Have Fressingfield Residents been listened to?

Information used to inform the draft NDP included the survey of residents in March 2025. As has been previously documented some respondents were very unhappy and confused about the wording of the choice of potential sites because the 'None of the above' option followed the instruction '**If** MSDC were to allocate more housing in Fressingfield in the future which of the following would be the most suitable location.' This makes the 'None of the above' meaningless.

Whilst trying to understand how the draft NDP had reached the conclusion that 20-30 dwellings over the 20 year period had the support of residents I categorised the raw data (the commentary on the survey forms submitted) into 3 categories. The responses highlighted in Green are **against** any further housing in the village most significantly because of the lack of suitable infrastructure. The responses highlighted in Yellow are slightly more ambivalent and the non- highlighted are in favour of some development.

Much is made, correctly, in the draft NPD about the pressures from national and local government to extend and permit further housing development and it maybe that the PC's decision to attempt to get agreement for developments that fall below the indicative housing figures proposed is a reasonable approach. However I do not think that it is acceptable to downplay so many residents' concerns about the inadequate infrastructure. The Parish Council/ NDP Steering Group have tried to pin down Anglian Water (Infrastructure Paper Dec. 2025) about potential solutions to the sewage problems but their replies are unhelpful and reference digital maps which private residents have to buy to view.

Extract from draft NDP:

1.5 Government guidance is clear that Neighbourhood Plans cannot block development, but they can shape it and ensure that proposals that come forward are appropriate for the parish in terms of size, scale and character **and that they do not put undue strain on the existing infrastructure of the parish.**

Raw data from 2025 Housing Survey 324 responses 907 surveys sent out 36% response rate

1. Affordable housing becoming very necessary
2. All houses to look different
3. Already a large village for amenities in such a rural area which it needs to remain
4. Antiquated sewage systems that cannot withstand the pressure of heavy rain
5. Any larger developments could not be accommodated by current infrastructure and utilities
6. As long as it doesn't cause problems for existing homeowners
7. Assumption: All developments have adequate drainage and access
8. Can't see how extra housing will help as infrastructure is struggling already.
9. Careful thought has to be given with regard to the infrastructure of the village i.e. school, doctors, when adding extra houses co housing
10. Concerns regarding infrastructure deficit.
11. Daft question, if I tick none of these which others should I fill in
12. Difficult to answer Q10/Q13. It all depends on the needs of the local population.
13. Don't need any more housing
14. Don't need new houses in Fressingfield. Can't sell the ones they are building in New Street (was)

15. Due to a complete lack of transport and infrastructure
16. Filling in spaces (infill site) is intrusive and building too many houses stops a small community village being just that. Keep villages as villages not towns.
17. Fressingfield cannot accommodate any further housing
18. Fressingfield cannot sustain any more housing
19. Fressingfield does not have infrastructure to support more housing of any kind. No buses. No work in surrounding areas. No capacity in the surgeries around. Drainage system already not coping - regular flooding with sewage on Low Road.
20. Fressingfield does not need more houses of any category Employment and Infrastructure does not support more residents
21. Fressingfield has enough housing. There is no public transport, medical centre is full
22. Fressingfield is a village and is already a big village. It does not have the facilities to deal with anymore houses
23. Fressingfield is a village its already has met its housing quota for the NDP, more housing will ruin its rural setting, character and quality of life.
24. Fressingfield is a village not a town. Infrastructure is not there . Environmental impact, sewage, flooding, tree loss, light pollution
25. Fressingfield is already too big. It does not have sufficient amenities to accommodate additional housing
26. Fressingfield is already too big. It does not have sufficient amenities to accommodate additional housing
27. Further significant building in the village would not be sustainable with the current infrastructure.
28. Growth of the village increases community and helps diversify the village and to help make it a nicer place for all
29. Have concerns about infrastructure deficit...pressure on doctors surgery, sewag already spilling over when it rains. More houses means more cars on the roads, roads already full of potholes, public transport non existent.
30. Hope that if more houses are built in the village it will not change the lovely outlook of Fressingfield.
31. How can one tick at least 3 boxes when 'none of the above'
32. I believe we don't need anyone homes. The latest development has been a nightmare!
33. I don't think the village requires expanding.
34. I think sustainability should be a key factor of any new development i.e. no reliance on fossil fuels for new homes.
35. Ideally leave it as it is
36. If all houses with current planning permission were built I feel that would be sufficient . But if a few more needed , infills and small sites would be most suitable.
37. If we need affordable housing larger sites would have cheaper housing available
38. Individual plots or infill brownfield sites would be preferable
39. Infill or small development will fit in better with the parish and not destroy its character. It will also allow facilities like shops and doctors to be scaled to fit such incremental development.
40. Infrastructure (sewage, roads, public transport, doctors surgery) already understrain to cope with numbers
41. Insufficient infrastructure for medium/large developments especially sewage and grey water disposal. Medical centre has not capacity for new patients and school has limited capacity.

42. Is there much point in this exercise when the half completed housing estate in Wingfield Road was permitted . Did the parish council raise any objections to overcrowded and badly designed, badly built estate. If there were no objections by the parish council what on earth is the point of having one. If the objections were raised there should have been more information given.
43. It has to have parking and visitor parking if houses in a cluster
44. Keep the sites small but affordable
45. Large developments change the very nature of a village. We are not opposed to new development in principle but would oppose larger scale ones.
46. Large scale developments are not suitable for a small village if it is to retain its identity
47. Look at Harleston for more houses and infrastructure better than Fressingfield
48. Mid Suffolk District Council should be encouraged not to allocate more housing in Fressingfield. The sewerage/water infrastructure cannot cope as it is. The same applies to electricity supply/broadband. Are the same facilities shared with other parishes.
49. More facilities needed before more homes and finish other builds that have been abandoned
50. More houses to attract more people and expand the village
51. More housing should not be allocated in Fressingfield. Such proposals do not take into account a struggling infrastructure and local resources
52. MSDC are well aware of the history of feeling within the community because of our distance from appropriate resources and lack of adequate infrastructure . We rely on our PC to fight on our behalf against any such assumption on the part of MSDC that we can continue to attract working families or sustain estate influx.
53. No further housing
54. No further housing is sustainable with current infrastructure . No public transport,electricity supply dips and cuts out over winter, sewage egress problems, flooding problems, poor broadband making homeworking very difficult. Shared facilities

with adjacent parishes and proposed development in these parishes will place even great strain on already over burdened infrastructure system.

55. No more houses
56. No more houses in Fressingfield
57. Only if infrastructure is improved to provide for additional inhabitants first
58. Only way new build could even be considered is if infrastructure improved. Currently it is not coping .
59. Our present building sites do not seem to cope with access or drainage. The abandoned New Street site is an unfinished eyesore and Priory Road (single lane and partly unmade road) STILL has to put up with traffic to the Scout Site due to unfinished road to building site
60. People mostly move here when older. Younger people tend to live in areas with more jobs
61. Please stop building the 5 bedroom houses that people can't afford. Where are the small 2 up 2 down houses?
62. Question 4 is very badly worded. To confirm I don’t need any more housing in Fressingfield
63. Realistically to gain any affordable housing it would need 11-20 homes to make cost effective. However, the preference would be for smaller sites.
64. Roads in very dangerous conditions all around - more traffic - more accidents
65. Sewage system***is inadequate now let alone with new building of homes of any number!!!Manhole covers blow off on a regular basis leaving sewage strewn about especially after heavy rainfall.

66. Should planning permission be given for more houses it should include a significant upgrade to the infrastructure i.e. drains, electricity, roads etc
67. Sites up to 15 would be in keeping with existing yard style developments small different to look at. No identical rows or lego houses space them out; let them breathe
68. Subject to upgrading the Victorian sewage system which frequently causes flooding and distribution of raw sewage material onto the roads and into the becks
69. Surgery and school cannot cope with more
70. The half finished development on Wingfield Road is ugly and an eyesore and demonstrates that no further development should be permitted in the village on this scale.
71. The services, infrastructure and amenities are such that more people living in the village would add existing problems.
72. The village already has an unfinished development of approximately 30 dwellings which are empty, plus a dozen properties for sale which includes 8 of the last development - still unsold. Why do we need more.
73. The village infrastructure is inadequate for more housing
74. There are still unfinished homes lying incomplete and abandoned. Also there is not enough space at the doctors to support additional households.
75. There are three areas which make up the cost of residential property. The cost of site, building and margin. Bigger the site cheaper the plots, cheaper the cost of infrastructure - cheaper housing.
76. There is a lot of housing development currently being undertaken in Harleston which is far more suitable location than Fressingfield
77. There is not the infrastructure to home many more people in the village and the school and GPs are at capacity
78. They should not allocate more housing in this small village
79. This question is nonsensical if you are insisting on ticking a box how can one be'none of the above' . Should say tick any that apply or all that apply
80. To keep a community alive we need to evolve at an absorbable rate.
81. Too many houses already for doctors and schools to cope with also too many cars for small roads
82. Too many new houses already
83. Too many new houses already
84. We have had our housing allocation met by the NDP. We don't want to become an urban large scale village
85. What about infrastructure? The public transport, overcrowded medical centre
86. When these sites are being built, parking spaces become such a big problem. New homes need to be more spaced out. All these big sites create these problems.
87. Cars parked everywhere. Look at Harleston. Fressingfield is a village and should
88. stay just that. In my opinion too many houses going up everywhere spoiling the rural countryside we have had enough.
89. Why 3 minimum? Above is subject to clear independent evidence that the infrastructure (roads, public transport, sewerage and doctors surgery) is completely inadequate as it cannot cope with current housing, let alone more.
90. Younger couples will want to live where there are more facilities and jobs, not small villages housing, should be built there

Jenny Morris Bradshaw

2/02/2026