely to remain relatively constant with increasing return periods.'



This shows where the analysis for the climate change allowances were derived from not the return period that they should be applied to. In support of this application, it will be necessary to look at the peak flood event for modelling. This is the 1% (1 in 100 annual probability).

Once the correct modelling has been used, this will enable the applicant to address all six points raised in our previous objection in a revised FRA.

For further advice, please find attached our Climate Change Allowances guidance.

We trust this advice is useful.

Yours sincerely,

**Miss Eleanor Stewart**  
**Sustainable Places - Planning Advisor**

Direct dial 020 8474 8097

Email [planning.ipswich@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:planning.ipswich@environment-agency.gov.uk)

cc Philip Cobbold Planning Consultancy





## **Planning Applications – Suggested Informative Statements and Conditions Report**

AW Reference:	00018450
Local Planning Authority:	Mid Suffolk District
Site:	Land South Of Chapel Road, Mendlesham
Proposal:	Creation of 28 x C3 dwellings
Planning Application:	4242/16

**Prepared by: Mark Rhodes**

**Date: 09 December 2016**

If you would like to discuss any of the points in this document please  
contact me on 0345 0265 458 or email  
[planningliaison@anglianwater.co.uk](mailto:planningliaison@anglianwater.co.uk)

---



## **ASSETS**

### **Section 1 – Assets Affected**

- 1.1 Our records show that there are no assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within the development site boundary.

## **WASTEWATER SERVICES**

### **Section 2 – Wastewater Treatment**

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

### **Section 3 – Foul Sewerage Network**

- 3.1 The sewerage system at present has available capacity for these flows via a gravity connection to the public foul water sewer. 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

### **Section 4 – Surface Water Disposal**

- 4.1 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.

### **Section 5 – Trade Effluent**

- 5.1 Not applicable
-



**From:** planningconsultations [mailto:planningconsultations@nwl.co.uk]  
**Sent:** 27 October 2016 11:00  
**To:** Planning Admin  
**Subject:** Planning Consultations Response - 4242/16

Our Ref: PC/16/217

Your Ref: 4242/16

Dear Sir or Madam,

**Location:** Land of north west of, Mason Court (known as Old Engine Meadow), Mendlesham

**Proposal:** Application for Outline Planning Permission (include access only) for the erection of 28 dwellings

I acknowledge receipt of your emailed letter dated 25<sup>th</sup> October 2016 regarding the above.

We would advise you that from our records our existing apparatus does not appear to be affected by the proposed development. We have no objection to the development subject to compliance with our requirements. Consent is given to this development on the condition that new metered water supply is provided for each new dwelling for revenue purposes.

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

Yours faithfully

**Bryony Meredith**  
Planning Administrator

T – 01268 664 267                      E – [bryony.meredith@nwl.co.uk](mailto:bryony.meredith@nwl.co.uk)  
W – [www.eswater.co.uk](http://www.eswater.co.uk)

Tweet us @eswater\_care

Essex & Suffolk Water, Sandon Valley House, Canon Barns Road,  
East Hanningfield, Chelmsford, CM3 8BD

**ESSEX & SUFFOLK**  
**WATER** *living water*



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

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

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

Our Ref: 2016\_4242  
Date: 27 October 2016

For the Attention of John Pateman-Gee

Dear Mr Isbell

**PLANNING APPLICATION 4242/16 – LAND TO NORTH WEST OF MASON COURT,  
MENDLESHAM: ARCHAEOLOGY**

This application lies in an area of archaeological interest recorded in the County Historic Environment Record. Scatters of Roman, medieval and post medieval finds have been recorded from within the site itself (MDS 171), with other scatters of multi-period finds located surrounding the proposed development area. As a result, there is high potential that heritage assets of archaeological interest will be encountered at this location. Any groundworks causing significant ground disturbance have the potential to damage any archaeological deposit that exists.

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

The following two conditions, used together, 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 (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 investigation. 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.

Please let me know if you require any clarification or further advice.

Yours sincerely

Rachael Abraham

Senior Archaeological Officer  
Conservation Team



Your Ref: MS/4242/16  
Our Ref: 570\CON\3598\16  
Date: 17<sup>th</sup> November 2016  
Highways Enquiries to: martin.egan@suffolk.gov.uk



**All planning enquiries should be sent to the Local Planning Authority.**  
Email: planningadmin@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

The Planning Officer  
Mid Suffolk District Council  
Council Offices  
131 High Street  
Ipswich  
Suffolk  
IP6 8DL

**For the Attention of:** John Pateman-Gee

Dear Sir,

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 - CONSULTATION RETURN MS/4242/16**

**PROPOSAL:** Application for Outline Planning Permission (include access only) for the erection of 28 dwellings

**LOCATION:** Land To North West Of Mason Court, (Known as Old Engine Meadow), Mendlesham.

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

The Highway Authority has no objection to this application. I note that the scheme is in outline form only so will not pass comment on the submitted layout (which would require amending to meet current highway standards).

The point of access onto Chapel Road is acceptable but I would request that the proposed footway from the site extends out onto Chapel Road and extends to join with the adjacent Health Centre. There is no footway link at present.

The provision of this footway will also serve as access to two formal bus stops which need to be established on Chapel Road and SCC has requested a contribution of £5000 to establish these. There is sufficient highway land to accommodate both bus stops and the footway. There are currently two bus



routes which pass the site but no formal stops. The provision of proper bus stops will encourage patronage of the bus routes by prospective occupants of the site.

If the applicant is willing to incorporate the above into the scheme then the following conditions will be appropriate:

1

Condition: Before any of the new dwellings are first occupied the footpath links to Mason Court and Horsefair Close, generally as shown on the submitted drawing, number 163/2016/SK01, shall be provided and be available for use by the residents.

Reason: To ensure that a formal footpath route is available for new residents to access the village facilities.

2

Condition: Before any dwelling is first occupied a new footway shall be provided along Chapel Road to link the new access with the adjacent Health Centre in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that there is a safe pedestrian access between the development and the adjacent Health Centre.

3 B2

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

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

4 D 1

Condition: Prior to the access being constructed the ditch beneath the proposed access shall be piped or bridged in accordance with details which previously shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be retained thereafter in its approved form. (See Note 6).

Reason: To ensure uninterrupted flow of water and reduce the risk of flooding of the highway.

5 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.

6 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.

7 P 2

Condition: Before the development is commenced details of the areas to be provided for the manoeuvring and parking of vehicles including 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 ensure the provision and long term maintenance of adequate on-site space for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles, where on-street parking and manoeuvring would be detrimental to highway safety.

8 NOTE 02

It is an OFFENCE to carry out works within the public highway, which includes a Public Right of Way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Any conditions which involve work within the limits of the public highway do not give the applicant permission to carry them out. Unless otherwise agreed in writing all works within the public highway shall be carried out by the County Council or its agents at the applicant's expense. The County Council's Central Area Manager must be contacted on Telephone: 01473 341414. Further information go to: <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/parking/apply-for-a-dropped-kerb/>

A fee is payable to the Highway Authority for the assessment and inspection of both new vehicular crossing access works and improvements deemed necessary to existing vehicular crossings due to proposed development.

9 NOTE 06

The proposal will require the piping of a ditch. As the proposal requires work affecting an ordinary watercourse, including a ditch, whether temporary or permanent, then consent will be required from Suffolk County Councils' Flood and Water Management team. Application forms are available from the SCC website:

<http://www.suffolk.gov.uk/environment-and-transport/planning-and-buildings/land-drainage>. Applications for consent may take up to 8 weeks to determine and will incur an additional fee.

10 NOTE 07

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.

11 NOTE 12

The existing street lighting system may be affected by this proposal. The applicant must contact the Street Lighting Engineer of Suffolk County Council, telephone 01284 758859, in order to agree any necessary alterations/additions to be carried out at the expense of the developer.

Yours faithfully,

**Mr Martin Egan**  
**Highways Development Management Engineer**  
Strategic Development – Resource Management



## Consultation Response Pro forma

<b>1</b>	<b>Application Number</b>	<b>M/4242/16/OUT</b>  <b>Application for outline planning permission (including access only) for 28 dwellings on land to the north west of Masons Court and Old Engine Meadow, Mendlesham</b>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Date of Response</b>	17.11.2016	
<b>3</b>	<b>Responding Officer</b>	Name: Julie Abbey-Taylor Job Title: Professional Lead – Housing Enabling Responding on behalf of... Strategic Housing service	
<b>4</b>	<b>Recommendation</b> (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.	Comment – as the application is outline there is no objection at the moment, however we would like to see a balanced mix of dwellings across all tenures that reflect the housing needs survey carried out as part of the on-going Neighbourhood Plan work and the registered need for Affordable homes on the Council's housing register.	
<b>5</b>	<b>Discussion</b> 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.	The emerging Neighbourhood Plan includes for any new affordable housing supply to be allocated to those with a local connection to Mendlesham. Currently any planning gain site would normally be allocated to those on the district wide register via Gateway to Homechoice.  See attached detailed Housing enabling information.  Affordable housing mix to provide a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bed dwellings.	
<b>6</b>	<b>Amendments, Clarification or Additional Information Required</b> (if holding objection)  If concerns are raised, can they be overcome with changes? Please ensure any requests are proportionate	Affordable housing mix should reflect the required 75% rented and 25% shared ownership provision as detailed in the 2012 SHMA. There will be a new SHMA published in 2017 which may recommend a different balance but will be reviewed once any approved application applied for Reserved Matters.	
<b>7</b>	<b>Recommended conditions</b>	See box 5 & 6. Affordable housing to be provided at 35% as required by the District Council	

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



## Consultation Response Pro forma

1	<b>Application Number</b>	4242/16	
2	<b>Date of Response</b>	15/11/2016	
3	<b>Responding Officer</b>	Name:	Hannah Bridges
		Job Title:	Waste Management Officer
		Responding on behalf of...	Waste Services
4	<b>Recommendation</b> (please delete those N/A)  Note: This section must be completed before the response is sent. The recommendation should be based on the information submitted with the application.	No objection subject to condition	
5	<b>Discussion</b> 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.		
6	<b>Amendments, Clarification or Additional Information Required</b> (if holding objection)  If concerns are raised, can they be overcome with changes? Please ensure any requests are proportionate		
7	<b>Recommended conditions</b>	The presentation points for wheeled bins included on the maps. Please ensure that shared road surfaces are not blocked paved as this is not suitable for dustcarts to manoeuvre on.	

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.



## Consultation Response Pro forma

1	<b>Application Number</b>	4242/16 Mason Court, Mendlesham	
2	<b>Date of Response</b>	3.11.16	
3	<b>Responding Officer</b>	Name:	Paul Harrison
		Job Title:	Heritage and Design Officer
		Responding on behalf of...	Heritage
4	<b>Summary and Recommendation</b> (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.	1. The Heritage Team considers that the proposal would cause <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>no harm to a designated heritage asset because there would be no material impact on the setting or significance of listed buildings or of the Conservation Area.</li> </ul>	
5	<b>Discussion</b> 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.	In view of the location of listed buildings in relation to the site, and the character of intervening development, the proposal would have no material impact on the setting or significance of listed buildings in the area.  Similarly in view of the location of the site in relation to the Mendlesham Conservation Area, and in view of the nature and layout of intervening development, the proposal would have no material impact on the setting of, or views into or out of, the Conservation Area.	
6	<b>Amendments, Clarification or Additional Information Required</b> (if holding objection)  If concerns are raised, can they be overcome with changes? Please ensure any requests are proportionate		
7	<b>Recommended conditions</b>		

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.





OFFICIAL

4242/16

## Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service

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

Mid Suffolk District Council  
Planning Department  
131 High Street  
Needham Market  
Ipswich  
IP6 8DL

<b>Planning Control</b>	
<b>Received</b>	
<b>15 NOV 2016</b>	
Acknowledged .....	
Date .....	
Pass to .....	JPG

Your Ref:  
Our Ref: FS/F221357  
Enquiries to: Angela Kempen  
Direct Line: 01473 260588  
E-mail: Fire.BusinessSupport@suffolk.gov.uk  
Web Address: <http://www.suffolk.gov.uk>

Date: 11/11/2016

Dear Sirs

**Old Engine Meadow and land to the rear of Horsefair Close, Mendlesham,  
Stowmarket IP14 5SQ**

**Planning Application No: 4242/16 + S106**

I refer to the above application.

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

### Access and Fire Fighting Facilities

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

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

### Water Supplies

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

Continued/

OFFICIAL



OFFICIAL

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

Mrs A Kempen  
Water Officer

Enc: PDL1

Copy: Mr P Cobbold, 42 Beatrice Avenue, Felixstowe IP11 9HB  
Enc: Sprinkler information



OFFICIAL



## Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service

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

Mid Suffolk District Council  
Planning Department  
131 High Street  
Needham Market  
Ipswich  
IP6 8DL

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: 11 November 2016

### **Planning Ref: 4242/16 + S106**

Dear Sirs

#### **RE: PROVISION OF WATER FOR FIRE FIGHTING**

**ADDRESS:** Old Engine Meadow and land to the rear of Horsefair Close,  
Mendlesham, Stowmarket IP14 5SQ

**DESCRIPTION:** 28 dwellings

**NO: HYDRANTS POSSIBLY REQUIRED: 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.

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



OFFICIAL

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

Yours faithfully

Mrs A Kempen  
Water Officer



**From:** RM PROW Planning  
**Sent:** 10 November 2016 12:01  
**To:** Planning Admin  
**Subject:** RE: Consultation on Planning Application 4242/16

**For The Attention Of: John Pateman-Gee**

## **Rights of Way Response**


Thank you for your consultation regarding the above planning application.

Please accept this email as confirmation that we have no comments or observations to make in respect of this application affecting the Public Footpath 56.

Please note, there may also be 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.

Regards

**Jackie Gillis**  
**Green Access Officer**  
**Access Development Team**  
Rights of Way and Access  
Resource Management, Suffolk County Council  
Endeavour House (Floor 5, Block 1), 8 Russell Road, Ipswich, IP1 2BX

 <http://publicrightsofway.onesuffolk.net/> | [Report A Public Right of Way Problem Here](#)



**From:** Consultations (NE) [mailto:consultations@naturalengland.org.uk]  
**Sent:** 11 November 2016 09:57  
**To:** Planning Admin  
**Subject:** 4242/16

Application ref: 4242/16  
Our Ref: 199720

**Natural England has no comments to make on this application.**

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 **Impact Risk Zones** (available on Magic and as a downloadable dataset) prior to consultation with Natural England.

Yours faithfully

Dawn Kinrade  
Natural England  
Technical Services  
Consultations Team