



**SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE - UPDATE SHEET**

26 January 2021

**Items 6 and 7 – DC/20/3264/FUL and DC/20/3361/FUL – A phased development comprising Hybrid Planning Application: (i) Full Planning Application – Residential development of 129 dwellings (including affordable housing) together with public open space, roads, accesses, parking garages, drainage and associated infrastructure; (ii) Outline Planning Application – seven No. serviced Self Build Plots with associated access and infrastructure at Land between High Street and Chapel Lane, Pettistree, IP13 0HQ**

4.1 An additional representation has been received seeking details relating to:

- Whether road frontage trees will be retained
- Whether the perimeter paths and play spaces will be open to the public or private akin to the paths and play spaces within the development to the north.
- Whether trees can be planted within 5m of the highway
- What works are proposed to be covered by the S106 contribution OF £40.8k

Officers respond as follows:

- Some trees are required to be lost to enable access and visibility splays. All the trees along the B1438 are assessed in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment as young/semi-mature and could be readily replaced with new specimens. Condition 12 requires details of landscaping which could include planting along the road frontages.
- The Agent has confirmed that perimeter paths around the site will be open to the public and secured as such through the S106. The open spaces to the north are also open to the public and secured as such by the S106 for that development. The management of the open space to the north has been passed to a management company controlled by the residents, but this does not mean that the spaces are private.
- The Highway Authority have confirmed that trees can be planted within 5m of the highway in accordance with Suffolk County Councils Draft Tree Guidance.

---

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

- The Highway Authority envisage the S106 contribution towards highway safety improvements outlined in paragraph 7.26 of the report.

### Additional representation from Pettistree Parish Council

Pettistree Parish Council welcomes this opportunity to submit these supplementary comments to the East Suffolk Planning Committee South prior to the meeting on 26th January 2021. These comments apply to both the above “duplicate” applications.

Suburbanisation of Pettistree:

The Local Plan, despite our objections, extended the long-standing settlement boundary of Wickham Market into Pettistree Parish without consultation. To quote from the Adopted Local Plan: 661. SCLP 12.60 (P390) “The site is within Pettistree Parish but is physically connected to Wickham Market and is therefore considered in terms of its relationship to Wickham Market.” The physical connection is only by virtue of a common parish boundary and the roads that cross between the parishes.

A planning decision on 21<sup>st</sup> Jan.2021 to refuse a single bungalow in The Street, Pettistree, is going to be very hard to explain to villagers because the reason was that it was outside the settlement boundary, whereas 136 homes are likely to be approved on the Hopkins Homes development that is far outside the Pettistree settlement boundary.

The new residents will be tied to Pettistree for paying council tax and electing MPs, District and County Councillors, but for almost everything else they will rely on Wickham Market. This includes all the key services of shopping, schools, medical centre and library.

Pettistree is being treated as a suburb of Wickham Market and this does not accord with the wishes of our two communities to exist separately while making proportionate use of each other’s facilities. Indeed, this suburbanisation of Pettistree is contrary to the statements made in the Local Plan and Hopkins Homes application, (DC/20/3361/FUL and DC/20/3264/FUL) that “coalescence” of the parishes and communities is being avoided.

Who will be responsible for the residents?

Inevitably there will be confusion in the minds of residents whether they are part of the Wickham Market community or Pettistree.

What will be the responsibilities of Pettistree Parish Council towards the residents of the new estate?

Responding to the planning process.

Despite being called “Public Access” the process is very hard to negotiate without previous experience. Even with experience many ‘clicks’ are needed to reach the planning documents and very limited return to previous screens is possible. The absence of notification of the existence, progress and committee hearing of an application is no longer notified to the relevant parish council or the individual who has made a comment.

It is hard to understand technicalities such as the use of a “duplicate” application and why so-called duplicate applications should be treated differently, with comments to one application not

being automatically applied to the other. Terms are used such as “expiry of a letter” when what is meant in plain English is the deadline date for comments.

Confusion over who can address the Planning Committee is another problem for first timers, as well as the many stages needed for logging in to the ESC planning site and then registering as a speaker.

Principle of new homes:

Pettistree is not against new homes but not in such numbers and with such a density.

Number of homes:

The high number of homes (136) is out of all proportion to the number of homes in Pettistree (85), despite being less than the excessive number (150) suggested by the Local Plan. The density is higher than the Wickham Place development and much of the vaunted open space is the four drainage basins designed to be flooded.

Impacts on Wickham Market:

There will be overload of the facilities and services provided by Wickham Market such as shops, parking, health centre, and school.

No practical solution has been proposed to the worsening of traffic congestion especially on the High Street going in or out of the village beside the post office. The problem is recognised by Highways in 7.26. The untargeted small sum of £41,000 specified for the roads in centre of the village will not provide the answer.

Impact on Pettistree facilities:

The only pub in the two villages (The Greyhound) cannot cope with the large influx that would come from this large development.

The Village Hall is much too small to accommodate a meeting of the new parishioners, and Pettistree will not receive enough CIL money to build a bigger one.

The Church could not accommodate even a small percentage of those from the new homes.

Impact on Ufford:

Access to the westbound A12 requires travelling through Ufford and passing the notoriously dangerous Ufford Triangle to reach the A12. Commuters to Woodbridge and beyond will increase congestion at the Melton crossroads that are already at capacity.

Long-term care of the open areas:

It is very worrying that a similar organisation to that in Wickham Place is likely for the new development. If operated in the same way it will produce “no-go” areas for walkers and “no-play” areas for non-estate families. (See photos)

The management company set up for the Wickham Place development is recognised as causing problems for access of non-residents to the open spaces and play area. (7.40)



Photos taken at Wickham Place on 23.01.21 by JPH

It appears that they now own the open areas and the developer's plan for a connecting path between the two settlements has been blocked by the existing management group. The planning officers recognise that a problem exists when they say in their conclusion at 8.1, "The lack of connectivity with the existing development to the north is a design shortfall in the scheme and fails to create community cohesion between the developments". How will this be addressed before building goes ahead?

Tree planting:

Stipulations have been made by the SCC Highways Authority that no trees shall be planted closer than 5 metres to the carriageway.\* This will apply to both the B1438 (High Street) and the roads within the estate. If closer planting is done, as in the plans, the estate roads will not be adopted. Maintenance and probably ownership will then be taken on by a private company. Future conflicts can then be expected over ownership and access to the estate roads.. If the planting guidance is followed, the screening and amenity planting schemes will fail.

\*Letter of 9<sup>th</sup> December from Ben Chester.

General matters:

The meeting documents do not contain the results of the latest archaeological survey that was required by the Suffolk County Council Archaeological Unit.

No explanation has been given why solar panels to produce electricity are not required as original equipment on the new buildings.

The commitment to footway connections to Chapel Lane should be viewed in the context of the absence of any footway in most of Chapel Lane, which is narrow and often has a lot of vehicles parked outside the houses lining the lane. The lane is also subject to heavy flooding in wet weather as has been evident this winter.

Pettistree Parish Council continues to object strongly to **both** applications.

## Additional Information from Wickham Market Parish Council

WMPC maintain its objection to this planning application and would like to take this opportunity to reinforce our concerns as set out in the letter dated 12th October 2020.

We also highlight matters which we consider need to be addressed by ESC/SCC/Hopkins Homes if the committee are minded to accept the officer's recommendation to approve the development and prior to consent being issued.

WMPC have considered our resident's concerns and those expressed by our neighbouring Parish Council.

### 1. Location

We have grave concerns regarding this area of housing being located in our neighbouring Parish. We consider that it is out of scale with the village of Pettistree and will create a further mass of housing on the edge of WM village. The site has been encapsulated by ESC within an extended settlement boundary (ESC SCLP 2020) for WM village. This results in concerns we have over financial issues relating to CIL payment and the Parish precept. We consider that the Parish boundary anomaly will need to be addressed by ESC (at no cost to WM) if the application is consented and the development built out.

### 2. Housing numbers

The proposed housing is in excess of that required for our village asset out in the Housing Needs Assessment dated March 2017. This assessment was written by AECOM and they suggested that Wickham Market should be looking to allocate sites for between 32 and 110 by 2036. We are looking to allocate the maximum suggested i.e., a further 110 new homes within our parish as part of the Neighbourhood Plan. The proposed 136 homes is on top of the number which was considered appropriate for WM. Despite their technical location in Pettistree Parish they will be within the settlement of WM. Two letters were sent in 2018 and 2019 to ESC as part of the Local Plan consultation, both of which expressed concerns over the draft policy, adopted as SCLP 21.60. The affordability ratio of entry level occupation for lower quartile income in Suffolk Coastal is 7.6, the highest in Suffolk. This means that many local people will not be able to afford these new homes. We are concerned that the homes will attract purchasers from beyond Suffolk, some as second homes.

### 3. Infrastructure Capacity

The capacity of our key local services and facilities will become overstretched as they already support several neighbouring parishes and villages which are or will be seeing further residential development, such as Campsea Ashe, Rendlesham, Charsfield and Ufford. We already see many people coming from Melton to use our COOP supermarket due to its good parking and generous aisle space. Of particular concern is the lack of capacity of the Medical Centre and Dental Practice to take additional patients. The plan to expand the capacity through CIL contributions is ill conceived as there is no space for expansion of the Wickham Market Medical Centre, and it is likely to be difficult to recruit additional medical staff for an expanded practice.

#### 4. Highways infrastructure

We have grave concerns regarding the capacity of our village road network. The development will add to the pressure of traffic passing through the village, often at excessive speed. We have already identified a number of choke points in the village including the area of the COOP, access to the village hall, Chapel Lane junction and Post Office.

There will be significant cumulative impacts arising from other consent developments at Pettistree and Ufford and also from EDF Sizewell C traffic (should this take place). Liaison with EDF is underway and we whilst we are hopeful that they will offer some mitigation work, funded and implemented through legal agreements with SCC Highways, this is unlikely to reduce the excessive volumes of traffic generated by the local EDF work force (we are told there will be local employment opportunities).

The footway leading from Rogues Lane through to the COOP is in places narrow, in poor condition, flooded at times and with the highway boundaries in poor condition. The location of the bus stop northwards is poor due to the narrow footway in the front of the cemetery, steepbank and deep ditch.

We have noted the SCC Highways correspondence regarding financial contributions of £40.8k for work in the village which seems to be a very low figure considering the options that are currently being discussed, and £11.5k for legal work relating to speed limit works. We note that Hopkins will also fund bus stop and other works through a Section 278 agreement. We have previously enquired as to why previous S278 works were not completed as agreed.

WMPC and its Traffic Working Group would like to be involved in discussions regarding the full package of highway works to be undertaken on the B1438 such as the bus stop, footway works, crossing, gateway design and location, speed control measures and the future of the highway trees (east side of carriageway).

We are disappointed that the funding request by SCC for a new bus service has not been pursued as this could have represented a positive way of reducing private car use.

We would urge SCC Highways to adopt the highways within the development (other than private drives) in addition to the public footways proposed. This is the only way we can be satisfied that the promised public routes through the green spaces will be delivered and maintained for all.

#### 5. Residential Connectivity

We remain concerned about the lack of connectivity between the two housing site and are pleased that ESC also share our concerns (with the proposal to set aside funding). It is of the utmost importance for our community to be connected by footways, the pandemic has really highlighted the need for friends, families and carers to be able to walk freely using linkages to visit and deliver provisions around the community. This need also applies to our young people who need to be able to walk freely and use the play areas on offer. None of these should be private but should contribute to the quantum of play provision in the village.

We urge ESC to resolve this issue with Hopkins Homes and their management company and are very concerned if Hopkins Homes are planning to use the same management company strategy with this new scheme. We are aware of a number of requests not to link the two developments

but also know that existing residents were not consulted by their management company and that some are concerned at the approach proposed.

Whilst we are very concerned about the impact on the rural character of Chapel Lane from additional development, we support the two proposed links onto the lane for walkers and cyclists. However we request that these utilise the two established openings in the hedgerow which are indicated on the plans. One is close to Plot 70 and one is a wide gap in the north east corner next to the proposed footpath.

The Parish Environment Group have worked with the landowner for some 25 years to successfully fill in gaps all along this hedgerow with new native species and oak trees (funded by the Council) and we request that this approach continues. The hedges here are home to a range of birds including yellow hammer and whitethroat and there should be no need to create new openings.

#### 6. Surface water drainage

We remain concerned regarding the proposed drainage basins. There is an ongoing and often serious flooding problem in this part of the village with watercourses and roads, particularly Chapel Lane, becoming flooded on several occasions each year. There has also been a flooding problem for the play area and green space at Wickham Place which suggests that capacity there is limited.

We need assurances that these basins will have the required capacity for all the development and also neighbouring water from the west, cemetery and farmland. We need assurance that the basins and the existing deep watercourse will be maintained by a public authority (either council or Anglian Water) and not left to the PC or private individuals to deal with when serious water, embankment or vegetation management work is required.

#### 7. Archaeology

We are disappointed to find that Archaeological assessment report has not been submitted in advance of the Planning meeting and that we have no time to consider its findings. This is a requirement of the Local Plan Policy SCLP12.60 and paragraph 12.668 of the SCLP. Trenches were excavated prior to Christmas, rapidly filled with water and then backfilled. We request that any report be forwarded in advance of any decision being made.

#### 8. Cumulative landscape impacts and tree scape

We maintain our objection and view that this development will have a further urbanising impact on the setting of both WM and Pettistree villages. We note the ESC comment regarding the appearance being seen in the context of existing new homes but this approach fails to consider the cumulative impacts from the two phases of development.

The site field rises by another five metres from Wickham Place and as a result the homes will be even more prominent in wider views from Pettistree, Campsea Ashe and WM. This further urbanisation will impact upon the setting of our two Conservation areas, our quiet lanes, the rural buffer between the parishes and the WM Cemetery (a non-designated Heritage Asset and home to the rare Bier House).

In order to adequately soften the development green spaces will need to be well planted with suitable trees, both within the layout and around the perimeters. We are not satisfied with the ongoing insistence by the SCC Highways Authority that trees should not be planted within five metres of an adopted highway. This matter has not been addressed nor resolved by the ESC report. If not resolved then most of the trees indicated will not be feasible. The use of underground cellular drainage structures further prevented tree planting at Wickham Place despite approved plans to the contrary and promised frontage trees were not installed by the developer.

The frontage trees (again planted by volunteers working with the landowner) comprise a wonderful mix of native species including the large hawthorns. There are anomalies between the plans as to the future of these trees in relation to the required visibility. We wish to see the detail of this and for a positive solution.

We request further consultation regarding the approach to planting, we wish to see a full scheme implemented with the use of native species a priority and not as indicated by the plan from Aspect Landscape Planning nor the stipulation set by the SCC Highways.

Whilst maintaining its objection to the development and the many unresolved issues we appreciate full consideration of all the issues we have raised at your planning meeting.

If ESC ignores the concerns of the Parishes, we request that we are fully involved in further discussions relating to the details of layout, drainage, landscape, highways and legal agreements in order to ensure that these address the specific technical concerns which we have and that we are fully informed as to outcomes.

7.17 Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service has confirmed receipt of the interim evaluation report and can confirm that there are no grounds to refuse this application on archaeological grounds and this application can go forward with conditions for a suitable programme of archaeological works. Conditions requested are included in the recommendation.

Conditions 26, 27 and 32 - The Highway Authority have confirmed that it is not necessary for Conditions 26, 27 and 32 to be 'pre-commencement' conditions. Conditions 27 and 32 could be amended to 'prior to any above ground works and works necessary to access the site' and Condition 26 could be amended to 'prior to occupation'. These amendments are considered acceptable.

9 The following additional conditions are proposed:

34 No development shall take place within the area indicated [the whole site] until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work has been secured, in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.  
The scheme of investigation shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

- a. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
- b. The programme for post investigation assessment
- c. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording
- d. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
- e. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
- f. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.
- g. The site investigation shall be completed prior to development, or in such other phased arrangement, as agreed and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: The site is potentially of archaeological and historical significance.

- 35 No building shall be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed, submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under Condition 1 and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition.

Reason: The site is potentially of archaeological and historical significance.

**Item 8 - DC/20/1002/ARM – Approval of Reserved Matters and Discharge of Condition 18 relating to Outline Planning Consent (APP/J3530/W/15/3138710 – DC/15/1128/OUT) – Phase 1 - Residential (255 dwellings, open space and supporting services and infrastructure), land off Candlet Road, Felixstowe, IP11 9QZ**

Additional comments of Suffolk County Council Lead Local Flood Authority

Recommend approval subject to conditions. The LLFA note that significant design progress has been made with the surface water drainage strategy since submission of this application. The strategy has significantly changed to better align with current policy and guidance. Whilst it is not fully compliant with new policy and guidance (and thus should not set a precedent for future developments) it is a reasonable compromise given the time elapsed since approval of the Outline application. The Applicant is proposing SuDS to be adopted by Anglian Water and positive discussions have taken place to this affect with Anglian Water.

- 10 The following additional conditions are recommended:

- 9 No development shall commence until details of the strategy for the disposal of surface water on the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority (LPA).

Reason: To ensure that the principles of sustainable drainage are incorporated into this proposal, to ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained

- 10 No development shall commence until details of the implementation, maintenance and management of the strategy for the disposal of surface water on the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The strategy shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure clear arrangements are in place for ongoing operation and maintenance of the disposal of surface water drainage.

- 11 Within 28 days of practical completion of the last dwelling, surface water drainage verification report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority, detailing and verifying that the surface water drainage system has been inspected and has been built and functions in accordance with the approved designs and drawings. The report shall include details of all SuDS components and piped networks, in an agreed form, for inclusion on the Lead Local Flood Authority's Flood Risk Asset Register.

Reason: To ensure that the surface water drainage system has been built in accordance with the approved drawings and is fit to be put into operation and to ensure that the Sustainable Drainage System has been implemented as permitted and that all flood risk assets and their owners are recorded onto the LLFA's statutory flood risk asset register as required under s21 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 in order to enable the proper management of flood risk with the county of Suffolk <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/flooding-and-drainage/flood-risk-asset-register/>

- 12 No development shall commence until details of a Construction Surface Water Management Plan (CSWMP) detailing how surface water and storm water will be managed on the site during construction (including demolition and site clearance operations) is submitted to and agreed in writing by the LPA. The CSWMP shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved plan for the duration of construction. The approved CSWMP shall include: Method statements, scaled and dimensioned plans and drawings detailing surface water management proposals to include:-

- i. Temporary drainage systems
- ii. Measures for managing pollution / water quality and protecting controlled waters and watercourses
- iii. Measures for managing any on or offsite flood risk associated with construction

Reason: To ensure the development does not cause increased flood risk, or pollution of watercourses or groundwater <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/flooding-and-drainage/guidance-on-development-and-flood-risk/construction-surface-water-management-plan/>