

Stonham Parish

From: Stonham Aspal Parish Council [<mailto:sapc.clerk@yahoo.co.uk>]
Sent: 17 January 2017 23:57
To: Kathryn Oelman
Subject: Re: Reconsultation on Planning Application 3150/15

Dear Kathryn

Thank you for the extension. Following a meeting of Stonham Aspal Parish Council on 17 January 2017, an objection was made to both the original application and its subsequent amendments. The overpopulation of the development compared to the village's population provides a severe burden to the area's existing services and infrastructure. The development, particularly with its large events, is also not in keeping with the area's surroundings. The advent of an unsightly car wash presents an environmental issue with the disposal of waste. Agricultural exits are also being used on the occasion of events when it was previously understood that they would not be used on such occasions.

Regards

Simon Ashton
Parish Clerk
Stonham Aspal Parish Council
sapc.clerk@yahoo.co.uk
stonhamaspal.onesuffolk.net

From: Kathryn Oelman
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2016 12:02 PM
To: Parish - Stonham Aspal
Subject: RE: Reconsultation on Planning Application 3150/15

Dear Simon,

You can have the extension, but this only gives me limited time to take on board your comments and address them in the committee report as I must still meet the deadline for reports to go to committee on time.

The changes are confined to limited areas of the application, so most of it the Parish Council should be familiar with.

The government does not give us any 'grace' in terms of the statutory time period to account for Christmas, so we still have the same deadlines and the same targets to meet and the applications don't stop coming in. On this application I gave 21 days instead of the normal 14 to account for Christmas. In future you may want to consider routinely convening an extra planning meeting to account for the Christmas period as this would give your parishioners adequate notice and you could cancel should nothing be tabled. Extending the parish deadline for consultation puts considerable pressure upon officers, particularly as we are already working to a restricted time period ourselves due to Bank Holidays and Christmas closing; allowing even more time for a parish response can make meeting a deadline almost impossible.

Kind regards,
Kathryn

Kathryn Oelman BSc(Hons), MSc, MRTPI
Senior Development Management Officer
Mid Suffolk and Babergh District Councils Working Together

Telephone: 01473 825863 (Babergh District Council)
Telephone: 01449 724989 (Mid Suffolk District Council)

Consultee Comments for application 3150/15

Application Summary

Application Number: 3150/15

Address: Stonham Barns, Pettaugh Road, Stonham Aspal, IP14 6AT

Proposal: Hybrid application for full planning permission and outline planning permission - the full description is available by clicking on the documents tab.

Case Officer: Kathryn Oelman

Consultee Details

Name: Mrs Alison Green

Address: Granary Cottage Mill Green, Stonham Aspal, Stowmarket IP14 6DA

Email: sapc.clerk@yahoo.co.uk

On Behalf Of: Stonham Aspal Parish Clerk

Comments

Stonham Aspal Parish Council are objecting to this planning application on the following grounds

The plan includes a total of 126 static caravans and lodges. Put in perspective Stonham Aspal is a village with approximately 226 properties and this would represent an increase of 56% in accommodation. There is no doubt that the potential increase in population (even if transitory or subject to occupancy restrictions) will have a massive impact on the local community of the village and its infrastructure. And the parish council question whether this size of the increase is in keeping with the village environment.

The Parish Council have concerns that the existing infrastructure cannot support the increased population in terms of onsite utilities, sewerage, and access to water for emergency services. And within the local area in terms of emergency services, and meeting health and social needs.

Road safety is also a major concern. The A1120 is already a busy road with safety issues associated with narrow pathways properties being fairly close to the road and children trying to get safely to the school. The increase in traffic will only exacerbate the existing problems which are already proving difficult to control.

In addition to volume of traffic the current access on and off the site are straight on / off of a 60mph stretch of road which is a safety issue in itself.

The Parish Council also has concerns over the safety of a golf course so close to a busy A road where golf balls could stray into the path of traffic travelling at 60mph. It is difficult to see what safety measures could be put in place without impacting on the rural landscape.

Not so much an objection as a concern that the community would like reassurance on; is how

residency restrictions will be policed. As much as the Parish Council appreciate that Starglade are only applying for properties that can only be occupied for 11 months of the year the lodges have been accidentally publicised as 12 month of the year residency. This could potentially create the wrong impression and attracted buyers who are after permanent residences.

3150/15

PETTAUGH PARISH COUNCIL

5 Mill Field
Pettaugh
Suffolk
IP14 6JB

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



9th July 2016

Dear Sirs

STONHAM BARNES LTD - Planning Application 3150/15

http://planningpages.midsuffolk.gov.uk/onlineapplications/files/CB7C7A1DA843C2D71E7A26B0A4D0F40B/pdf/3150_15-AMENDED_PLANNING_STATEMENT-670107.pdf

With reference to the Amended Planning Statement dated 18th May 2016 Pettaugh Parish Council wishes to object to the above application on the following grounds. *(See comments in italics)*

Introduction

4. The applicants have also carried out pre-application discussions with the local community. Local residents have previously been invited to an exhibition at Stonham Barns. The current proposal has evolved from that which was the subject of the initial consultation but the overall scale and complexity of the scheme remains the same.

- *Original Planning Statement January 2016 had a total of 18 static caravans amended to 39 in the May 2016 statement and 37 lodges in January 2016 statement now 87 in the May 2016 both figures a very substantial increase in scale and complexity?*

Statement 12.

- *How will the 11 month occupancy be enforced by MSDC in the following paragraphs v – xiii?*
- v. Use of land for the stationing of 21 static caravans for holiday rental subject to 28 day occupancy restriction.
- vi. Use of land for the stationing of 18 static caravans for holiday use (owner occupied) subject to restriction preventing occupation for one month of the year.
- xi. Use of the land adjacent to existing golf course for the stationing of 7 owner occupied holiday lodges subject to restriction preventing occupation for one month of the year.
- *These lodges appear to have been sold with the promise of 12 month occupancy, although this advertising material has apparently been removed from the website.*
- xii. Use of the land for stationing of 15 fishing lodges for holiday rental subject to 28 day occupancy restriction.

xlii. Use of land for stationing 65 owner occupied holiday lodges subject to restriction preventing occupation for one month of the year.

Statement 19.

19. Part (vi) of the application proposes the stationing of a total of 18 static caravans/holiday lodges for owner-occupiers and relates to an area to the west of the meerkat enclosure. The applicant is happy for these units to be subject to a restriction which will prevent occupation for one month of the year to prevent those being used as permanent accommodation. The following conditions are proposed,

1. The caravans (or cabins/chalets) are occupied for holiday purposes only;
 2. The caravans (or cabins/chalets) shall not be occupied as a person's sole, or main place of residence;
 3. The owners/operators shall maintain an up-to-date register of the names of all owners/occupiers of individual caravans/log cabins/chalets on the site, and of their main addresses, and shall make this information available at all reasonable times to the local planning authority.
- *How will the 11 month occupancy be enforced by MSDC?*

Statement 20.

20. These conditions would be appropriate for the static caravans/lodges which are to be owner/occupied units and provide the Council with the level of control to prevent permanent habitation and would also provide the operators with sufficient flexibility for potential owner occupiers.

- *How will the 11 month occupancy be enforced by MSDC?*
- *It has been suggested that that lodge residents have registered with local GP practices using 'new lodges at Stonham Barns' as their main residence address.*
- *What happens to the lodges already sold with the promise of 12 month occupancy?*

Statement 52.

52. The new holiday lodges to be stationed on the site will be screened by the earth bund and by new and existing landscaping. None of the uses or building operations proposed by this application will have a significant adverse impact on the landscape which would outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development as a whole.

- *How does the erection of prefabricated 'mobile home' type lodges surrounded by earth mounds fulfill the planning constraint regarding design and layout to 'Maintain and enhance the appearance of their surroundings.'*

The Parish Council wish to add the following final comment: It would appear that this development will put an onerous responsibility on MSDC to enforce the residency conditions. Consideration should also be given to the impact on the local infrastructure in the adjacent villages of Pettaugh and especially Stonham Aspal, given that the total possible number of residences for 11 months of the year will be 126, each residence with possibly two occupants.

Yours sincerely

Mrs M S Marlow
Acting Clerk



Consultation Response Pro forma

1	Application Number	3150/15 as amended Stonham Barns	
2	Date of Response	18.1.17	
3	Responding Officer	Name:	Paul Harrison
		Job Title:	Heritage and Design Officer
		Responding on behalf of...	Heritage
4	Summary and Recommendation (please delete those N/A) Note: This section must be completed before the response is sent. The recommendation should be based on the information submitted with the application.	1. The Heritage Team considers that the proposal would cause <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset because it would include a building of unspecified form, dimensions and appearance in the setting of a listed building. 2. The Heritage Team recommends that precise details of form, dimensions and appearance be secured.	
5	Discussion Please outline the reasons/rationale behind how you have formed the recommendation. Please refer to any guidance, policy or material considerations that have informed your recommendation.	The application has been amended in various respects, but since there appears to be no change regarding the item referred to in our previous comment, we have nothing to add to that, and repeat it below. School Farmhouse is situated to the south side of the A1120 and is otherwise surrounded by the application site. It has a modest garden which appears well treed to the east. Within the site are former farm buildings which appear to be historically associated with the farmhouse. Most of the elements of the proposal will have little or no impact on the setting of the listed building, but the proposed position of the food court or play area would abut the south east boundary of the farmhouse. In this position it would be important that the building is not so tall or large or of such appearance as to impose or intrude on the setting of the listed building.	
6	Amendments, Clarification or Additional Information Required (if holding objection) If concerns are raised, can they be overcome with changes? Please ensure any requests are proportionate		

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.

7	Recommended conditions	
---	------------------------	--

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	Application Number	3150/15 Stonham Barns, Stonham Aspal	
2	Date of Response	7.7.16	
3	Responding Officer	Name:	Paul Harrison
		Job Title:	Heritage and Design Officer
		Responding on behalf of...	Heritage
4	Summary and Recommendation (please delete those N/A) Note: This section must be completed before the response is sent. The recommendation should be based on the information submitted with the application.	1. The Heritage Team considers that the proposal would have potential to cause <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset because it would include a building of unspecified form, dimensions and appearance in the setting of a listed building. 2. The Heritage Team recommends that precise details of form, dimensions and appearance be secured.	
5	Discussion Please outline the reasons/rationale behind how you have formed the recommendation. Please refer to any guidance, policy or material considerations that have informed your recommendation.	School Farmhouse is situated to the south side of the A1120 and is otherwise surrounded by the application site. It has a modest garden which appears well treed to the east. Within the site are former farm buildings which appear to be historically associated with the farmhouse. Most of the elements of the proposal will have little or no impact on the setting of the listed building, but the proposed position of the food court would abut the south east boundary of the farmhouse. In this position it would be important that the building is not so tall or large or of such appearance as to impose or intrude on the setting of the listed building.	
6	Amendments, Clarification or Additional Information Required (if holding objection) If concerns are raised, can they be overcome with changes? Please ensure any requests are proportionate		
7	Recommended conditions		

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.

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEMORANDUM

TO: Katherine Oelman Development Control Team
FROM: Environmental Protection Team DATE: 26.08.2016
YOUR REF: 3150/15/FUL
SUBJECT: Stonham Barns Leisure Complex, Stonham Barns, Stonham Aspel.

Thank you for consulting me on the above application.

In respect of other environmental health issues I would like to comment on this application with reference to any adverse impacts from noise on the quality of life and health to occupiers of neighbouring noise sensitive premises. These noise impacts are with reference to amplified sound and music entertainment noise.

The applicant has submitted two Noise Assessment reports by H&H Acoustic Consultancy dated 28th September 2012 and 2 March 2015.

The first report was commissioned in 2012 to assess noise levels from the 'UK Bus Jam'. This event was considered to be representative of a typical event in the marquee. The report has a summary but no conclusions or recommendation. It appears to have been an exercise in measuring, characterising and reporting on noise levels. Although this report is informative and carried out by a competent acoustic consultant, within the context of the application submitted, it does not advise on the impact of entertainment (showground) noise at the nearest noise sensitive premises.

The second report was commissioned in 2015 to assess background noise in order to advise on acceptable noise levels at the nearest noise sensitive premises having regard to the Noise Council's "Code of Practice on Environmental Noise Control at Concerts" (CoP).

The survey reported the average background noise level between 9am and 11pm at 35 dB(A). The survey also reported background noise levels fell below the average 35 dB(A) during the late evening (between 19:00 and 23:00 hours). This is consistent with monitoring results I have taken when measuring noise from events during 2016.

The CoP recommends a noise limit dependant on the number of events. For up to 12 outside events the background noise level should not be exceeded by 15 dB(A) and for up to 30 indoor events this figure is reduced to 5 dB(A).

For the purposes of the licensing arrangements and preventing public nuisance a guideline level of 10 dB(A) was agreed with the licensee. This translates to a boundary noise limit of 52 dB(A) at the site boundary with premises in Crowfield Road.

Since the second report changes have been made to the entertainment area known as the marquee. The marquee (now known as the Barn) has been totally enclosed by timber clad cavity walls with double glazed windows and doors.

The application seeks to replicate the same licensing condition if approved arguing that:

"environmental health are happy with noise levels".

I am sure you are aware the licensing objective in respect of noise (preventing public nuisance) is different to that of the National Planning Policy (preventing adverse and significant adverse noise impacts).

A noise which is incongruous with a quiet rural environment and 10 dB above background noise levels, if occurring frequently, is widely accepted as having a significant adverse impact. The application in this instance is for up to 60 event days which in my opinion would be sufficiently frequent to have such an impact.

I would therefore recommend, should approval be given, that after 9pm the boundary noise limit is reduced to 47 dB(A). This corresponds to 5 dB(A) above the average daytime background noise level and for the number of events would not cause an adverse impact. It would mean the entertainment noise would be discernible but not overly intrusive inside noise sensitive premises.

To safeguard neighbouring noise sensitive dwellings or premises I would recommend the following noise limit levels:

Amplified sound and music entertainment noise for outside and inside events between 21:00 and 23:00 hours -

1. The L_{AeqT} of amplified sound and music based entertainment noise shall not exceed by more than 5 dB(A) the representative background noise L_{A90} (without entertainment noise) at 1 metre from the façade of any neighbouring noise sensitive dwelling or premises. Time period T will be 15 minutes.
2. The music based entertainment noise level, in any event, shall not exceed 47 dB L_{AeqT} at the western boundary of the site with dwellings in Crowfield Road. Time period T will be 15 minutes.

Amplified sound and music entertainment noise at all other times (i.e. between 23:00 and 09:00 hours) is prohibited, except for Saturday and Sunday prior to any bank holiday (23:00:00 to 00:00 hours), Christmas Eve (23:00 to 00:00 hours) and New Years' Eve (23:00 to 01:30hours on New Years' day) when music will be allowed and comply with conditions 1 and 2 above.

I trust this advice is of assistance

David Harrold MCIEH

Senior Environmental Health Officer

David.harrold.Drafts.StonhamB2Aug16

Environmental Health:
sustainability

From: Iain Farquharson
Sent: 20 June 2016 11:59
To: Planning Admin
Subject: RE: Consultation on Planning Application 3150/15

Our Ref M3 179878

Sir/Madam

The application does not make reference to policy CS3. There is no attempt to suggest methods by which the development would provide 10% of the predicted energy requirements nor is there information regarding sustainable construction.

While it is acknowledged that this is an outline application the extent of the proposals are significant with the potential for significant energy demand (over 120 holiday lodges & caravans, plus touring caravans plus new food hall plus other smaller construction). Accordingly some forethought as to energy consumption, energy conservation and sustainable construction is expected. In addition the style of buildings eg caravans & lodges are likely to have a strong reliance on electric based heating or possibly bottled gas and do not easily lend themselves to energy conservation therefore increasing the importance of considering this topic at an early stage.

The recommendation is refusal of permission, the applicant or his agent is requested to address this important topic and submit information accordingly for consideration.

Iain Farquharson

Environmental Management Officer
Babergh Mid Suffolk Council

☎ 01449 724878

✉ iain.farquharson@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

Environmental Health:
Land Contamination

From: Nathan Pittam
Sent: 21 December 2016 11:17
To: Planning Admin
Subject: 3150/15/FUL. EH - Land Contamination.

M3 : 187774

3150/15/FUL. EH - Land Contamination.

**Stonham Barns Leisure Complex, Stonham Barns, Pettaugh Road, Stonham
Aspal, STOWMARKET, Suffolk, IP14 6AT.**

**Hybrid application for full planning permission and outline planning
permission including: i) Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 655/02
to enable the existing showground to operate between ..**

Many thanks for your request for comments in relation to the above application.
Having reviewed the application I can confirm that I have no objections to the
proposed development from the perspective of land contamination.

Regards

Nathan

Nathan Pittam BSc. (Hons.) PhD
Senior Environmental Management Officer
Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils – Working Together
t: 01449 724715
m: 07769 566988
e: Nathan.pittam@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk
w: www.babergh.gov.uk www.midsuffolk.gov.uk

Environmental Health:
Land Contamination

From: David Harrold
Sent: 16 June 2016 15:33
To: Planning Admin
Cc: Kathryn Oelman
Subject: Plan Ref 3150/15/FUL Stonham Barnes Leisure Complex, Pettaugh Road, Stonham Aspal EH
- Land Contamination.

Thank you for consulting me on the above application.

In respect of land contamination issues I can confirm that I do not have any objections to the proposed development.

David Harrold MCIEH

Senior Environmental Health Officer
Babergh and Mid Suffolk Council

01449 724718

MSDC Tourism

From: Tracey Brinkley
Sent: 27 July 2016 12:24
To: Planning Admin
Cc: Kathryn Oelman
Subject: Consultation on Planning Application 3150/15

Location: Stonham Barns, Pettaugh Road, Stonham Aspal, IP14 6AT

Proposal: Hybrid application for full planning permission and outline planning permission

I would like to confirm support for the above application.

The current visitor destination plan (amongst many recommendations) emphasises the need to encourage more overnight stays, and families to visit, and for visitors to come all year round. This development has the potential to help address these areas. The VDP and other supporting documents can be found on our website.

<http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/business/economic-development/tourism-development-in-babergh-and-mid-suffolk/>

With regard to the condition to restrict the use of the different holiday accommodation I would recommend a flexible condition is used as detailed below which restricts the use and occupancy to holiday accommodation which is the essential element, without imposing rigid timescales when it can be occupied. Imposing a more rigid condition would be difficult to monitor and enforce effectively, and, will have an impact on the viability of the project, and conflicts with the aim of encouraging visitors to come all year round, and is therefore counter-productive.

Proposed wording:

'The accommodation shall be occupied for holiday purposes only. The accommodation shall not be occupied as a person's sole or main place of residence. The site owners/ operators shall maintain an up-to-date register of the names of all occupants of the accommodation and of their main home addresses; the site owners/ operators shall make this information available at all reasonable times to the local planning authority.'

It is acknowledged that the Stonham Barns complex is an important visitor destination for the district, attracting a large number of visitors to the area, to visit the large number of businesses located on site, to the various attractions present and also to the Events hosted on site. It is also an important location for small businesses, both long established ones, as well as an opportunity for new businesses to become established. A large number of people are employed, in a range of jobs from across the diverse range of businesses found on site. This is clearly a wider economic benefit to the local area through the supply chain for the local businesses on site.

Tracey Brinkley

Tourism Development Officer

T 01449 724637

E: tracey.brinkley@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

Tourism Development Webpages: <http://www.babergh.gov.uk/business/economic-development/tourism-development-in-babergh-and-mid-suffolk/>

Open for Business Team

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils - Working Together

w: www.babergh.gov.uk www.midsuffolk.gov.uk

<http://heartofsuffolk.co.uk/>

MSDC Enforcement

From: Simon Bailey
Sent: 03 August 2016 16:19
To: Kathryn Oelman
Cc: Michelle Windsor
Subject: FW: Consultation on Planning Application 3150/15

Kathryn,

Enforcement comments:

"The elements of the application encompass all the matters considered to be outstanding by the Enforcement team, with the exception of adverts (which continue to be subject to negotiation with the landowner), and therefore covers the regularisation of unauthorised developments at the site. Attached is a document detailing what Enforcement consider to be the elements with planning permission, and those without."

Hope the above is sufficient. If you need anything further, please let me know.

Regards,

S.

Simon Bailey BA MSc
Senior Planning Enforcement Officer
Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils - Working Together
T 01473 825724 | 01449 724558
E simon.bailey@babergh.gov.uk | simon.bailey@midsuffolk.gov.uk
E dconf@babergh.gov.uk | planningenforcement@midsuffolk.gov.uk
W www.babergh.gov.uk | www.midsuffolk.gov.uk

For details of our Duty Officer Service, see our websites: Babergh Duty Planning Officer Service or Mid Suffolk Duty Planning Officer Service

***** Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging started in Mid Suffolk and Babergh on 11th April 2016. See our websites for the latest information here: CIL in Babergh and CIL in Mid Suffolk ******

Your Ref: MS/3150/15
Our Ref: 570\CON\4272\16
Date: 31 January 2017
Highways Enquiries to: martin.egan@suffolk.gov.uk



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

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

For the Attention of: Ms K. Oelman

Dear Kathryn,

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
CONSULTATION RETURN MS/3150/15**

**PROPOSAL: Hybrid application for full planning permission and outline planning
Permission. Amended details (12/12/2016) include: amended full description of
proposed works, amended planning statement, retention of existing Unit
11 and retention of existing event barn**

LOCATION: Stonham Barns, Pettaugh Road, Stonham Aspal, IP14 6AT

ROAD CLASS: A1120

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highways Authority recommends that permission be refused to the following element(s) of the proposal:

XVI. Use of existing accesses for exit only during events and as entrance for trade vehicles during events;

for the following reasons:

The intensification of use for both purposes would be detrimental to highway safety.

Comment:

No reason is given to justify the use of the accesses for trade vehicle entrance to the site that would outweigh the increased safety risks of this. While agricultural vehicles have used the accesses, it hasn't been demonstrated that the accesses are suitable for all vehicles, notably left turning vehicles may need to cross the carriageway to turn into the access and the strength of the existing ditch crossing structures is unverified. Additional signing and potentially road markings would be necessary to guide drivers to the relevant access. The signs could be confusing and would constitute sign clutter for most of the year (if nothing else).

The planning statement only refers to the use of the accesses as site exits only saying (para. 31), *'this arrangement will help with traffic circulation within the site on event days when large queues can build up within the site when visitors leave.'* The application fails, however, to demonstrate any overriding

need for Accesses 1 and or 2 to be used for this purpose or that the accesses are suitable for all vehicles. The Transport Statement (TS) only shows that the existing access operates with almost no delay during normal weekday conditions. It is acceptable for there to be some delay accessing the highway in a safe location on a few occasions per year. Furthermore, temporary traffic management for the main access may be agreeable and cost effective for a small number of events.

The existing main access has a good accident history and is properly signed and marked. Being field accesses, it is likely that mud and debris would be dragged onto the highway; this would clearly cause an increased risk of loss of control accidents.

It is acknowledged that, because the road is relatively straight and wide, the normal y-distance for visibility splays to the accesses are achievable. It is so not common for accesses to be sited where visibility distances are over twice the normal requirement. In high temperatures, heat haze could be a problem there. Low sunshine can also be a problem on east-west aligned roads.

The highway verge is wide too, which would facilitate higher exit flow rate but increases the risk of drivers failing to look properly or otherwise failing to see vehicles in their haste to enter the highway due to preceding vehicles obscuring their view. The risk of an incident is a multiplication of the frequency of a hazardous action happening by the severity of the likely outcome. The severity could be high due to the high speeds of passing traffic. Low frequency access by large, obvious, agricultural vehicles would generate a relatively low risk per movement therefore compared to high intensity use, (even if only on a few days per year).

Most importantly, the length of road onto which the accesses are located is used for overtaking. TD42/95 (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 6 Section 2) paragraph 2.2 says, 'high major road speeds or the possibility of major road overtaking traffic should not be encouraged at major/minor priority junctions.' It is very likely that vehicles would pull out in advance of fast moving traffic encouraging overtaking and the risk collisions. It is noted that there has been a severe injury incident on this stretch of highway in the last 5 years.

In conclusion, it is suggested that the risk of the proposal equates to a severe residual impact and moreover, to avoid abuse the existing accesses should be closed except for the use by agricultural machinery as historically used.

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highways Authority does not object to items I, X, XIII, XIX as set out in the amended full description of proposed works.

The County Council objects to the other elements of the proposal unless mitigation in terms of measures to promote sustainable transport and measures to protect highway users from hazards associated with the development are secured. Details are set out below.

The TS suggests that the potential for additional traffic generation is limited to 55 holiday lodges, 20 touring caravan pitches, and the 18-hole golf course. Not surprisingly the impact of these at normal weekday peak traffic times on journey time delay is insignificant. No analysis has been provided of the overall traffic impact on weekends, holidays, or major events in the TA report. There is local concern about traffic through Stonham Aspal but no severe congestion near the site and by simple comparison with the existing development the increase in trips from the above elements of the proposal aren't considered to warrant refusal. Currently unconsented uses, however, are not considered and cumulatively these with the new use could be significant and warrant mitigation.

It is remarkable, for example, that such a large destination so close to a village (that could benefit from facilities and be a source for employees (and vice-versa)), is not readily connected by footpaths, footways and or cycletracks. Therefore it is suggested that the increase in use including unconsented uses clearly warrants sustainable access improvements. The TS shows the village is well within 2km walking distance but it is not considered to be an attractive proposition to walk or cycle between the site and the village mainly because there is no footway and because of perceived and actual high vehicle speeds. There is potential for mitigation by way of a footway extension and a speed limit change. It is considered that these would all the relevant tests for planning obligations, being:

- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;

- directly related to the development; and
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Safe access to the public / central facilities within the site during opening hours must be secured. A footway extension scheme appears to be feasible within highway between the nearest footway in the village and the northwest corner of the site. An initial estimate at £75,000 has been provided to me to deliver this. Access to the central facilities on the site could then be achieved through the site. Alternatively, the footway could be extended along the highway verge to the main entrance but at significant extra cost to the applicant, if that is what they would prefer.

The TS suggests the speed limit could be reduced to 30mph. The County Council's Speed Limit Policy <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/assets/suffolk.gov.uk/Environment%20and%20Transport/Roads%20and%20Pavements/2015.07.23-Speed-Limit-Policy.pdf> does not support the extension or addition of a 30mph limit in the rural location of the site.

The least onerous criteria for a speed limit reduction [to 50mph] could be met, however, and it is reasonable for an order to be promoted on grounds of encouraging sustainable access. I should make it clear that this is a cumulative argument accounting for the currently unconsented uses as well as the proposed new ones. Also, such a 50mph speed limit would not be sufficient to alter the recommendation with respect to the accesses, as it would still be a high speed road with risks outlined above and the extent of the limit may not extend far enough east to cover them anyway.

A S106 contribution covering the County Council's costs, initially estimated at approximately £13,000, would be necessary for the Council to consider and promote a speed limit order necessary for the development. The grounds suggested in the policy such as of supporting an economic development initiative such as in a tourist area would be cited. Engineering measures would be required as well to assist enforcement and are included in the above sum. I'm advised that such an order must be considered by the Speed Limit Cases Panel and no assurance can be given that it would be supported now.

The above highway contributions should be index linked and be payable on or before the following:

- the first use of the new building to be used as an indoor children play area under item II of the amended full description of the proposed works;
- first use of any of the static caravans under items V or VI;
- first use of any of the lodges under item XI or XII; or
- first use of the pitch and putt golf course under item XIV

Any of the highways contributions unspent 5 years after receipt would be repayable.

There are 2 bus stops near the site access, which ought to have hardstanding areas, raised and lowered kerbs (to assist access to the buses and to cross the road), footways linked into the site and a shelter. These are clearly development-specific improvements. This public transport improvement contribution is recommended to promote sustainable transport. The cost is initially estimated at £15,000, again index linked, payable at the same trigger points as the highway contribution above and unspent balance repayable after 5 years

Finally, the golf course is close to the highway. Stray golf balls can be a hazard to highway users. Details of measures ensure that this risk is avoided or prevented must be required. It may be feasible and preferable to arrange the course so that this risk is avoided. A net fence may otherwise be required to reduce the risk to an acceptable level. Therefore, a condition must be imposed on any permission to a proposal including the said golf course to address this risk.

Yours sincerely,

Christopher Fish

Senior Development Management Engineer
Strategic Development – Resource Management

SCC Floods
& Water

From: Jason Skilton
Sent: 10 May 2017 14:03
To: Kathryn Oelman
Subject: 2017-05-10 JS Reply Stonham Barns, Pettaugh Road, Stonham Aspal, IP14 6AT Ref 3150/15

Dear Kathryn,

After a site visit, with yourself and the applicant, I can now revise my initial requirement with regard to the disposal of surface water for this hybrid application which contains both retrospective and new applications.

- I. Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 655/02 to enable the existing showground (area outlined in yellow on the submitted plan) to operate between the hours permitted by the Licence granted by the Council on 10 October 2014. **No comment**
- II. Outline planning application for the erection of new building to be used as an indoor children play area (Class D2) on land adjacent to building No24. - **SCC require a surface water drainage strategy for this element of the application if the new building is 1000sqm or more.**
- III. Outline planning application for the erection of a single storey extension to Unit 11 (Class A1); - **Sustainable surface water system to be installed as per Building Regs part H3**
- IV. Retention of retail pods (Class A1/A2/B1) located in market square (buildings labelled 'A', 'B', 'C', 'D', 'E', 'PC7(G)', 'PC5(E)', 'PC4(D)', 'PC1,2,3,5,6,7(A,B,C)' and 'PC6(F)' on the submitted plan; **Sustainable surface water system to be installed as per Building Regs part H3**
- V. Use of land for the stationing of 51 static caravans for holiday rental (subject to 28 day occupancy restriction) on land adjacent to west of dog training area (identified as R1 to R51 on the submitted drawing). **Sustainable surface water system to be installed as per Building part H3**
- VI. Use of land for the stationing of 34 static caravans for holiday use (owner occupied) subject to restriction preventing occupation for one month of the year, on land to west of meerkat enclosure (identified as units 0 to 33 on the submitted plan; - **Sustainable surface water system to be installed as per Building Regs part H3**
- VII. Continued use of land for touring caravans (area outlined in orange on the submitted plan); **No comment**
- VIII. Continued use of land as an extension to the existing showground and/or for use as touring caravan site; **No comment**
- IX. Continued use of land for car boot sales on Sundays (taking place on car park 'A', car park 'B' or the showground); **No comment**
- X. Repositioning of earth bund on northern side of existing fishing lake No1; **No comment**
- XI. Use of land adjacent for the stationing of 76 holiday lodges (owner occupied) subject to restriction preventing occupation for one month of the year (identified as L01 to L045 and L057 to L086 on the submitted plan); - **Sustainable surface water system to be installed as per Building Regs part H3**

XII. Use of land for stationing of 11 holiday lodges for rental subject to 28 day occupancy restriction (lodges L046 to LO56); - **Sustainable surface water system to be installed as per Building Regs part H3**

XIII. Retention of alterations to existing field shelters to form stables; **No comment**

XIV. Use of land for pitch and putt golf course; **No comment** (*note this element has been removed from the application*)

XV. Use of land as overflow car parks; **No comment**

XVI. Use of existing accesses for exit only during events and as entrance for trade vehicles during events; **No comment**

XVII. Retention of alterations and extension to permanent marquee on the showground to form events barn; **No comment**

XVIII. Use of land as car wash; and, - **SCC require a surface water drainage strategy for this element of the application to protect groundwater.**

XIX. Landscaping. **No comment**

Kind Regards

Jason Skilton
Flood & Water Engineer
Suffolk County Council

Tel: 01473 260411
Fax: 01473 216864

SCC Flood + water management

From: Jason Skilton
Sent: 19 December 2016 08:33
To: Planning Admin
Cc: Kathryn Oelman
Subject: 2016-12-19 JS Reply Ref 3150/15 Stonham Barns, Pettaugh Road, Stonham Aſpal, IP14 6AT

Suffolk County Council, Flood and Water Management can make the following initially comments:-

General Comment

We would like to see a flood risk assessment undertaken for the whole site and to include any future proposed development. For elements of the proposed development SCC require surface water drainage strategies to be submitted. The strategy should be in line with our local SuDs guidance.

Specific Comments

- I. Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 655/02 to enable the existing showground (area outlined in yellow on the submitted plan) to operate between the hours permitted by the Licence granted by the Council on 10 October 2014. No comment
- II. Outline planning application for the erection of new building to be used as an indoor children play area (Class D2) on land adjacent to building No24. - **SCC require a surface water drainage strategy for this element of the application**
- III. Outline planning application for the erection of a single storey extension to Unit 11 (Class A1); - **SCC require a surface water drainage strategy for this element of the application**
- IV. Retention of retail pods (Class A1/A2/B1) located in market square (buildings labelled 'A', 'B', 'C', 'D', 'E', 'PC7(G)', 'PC5(E)', 'PC4(D)', 'PC1,2,3,5,6,7(A,B,C)' and 'PC6(F)' on the submitted plan; - **SCC require a surface water drainage strategy for this element of the application**
- V. Use of land for the stationing of 51 static caravans for holiday rental (subject to 28 day occupancy restriction) on land adjacent to west of dog training area (identified as R1 to R51 on the submitted drawing). - **SCC require a surface water drainage strategy for this element of the application**
- VI. Use of land for the stationing of 34 static caravans for holiday use (owner occupied) subject to restriction preventing occupation for one month of the year, on land to west of meerkat enclosure (identified as units 0 to 33 on the submitted plan; - **SCC require a surface water drainage strategy for this element of the application**
- VII. Continued use of land for touring caravans (area outlined in orange on the submitted plan); No comment
- VIII. Continued use of land as an extension to the existing showground and/or for use as touring caravan site; No comment
- IX. Continued use of land for car boot sales on Sundays (taking place on car park 'A', car park 'B' or the showground); No comment
- X. Repositioning of earth bund on northern side of existing fishing lake No1; No comment

XI. Use of land adjacent for the stationing of 76 holiday lodges (owner occupied) subject to restriction preventing occupation for one month of the year (identified as L01 to L045 and L057 to L086 on the submitted plan); - SCC require a surface water drainage strategy for this element of the application

XII. Use of land for stationing of 11 holiday lodges for rental subject to 28 day occupancy restriction (lodges L046 to L056); - SCC require a surface water drainage strategy for this element of the application

XIII. Retention of alterations to existing field shelters to form stables; No comment

XIV. Use of land for pitch and putt golf course; No comment

XV. Use of land as overflow car parks; No comment

XVI. Use of existing accesses for exit only during events and as entrance for trade vehicles during events; No comment

XVII. Retention of alterations and extension to permanent marquee on the showground to form events barn; No comment

XVIII. Use of land as car wash; and, - SCC require a surface water drainage strategy for this element of the application

XIX. Landscaping. No comment

Kind Regards

Jason Skilton
Flood & Water Engineer
Suffolk County Council

Tel: 01473 260411

Fax: 01473 216864

From: RM Floods Planning
Sent: 22 June 2016 07:44
To: Planning Admin
Cc: Kathryn Oelman
Subject: JS reply Stonham Barns, Pettaugh Road, Stonham Aspal, IP14 6AT - 3150/15

Suffolk County Council, Flood & Water Management can make the following initial comments

We would like to see a plan showing the current site as we can only find a plan showing the proposed development/changes. This is to evaluate the percentage of permeable land that is to be developed.

Kind Regards

Jason Skilton
Flood & Water Engineer
Suffolk County Council

Tel: 01473 260411
Fax: 01473 216864

From: planningadmin@midsuffolk.gov.uk [mailto:planningadmin@midsuffolk.gov.uk]
Sent: 13 June 2016 12:40
To: RM Floods Planning
Subject: Consultation on Planning Application 3150/15

Correspondence from MSDC Planning Services.

Location: Stonham Barns, Pettaugh Road, Stonham Aspal, IP14 6AT

Proposal: Hybrid application for full planning permission and outline planning permission including:

- i) Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 655/02 to enable the existing showground to operate between the hours permitted by the Licence granted by the Council on 10 October 2014
- ii) Outline planning application for the erection of new food court building (Class A1);
- iii) Outline planning application for the erection of a single storey extension to Unit 11 (Class A1);
- vi) Retention of retail pods (Class A1/A2/B1) located in market square
- v) Use of land for the stationing of 21 static caravans for holiday rental subject to 28 day occupancy restriction (land adjacent to west of dog training area).

- vi) Use of land for the stationing of 18 static caravans for holiday use (owner occupied) subject to restriction preventing occupation for one month of the year (land to west of meerkat enclosure);
- vii) Continued use of land for touring caravans;
- viii) Continued use of land as an extension to the existing showground and/or for use as touring caravan site;
- xi) Continued use of land for car boot sales on Sundays;
- x) Repositioning of earth bund on northern side of existing fishing lake No1.
- xi) Use of land adjacent to existing golf course for the stationing of 7 owner occupied holiday lodges subject to restriction preventing occupation for one month of the year (lodges L80 to L86);
- xii) Use of land for stationing of 15 fishing lodges for holiday rental subject to 28 day occupancy restriction (lodges L023 to LO37);
- xiii) Use of land for stationing 65 owner occupied holiday lodges subject to restriction preventing occupation for one month of the year on land adjacent to fishing lakes and proposed golf course (lodges L01 to LO22 and LO38 to L080);
- xiv) Retention of alterations to existing field shelters to form stables;
- xv) Use of land for pitch and putt golf course Use of land as overflow car parks
- xvii) Use of existing accesses for exit only during events and as entrance for trade vehicles during events;
- xviii) Outline planning application for extension to permanent marquee on the showground; and,
- xix) Landscaping.

We have received an application on which we would like you to comment. A consultation letter is attached. To view details of the planning application online please click [here](#)

We request your comments regarding this application and these should reach us within 21 days. Please make these online when viewing the application.

The planning policies that appear to be relevant to this case are C01/03, NPPF, GP1, CL8, HB1, CL6, which can

be found in detail in the Mid Suffolk Local Plan.

Suffolk Fire:
water Hydrants

From: Andrea Stordy
Sent: 15 December 2016 14:12
To: Planning Admin
Subject: FAO: Kathryn Oelman

Planning Application: 3150/15
Location: Stonham Barns, Pettaugh Road, Stonham Asp0al, IP14 6AT

Good Afternoon,

Thank you for your letter of 12/12/2016.

Please be advised that we have made formal comment on planning application 3150/15 on 29/07/2016, although we note that our comments have not been published. The comments may remain in place for the amended works.

If you require a copy of the original comments made, please email your request, quoting Fire Ref.: F200160, to water.hydrants@suffolk.gov.uk.

Kind regards,

Sent on behalf of the Water Officer

Andrea Stordy
BSC

Engineering,
Public Health and Protection
Suffolk County Council
3rd Floor, Lime Block
Endeavour House,
Russell Road,
IP1 2BX

Tel.: 01473 260564
Team Mailbox: water.hydrants@suffolk.gov.uk



OFFICIAL

3150/15

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

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL PLANNING CONTROL RECEIVED
14 JUL 2016
ACKNOWLEDGED
DATE
PASSTO <i>KO</i>

Your Ref:	3150/15
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: 13 July 2016

Planning Ref: 3150/15

Dear Sirs

RE: PROVISION OF WATER FOR FIRE FIGHTING
ADDRESS: Stonham Barns, Pettaugh Road, Stonham Aspal IP14 6AT
DESCRIPTION: Hybrid development
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

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

Yours faithfully

Mrs A Kempen
Water Officer

We are working towards making Suffolk the Greenest County. This paper is 100% recycled and made using a chlorine free process.

OFFICIAL



OFFICIAL

3150/15

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: 3150/15
Our Ref: FS/F200160
Enquiries to: Angela Kempen
Direct Line: 01473 260588
E-mail: Fire.BusinessSupport@suffolk.gov.uk
Web Address: http://www.suffolk.gov.uk



Date: 13/07/2016

Dear Sirs

Stonham Barns, Pettaugh Road, Stonham Aspal IP14 6AT
Planning Application No: 3150/15

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 Authority recommends that fire hydrants be installed within this development. 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 Authority recommends the use of an existing area of open water as an emergency water supply (EWS).

Criteria appertaining to Fire and Rescue Authority requirements for siting and access are available on request from the above address.

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service also 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

Suffolk Wildlife
Trust

From: James Meyer [<mailto:JamesM@suffolkwildlifetrust.org>]
Sent: 05 August 2016 11:30
To: Kathryn Oelman
Subject: RE: Planning Application 3150/15: Hybrid application at Stonham Barns

Hi Kathryn,

Apologies for the delay in getting back to you on this, we have the following comments on these proposals:

- In relation to the outline application for the new food court building and extension to unit 1.1, these do not appear to have been assessed as part of the ecological survey of the site. It is therefore unclear whether they would result in any loss of habitat or impacts on protected and/or Priority species. If habitat suitable for protected and/or Priority species is present in the areas proposed for these parts of the development, they further assessment should be undertaken prior to the determination of this application.
- The location of proposed lodges LO73 to 80 appears to be currently be a hedgerow, which the ecological survey assessed as being an important hedgerow under the Hedgerow Regulations (1997). We would object to the loss of this hedgerow unless it can be demonstrated that such loss can be adequately compensated.
- The ecological survey report makes reference to recording skylarks on the site, although there appears to be no further detail on this. It is understood that the land proposed for the new golf course is currently arable land, dependent on crop rotation this area is likely to provide suitable nesting habitat for skylarks. Skylark is a UK and Suffolk Priority species and therefore any potential impact on them should be adequately assessed and mitigated or compensated as part of this proposal.
- It is noted that the application makes reference to landscaping, we recommend that any landscape planting uses native species of local provenance and is managed to maximise its biodiversity value.

I hope the above is helpful, if you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards

James

James Meyer
Conservation Planner

From: Kathryn Oelman [<mailto:Kathryn.Oelman@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>]
Sent: 01 August 2016 16:10
To: James Buckingham <James.Buckingham@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>; Lee Carvell <Lee.Carvell@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>; David Pizzey <David.Pizzey@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>; Heather Worton <Heather.Worton@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>; James Meyer <JamesM@suffolkwildlifetrust.org>; Steel, Graham <graham.steel@environment-agency.gov.uk>
Cc: Joanna Hart <Joanna.Hart@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Application 3150/15: Hybrid application at Stonham Barns

Dear Sirs,

Re: 3150/15: Hybrid application at Stonham Barns

I am writing as we requested your comments (or your organisations comments) in respect of this application on 13th June 2016. Our records appear to show that I have not yet received anything so far and the consultation deadline has expired. I am very interested to receive your comments if you have any. If you would like to arrange an extension or do not wish to reply, please also contact me to let me know.

Kind regards,
Kathryn

Kathryn Oelman BSc(Hons), MSc, MRTPI
Senior Development Management Officer
Mid Suffolk and Babergh District Councils Working Together

Telephone: 01473 825863 (Babergh District Council)
Telephone: 01449 724989 (Mid Suffolk District Council)
Websites: www.midsuffolk.gov.uk www.babergh.gov.uk

***** Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging started in Mid Suffolk and Babergh on 11th April 2016. See our websites for the latest information here: [CIL in Babergh](#) and [CIL in Mid Suffolk](#) ******

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.

suffolkwildlifetrust.org | [@suffolkwildlife](https://twitter.com/suffolkwildlife) | facebook.com/suffolkwildlife

Suffolk Wildlife Trust, Brooke House
Ashbocking, Ipswich, IP6 9JY
01473 890089

Suffolk Wildlife Trust is a registered charity, no. 262777 | Company limited by guarantee no. 695346. VAT no. 460 456 258.
This e-mail and any attachments are confidential and may contain personal views which are not necessarily the views of Suffolk Wildlife Trust. Please note that Suffolk Wildlife Trust monitors e-mails sent or received. Further communication will signify your consent to this.



**Defence
Infrastructure
Organisation**

Mid Suffolk District Council
Planning Services, 131 High Street,
Suffolk
IP6 8DL
England

**Safeguarding
Statutory**

Defence Infrastructure Organisation
Kingston Road
Sutton Coldfield
West Midlands
B75 7RL

Tel: +44 (0)121 311 2025 Tel (MOD): 94421 2025

Fax: +44 (0)121 311 2218

Email: DIO-safeguarding-statutory@mod.uk

www.mod.uk/DIO

12 Jul 2016

Dear Ms Kathryn Oelman ,

Your Reference: 3150/15

Our Reference: 10036491

MOD Safeguarding

Proposal: 3150/15 - Hybrid application for full planning permission and outline planning permission

Location: Stonham Barns, Pettaugh Road, Stonham Aspal
Suffolk
IP14 6AT
England

Planning Reference: 3150/15

Thank you for consulting the Ministry of Defence (MOD) on the above proposed development which was received by this office on 13/06/2016.

The proposed application falls within the statutory aerodrome safeguarding consultation zones surrounding RAF Wattisham.

On reviewing the above referenced application, I can confirm that the MOD has no safeguarding objections to this proposal.

I trust this is clear however should you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Mr Michael Billings
Safeguarding Assistant