



PLANNING COMMITTEE NORTH - UPDATE SHEET
8 November 2022

Item 6: DC/21/4501/FUL - Hybrid planning application to include: (i) full planning application for retirement living accommodation, car parking, access, landscaping and ancillary development; and (ii) outline planning application with all matters reserved for a community use building and ancillary development - Dairy Farm, Saxons Way, Halesworth

Recommendation – paras. 1.4 and 9.1

The recommendation put before Planning Committee North is:

Authority to approve subject to the following:

Key considerations

- *removal of holding objection from the lead local flood authority*
- *removal of holding objection from the highway authority*

And subject to

- *agreement of all required planning conditions*
- *the completion of a s106 legal agreement (inc. the transfer of land for community use, details of a commuted sum calculation in lieu of affordable housing, and a mitigation contribution to the Suffolk Coast RAMS)*

Updated drawings/documents received since publication of reporting – para. 3.6

3.6 The following drawings and documentation have been submitted by the applicant in support of the application:

Drawings

- MI-2758-03-AC-001 - Site Location Plan
- MI-2758-03-AC-003 Rev. S - Proposed Site Plan
- MI-2758-03-AC-003 (02) Rev. P - Proposed Site Plan - Wider Context
- MI-2758-03-AC-005 Rev. A - Proposed Elevations 1
- MI-2758-03-AC-006 Rev. A - Proposed Elevations 2

LEGAL ADDRESS East Suffolk House, Station Road, Melton, Woodbridge IP12 1RT
 DX: 41400 Woodbridge

POSTAL ADDRESS Riverside, 4 Canning Road, Lowestoft NR33 0EQ
 DX: 41220 Lowestoft

- MI-2758-03-AC-007 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan
- MI-2758-03-AC-008 - Proposed First Floor Plan
- MI-2758-03-AC-009 - Proposed Second Floor Plan
- MI-2758-03-AC-010 Rev. A - Proposed Roof Plan
- MI-2758-03-AC-011 - Bungalow – Type B1 Proposed Floor Plan & Elevations
- MI-2758-03-AC-012 - Bungalow – Type B2 Proposed Floor Plan & Elevations
- MI-2758-03-AC-013 - Bungalow – Type B3 Semi Proposed Floor Plan & Elevations
- MI-2758-03-AC-024 - Proposed Garage Plot 6
- MI2758-03-AC-025 – Proposed Boundary Treatments
- Section Plot 6 (dated 4 November 2022)
- MI-2758-02-DE-001 Rev. G - Level Constraints Plan
- MI-2758-02-DE-002 Rev. P - Drainage Constraints Plan
- MI-2758-02-DE-007 Rev. E - Exceedance Flows Constraints
- MI-2758-02-DE-008 Rev. E - Maintenance Plan
- MI-2758-02-DE-010 Rev. E – Highway Swale Sections
- MI-2758-02-DE-011 Rev. B – Highway and Swale Gradients
- MI-2758-02-DE-012 Rev. A - Private Attenuation System
- MI-2758-02-DE-013 - Private Flow Control System
- MI-2758-02-DE-014 Rev. A - Impermeable Area Plan
- MI-2758-02-DE-015 Rev. B - Private Swale Details and Sections
- MI-2758-02-DE-016 Rev. A - SuDS Details
- MI-2758-DE-017 – Timber Check Dam Detail
- 508.0031.005 - Proposed Offsite Footway Improvements
- MI-2758-02-DE-003 Rev. C - Section 38 Arrangement Plan
- WM-2758-02-LA-001 Rev. A - Landscape Proposal – Public Footpath
- 1620-KC-XX-YTREE-TCP01 Rev. 0 - Tree Constraints Plan
- 508.0031.006 Rev. A – Indicative offsite parallel crossing

Documents/reporting

- Application from
- Flood Risk Assessment ref. A01-C03 (by JBA Consulting, dated October 2022)
- Operations and maintenance of SuDS note
- Microdrainage calculations – updated 4 November 2022
- Drainage Strategy Including Sustainable Urban Drainage Assessment (by Mucklow & Harris, dated 1 November 2022)
- Highways Technical Note (by Paul Basham, dated June 2022)
- Transport Statement ref. 508.0031/TS/2 (by Paul Basham Associates, dated September 2021)
- Travel Plan ref. 508.0031/TP/2 (by Paul Basham Associates, dated July 2021)
- Heritage Statement ref. MK0650_1 / SU0259_1 (by Cotswold Archaeology, dated February 2022)
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (by Inspired Ecology Ltd, dated April 2021)
- Visually Verified Montages ref. 11133-154-NPA-XX-XX-RP-Y-4600 (by Nicholas Pearson Associates – NPA Visuals, dated September 2021)
- Archaeological Statement re. SU0258_2 (by Cotswold Archaeology, dated August 2021 – received 25 October 2022)

- Design and Access Statement ref. MI-2758-03-DAS (by Neil Boddison Associates, dated August 2021)
- 2D Land Survey & Underground Services (by On Centre Surveys Ltd, dated 19 May 2021)
- Reptile Survey (by Inspired Ecology Ltd, dated May 2022)
- Biodiversity Net Gain Feasibility Assessment Version 1 (by SWT Trading Ltd, dated August 2021)
- Noise Assessment ref. R9155-2 Rev. 0 (by 24 Acoustics, dated 17 September 2021)
- Addendum to Noise Assessment ref. R9155-3 Rev. 0 (by 24 Acoustics, dated 8 February 2022)
- Energy Statement (by Focus Consultants, dated July 2021)
- Open Space Statement (by The Planning Bureau Ltd, dated September 2021)
- Phase I Site Appraisal ref. B21087/DTC/Rev. 1 (by Patrick Parsons, dated April 2021 – received 27 October 2022)
- Phase II Site Appraisal ref. B21087/GIR/Rev. 0 (by Patrick Parsons, dated May 2021)
- Planning Statement (by The Planning Bureau Ltd, dated September 2021)
- Statement of Community Involvement (by BECG, dated September 2021)
- Tree Survey ref. 1620-KC-XX-YTREE-TreeSurvey-Rev.0 (by Keen Consultants, dated March 2021)
- Financial Viability Assessment (by Alder King, dated 22 October 2021)
- Draft s106 Heads of Terms

Superseded reports due to design updates

- Artist Impression
- Proposed Street Scene MI-2758-03-AC-004
- Landscape Layout WM-2758-03-LA-002 Rev. B
- Planting Plan (Page 1 of 2) WM-2758-03-LA-003 Rev. A
- Planting Plan (Page 2 of 2) WM-2758-03-LA-004 Rev. A

Other reports

- Chain Reaction: The positive impact of specialist retirement housing on the generational divide and first-time buyers – Report by WPI Strategy for Homes for Later Living – August 2020
- Healthier and Happier: An analysis of the fiscal and wellbeing benefits of building more homes for later living – Report by WPI Strategy for Homes for Later Living – September 2019
- Ready for Ageing? Report - Published by the Authority of the House of Lords (HL Paper 140)
- The Top of the Ladder (by DEMOS, first published 2013)

Consultation – para. 4.3

4.3 Following receipt of further revised material in response to maintained statutory holding objections, the highway authority and lead local flood authority (LLFA) were re-consulted, along with neighbouring properties, Halesworth Town Council, SCC Rights of Way, Environment Agency, Sustrans, East Suffolk Council’s building control team, Anglian Water and the regional Disability Forum. The date of overall expiry is for submission of comments is currently **Monday 21 November 2022**.

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
East Suffolk Environmental Protection	9 June 2022 - 1 October 2021	22 June 2022 19 April 2022 21 October 2021

Summary of comments:

2 November 2022

“Land contamination: The Phase 1 report April 2021 submitted with the application identified several potential sources of contamination and has recommended that an intrusive investigation is carried out. This recommendation includes the communal area to the north of the site. I would agree with this conclusion and the site should not be developed until contamination has been adequately investigated and characterised in this area. In addition, I note that a Phase 11 investigation was also undertaken in May 2021 but did not include the communal area or include ground gas monitoring which was recommended for the whole area in the phase 1 report. I therefore ask that this work, and any remediation and validation which may subsequently be required, should be secured using appropriately worded conditions, such as (or similar).” – see full list of conditions.

“Noise Barrier: The noise assessment relies on a noise barrier to reduce the noise from activities in the rear garden of the adjacent public and the occupants closing their windows should the noise get too much for them. All licenced premises have the ability to have music in all parts of their premises so there continues to be a risk that these activities may cause disturbance to this new development. The initial noise assessment recommended a noise barrier of 3m and 15kg/m³. I would concur with his. However, I have a preference for a brick construction rather than a wooden fence as this will require limited maintenance and have a longer effective life span. Relying on occupants to close their windows as a form of mitigation leads towards unsatisfactory design, therefore the more effective the barrier the better.”

22 June 2022

“There appears to be no additional information in this re-consultation for me to be able to change my comments of 19th April 2022 and my previous contaminated land comments.”

19 April 2022

“The noise assessment relies on, in addition to the proposed barrier, mechanical ventilation and enhanced glazing sound insulation to ensure that any noise from the adjacent White Swan Public house does not cause disturbance to the occupiers of the nearest proposed dwellings.

From the original noise assessment - Music Noise 6.8 With the MVHR ventilation strategy and with the acoustically enhanced double-glazed windows closed (see specification in Section 5), the low-frequency music noise levels in the most affected living rooms and bedrooms would be in the region of 45 dB Leq, 63Hz, 1min and overall, below NR 20. This level is considered acceptable in the context of the site location and existing properties, which have no such mitigation measures.

From the further information supplied dated 8th February 2022

It is considered that the mitigation measures set out in the noise assessment, provide the appropriate level of protection to the proposed dwellings. For clarity, these measures include:

An acoustic barrier around the perimeter of the pub garden

Mechanical ventilation and heat recovery to all properties, which will provide satisfactory ventilation

Provision of enhanced glazing sound insulation performance to habitable rooms facing the pub garden

Provision in the nearest bungalows for the principal bedroom and living rooms to face away from the pub garden

I have highlighted the words of concern and would question if this is good design. I would not want this development to interfere with the operational viability of the adjacent public house. Will the residents of some of the properties in this new development wish to sit inside their homes with the windows closed to avoid noise from the neighbouring public house and its external beer garden?"

1 October 2021

Noise

Please can I have comment back on the points I have raised?

The White Swan Pub

This premises will be a source of noise for this development. I think that it would be useful to see what level of activity was the norm prior to the covid outbreak. Facebook was referenced as the only source of events are to take place in the future. Please can I ask that further research is carried out to ensure that we have a true representation what the level of activity is likely in the future post covid. There are no licensing reasons why there cannot be an increase in events held at the premises, inside or outside. I can confirm that East Suffolk Council has received noise complaints from neighbours adjacent to the pub over the last few years, but none were substantiated.

Co-Op Store

There is an extract unit, presumably serving the café for the Co-Op, this was not noted in the acoustic assessment. It has the potential to be disturbing. I would ask that this is investigated to ensure that it will not be a source of noise for the development site. If necessary, I would ask that a BS4142 assessment be made for this when in operating.

Standards and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) ORBH This development will be an agent of change, so suitable mitigation should be in place to ensure that this development does not interfere with the normal operations of the existing businesses, for example in this instance The White Swan Public House. The Noise assessment states that the Agent of Change principle would apply under the condition of a likely significant impact. We need to be clear that there is not significant impact. This may hinge on the use of the pub garden and the pub's future plans for it. As this application for Retirement Living Accommodation, there is a potential for it to be more sensitive to noise than other types of residential development and this also may impact on the agent of change principle. This does not seem to be taken into account. The report reference BS 8233:2014 and WHO Guidelines The noise levels described in these documents are for anonymous sources, such as road traffic or continuously running plant for which occupants may tolerate higher noise levels. Noise levels and appropriate time assessment periods are not given for other types of noise. The noise that this development will suffer from is likely to be from the adjacent White House Public House and the introduced sensitive receptors may well become sensitised to the noise as they will be so close.

Car Park Noise

The assessment used results of noise measurements from moving vehicles in their assessment of

the car park. I ask whether this takes into account the impulsive nature of people coming and going from the cars and the slamming of the car doors and boots?

Noise from outdoor seating areas

Existing ambient noise levels were compared with the predicted noise level from people in the pub garden - again no mention was made of the impulsive nature of the noise from people talking in the beer garden, and the fact that people when drinking alcohol have a tendency to become louder as the evening wears on. The measured noise levels from the evening were aggregated within the daytime 16 hrs. There was no thought to separate evening from daytime hours? As the day progresses into the evening and people are relaxing, reading or even sleeping noise has a far more significant impact and therefore requires greater control. This is recognised in various guidance including IEMA's 'Guidelines for Environmental Noise Impact Assessment':

Music Noise/Pub noise

The White Horse Public House can have live music, or the playing of recorded music if: o it takes place between 8AM and 11PM; and o the audience is no more than 500 people There is little in the way of limitations in terms of operating hours. The noise condition specified in their licence: Noise from entertainment provided at the premises, including voices and music, whether amplified or not, should not be audible from inside any noise sensitive premises (including dwelling) at any time.

The increase in the number of sensitive premises adjacent to the public house the more likely the Public House will be restricted in what they do as there will be a greater potential number of people to be affected by any function they put on.

The Acoustic consultant determines that the typical maximum noise event to be the tenth highest value during the measurement period. Please can this be explained in more detail, why was this figure decided upon? How many of these events were there through the night and were from the White Swan?

I noted that on my site visit to the site there were places where there is no existing screening between the development site and the pub garden. This is different to the statement "The pub garden, which includes a marquee, has a perimeter fence and brick wall at approximately 1.2 metre height" stated in the Acoustic Report.

The pub garden is busy in the warm summer months, the occupants of the proposed development will presumably also want to have their windows open. Part of the mitigation for the noise from the pub is for these premises to have their windows closed during the noisier times.

There were signs around the area advertising open mic night on Friday nights through October to January. The assertion that live events only take place on Sunday afternoons and are relatively infrequent and low key may be incorrect. I would ask for more evidence on what is planned rather than what is assumed.

The Acoustic assessment recommends a 3m high barrier for the pub garden on the development side. The design and access statement it states that there will be a 2m high acoustic barrier in point 7.9 on page 32. This needs to be clarified.

The proposed noise barrier must not reflect noise over to the existing premises along Swan Lane and increase the levels for these houses. If there is a chance for this to happen it will require mitiga

ting. Please can there be comment on this? Any acoustic barrier will require long term maintenance, this will need to be conditioned.

In addition to the acoustic barrier mitigation for the noise from the White Swan the use of MVHR units and closed windows are proposed. Sound insulation performance is specified for the windows, doors and walls of specified bungalows. Has any thought been put into alternative designs, so window do not have to be kept shut on warm summer evenings when the pub is likely to be busy? It is stated that noise from the pub garden will be 5dBa above the prevailing ambient noise at busy time and potentially far more at times when there is a music event. I would reiterate that these units are to accommodate potentially more sensitive residents than other developments.

Car Park

The noise assessment for the Co-Op car park, uses a prevailing ambient Noise level dB LAeq 1 hour - please can you tell me what time this measurement made and where was it made. It was suggested that it was made during the evening and early night-time. The use of LAeq will massage out the effects of impulsive noise, as these can be highly disturbing particularly late into the evening.

Future Community Building

There is no information on the proposed community building. If this is proposed to have any mechanical ventilation systems or potential to produce noise, I would ask that a further noise assessment is carried out.

Air Quality

Please can I have figures on the Annual Average Daily Traffic flows to rule out (or in) the need for an air quality assessment?

Contaminated Land

Contamination was found on site which will require remediating and validating, and the ground gas investigation is incomplete. I would ask that the following conditions be attached to any permission granted to ensure the site is suitable for the proposed use to ensure that the contaminated land investigation and remediation is completed."

Full response available on Public Access – including list of proposed conditions.

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
SCC Highways Department	18 October 2022	31 October 2022 11 August 2022 17 January 2022
	9 June 2022 1 October 2021	

Summary of comments:

31 October 2022

"Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highway Authority cannot make a comment at this time due to a lack of information to make an informed decision. The Highway Authority would recommend a holding objection until the information has been submitted: Notwithstanding the LLFA holding objection, which needs to be resolved on this site prior to highways being confident

that the on site drainage will not have a detrimental impact upon the adopted highway. Below are still some issues that require resolving prior to being able to recommend conditions for approval. These are due to not having the evidence that the outstanding issues can be conditioned to be resolved later: The swale requires a 3m easement on all sides and is now shown on the site layout plan MI-2758-03-AC-003 Rev P. This plan also shows the 0.5m level edge around the swale that is required, however it is not shown on the drainage constraints plan MI-2758-02-DE-002 rev K or highway swale sections plan MI-2758-02-DE-010 rev C. These plans need to match up in order to assess correctly. Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich. IP1 2BX www.suffolk.gov.uk Please note that streetlights and services would not be able to be installed in the footway adjacent to the swale. Streetlights are required for the this road and turning head to be adopted. It is noted that an ACO drain is proposed along the edge of the carriageway to drain into the swales. ACO drains are not a usually method of drainage accepted by SCC highways as a method on SCC highways maintained land. Plan MI-2758-03-AC-003 Rev P appear to indicate that no building will obstruct or over-sail the rear of the turning that is proposed to be adopted by SCC highways. SCC require at least the full 2m footway around turning head to accommodate pedestrians, and services. This would ideally be a 3m width footway to accommodate cyclists and the amount of services required in this location. This screenshot is my overlay demonstrating the cycleway and the drainage. This shows that the drainage for the whole cycleway does not agree, and the plans do not tie up. There is approx. 1m of cycleway not accounted for in the drainage plans. The below plan shows the private water from the site, which is assumed to be adopted by Anglia Water? What measures are in place to prevent private surface water from entering the potential adopted highway? SCC does not adopt private water in public drainage systems. This will prevent the road being adopted by SCC as highways authority. The below plan also shows the swale in the incorrect location. It needs to be set back 0.5m from back of footway. Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich. IP1 2BX www.suffolk.gov.uk The exceedance flow plan appears to show the exceedance flows going over adoptable highway land as per the green arrows. Again, what measure will prevent private water from entering the adopted highway? A formal crossing point should be installed on Saxon Way in accordance with the emerging neighbourhood plan. The design of this should be led by actual vehicle speeds and requirements of the users. It should encourage cyclists, pedestrians, and mobility scooters. The crossing should remain offset from the existing network links to prevent users from crossing into traffic. This can be grampian conditioned, however it should be shown on a plan as an indicative location and formal type of crossing, such as tiger (zebra with cycle facility) or a toucan. This will also be subject to a safety audit process. It is noted that the cycle storage on site is not sufficient to house two cycles per dwelling in line with the Suffolk Guidance for Parking. The average cycle is 1.8m long and has to be easily manoeuvrable. To get in in and out easily. And the access from them to the wider network needs to be suitable for a person to stand beside and push a cycle.at least 1.1m. This is contrary to the NPPF various paragraphs on encouraging sustainable transport modes. Accesses should also be suitable to wheel out bins. The internal cycle path through the site, should all be at grade to ensure that pedestrians and cyclists have priority over motorised vehicles.”

29 July 2022

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highway Authority cannot make a comment at this time due to a lack of information to make an informed decision. The Highway Authority would recommend a **holding objection** until the information has been submitted:

Policy

Land at Diary Farm, Saxons Way, Halesworth is an allocated site of 1.44 hectares and as such I shall be assessing the site as a whole and not just the full and outline as applied for.

WLP4.5 states that "Good footpath and cycle provision should be provided through the site, linking

the development with the town centre, residential areas and wider rights of way network." I cannot see any route through the site which is usable by the public to link this whole site to the wider links as per WLP4.5. Are any other options being provided to overcome this?

Emerging cycling strategy from East Suffolk states: "WLP4.5 Land at Dairy Farm, Saxons Way Recommendation: 1 - Introduce cycling and walking track along the WLP4.5 frontage of Saxon's Way. 2 - Replace the existing island crossing on Saxon's Way at Swan Lane with a zebra crossing. 3 - Upgrade Footpath 3 to a bridleway where possible. If widths not sufficient, consider routing Footpath 3 through the White Swan pub car park. 4 - Introduce cycle parking, close to recommended cycling routes, community centre, and/or White Swan pub. 5 - Upgrade Footpath 9 to a bridleway, widen and resurface. Connect the bridleway with the cycling and walking track recommended in point 1."

External Layout

The application should set out how cyclists and mobility scooters can access all of the site allocation. It is not clear as to the widths of Swann Lane and who is surfacing the lane and if the connections from the site are wide enough for cyclists and mobility scooters. Whilst the applicant Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich. IP1 2BX www.suffolk.gov.uk has stated that for this type of development cycle take up is lower than usual, the site should still be promoting sustainable modes of transport for staff, visitors and residents. whilst ensuring this site does not the connectivity to the remainder of the allocation.

The 3m widening on Swann Lane, is not shown on all plans for example the drainage plan. Plans need to be consistent to be able to assess them all.

The offsite improvements plan 508.0031.005 Rev- does not show the 3m widening on Swann Lane, this should be amended to show 3m wide lane and how it ties into the wider network. LTN 1/20 14.3.12 states: "Cycling facilities should be regarded as an essential component of the site access and any off-site highway improvements that may be necessary. Developments that do not adequately make provision for cycling in their transport proposals should not be approved. This may include some off-site improvements along existing highways that serve the development." NPPF paragraph 110 states: "In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that: a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location; b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;" NPPF paragraph 112 states: "Within this context, applications for development should: a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use; b) address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport; c) create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards; e) be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations." Therefore every opportunity should be taken to make this site compliant and supply 3m wide links to and through it.

Internal Layout

The overall site layout plan MI-2758-03-AC-003 Rev D and the latest drainage plan MI-2758-02-DE-002 Rev G do not show the same details. For example: footway widths (2m and 3m on layout 2m and 2m on drainage to Saxons Way) and turning head location (shown to be relocated in layout plan to avoid boundary as required and not in drainage plan. These plans should tie up on order to assess the layout to meet guidance and to ensure the drainage can be assessed correctly.

The swales on the internal access road which is to be offered for adoption are not to adoptable standards. The swales are proposed as 1m deep and 1:19 slopes immediately adjacent to the footway. This is contrary to our guidance of 1:4 slopes. Exert from our adopted Suffolk Streets guide: Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich. IP1 2BX www.suffolk.gov.uk

There is a substation shown clearly on plan MI-2758-03-AC-003 Rev D on the community land which on the drainage plans is shown to be in a swale and/or on a very steep slope of the swale. It is noted that an easement and attenuation tank is proposed on the community land, these areas cannot be planted or built on, as they are required to remain clear of obstructions for maintenance.

The 3m cycle route along the access road is not shown on the drainage plan and these plans need to reflect the addition of the cycle route. There will also be details required at detailed design stage of how the cycle way toes into Saxons Way.

The footway to the northwest of the turning head is shown on plan MI-2758-03-AC-003 Rev D to be clear of the red line and building. This clearance IS required in order to adopt the road. this clearance is not shown on drainage plan MI-2758-02-DE-002 Rev G. This footway would also be the link through the site to the community area adjacent and should be at least 2m wide.

The swales are adjacent the footway and approximately 1m deep, so may need fencing to protect footway users. Until issues over inconstant plans, lack of cycle/mobility scooter connectivity as per WLP4.5, unadoptable road and drainage design, and other issues outlined above, SCC as the local highway authority, does not have enough detail to assess that the application is policy and guidance compliant. There will also be Public Transport and Public Rights of Way requests for this application which will follow when we are in a position to recommend planning conditions.

15 February 2022

“Holding objection on Visibility splays and Sustainable Transport Links.

Parking provision is short by 40 spaces to SGD requires 76 plus 14 visitor parking. To be able to accept the shortfall, significant mitigation to promote sustainable transport modes should be provided to local facilities and transport links. Passenger transport have requested a bus stop layby in this location on the side of the development and RTP1 screens.

There is no cycle route provided or route suitable for mobility scooters from the/into development. How will these modes link into local facilities? In line with NPPF 110 a & b, 112a, b & c, and LTN 1/20 2014.3.12

The Transport statement quotes incorrect parking spaces dimensions of 2.4 x 4.8m. The current space dimensions are 2.5m x 5m for parking spaces.

It is not clear if the visibility splays can be achieved with the existing vegetation that is in place and not all appears to be on applicant's land. More information is required and if possible, based on a topographical survey? • What does the surface water on the proposed adoptable road connect into?

The section 38 drawing shows a turning head without the required maintenance strips. If adoption should be required, the layout should be to SCC standards and is separate to SCC planning acceptance.

More detail is required as to the crossing to the south of the parcel. It is unclear what the above plan is indicating. This is land maintainable by SCC, so any improvements here will require SCC agreement. More information on this area including the crossing is required.

Rights of way direct response to LPA.”

Full response(s) available on Public Access.

Guidance documents – para. 6.5

6.5 Other guidance documents, produced by East Suffolk Council or others, are listed below. These have not been produced as Supplementary Planning Documents but may also be relevant in decision making.

- Cycling and Walking Strategy (October 2022)
- Environmental Guidance Note
- Green Infrastructure Strategy (2015)
- Suffolk Guidance for Parking, Technical Guidance (May 2019)
- Suffolk Design Streets Guide (2022)

Noise – para. 7.63

7.63 The noise assessment relies on, in addition to the proposed barrier, mechanical ventilation and enhanced glazing sound insulation to ensure that any noise from the adjacent White Swan Public house does not cause disturbance to the occupiers of the nearest proposed dwellings. It is considered that the mitigation measures set out in the noise assessment, provide the appropriate level of protection to the proposed dwellings. For clarity, these measures include:

- An acoustic barrier around the perimeter of the pub garden – 3m high brick wall (details to be secured via condition)
- Mechanical ventilation and heat recovery to all properties, which will provide satisfactory ventilation.
- Provision of enhanced glazing sound insulation performance to habitable rooms facing the pub garden.
- Provision in the nearest bungalows for the principal bedroom and living rooms to face away from the pub garden.

Land contamination – paras. 7.65 and 7.66

7.65 Land contamination matters have been fully considered following receipt of the updated Phase I reporting, which includes the land allocated for community/pre-school use to the north of the site. The reporting identifies several potential sources of contamination and concludes that an intrusive investigation is required.

7.66 The full suite of land contamination conditions are therefore proposed, including further site investigation, remediation and validation. Land contamination requirements will need to be carried out in full prior to development and the transfer of community land to Halesworth Town Council.