

## **Levington and Stratton Hall Parish Council**

East Suffolk Council  
Planning Department  
East Suffolk House  
Station Road  
Melton Woodbridge  
IP12 1RT

20<sup>th</sup> September 2025

27 Brendon Drive  
Rushmere St Andrew  
IPSWICH IP5 1NJ  
Suffolk  
Telephone 07770575350

### **Planning Application No: DC/25/0681/ARM Red House Farm**

Approval of Reserved Matters of DC/23/1138/OUT – Erection of 18x No dwellings (including 6 affordables) with garaging, parking, accesses and landscaping – the quantity, type and layout of buildings within the proposed development...

Dear Sirs

The Parish Council considered DC/25/0681/ARM Red House Farm at a Planning Meeting on Wednesday, 17<sup>th</sup> September 2025 attended by members of the public who have passed on their views not only at the meeting but also on East Suffolk Portal.

Although amendments to the previously published plan have been made, the Parish Council's position on this application has not changed and the Parish Council **STRONGLY OBJECTS** to this application.

1. Although the two entrances into the development have been widened, this does not alter the other highway issues raised in our previous objections; dangerous bend, increase in traffic, refuse collection and lights shining in opposite properties.
2. Letter from Ben Winton at Transport Planning to Andrew Martin Suffolk Highways states “there are concerns over pedestrian connectivity to and from the site from the outside highway. A holding objection shall be maintained by the Highway authority.” The Parish Council reiterates the original comments with several updated amendments which are detailed below. The application states that all matters are reserved apart from ‘access’ and ‘the number of dwellings to be accommodated’. Our comments and objections below are focused on the issues relevant to these two matters.

1. Built Environment

- SCLP 12.56 “The layout of the development should reflect the linear nature of the village”. This accords with the narrow nature of the site. This latest proposal does not attempt to reflect the linear nature of the village but in order to accommodate the 18 dwellings required by ESC, the illustrative layout still involves ‘back building’ with 3 properties (plots 1,2 and 3) which have been left to the front of the development, and which the ESC has previously refused in the village. It is now effectively a representation of a row of mismatched terraced houses with five small gaps only, being the side paths of some of the properties. This is totally outside of the current look of the village.
- A further illustration of the lack of space on this plot of land to accommodate 18 houses is the fact there is now no longer a space between each of the houses, to the effect that plots 3, 5, 8, 16, 17 and possibly 18 have no direct access to their garden areas, where the bin and bicycle storage is located, which means their only access is to bring both bins and bicycles through the house itself. This is clearly not acceptable.
- The development needs to be in keeping with the built environment of the rest of village which is low density; this OPA is high density and contrary to the existing street scene. It should also be visually complimentary to the award-winning Red House Walk complex opposite, the appearance of which ESC protects with restrictions on extensions and modifications.
- Firstly without updated detailed plot information regarding bricks, facia and roofing material, reflective of the changing plot numbers following this reorganisation, we are unable to comment in this regard and reserve our position to comment further when this is available. There is also no specific sizing of the parking spaces provided. Without this information, while they may have drawn them on the plan, they could be very narrow resulting in cross parking and although they have met the criteria for the correct amount of spaces they may not comply with the size criteria of Suffolk County Council's Guidance for Parking 2023. This may also be the case for the garages as we have no size information with the new plan. It should be noted there is no specific allocation for visitor parking which will cause an issue with such a small site.
- There are insufficient EV charging points indicated for the number of properties. There should be at least 1 for each property. Even if you take account of the EV charging point ‘left’ in the garden of plot 5 and the one in the side passage of plot 10 (clearly left in error from the previous plan) there are still too few to meet the minimums required as set out in Suffolk County Council's Guidance for Parking 2023.
- I would like to draw the Planning Department's attention to the fact that with regard to the CIL letter in May 2025 in relation to the s.106 requirements with regard to mixed tenure of the properties, this has still not been addressed. We are keen to see how the plan may need to be further amended to address this as there does not appear to be scope to meet the requirements due to the limited space available on this site.

## 2. Highways Issues

- In order to accommodate 18 dwellings, the application relies on 2 separate road access points on to the narrow Bridge Road. Although mention is made of these being within the 30mph limit, but only just, it omits to mention the Northern one is very close to a dangerous blind bend. The PC has previously raised this danger with SCC Highways who agreed and painted central white lines.
- Concern is expressed about additional vehicles regularly travelling in and out of the village where there are only short footways, and the roads are frequently used by pedestrians and horse riders (there are many livery business' nearby). The residents request that a footpath is built between the new development and the end of Bridge Road to enable residents to access the bus service on the old A45 Felixstowe Road. The current footpath is shown as ending at the beginning of a blind bend.
- The 'internal' layout of the latest illustrative plan, if all the parking areas are filled parked cars, would restrict the ability of the waste collection teams to access the bins where they are indicated to be left for collection. Have the waste collection teams been consulted on this as to whether, for a new development, this would be satisfactory?
- Additionally, there is no walkway indicated for pedestrians to access the footpath from their properties without having to walk behind cars parked in the indicated parking areas. As cars will frequently be reversing out, their visibility of pedestrians, particularly children, will be severely reduced and will cause unnecessary risk and danger to pedestrians.

## 3. Natural Environment

- The proposed development site immediately borders the AONB where a high density housing development would be inappropriate. The hinterland to the AONB should have sparse developments leading away from it.
- SCLP 12.56 "The southern and western boundaries of the site comprise existing hedgerows and trees which should be retained other than where their removal is required to provide access. Further landscaping on the eastern boundary of the site would provide a separation between the site and the farm to the east. The Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty lies to the south and west of the site and development will therefore need to be sympathetic to the surrounding landscape". The existing natural mixed hedgerow along the site has been decimated by the applicant/landowner in advance of the submission of the application (and so now described by the applicant as "poor") and of little significance. The proposed high density development immediately adjacent to the AONB will not be "sympathetic to the surrounding landscape".
- In drawing up the current Local Plan, ESC (SCDC) unilaterally extended the Settlement Boundary into the countryside/natural environment. This is unwelcome by the PC. Should this

application be approved, there should be no further expansion of our Settlement Boundary. This encroachment into the natural environment is not supported. The proposed development represents a 21.2% increase in the number of dwellings within the Settlement Boundary.

#### 4. Village Facilities and Services

Levington is classified as a small village due to the lack of facilities including public transport. The daily bus service from the village to Ipswich has been withdrawn. A significant increase in journeys in private vehicles will be inevitable.

- The local primary school in the neighbouring village of Nacton is full and it has been reported that there will be no places for village children from 2024. An S106 contribution does not create immediately available additional places.
- The village water main has burst numerous times in recent years (7 in the last 11 years, 3 in the last 2) causing interruption of supply and frustrating road closures for repairs. It needs complete replacement.
- The sewerage system has blocked a number of times and the adequacy and resilience of the treatment plant near Levington Creek has been questioned.
- Surface water drainage is a continual problem through the village with frequent flooding across the road near the site. The proposed infiltration basins not only take up space but their appearance is questionable along the frontage of the development. No additional demand should be placed on these facilities.

No additional demand should be placed on these facilities.

For the above reasons it is the considered view of the Parish Council that although the Local Plan requirement for the site to provide 18 dwellings, in the context of this specific village environment is flawed and impractical. The site is physically too small, the local services are inadequate and the essential utilities too undependable to accommodate the projected increase in population.

We are very disappointed in the quality of the latest plan in that it gives no updated detailed plot information to properly comment on this amended development. It is poorly set out and there appears to have been no proper thought given, as evidenced by the points we have identified at the beginning of this letter. We believe that both the Planning Department and the Parish Council are deserving of better detailed and accurate information, rather than wasting time on such a poor quality plan.

Kind regards

Angie Buggs

Clerk to Levington and Stratton Hall Parish Council