

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write in relation to planning proposals 1449/17, 1648/17, 1432/17

I have already written strongly objecting these proposals, based on sustainability and quantity (Fressingfield has already during the last 12 months seen two separate developments passed).

I now write to express my sincere objections based on highway infrastructure and safety of residents.

The current very 'weak' road infrastructure coupled with regular flows of traffic entering and exiting the village already currently presents high risk to those using the road in question; New Street. Highways have strong reservations based on this yet the proposal remains to go ahead. This will make the position in New Street even worse.

The exit from Red farm is very close to the exit from the Post Mill development so all the objections relating to Red Farm now apply to Post Mill. In **addition the new houses in Red Farm** , will increase activity in New Street because of the surgery, shop, doctors surgery.

The report is very inconsistent in the objections made. New Street is a Class C road and feels very dangerous. As a mother of two small children, as well as a dog owner, I spend most days walking with my dog or children; walking cycling or scooting to / from school, the shop and the Doctors. There are no pavements to offer protection and always several parked cars which we have to (hurriedly!) navigate around; no mean feat with children and or/the dog on her lead. It always feels a stressful experience; primarily due to the safety factor (lack of / very few pavements together with parked cars and regular moving traffic flow in both directions).

This is all the more pertinent during harvest season, where many large tractors and farm vehicles frequent the road, but we also notice as well as cars commuting. In and out and around the village, many large chicken trucks and large animal feed lorries also use the road (and others around the village; where I must add, there are also very few pavements in place).

I imagine, what with the (already passed) two housing sites that we will also, a growing number of large heavy construction (and the like) vehicles involved with these two sites, but if yet more sites are passed it doesn't bare to think how congested/gridlocked? And dangerous New Street will be for my own family as well as others who walk to and from school/village amenities and of course, other pedestrians/dog walkers etc.

I have attached the reports from the Highways Agency for your information, which are very relevant.

Kind regards,

Kelly Letts.

Street Farm, Fressingfield.

Your Ref: MS/2285/15
Our Ref: 570\CON\2581\15
Date: 06 October 2015
Highways Enquiries to: martin.egan@suffolk.gov.uk



All planning enquiries should be sent to the Local Planning Authority.

Email: planningadmin@midsuffolk.gov.uk

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

For the Attention of: Rebecca Biggs

Dear Sir,

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

CONSULTATION RETURN MS/2285/15

PROPOSAL: Full Planning Permission - Erection of new Scout Headquarters with associated facilities and new access road. Outline Planning Permission- Erection of 30 new dwellings with all matters reserved (accept the new road access to serve the properties).

LOCATION: Land and Buildings at Red House Farm, Priory Road, Fressingfield, IP21 5PH

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highways Authority recommends that permission be refused for the following reasons:

Recommendation for Refusal

The Highway Authority recommends that this application be refused on the grounds of safety and unsustainability:

Unfortunately neither the residential element nor the Scout Headquarters element of the application are able to achieve safe and suitable access to the site for all people and are not able to promote sustainable methods of travel to and from the site.

Residential Element

The new access onto New Street is not suitable as shown in terms of layout and junction visibility. Although these elements may be overcome with submission of revised details the principal issue is the lack of safe access for pedestrians.

The application site is located on the edge of the village and is served by New Street, a C class road with a 30mph speed limit. 30 dwellings will likely generate significant levels of pedestrian movements in order to access the village school, shop and other amenities. Although New Street has footways for part of its length the majority does not so pedestrians have to walk on the road. There is restricted

street lighting and restricted areas to allow pedestrians to step off the road in safety to allow traffic to pass.

The residential development will therefore result in an unacceptable increase in the amount of pedestrians having to walk in the road to the detriment of highway safety and contrary to the objectives of the NPPF. The lack of appropriate footway links will also encourage a likely increase in unsustainable methods of travel to and from the site.

Scout Headquarters Element

Similarly the scout hall will attract pedestrian, cycle and vehicular traffic with many trips being undertaken during the hours of darkness for parts of the year. It is noted that 37% (58 people) of members are from Fressingfield with the remaining 63% (97 people) travelling from parishes further afield. The supporting planning statement also indicates potential daytime use by schools and other organisations in order to raise additional funds.

Although the scout hall will have its vehicular access from New Street there will be pedestrian and cycle access via Priory Road. Inevitably there will be an increase in pedestrians having to walk along Priory Road with some also using New Street. The last stretch of Priory Road has no street lighting, is narrow, only being wide enough for one car with limited suitable space to step off the road safely.

It is likely that some patrons will be dropped off by car using the Priory Road approach which is not considered suitable for additional vehicular traffic. It may be seen as a more commodious route by some. In addition there is no street lighting or car turning areas at the end of Priory Road so probable congestion may occur at drop off and pick up times.

The NPPF identifies as a core principle that development should actively make the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and that development should be focused in locations where car travel is minimised. This location and the nature of the routes to the village amenities means that this development is not able to maximise the use of sustainable methods of transport and the resultant increase in pedestrians having to walk in the road will be detrimental to road safety.

It does not appear that any space exists in which to provide improved pedestrian access to the application site so it is unlikely that the above concerns can be overcome.

Yours faithfully,

Andrew Pearce
Senior Development Management Engineer
Strategic Development – Resource Management

Your Ref: MS/2285/15
Our Ref: 570\CON\0340\16
Date: 19th February 2016
Highways Enquiries to: martin.egan@suffolk.gov.uk

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

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

Dear
Sir,

For the Attention of: Rebecca Biggs

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
CONSULTATION RETURN MS/2285/15

PROPOSAL: Full Planning Permission- Erection of new Scout Headquarters with associated facilities and new access road. Outline Planning Permission- Erection of 30 new dwellings with all matters reserved (accept the new road access to serve the properties). Revised Access Details.

LOCATION: Land and Buildings at Red House Farm, Priory Road, Fressingfield, IP21 5PH

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

DRAWING NUMBER 1005/03/001 DATED 18-01-2016.

I refer to the new submitted drawing which indicates a revised access onto New Street which is intended to serve the 30 new dwellings and new Scout Headquarters building. Unfortunately these details do not overcome the main highway issues and our Recommendation of Refusal dated 24th September 2015 is still applicable.

As previously stated in our responses it may be possible to achieve a satisfactory vehicular access to the application site through negotiation and submission of appropriate details but the main objection relates to the lack of safe pedestrian links between the site and the village.

The latest proposals do not overcome this problem and do not address the access difficulties via Priory Road. Again as previously mentioned, and reiterated in my email dated 14th October 2015, unfortunately I do not believe that the pedestrian safety issues are able to be overcome as there is not sufficient space available to provide sufficient new footways.

For these reasons I am not able to withdraw the recommendation of refusal.

As a footnote I would again confirm that the area of land hatched red is shown to cross a private area of land to the front of Rivetts Cottage and Rivetts Barn. This is not a highway verge, it is private land so is not available for visibility purposes or for locating any warning signs as suggested.

Yours faithfully,

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

Your Ref: MS/2285/15
Our Ref: 570\CON\2581\15
Date: 24 September 2015
Highways Enquiries to: martin.egan@suffolk.gov.uk



All planning enquiries should be sent to the Local Planning Authority.

Email: planningadmin@midsuffolk.gov.uk

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

Dear Sir,

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
CONSULTATION RETURN MS/2285/15**

PROPOSAL: Full Planning Permission - Erection of new Scout Headquarters with associated facilities and new access road. Outline Planning Permission- Erection of 30 new dwellings with all matters reserved (accept the new road access to serve the properties).

LOCATION: Land and Buildings at Red House Farm, Priory Road, Fressingfield, IP21 5PH

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highways Authority recommends that permission be refused for the following reasons:

Recommendation for Refusal

The Highway Authority recommends that this application be refused on the grounds of safety and unsustainability:

Unfortunately neither the residential element nor the Scout Headquarters element of the application are able to achieve safe and suitable access to the site for all people and are not able to promote sustainable methods of travel to and from the site.

Residential Element

The new access onto New Street is not suitable as shown in terms of layout and junction visibility. Although these elements may be overcome with submission of revised details the principal issue is the lack of safe access for pedestrians.

The application site is located on the edge of the village and is served by New Street, a C class road with a 30mph speed limit. 30 dwellings will likely generate significant levels of pedestrian movements in order to access the village school, shop and other amenities. Although New Street has footways for part of its length the majority does not so pedestrians have to walk on the road. There is restricted street lighting and restricted areas to allow pedestrians to step off the road in safety to allow traffic to pass.

The residential development will therefore result in an unacceptable increase in the amount of pedestrians having to walk in the road to the detriment of highway safety and contrary to the objectives of the NPPF. The lack of appropriate footway links will also encourage a likely increase in unsustainable methods of travel to and from the site.

Scout Headquarters Element

Similarly the scout hall will attract pedestrian, cycle and vehicular traffic with many trips being undertaken during the hours of darkness for parts of the year. It is noted that 37% (58 people) of members are from Fressingfield with the remaining 63% (97 people) travelling from parishes further afield. The supporting planning statement also indicates potential daytime use by schools and other organisations in order to raise additional funds.

Although the scout hall will have its vehicular access from New Street there will be pedestrian and cycle access via Priory Road. Inevitably there will be an increase in pedestrians having to walk along Priory Road with some also using New Street. The last stretch of Priory Road has no street lighting, is narrow, only being wide enough for one car with limited suitable space to step off the road safely.

It is likely that some patrons will be dropped off by car using the Priory Road approach which is not considered suitable for additional vehicular traffic. It may be seen as a more commodious route by some. In addition there is no street lighting or car turning areas at the end of Priory Road so probable congestion may occur at drop off and pick up times.

The NPPF identifies as a core principle that development should actively make the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and that development should be focused in locations where car travel is minimised. This location and the nature of the routes to the village amenities means that this development is not able to maximise the use of sustainable methods of transport and the resultant increase in pedestrians having to walk in the road will be detrimental to road safety.

It does not appear that any space exists in which to provide improved pedestrian access to the application site so it is unlikely that the above concerns can be overcome.

Yours faithfully,

Andrew Pearce
Senior Development Management Engineer
Strategic Development – Resource Management

Your Ref: MS/4410/16
Our Ref: 570\CON\0840\17
Date: 6th March 2017
Highways Enquiries to: martin.egan@suffolk.gov.uk



All planning enquiries should be sent to the Local Planning Authority.

Email: planningadmin@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

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

For the Attention of: Rebecca Biggs

Dear Rebecca,

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

CONSULTATION RETURN MS/4410/16

PROPOSAL: Permission for the erection of a new Scout Headquarters Building, with associated facilities and access road and Outline Planning Permission for the construction of up to 28 residential dwellings with all matters reserved (access, layout, andscape, appearance and scale).

LOCATION: Land and Buildings at Red House Farm, Priory Road, Fressingfield, IP21 5PH

ROAD CLASS:

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highways Authority recommends that permission be refused for the following reasons:

I refer to your email dated 23/02/2017 which contained a link to "Technical Note 01" dated 15th February 2017. As you know this latest submission still does not overcome the lack of a footway link on New Street to serve the Scout Hut and the associated 28 new dwellings. Therefore, as previously advised on several occasions I confirm again that the Highway Authority recommends refusal of application 4410/16 due to the lack of agreement to provide a footway on New Street linking the site to the village. This was also the principal highways objection with the earlier application 2285/15.

Recommendation of Refusal.

The application site is located on the western edge of the village and proposes a new access onto New Street, a C Class road. The nearest existing footway on New Street is at the junction of Priory Crescent, a distance of approximately 145 metres. Pedestrians from the application site will walk in the road for this distance. New Street does not have any street lights for this length. The application proposes up to 28 new dwellings and a new Scout Hut. The development will generate increased levels of pedestrian movements onto New Street to access the village school, shop, bus stops and other amenities.

This increase in pedestrians walking in the road will be detrimental to highway safety and contrary to the objectives of the NPPF. The lack of a footway on New Street will also encourage a probable increase in unsustainable methods of travel to and from the site by future residents. The NPPF identifies as a core principle that development should actively make the fullest use of public transport, walking, and cycling and that development should be focused in locations where car travel is minimised. This edge of village location with poor pedestrian connectivity is not able to maximise sustainable modes of transport and does not provide safe and suitable access for all people as required by the NPPF:

- Paragraph 32 - safe and suitable access to the application site cannot be achieved for all people, in this case pedestrians.
- Paragraph 34 – the location of the site and the lack of footway links do not allow sustainable travel modes to be maximised.
- Paragraph 35 – the application site is not located where sustainable transport modes can be exploited for the movement of people. Priority is unable to be given to pedestrians due to lack of safe footway routes and the location does not allow potential conflicts between pedestrians and traffic to be minimised.
- Paragraph 38 – Although the site does have key facilities within walking distance the lack of suitable footway connections will deter pedestrians from walking to them.

Additional Comments.

The Highway Authority reiterates that a footway on New Street can be accommodated on either highway verge or land controlled by the applicant across the New Street site frontage. Despite the statements and various misquotes (of previous correspondence) within the submitted Technical Note, third party land is not required for such a footway and provision is feasible. Enclosed is a highway definition plan extract for your records; the highway verge is not unconfirmed here.

It should be noted from the highway definition that a 1.5m verge width is available for the 'worst' section; a footway at this width is considered acceptable in this edge of village rural location and is a significant improvement to having no footway. Across the site frontage the 1.8m wide standard can be achieved.

Current design guidance, primarily Manual for Streets, encourages connecting developments to their surroundings. Developments with poor links to the surrounding area encourage movement to and from it via car rather than more sustainable means. Walkable neighbourhoods are encouraged and it is acknowledged that walking offers the greatest potential to replace short trips via car. Designs should encourage interconnected street patterns and layouts to reduce resident's reliance on the car.

It is accepted that the application can promote pedestrian access via Priory Road for some, although this will still require walking in the road. It will not, however, provide a commodious route or option for the complete site. Many pedestrians will therefore use the New Street route, which will be the more convenient, shorter walk and it is these pedestrians that will be more at risk.

New Street in this area has no street lighting, is predominantly a straight road with little built up frontage and measured traffic speeds (85th percentile speeds surveyed at the site access) frequently exceed the 30mph speed limit. A kerbed footway should also reduce speeds a little. Street lighting isn't considered necessary currently, although ducting to provide for future lighting would be advisable. Priory Road has street lighting as far as no. 7. some 90m short of the site.

Speed Tables – The Highway Authority maintains that the installation of speed tables on the new access road, used to slow vehicles down, illustrates obvious design flaws; essentially the new road is too straight, therefore speeds will be excessive. The designer acknowledges this flaw by introducing tables as a speed reduction measure. I assume the access road has been designed to hug the western site boundary primarily to maximise the area left for development. Speed tables inconvenience several road users, can be hazardous for two wheeled vehicles and the constant noise of vehicles having to brake and ride over the tables is not ideal for residents. Vehicle speeds should be kept low in new

residential areas by horizontal alignment; introducing bends. This is not, however, a reason on its own to refuse this application but it may have implications for a potential agreement between the developer and the County Council for the adoption of the new road in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Development Management Engineer
Strategic Development – Resource Management