

REDGRAVE PARISH COUNCIL

Wayside Cottage ~ Cherry Tree Lane ~ Botesdale ~ Diss ~ IP22 1DL

Tel: 01379 890141

The Parish Council considered application DC/17/05663 for 30 residential units at Land Adjacent to Charters Towers at a meeting of over 60 residents, who raised significant objections to the proposals. The Parish Council also identified significant objections to the proposals as set out below.

Village character, density and design:

Mid Suffolk District Council's Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2008) notes that Redgrave is a linear settlement along a road from a crossing point on the Little Ouse river which leads up onto the clay arable lands. The Appraisal states that the settlement pattern in Redgrave has houses 'along the approach road from the north-west mostly one plot deep. This means that, although not often visible, the countryside is never far away.' This linear form of development is most evident approaching the village from Gallows Hill, where the first houses on the northern side of the road can be seen with an open field behind them. This field is included within the conservation area boundary reflecting that it is not simply a part of the general landscape setting of Redgrave but plays a particularly important role in defining the historic linear form of development with houses a single plot deep and countryside behind.

The proposed development would fill this open field. Only one of the new buildings faces Gallows Hill, reflecting the existing pattern of 'ribbon' development along the road. However, at 9m it is significantly taller than the existing roadside buildings and would be set back from the road side behind a front garden unlike most of the existing buildings. The rest of the new development, some 29 houses, would be set at an angle to the road or around a cul-de-sac. This would be entirely at odds with the historic pattern of development in the conservation area as well as removing a particularly important part of its setting. This is contrary to saved policy GP1 which states that the siting of buildings and the creation of open spaces between existing and proposed buildings should maintain or enhance the character of the site, with attention to the treatment of boundaries particularly on the edge of settlements. The new houses seek to reflect local styles of building in the use of brick and rendered walls, but several are grouped in short terraces giving them a massing and density not found in the generally informal and low density traditional building in the area. Many of them would also be built on deep plans and with shallow pitched roofs. The elevations on drawing 17-050-202 show how this would give buildings broad bulky side elevations that are inelegant and unlike traditional forms of building. We consider that this is contrary to saved policy H13 of the Local Plan which specifies that design and layout should respect the character of the proposal site and the relationship of the proposed development to its surroundings; and - should complement the scale and form of traditional building in the area.

The Heritage section of the Design and Access Statement submitted with the current application does not repeat the Conservation Area Appraisal's comments on the form of development or landscape setting of Redgrave or assess the contribution the proposed development site makes to its significance but instead comments on views not affected by the development. The application does not, therefore, satisfy the requirements of para 128 of the NPPF which states that applicants must submit sufficient information to allow assessment of the impact of proposed development on conservation areas. Despite this, the contribution the site makes to the historic significance of the conservation area is clear and its inclusion in the designated area reflects this. The Parish Council considers that the development would result in harm to the significance of the conservation area in terms of the NPPF para 132. NPPF para 128 also states that a 'clear and convincing' justification must be made for 'any' such harm. The Parish Council does not believe such a justification has been made.

Transport/sustainability and access:

Transport / Sustainability – The Transport Assessment provided within the planning statement is brief and contradictory, and is of limited value in assessing whether the development creates a “safe and secure layout which minimise(s) conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians”. (NPPF para 35) or meets considerations laid out in saved policy T10. The Assessment states that the B1113 'is not a busy road, even at peak morning and afternoon commuting times'. In contrast, the Ecological report and Landscaping statement describe the B1113 as 'heavily used". A 2016 police survey recorded upwards of 14,000 movements through the village in an average week. The road is narrow, particularly at the junction with Sandy Lane and the footway from the site to the village centre narrows to only 700mm in places. Lorries and farm vehicles often mount the pavement to avoid oncoming vehicles. There is no scope to widen the footway into the village due to the proximity of existing buildings.

Access - Although it might be possible to achieve required visibility splays for an access to the site, this is based on a 30mph speed and there is no evaluation within the application of the real speeds achieved as vehicles enter the village and approach the site. The police survey referred to above and data from a Vehicle Activated Sign located on Gallows Hill indicate that speeds in this area largely exceed the speed limit. Again, without an up to date speed survey within the application, full consideration of the access location cannot be made.

Social Issues and amenity:

The street scene has already been mentioned with regard to the character of the site and village. However, it must also be considered in terms of social cohesion and inclusion. NPPF para 61 states that planning “decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment”. The position within the site and the orientation of the affordable housing – the flatted building and semi-detached houses – is clumsy and ill-considered. With their backs to the proposed cul-de-sac and either set in isolation at the far end of the site or at an angle to the street, the affordable properties do not share the same street scene as the other houses within the development or the existing houses along the main road, resulting in social isolation rather than integration.

Additionally, the relationship and the interaction between the development and the village will significantly reduce the amenity and privacy of nearby residents (saved policy H16), particularly of the last three houses in the village. As the land rises behind them, the proposed 2-storey houses back onto their gardens, not just overlooking but imposing. The last house in the row, Pine Cottage, particularly suffers with direct overlooking from two angles and a concentration of parking behind its garden.

The central green space would be relatively unusable by families as it is completely cut off from the surrounding houses by the access road.

Finally, the 1300m² fenced in buffer area to the south, with no indication in the application of how it will be maintained, is likely to become a no-man’s land of overgrown vegetation and over-fence fly-tipping contrary to saved policy GP1 which states that the interrelationship between buildings and open spaces in any layout should act to minimise opportunities for criminal activity.

With regard to all of the above, it should be noted that NPPF para 64 states that “permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.”

Other:

The Suffolk Sites & Monuments Record contains a number of entries relating to archaeology in and around Redgrave, including an entry on the application site which shows potential for early Anglo Saxon archaeology in the vicinity. However, there is no assessment of the archaeological impact within the application and as such the proposals are contrary to saved policy HB13.

The Ecology report is of limited scope and doesn't allow full assessment of the impact in terms of saved policy CL8 or NPPF para 118. Although the Design and Access Statement proposes that a 1300m² buffer area to the south will provide a new wildlife corridor, it unfortunately terminates at the "heavily used" B1113.

Surface water drainage has not been adequately addressed as there is no inclusion of an attenuation pond on the site.

The proposals would result in the loss of agricultural land. Saved policy CL11 encourages the retention of high quality agricultural land and there is no information on the quality of the field which is simply referred to as no longer "useful".

Four of the houses are designated as self-build, making them exempt from affordable housing requirements and Community Infrastructure Levy and thus reducing what little benefit there would be to the community from the proposed development.

Conclusion:

Redgrave Parish Council strenuously OBJECTS to the granting of consent for application DC/17/05663 for the reasons set out above. Furthermore, it is appalled by the complete lack of community engagement prior to submission of this application, resulting in an application which completely ignores local needs and concerns.

From:Ipswich, Planning
Sent:Wed, 3 Jan 2018 15:50:11 +0000
To:BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Subject:RE: MSDC Planning Consultation Request - DC/17/05663
Attachments:FINAL Development Management Consultation Checklist 160725 (002).docx

Thank you for your email.

We are returning this consultation without comment because we have checked the application and it is not clear why we have been consulted. Please find attached a consultation checklist which explains when to consult us.

If, after reconsideration, you still need us to comment on this planning application, please specify why.

If you confirm why we have been appropriately consulted, our 21 day statutory consultation period will start. If not, we will take no further action.

We have adopted this approach because we are currently receiving large numbers of inappropriate consultations. These significantly reduce the time and staff resources we have to provide you with timely statutory consultation responses.

Kind Regards

Charlie Christensen
Sustainable Places Planning Advisor – East Anglia Area (East)
Environment Agency | Icen House, Cobham Road, Ipswich, Suffolk, IP3 9JD

charlie.christensen@environment-agency.gov.uk
External: 020 847 45593 | Internal: 45593



National Customer Contact Centre: 03708 506506

(Weekday Daytime calls may cost 8p plus up to 6p per minute from BT Weekend Unlimited. Mobile and other providers' charges may vary.)

Your ref: DC/17/05663
Our ref: Redgrave – land adjacent to Charters
Towers, The Street 00053217
Date: 03 January 2018
Enquiries to: Neil McManus
Tel: 01473 264121 or 07973 640625
Email: neil.mcmanus@suffolk.gov.uk

Ms Sarah Scott,
Growth & Sustainable Planning,
Mid Suffolk District Council,
Endeavour House,
8 Russell Road,
Ipswich,
Suffolk,
IP6 8DL

Dear Sarah,

Redgrave: land adjacent to Charters Towers, The Street – developer contributions

I refer to the proposal: planning application – erection of 30 No. residential units.

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

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

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

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 charges CIL on planning permissions granted after 11th April 2016. Regulation 123 requires mid Suffolk to publish a list of infrastructure projects or types of infrastructure that it intends will be, or may be, wholly or partly funded by CIL.

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

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

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

- 1. Education.** 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 30 dwellings, namely:

- a. Primary school age range, 5-11: 8 pupils. Cost per place is £12,181 (2017/18 costs).
- b. Secondary school age range, 11-16: 6 pupils. Cost per place is £18,355 (2017/18 costs).
- c. Secondary school age range, 16+: 1 pupil. Costs per place is £19,907 (2017/18 costs).

The local catchment schools are St Botolph's CEVCP School in Botesdale and Hartismere School in Eye.

Based on existing forecasts SCC will have no surplus places available at the catchment primary and secondary schools when considering the impact of cumulative growth in the locality. On this basis CIL funding of at least £97,448 (2017/18 costs) will be sought for primary school provision and CIL funding of at least £130,037 (2017/18 costs) will be sought for secondary school provision.

- 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 falls within the ward of Rickinghall and Hessett, where there is a predicted deficit of 34 places in September 2017. Therefore, for the 3 children arising from this development will require a full CIL contribution for early years of £24,999.

From September 2017, working families may get an additional 15 hours' free childcare entitlement per week on top of the current 15 hours, giving a total of 30 hours a week for 38 weeks of the year.

- 3. Play space provision.** Consideration will need to be given to adequate play space provision. A key document is the 'Quality in Play' document fifth edition published in 2016 by Play England.
- 4. Transport issues.** Refer to the NPPF 'Section 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. Suffolk County Council FAO Sam Harvey will coordinate this.

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

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

5. Libraries. The libraries and archive infrastructure provision topic paper sets out the detailed approach to how contributions are calculated. A CIL contribution of £216 per dwelling is sought i.e. £6,480, 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 provided to the decision-taker in respect of this planning application.

Yours sincerely,

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

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

Subject:FW: 2018-01-08 JS Reply Land Adjacent To Charters Towers , The Street, Redgrave, IP22 1RZ Ref DC/17/05663

From: RM Floods Planning

Sent: 08 January 2018 08:23

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

Cc: Sarah Scott <Sarah.Scott@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>

Subject: 2018-01-08 JS Reply Land Adjacent To Charters Towers , The Street, Redgrave, IP22 1RZ Ref DC/17/05663

Dear Sarah Scott,

Subject: Land Adjacent To Charters Towers , The Street, Redgrave, IP22 1RZ Ref DC/17/05663

Suffolk County Council, Flood and Water Management have reviewed application ref DC/17/05663.

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

- Surface Water Drainage Strategy & Appendices Ref 22483 Rev 0
- Site Location Plan Ref 17-050-00 Rev 1
- Proposed Block Plan Ref 17-050-20 Rev 0
- Landscape Statement (no reference)
- Topographical Survey Ref 17-050-00 Rev 2

The reason why we are recommending a holding objection is because what the applicant has identified a viable method for the disposal of surface water for the dwellings, they have not identified or design a surface water drainage system for the road infrastructure.

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

1. Submit details as part of the surface water drainage strategy on how the surface water from the highway will be drained and the drainage assets maintained.

Kind Regards

Jason Skilton

Flood & Water Engineer

Suffolk County Council

Tel: 01473 260411

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

From: planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk [<mailto:planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>]

Sent: 03 January 2018 11:09

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

Subject: MSDC Planning Consultation Request - DC/17/05663

Please find attached planning consultation request letter relating to planning application - DC/17/05663
- Land Adjacent To Charters Towers , The Street, Redgrave, IP22 1RZ

Kind Regards

Planning Support Team

Emails sent to and from this organisation will be monitored in accordance with the law to ensure compliance with policies and to minimize any security risks. The information contained in this email or any of its attachments may be privileged or confidential and is intended for the exclusive use of the addressee. Any unauthorised use may be unlawful. If you receive this email by mistake, please advise the sender immediately by using the reply facility in your email software. Opinions, conclusions and

From:David Pizzey
Sent:Tue, 9 Jan 2018 10:21:34 +0000
To:Sarah Scott
Cc:BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Subject:DC/17/05663 Land Adjacent To Charters Towers , The Street, Redgrave

Sarah

This application site contains one tree of particular merit, a large mature English Oak in the north west corner. I note it is scheduled for retention but am concerned about the close proximity of development that could lead to adverse impact during construction and pressure for pruning/removal following completion. It will therefore be beneficial for more detailed assessment of this issue and additional space in the layout design if necessary.

Please let me know if you require any further input.

Regards

David

David Pizzey FArborA

Arboricultural Officer

Tel: 01449 724555

david.pizzey@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

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

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils – Working Together

From:Infrastructure Team (Babergh Mid Suffolk)
Sent:Tue, 9 Jan 2018 11:35:56 +0000
To:BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Subject:RE: MSDC Planning Consultation Request - DC/17/05663

Hello

This development site lies within the high value zone for MSDC CIL Charging and would be subject to CIL at a rate of £115m² (subject to indexation). The Developer should ensure they understand their duties in relation to compliance with the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).

Kind regards,

Angharad Firth
Infrastructure Support Officer
Infrastructure Team
Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council – Working Together

Mob: 07710854584
Tel: 01449 724978

Please note that from Monday 6 November 2017 the team will be based at Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich IP1 2BX.

We have two new customer access points:

Stowmarket 54 Ipswich Street, IP14 1AD

Monday - Thursday, from 9.00am - 5.00pm, or Friday, from 9.00am - 4.30pm

Sudbury Town Hall, Old Market Place, CO10 1TL

Monday - Thursday, from 9.00am - 12.30pm and from 1.30pm - 5.00pm, or Friday, from 9.00am - 12.30pm and from 1.30pm - 4.30pm.

Personal Office Hours: Mon-Thurs 9:30 – 17:30 Fri 9:30 – 17:00

Please be advised that any comments expressed in this email are offered at an officer level as a professional opinion and are given without prejudice to any decision or action the Council may take in the future. Please check with the emails author if you are in any doubt about the status of the advice given within this email.

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

From: planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk [<mailto:planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>]
Sent: 03 January 2018 11:09
To: Infrastructure Team (Babergh Mid Suffolk) <Infrastructure@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: MSDC Planning Consultation Request - DC/17/05663

Please find attached planning consultation request letter relating to planning application - DC/17/05663 - Land Adjacent To Charters Towers , The Street, Redgrave, IP22 1RZ

Kind Regards

Babergh District Council
Planning Department
Endeavour House
Russell Road
Ipswich
IP1 2BX

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

Your Ref:
Our Ref: ENG/AK
Enquiries to: Mrs A Kempen
Direct Line: 01473 260486
E-mail: Angela.Kempen@suffolk.gov.uk
Web Address: www.suffolk.gov.uk

Date: 12 January 2018

Planning Ref: DC/17/05663

Dear Sirs

RE: PROVISION OF WATER FOR FIRE FIGHTING
ADDRESS: Land adjacent to Charters towers, The Street, Redgrave IP22 1RZ
DESCRIPTION: 30 residential units
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

Babergh District Council
Planning Department
Endeavour House
Russell Road
Ipswich
IP1 2BX

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

Your Ref:
Our Ref: FS/F190984
Enquiries to: Angela Kempen
Direct Line: 01473 260588
E-mail: Fire.BusinessSupport@suffolk.gov.uk
Web Address: <http://www.suffolk.gov.uk>

Date: 12/01/2018

Dear Sirs

Land adj. to Charters Towers, The Street, Redgrave IP122 1RZ
Planning Application No: DC/17/05663

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

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: Hollins Architects, 4a Market Hill, Framlingham, Woodbridge IP13 9BA
Enc: Sprinkler information



Consultation Response Pro forma

1	Application Number	DC/17/05663 Planning application for the erection of 30 residential dwellings on land adjacent to Charters Towers, The Street, Redgrave IP22 1RZ	
2	Date of Response	18/01/2018	
3	Responding Officer	Name:	Leigh-Anne Francis
		Job Title:	Temp Housing Enabling Officer
		Responding on behalf of...	Strategic Housing service
4	Recommendation (please delete those N/A) Note: This section must be completed before the response is sent. The recommendation should be based on the information submitted with the application.	No objection – supported as the development will meet the local housing needs as identified in The Ipswich Housing Market Area, Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) document as updated in 2017 which confirms that there is a continuing need for housing across all tenures and a growing need for affordable housing. The 2017 SHMA indicates that in Mid Suffolk there is a need for 94 new affordable homes per annum.	
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.	This application proposes 30 units of which 12 will be provided as affordable homes. This is Policy compliant with the requirement to provide 35% affordable on all sites of 10 units or more within the Mid Suffolk district. The allocation of these units will be to applicants registered on the Council's housing register Homechoice. The housing waiting list currently shows that there are 4 applicants requiring accommodation in this area who have a local connection to the area. The need is for 1 and 2 bed units. As part of this development 800sqm of the market accommodation to be provided will be for self-build which is mentioned in the Joint Strategic Plan 2014-2017 and is one of the Governments key priorities for encouraging innovative ways of housing delivery.	
	Amendments, Clarification or Additional Information Required (if holding objection)	It would be proposed that at Reserved Matters the layout submitted should accommodate the that the affordable units are as follows: -	

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.

	<p>If concerns are raised, can they be overcome with changes? Please ensure any requests are proportionate</p>	<p><u>Affordable Rented = 9 (75%)</u> 3 x 1 bed 2-person houses @ 58 sqm 6 x 2bed 4-person houses @ 79 sqm</p> <p><u>Shared Ownership = 3 (25%)</u> 1 x 2bed 3-person bungalow @ 61 sqm 2 x 2 bed 4-person house @79 sqm</p>
7	<p>Recommended conditions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing secured as per schedule of units as detailed in box 6. • The affordable homes should be built to comply with the Technical housing standards – nationally described space standards March 2015. • The Council is granted 100% nomination rights to all affordable units on initial lets and 75% thereafter. • The Shared Ownership properties must have an upper limit of an initial share purchase of 80%. • The location and phasing of the affordable housing units must be agreed with the Council to ensure they are integrated within the proposed development according to current best practice. • Adequate parking is made for the affordable housing units.

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.



18 January 2018

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

By email only

Dear Sarah,

Application: DC/17/05663

Location: Land Adjacent To Charters Towers Gallows Hill Redgrave IP22 1RZ

Proposal: Planning Application - Erection of 30 No. residential units

Thank you for consulting Place Services on the above application.

Holding objection due to lack of ecological information to determine the impacts of the development on protected species and priority species/habitats

An ecological report (Framlingham Environmental, July 2017) has been submitted for this application. However, there is currently no desk study within the ecological report to examine what designated sites, protected species and priority species/habitat may be present and affected by the proposed works. Consequently, there is currently insufficient ecological information for determination of this application.

Place Services undertook a data search using the Suffolk Biodiversity Information Service (SBIS) for this application and determined that there are records of bats, hedgehogs and swifts nearby to the proposed development. Therefore, a revised ecological report should be undertaken to consider all designated sites, protected species and priority species/habitats.

This will ensure that the decision made for this application is based on all relevant material considerations, in accordance with Government Circular 06/2005 (sections 98 and 99). Any mitigation measures considered necessary for protected species and priority species/habitats can then be secured as conditions of any consent. Reasonable biodiversity enhancements should also be included to meet the requirements of paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This could be supplied by providing enhancement recommendations for the potential priority species occupying the site (swifts and hedgehogs).

I look forward to working with the LPA and the applicant to provide the missing information to remove my holding objection

Please contact me with any further queries.



Regards,

Hamish Jackson BSc (Hons)
Junior Ecological Consultant
Place Services at Essex County Council
Hamish.Jackson@essex.gov.uk

Place Services provide ecological advice on behalf of Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils

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

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

Philip Isbell
Corporate Manager - Development Manager
Planning Services
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich IP1 2BX.

Enquiries to: Hannah Cutler
Direct Line: 01284 741232
Email: Hannah.Cutler@suffolk.gov.uk
Web: <http://www.suffolk.gov.uk>

Our Ref: 2017_05663
Date: 17/01/2018

To Whom it may concern

Dear Mr Isbell

Planning Application DC/17/05663/FUL – Land Adjacent Charters Towers, (Pound Farm), The Street, Redgrave: Archaeology

This site lies in an area of high archaeological potential recorded on the County Historic Environment Record, near the tumulus marked on the 1st edition OS map (1837-1840) (RGV 008) find spots of Saxon Cinerary Urns (RGV 005) and other Saxon artefacts (RGV 004). It overlooks the sources of both the rivers Little Ouse and Waveney to the north lower in the valley and is on sandy soils which tended to attract early occupation. This field has received some quarrying like those nearby but only a small proportion of the site. Thus, there is high potential for the discovery of below-ground heritage assets of archaeological importance within this area, and groundworks associated with the development have the potential to damage or destroy any archaeological remains which exist.

Given the high potential, lack of previous investigation and size of the proposed development area, I recommend that, to establish the full archaeological implications of this area the applicant should be required to provide for an archaeological evaluation of the site prior to the determination of the planning application submitted for this site, to influence design amendments if needed to preserve remains *in situ*. This area cannot be assessed or approved in our view until a full archaeological evaluation has been undertaken, and the results of this work will enable us to accurately quantify the archaeological resource (both in quality and extent). This is in accordance with paragraphs 128 and 129 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

To establish the archaeological potential of the site, a metal detecting survey will be required in the first instance. The metal detecting survey results will be used to decide on the timing and extent of trial trenched evaluation which is required at this site. The results should inform the development to ensure preservation *in situ* of any previously unknown nationally important heritage assets within the development area.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Dr Hannah Cutler

Archaeological Officer
Conservation Team

BABERGH/MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEMORANDUM

TO: Development Control.

For the attention of: Elizabeth Thomas.

FROM: Ray Bennett, Environmental Protection Team.

DATE:19.01.18

Environmental Health-Noise/Odour/Light/Smoke.

YOUR REF: DC/17/05663.

SUBJECT: Erection of 30 No. residential units.

ADDRESS: Land Adjacent to Charters Towers, The Street, Redgrave, IP22 1RZ.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment of the above planning application. It is noted that the proposal is approximately 600 metres from an agricultural rearing and processing unit. This site is "permitted" by the Environment Agency who regulate the operation and would deal with most issues arising from it.

Although I have no objection, in principle, to the proposed development. I would however recommend the following conditions:

1. Hours of work.

During any ground works/demolition/construction hours of work to be:

Monday to Friday between 08:00 hrs and 18:00 hrs

Saturday between 09:00 hrs and 13:00 hrs

No noise intrusive work to be undertaken on a Sunday, Bank or Public Holiday.

Please note that deliveries/collections shall take place only during the above hours.

Reason – To minimise detriment to nearby residential amenity.

2. Smoke.

During any ground works/demolition/construction no burning of materials on the site.

Reason – To minimise detriment to nearby residential amenity.

3. Dust.

The Developer or their Contractors shall take all reasonable measures, which shall include the provision and use of adequate water spraying equipment to minimise dust nuisance and to damp down areas where activities are likely to create dust. Measures shall include the provision of bowsers where appropriate and ensuring that stockpiles shall be covered to prevent the generation of dust.

4. Light.

Any external lighting associated with the development both during construction and as part of the proposal shall be kept to the minimum necessary for the purposes of security and site safety and shall prevent upward and outward light radiation.

Reason – To minimise detriment to nearby residential amenity.

Thank you

Ray Bennett
Environmental Protection officer



Historic England

EAST OF ENGLAND OFFICE

Ms Sarah Scott
Mid Suffolk District Council
131 High Street
Needham Market
Suffolk
IP6 8DL

Direct Dial: 01223 582738

Our ref: **W:** P00758530

22 January 2018

Dear Ms Scott

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

**LAND ADJACENT TO CHARTERS TOWERS, THE STREET, REDGRAVE, IP22
1RZ**

Application No. DC/17/05663

Thank you for your letter of 3 January 2018 regarding the above application for planning permission. On the basis of the information available to date, we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.

It is not necessary for us to be consulted on this application again, unless there are material changes to the proposals. However, if you would like detailed advice from us, please contact us to explain your request.

Yours sincerely

Clare Campbell

Principal Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas
E-mail: clare.campbell@HistoricEngland.org.uk



24 BROOKLANDS AVENUE, CAMBRIDGE, CB2 8BU

Telephone 01223 582749
HistoricEngland.org.uk





Planning Applications – Suggested Informative Statements and Conditions Report

AW Reference:	00025812
Local Planning Authority:	Mid Suffolk District
Site:	Land Adjacent To Charters Towers Gallows Hill, Redgrave
Proposal:	Planning Application - Erection of 30 No. residential units
Planning Application:	DC/17/05663

Prepared by: Pre-Development Team

Date: 01 February 2018

If you would like to discuss any of the points in this document please contact me on 0345 606 6087 or email 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 Redgrave Crackthorn Bridge 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. 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
-

Your Ref: DC/17/05663
Our Ref: 570\CON\4909\17
Date: 2nd February 2018
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
1st Floor, Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich
Suffolk
IP1 2BX

For the Attention of: Sarah Scott

Dear Sir,

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
CONSULTATION RETURN DC/17/05663

PROPOSAL: Planning Application - Erection of 30 No. residential units
LOCATION: Residential Development, The Street, Redgrave
ROAD CLASS:

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

Drawing Number 17-050-201.

It is not entirely clear from the submitted application documentation which elements are to remain as reserved matters so my comments below cover both access and layout.

In highway terms the principle of development is acceptable but the current details submitted are not considered acceptable for the following reasons:

- 1) The position of the main access is not positioned in the optimum location within the available site frontage. This means that access visibility splays are not maximised, particularly looking to the north. It is therefore recommended that the access is moved further south to coincide with the existing access location. This means moving it approximately 12 metres to the south. This improves the junction visibility and forward visibility to the access and vehicle turning movements from each approach. Please note that this is a repeat of the informal guidance given to the Agent in 2017.
- 2) The available visibility splays are to be indicated on the submitted drawings.
- 3) The existing frontage footway needs to be widened to 1.8 metres between the site access and the boundary with Pine Tree Cottage.

- 4) There is no need to have a bus stop / lay-by on the site frontage as the current bus service does not pass the site.
- 5) The junction access radii may be reduced to 6 metres.
- 6) The access road should be a minimum of 4.8 metres wide to allow two vehicles to pass safely. It appears currently to only measure 4m which is too narrow.
- 7) Bends on the access road which have a centre line radius below 30m will require road widening to allow vehicles to pass.
- 8) I recommend that a footway is provided within the site on at least one side of the new access road.
- 9) The private drive serving Plots 8 to 11 should be 4.5m wide for the first 10m length and there is insufficient manoeuvring space for the car parking spaces.
- 10) Cycle storage / parking spaces for the flats should be covered and secure.
- 11) Plot 1 car parking spaces involve a long reversing manoeuvre.
- 12) Car parking spaces should be a minimum of 5m by 2.5m. When positioned against boundary walls / fences etc., the spaces should be widened. Plots 1 to 5, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 therefore need to be widened in order to allow access to each side of a car.
- 13) The garages for Type E, 3 bed house, are too small and therefore will not count towards a useable parking space. Garage size should be increased or alternatively additional parking spaces are required.
- 14) There is insufficient manoeuvring space for Plots 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 29. With 2 cars parked on the driveways there is insufficient road space to reverse off.
- 15) The applicant should be made aware that SCC will not accept permeable paving as a road construction or crate style soakaways for road surface water drainage. This may have an impact on the surface water drainage strategy as the report currently suggests both options will be used.

Please inform the applicant of my comments and I shall await further details.

Yours faithfully,

Mr Martin Egan
Highways Development Management Engineer
Strategic Development

From:Iain Farquharson
Sent:Mon, 12 Feb 2018 12:24:32 +0000
To:BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Subject:M3 224599: MSDC Planning Consultation Request - DC/17/05663

Dear Sir/Madam

We have no objection to this proposal and are pleased to see there is a commitment o build the properties to the PassivHause standard.

We request that a condition be included should permission be granted that requires the passiv haus standard be used for construction of all the dwellings. It is noted that applicant is not intending to register the properties for certification but suitable evidence (to be agreed between the council and applicant) that they have been constructed to this standard will be required.

Regards

Iain Farquharson

Senior Environmental Management Officer
Babergh Mid Suffolk Council

BB01449 724878 / 07860 827027
//iain.farquharson@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

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

From: planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk [<mailto:planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>]
Sent: 03 January 2018 11:09
To: Environmental Health <Environmental@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: MSDC Planning Consultation Request - DC/17/05663

Please find attached planning consultation request letter relating to planning application - DC/17/05663 - Land Adjacent To Charters Towers , The Street, Redgrave, IP22 1RZ

Kind Regards

Planning Support Team

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