**DC/21/02671: The Proposed Development of Chantry Vale P2**

**Objection letter to support Parish Council Response**

Suggested response to BMSDC Planning re Chantry Vale Development based on concerns identified during Parish workshops, presentations and meetings. These are predominantly not in favour of the proposed application in its present form and so the suggested draft is in the form of an objection.

May we thank those that attended the workshops / presentation / open day and meeting and for your observations.

A draft letter is provided listing bullet points for your use if you agree with issues raised and wish to submit a hard copy letter, or you may use it as a guide to responding if you have other views. A brief explanation of bullet points raised continues on last page.

These points and explanations will be replicated on parish website for anyone wishing to copy/paste into their own constructed document as they feel relevant, and / or for construction of web/email response.

A more detailed Parish Council response will be posted on the parish website in due course.

Methods of submitting your response

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Commenting in Writing/Email**

* + Send your comments to – Planning Department, **Babergh** and Mid Suffolk **District** **Councils**, Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road ,Ipswich IP1 2BX
  + or by email to: [planninggreen@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:planninggreen@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk)
  + Please ensure your name, address, the planning reference number and if you object or approve is in the letter and sign as appropriate otherwise your comments may not be included.
  + Completed letters may also be posted into the Parish Council mail box at the Tithe Barn (Beige parcel box in rear courtyard by the main entrance). We will deliver on your behalf.

**Commenting Online**

-- First you need to register on the website.

* + Goto <https://planning.babergh.gov.uk/online-applications/registrationWizard.do?action=start> fill in the form
  + Confirm your registration via the confirmation email BDC send out to you
  + After registration, go directly to the planning application via <https://planning.baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/simpleSearchResults.do?action=firstPage>
  + Click on the ‘Make Public Comment’ box, fill in the ‘Your Comment’ box and submit
  + Useful info on how to comment on a planning application can be found at <http://www.babergh.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning/view-an-existing-application/comment-on-a-planning-application/>
  + Dates of Planning Meetings & Agendas/Minutes can be found at <http://bdcdocuments.onesuffolk.net/planning-formerly-known-as-development/>

**Contacts**

* + Sproughton Parish Council:-
  + Clerk: Mrs Kirsty Webber, Email: [SproughtonPC@gmail.com](mailto:SproughtonPC@gmail.com)
  + Website: <http://sproughton.onesuffolk.net/> (updates will be published here),
  + councillor contact details <http://sproughton.onesuffolk.net/parish-council/>
  + Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/Sproughton?fref=ts> (updates will be published here)
  + Twitter: @SproughtonPC (updates will also be tweeted)
  + Notices will be put up around the village

Planning Department,

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils,

Endeavour House,

8 Russell Road,

Ipswich,

Suffolk IP1 2BX

[planninggreen@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:planninggreen@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk)

**Dear Sir/Madam,**

**RE: DC/21/02671 ‘*Outline planning permission (some matters reserved, access to be considered) Town & Country Planning Act 1990 – Erection of up to 750 dwellings, and up to 3ha of primary education land, public open space, sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), landscaping and highway improvements (accompanied by EIA statement). Land North of the A1071, Ipswich*’ (53ha, 131ac)**

**I object to this planning application in its present form due to the following concerns which have been raised by our community. I understand that our Parish Council will be providing a more detailed response in relation to these issues of concern. Please respond to confirm receipt of my objection.**

* **Unacceptable adverse impact on Landscape**
* **Unacceptable adverse impact on Heritage Assets**
* **Inadequate provision of community facilities in development.**
* **Application is premature.**
* **Development of a valley this size should first be subject to a publicly consulted Master Plan.**
* **Unacceptable and significant threat of Coalescence to Sproughton.**
* **Inadequate consideration for cumulative impact on local infrastructure in the area.**
* **Drainage strategy presenting unacceptable risk to listed Grade 2 Heritage Asset.**
* **No consideration of Sproughton Neighbourhood Plan Design Codes.**
* **Lack of clarity of proposed building sizes and planting.**
* **Poses threat to two important local Wildlife Areas**
* **Not acceptable without planning conditions to ensure 35% affordable housing.**
* **Inadequately defined Primary School Provision**
* This is a Special Landscape Area and Policy CR04 requires that development should improve or not adversely impact on Landscape value. This is clearly not the case. Local planning is also guided by the SCC Landscape Character Type Assessment which recommends that building should be avoided near the upper valley side and is better placed on the plateau where it can be screened and hidden from the retained landscape. This guidance is not being followed. Confirmed by various landscape consultants.
* These issues also impact on the Grade 2 Heritage assets, Chantry Park, Red House and Springvale Farm as they are closely related to the landscape. Especially building beside the historic tree line edge of the park and on the Valley Side/Ridge to the West of Red House. This has been confirmed by heritage consultants, some commissioned by BMSDC who must be considered as providing the most unbiased and reliable advice to the council.
* This application includes no provision for social, sport or community buildings. The complete Wolsey Grange development would be a separate community of 1225 homes, twice the size of the entire parish. Relying on access to the school as a community building is not guaranteed and may be withdraw for any number of reasons at any time and the existing community provisions are remote and inadequate. It is just not acceptable for a distinct community of this size to provide no social, sport or community buildings/facilities for its residents.
* This large site was not a strategic site in the current Core Strategy to 2031 . It is a site proposed in the emerging Joint Local Plan to 2037 but this is still under examination and all allocations are not yet agreed so this application is premature.
* A development of this size and impact should require a fully consulted masterplan. This site was under consideration since 2014 but by excluding it from the Wolsey Grange one Master Plan consideration of the total or cumulative impact on the Valley has been overlooked. A full master plan considering the total valley development proposed should first be undertaken.
* Sproughton is under increasing threat of merging with neighbouring communities and losing its individual & historic identity (creeping coalescence) and an additional total 1,225 homes will triple the size of our parish overwhelming the individuality of our village. As the LPA the council has a duty under the NPPF to prevent creeping coalescence.
* The local infrastructure is inadequate and inadequate provisions are being made for this site and other developments in the surrounding area. Local primary health care is already overwhelmed and inaccessible. NHS Dental and GP surgeries are NHS funded but privately owned so S106 payments to the local NHS do not create new surgeries. Adequate primary health care should be assured before a development of this size is approved. Public transport provision is minimal forcing people into cars and the local roads cannot cope. Ignoring this wider impact is ignoring a deterioration that needs to be resolved before considering this application.
* This application proposes a SUDS drainage strategy that takes the run of from over 1200 new homes and sends it through a network of ancient drainage ditches and under an important, sensitive and vulnerable grade 2 listed building supported by an assessment based on the minimum future storm assessment required. In light of recent national flood disasters, more recent European Flood disasters and the regularity that meteorological records are now being broken then accepting a marginal assessment seams inadequate and reckless.
* The Sproughton Neighbourhood Plan Design Codes is a document (written by AECOM) that stands on its own as guidance for appropriate local development, it should be respected by the developer. Three and two & a half storey homes are not in accordance with this document especially in a development that will overwhelm the Parish as are several other elements of this application like a proposed lower row of visually damaging white properties facing the heritage assets.
* There is no mention of the number of bungalows or where they will be built. Only maximum building sizes are shown and applied for leaving no guarantee any much needed bungalows will be built. The same applies to green infrastructure and planting giving no specifics of numbers or density of planting. The design and access statement only talks about filtered views which is vague and unacceptable as the level of planting and screening from the sensitive heritage areas should be assured and defined before considering the adverse visual impacts.
* Unspecified wildflower planting may be a bio gain but that is not the wildlife priority here. Chantry Park a County Wildlife Site and Chantry Cut Island a nature site support many diverse and protected species. These must maintain healthy connection with the wider countryside via A14 wildlife corridors to ensure health of species by genetic exchange. But building is slowly cutting of these corridors; WG1 has cut off the Copdock interchange tunnels, WG2 will cut of the A1071 Bridge. Wildlife access to these corridors must be to retained, preserve and enhance if these wildlife assets are to thrive.
* The 35% affordable housing commitment was not honoured in the WG1 application based on questionable viability claims. This cannot happen again. If this outline planning application is approved it should be conditional on 35% affordable housing approval such that the approval will be withdrawn if not delivered.
* This outline planning application should not be approved without assurances from the education department that a primary school will be built in sufficient time for children moving into the present WG1 development to be accommodated as intended in the approved WG1 application because the village school is already too small and without such an assurance several hundred children will move in without this necessary school is built.