

PLANNING APPLICATION DC/19/05741 STRADBROKE ROAD, FRESSINGFIELD

Dear Mr Pearce,

On behalf of SAFE (Supporters Against Further Expansion) I wish to strongly object to the above planning application for Stradbroke Road, Fressingfield.

As far as we are concerned the basic guidance as to the building in an hinterland village has not changed and there can be no reason to approve this development or indeed Applications DC/19/05740 and DC/19/05956 as they fly in the face of published national and local policies.

1) GOVERNMENT POLICY

' We will focus housebuilding on URBAN AREAS where people want to live and where most jobs are created, making the best use of our urban land and continuing the strong protection of our Green Belt. IN PARTICULAR building high quality housing in CITY CENTRES AND TRANSPORT HUBS.'

2) MSDC HOUSING POLICY

'The Council will REDUCE THE NEED TO TRAVEL, REDUCE JOURNEY DISTANCES and make it safer and easier for people to access jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by PUBLIC TRANSPORT, WALKING AND CYCLING.

3) MSDC REVISED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

As this document nears acceptance Fressingfield, rightly, has been downgraded to an hinterland village. This means that its new housing contribution has been reduced and there is an expectation of some 5/6 houses a year. As we already have 51 new builds agreed by MSDC but not yet built there is absolutely no requirement for new agreements for the next ten years.

4) FRESSINGFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Fressingfield's NDP has been approved by the inspector and awaits ratification by the villagers (something which will happen!). It confirms a build of 60 houses maximum over the next ten years which includes the 51 already in the pipeline. It does not identify STRADBROKE ROAD as a potential site for development.

IF ALL THE ABOVE CARRY ANY WEIGHT AT ALL (AS THEY CERTAINLY DO) then this proposed development must be refused. Not to do so would contradict all presently held policies and soon to be implemented ones, both local and national.

OTHER FACTORS

1) SUSTAINABILITY (or lack of it!)

- a) The village is many miles from the nearest transport hub let alone A road. The roads into and out from the village are, on most cases, winding and narrow. The nearest railway station is in Diss, 10 miles away. In the centre of the village roads are narrow, congested and ,in large parts, have no pavement.
- b) There are NO regular bus services, the last one was discontinued last year. There are two school buses operating only in Term time and therefore useless to, and totally unused by, the general public. (Safe guarding of children regulations would prohibit such a mix in any case.)
- c) There are 58 f/t equivalent jobs in the village. (I carried out a comprehensive survey last year). Nearly half of these require a Degree qualification i.e. doctors, nurses and teachers. An influx of people to this new development would create a massive, new carbon footprint as they travelled distances to work. This is totally against government and MSDC policies.

- d) There are hardly any services in the village. A village shop with one till cannot be described as a super store (more on the store later). There is a Primary School, surgery, three churches, a public house and a restaurant. The school is full (Suffolk C.C. declaration in August 2019) and the surgery under increasing pressure with longer waiting times and on street parking problems at busy times. Amenities are limited to two tennis courts, a bowling green and a children's play area. Villagers have to raise a significant carbon footprint every time they wish to access other, higher order amenities such as cinemas, theatres and sporting activities.

ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARDS

Anglia Water have admitted that there is an extremely serious and totally unacceptable problem with sewage egress in Low Road in Fressingfield. With increasing frequency (5 SINCE OCTOBER 2019) at times of heavy OR prolonged rainfall sewage, including human faeces, sanitary towels, loo paper and other materials are forced out through manhole covers to flood Low Road, adjacent gardens and the beck. Increased housing in Stradbroke Road will exacerbate this problem creating more and more serious AND frequent flooding. Anglia Water have stated that it is likely to take years to solve this problem. NO COMMUNITY SHOULD BE SUBJECTED TO SUCH DISGUSTING CONDITIONS AND TO ADD TO IT BY ALLOWING YET MORE HOUSING IS TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE.

Indeed you, Mr Pearce, at the Planning Committee meeting in November 2018 stated, when urging the Committee to refuse all three applications, that until the effect on the village of the approved build of 51 houses had been assessed no further house builds should be agreed. THIS MUST STILL BE THE CASE TO-DAY.

SCHOOL SAFETY

The opening of School Lane by MSDC Planning Committee to allow the building of houses and a new Baptist Chapel beyond the school means that faster, more frequent and larger vehicles are already destined to drive past the entrance to the school. If the Stradbroke Road development is allowed then there will be more traffic passing the entrance to School lane at school opening and closing times; this in itself creates a greater danger to youngsters but the proposed provision of a new shop presents even greater danger. I was Headmaster of a school in the north where, just across the road from the school was a grocers shop selling sweets. So great was the pull of this shop to youngsters at the end of the day AND at lunch-time that I had to organise staff to patrol at these times and to persuade the owner to limit his opening times. Hungry, impulsive youngsters were a danger to themselves in their desire to cross the road. Locating a new village shop just across the road from School Lane could well have this same effect. I know that many planning authorities look very carefully at such proposals for this very reason, namely child safety.

SHOP ACCESSIBILITY

The developer believes he has made a clever move by persuading the shop owner to re-locate into the Stradbroke Road. However, what he is proposing will mean that the many elderly shoppers who presently walk to the existing shop will have much further to go and many will have to negotiate Jubilee Corner which is seen as a major danger spot. Coupled with the increased danger to school children I believe that the disadvantages of re-location outweigh the advantages.

IN CONCLUSION

This proposed development, if approved, would fly in the face of all published national and local planning policies, including, importantly, that of MSDC. It would be at odds with your new Local Development Plan and our rapidly emerging Neighbourhood Development Plan. (a cynic would say that these applications have been made to get in ahead of the revised plans of MSDC and Fressingfield). The grounds for rejecting it on the basis of unsustainability are just as strong as ever and in the case of public health and damage to the environment the argument against the development is MUCH stronger now than it was 14 months ago. The evidence has been piling up (literally!) and a visit to Low Road on a rainy day would convince anybody of the need to reject applications for yet more house building in the foreseeable future.

Once again, if you take into account the THREE, new proposed developments and add them to the 51 in the pipe-line you come up with a figure of over 110 new houses. This is totally out of proportion to a settlement of this size. There should only be one outcome, a refusal of the application.

Thank you for taking the time to read my submission on behalf of SAFE

Yours sincerely

John Kelsall

On behalf of SAFE (John Castro, Pam Castro, Elizabeth Manero, John Kelsall, Michael Miles, Abi Maydon, Paul McCann, Tim Eastoe).