

Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2037

Modification Submission Draft – Consultation on Examination issues

In November 2021, the independent examination of the modification submission draft Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan was suspended to allow for further work to be undertaken to address two issues. This required:

1. the strategic environmental assessment (SEA) process to be revisited and the preparation of an SEA Screening Report which, retrospectively, now confirms that a full SEA of the Plan was required, *and*
2. correcting the submitted Consultation Statement which did not include a list of those who were consulted at the Reg 14 pre-submission stage (Feb - Apr 2021).

With both resolved, a focused consultation on these two issues alone was held between 15 March and 29 April 2022.

Written representations were received from seven organisations / individuals. They are listed below, and copies of their representation are attached.

Rep No.	Consultee
(1)	Suffolk County Council
(2)	Natural England
(3)	Historic England
(4)	Highways England
(5)	Water Management Alliance
(6)	Marine Management Organisation
(7)	Resident – Mr Stiff

This page is intentionally blank

(1) SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL

Date: 21 April 2022
Enquiries to: Georgia Teague



Email: neighbourhoodplanning@suffolk.gov.uk

Mid Suffolk District Council
Endeavour House,
8 Russell Road,
Ipswich
IP1 2BX

Dear Mr Bryant,

Focused Consultation of the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan process

Thank you for consulting Suffolk County Council (SCC) on the Focused Consultation of the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan process.

There have been no amendments made to the draft plan itself, and as such our previous comments raised during the Reg16 consultation still stand.

We have no comments to make on the amended Consultation Statement and the SEA screening documents.

We wish to be kept updated with the future progress of this plan.

If there is anything that I have raised that you would like to discuss, please use my contact information at the top of this letter.

Yours sincerely,

Georgia Teague
Planning Officer
Growth, Highways, and Infrastructure

[PLEASE NOTE: THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

(2) NATURAL ENGLAND

Date: 21 April 2022
Our ref: 387569
Your ref: 20220246



Paul Bryant
Mid Suffolk District Council
communityplanning@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ

BY EMAIL ONLY

T 0300 060 3900

Dear Paul Bryant

Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan – Focused Consultation

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 15 March 2022

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.

Natural England does not have any specific comments on consultation.

However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.

For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Yours sincerely

Dominic Rogers
Consultations Team

Annex 1 - Neighbourhood planning and the natural environment: information, issues and opportunities

Natural environment information sources

The [Magic](#)¹ website will provide you with much of the nationally held natural environment data for your plan area. The most relevant layers for you to consider are: **Agricultural Land Classification, Ancient Woodland, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Local Nature Reserves, National Parks (England), National Trails, Priority Habitat Inventory, public rights of way (on the Ordnance Survey base map) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (including their impact risk zones)**. Local environmental record centres may hold a range of additional information on the natural environment. A list of local record centres is available [here](#)².

Priority habitats are those habitats of particular importance for nature conservation, and the list of them can be found [here](#)³. Most of these will be mapped either as **Sites of Special Scientific Interest**, on the Magic website or as **Local Wildlife Sites**. Your local planning authority should be able to supply you with the locations of Local Wildlife Sites.

National Character Areas (NCAs) divide England into 159 distinct natural areas. Each character area is defined by a unique combination of landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and cultural and economic activity. NCA profiles contain descriptions of the area and statements of environmental opportunity, which may be useful to inform proposals in your plan. NCA information can be found [here](#)⁴.

There may also be a local **landscape character assessment** covering your area. This is a tool to help understand the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape and identify the features that give it a sense of place. It can help to inform, plan and manage change in the area. Your local planning authority should be able to help you access these if you can't find them online.

If your neighbourhood planning area is within or adjacent to a **National Park** or **Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)**, the relevant National Park/AONB Management Plan for the area will set out useful information about the protected landscape. You can access the plans on from the relevant National Park Authority or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty website.

General mapped information on **soil types** and **Agricultural Land Classification** is available (under 'landscape') on the [Magic](#)⁵ website and also from the [LandIS website](#)⁶, which contains more information about obtaining soil data.

Natural environment issues to consider

The [National Planning Policy Framework](#)⁷ sets out national planning policy on protecting and enhancing the natural environment. [Planning Practice Guidance](#)⁸ sets out supporting guidance.

Your local planning authority should be able to provide you with further advice on the potential impacts of your plan or order on the natural environment and the need for any environmental assessments.

¹ <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>

² <http://www.nbn-nfbr.org.uk/nfbr.php>

³ <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimportance.aspx>

⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-area-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making>

⁵ <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>

⁶ <http://www.landis.org.uk/index.cfm>

⁷ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/807247/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf

⁸ <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/natural-environment/>

Landscape

Your plans or orders may present opportunities to protect and enhance locally valued landscapes. You may want to consider identifying distinctive local landscape features or characteristics such as ponds, woodland or dry stone walls and think about how any new development proposals can respect and enhance local landscape character and distinctiveness.

If you are proposing development within or close to a protected landscape (National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) or other sensitive location, we recommend that you carry out a landscape assessment of the proposal. Landscape assessments can help you to choose the most appropriate sites for development and help to avoid or minimise impacts of development on the landscape through careful siting, design and landscaping.

Wildlife habitats

Some proposals can have adverse impacts on designated wildlife sites or other priority habitats (listed [here](#)⁹), such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest or [Ancient woodland](#)¹⁰. If there are likely to be any adverse impacts you'll need to think about how such impacts can be avoided, mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for.

Priority and protected species

You'll also want to consider whether any proposals might affect priority species (listed [here](#)¹¹) or protected species. To help you do this, Natural England has produced advice [here](#)¹² to help understand the impact of particular developments on protected species.

Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land

Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services for society. It is a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, a store for carbon and water, a reservoir of biodiversity and a buffer against pollution. If you are proposing development, you should seek to use areas of poorer quality agricultural land in preference to that of a higher quality in line with National Planning Policy Framework para 171. For more information, see our publication [Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land](#)¹³.

Improving your natural environment

Your plan or order can offer exciting opportunities to enhance your local environment. If you are setting out policies on new development or proposing sites for development, you may wish to consider identifying what environmental features you want to be retained or enhanced or new features you would like to see created as part of any new development. Examples might include:

- Providing a new footpath through the new development to link into existing rights of way.
- Restoring a neglected hedgerow.
- Creating a new pond as an attractive feature on the site.
- Planting trees characteristic to the local area to make a positive contribution to the local landscape.
- Using native plants in landscaping schemes for better nectar and seed sources for bees and birds.
- Incorporating swift boxes or bat boxes into the design of new buildings.
- Think about how lighting can be best managed to encourage wildlife.
- Adding a green roof to new buildings.

⁹<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimportance.aspx>

¹⁰ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-and-veteran-trees-protection-surveys-licences>

¹¹ <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimportance.aspx>

¹² <https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals>

¹³ <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/35012>

You may also want to consider enhancing your local area in other ways, for example by:

- Setting out in your plan how you would like to implement elements of a wider Green Infrastructure Strategy (if one exists) in your community.
- Assessing needs for accessible greenspace and setting out proposals to address any deficiencies or enhance provision.
- Identifying green areas of particular importance for special protection through Local Green Space designation (see [Planning Practice Guidance on this](#) ¹⁴).
- Managing existing (and new) public spaces to be more wildlife friendly (e.g. by sowing wild flower strips in less used parts of parks, changing hedge cutting timings and frequency).
- Planting additional street trees.
- Identifying any improvements to the existing public right of way network, e.g. cutting back hedges, improving the surface, clearing litter or installing kissing gates) or extending the network to create missing links.
- Restoring neglected environmental features (e.g. coppicing a prominent hedge that is in poor condition, or clearing away an eyesore).

¹⁴ <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space/local-green-space-designation/>

(3) HISTORIC ENGLAND

E from: Historic England
Rec'd: 19 April 2022
Subject: Re: Mendlesham N'hood Plan - Focused consultation ending 29 Apr 2022

Dear Paul,

Thank you for your email.

I can confirm that we have no further comments to make at this stage.

Kind regards,

Edward

Edward James
Historic Places Adviser - East of England
Historic England



Historic England

Brooklands | 24 Brooklands Avenue | Cambridge | CB2 8BU

www.historicengland.org.uk

Twitter: @HE_EoE

[PLEASE NOTE: THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

(4) HIGHWAYS ENGLAND

E from: Mark Norman (on behalf of Planning EE)
Rec'd: 23 March 2022
Subject: Consultation Response Mendlesham N'hood Plan

Dear Sir/Madam

Thank you for consulting Highways England on the above Neighbourhood Plan.

Highways England is a strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). In respect to this Neighbourhood Plan, the nearest trunk road is A14.

We have reviewed the plan and note the area and location that is covered is remote from the A14. Consequently the draft policies set out are unlikely to have an impact on the operation of the trunk road and we offer **No Comment**.

Kind regards

Mark Norman

Spatial Planner

Network Operations

National Highways | Woodlands | Manton Lane | Bedford | MK41 7LW

Web: <http://www.highways.gov.uk>

GTN: 0300 470 4938

This email may contain information which is confidential and is intended only for use of the recipient/s named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any copying, distribution, disclosure, reliance upon or other use of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and destroy it.

National Highways Limited | General enquiries: 0300 123 5000 | National Traffic Operations Centre, 3 Ridgeway, Quinton Business Park, Birmingham B32 1AF | <https://nationalhighways.co.uk> | info@nationalhighways.co.uk

Registered in England and Wales no 9346363 | Registered Office: Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford, Surrey GU1 4LZ

Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

[ENDS]

[PLEASE NOTE: THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

(5) WATER MANAGEMENT ALLIANCE

E from: Planning planning@wlma.org.uk
Rec'd: 13 April 2022
Subject: Re: Mendlesham N'hood Plan - Focused consultation ending 29 Apr 2022

Our Ref: 21_05044_P

Good Afternoon,

Thank you for your email regarding your focused consultation on the modification draft Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan.

As per Page 14 of the revised Consultation Statement, the Board acknowledged receipt of notification of informal consultation and offered no comments (on 17th February 2021).

However, the Board subsequently provided comments with regards to surface water drainage strategies from major sites (> 10 dwellings or > 1 ha) in response to the Regulation 16 modification draft Mendlesham N'hood Plan (comments provided on 10th August 2021 as shown in the attached document, referenced 21_05044_P).

We note that a major development site has been allocated to the south of Glebe Way (Section 1.3.1.2 of the SEA Screening Report). Please refer to the recommendations made by the Board in our letter of 10/08/21 in the attached document. [\[MSDC Note: See next page\]](#)

The Board has no further comments to make with regards to the documents relevant to this focused consultation.

Kind Regards,

Will



William Chandler BSc (Hons)

Sustainable Development Officer

Water Management Alliance

m: 07826 940760 | dd: 01553 819622 | William.Chandler@wlma.org.uk

Registered office: Kettlewell House, Austin Fields Industrial Estate, King's Lynn, Norfolk, PE30 1PH

t: 01553 819600 | e: info@wlma.org.uk | www.wlma.org.uk

WMA members: [Broads Drainage Board](#), [East Suffolk Drainage Board](#), [King's Lynn Drainage Board](#), [Norfolk Rivers Drainage Board](#), [South Holland Drainage Board](#), [Waveney, Lower Yare and Lothingland IDB](#) in association with [Pevensey and Cuckmere Water Level Management Board](#)

Our Ref: 21_05044_P

10th August 2021

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan

The site is near to the Internal Drainage District (IDD) of the East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and the Waveney, Lower Yare and Lothingland IDB and is partially within both of the Board's Watershed Catchments (meaning water from the site will eventually enter the IDD). Maps are available on the Board's webpages showing the Internal Drainage District (East Suffolk IDB: https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/ESIDB_Index_plan.pdf Waveney, Lower Yare and Lothingland IDB: [Waveney, Lower Yare & Lothingland IDB \(arcgis.com\)](https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/ESIDB_Watershed.pdf)) as well as the wider watershed catchment (East Suffolk IDB: https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/ESIDB_Watershed.pdf). Waveney, Lower Yare and Lothingland has recently joined the Water Management Alliance and the watershed catchment mapping will be available on the website in due course.

The reason for our comment is to promote sustainable development within the Board's Watershed Catchments therefore ensuring that flood risk is not increased within the Internal Drainage District (required as per paragraph 163 of the [National Planning Policy Framework](#)). For further information regarding the Board's involvement in the planning process please see our [Planning and Byelaw Strategy](#), available online.

If there will be any major developments, defined as being 10 or more dwellings or a site area over 1 ha, please be aware of the following recommendations:

- We recommend that any drainage strategy supplied has been considered in line with the Planning Practice Guidance [SuDS discharge location hierarchy](#).
- If it is proposed that a site disposes of surface water via infiltration, we recommend that the viability of this proposal is evidenced. As such we would recommend that the proposed strategy is supported by ground investigation to determine the infiltration potential of the site and the depth to groundwater. If on-site material were to be considered favourable then we would advise infiltration testing in line with BRE Digest 365 (or equivalent) to be undertaken to determine its efficiency. If (following testing) a strategy wholly reliant on infiltration is not viable and a surface water discharge proposed to a watercourse within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD then we request that this be in line with [the Non-Statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems](#) (SuDS), specifically S2 and S4. Resultantly we recommend that the discharge from this site is attenuated to the Greenfield Runoff Rates wherever possible.



Cert No.
GB11990

MEMBER INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARDS

Broads (2006) IDB, East Suffolk IDB, King's Lynn IDB, Norfolk Rivers IDB,
South Holland IDB, Waveney, Lower Yare and Lothingland IDB

In Association with Pevensey and Cuckmere WLMB



Cert No.
GB11991

- If the applicant intends to discharge surface water to a watercourse within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD, we request that this discharge is facilitated in line with [the Non-Statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems](#) (SuDS), specifically S2 and S4. Resultantly we recommend that the discharge from this site is attenuated to the Greenfield Runoff Rates wherever possible.

Kind Regards,

Will

William Chandler
Sustainable Development Officer
Water Management Alliance

[PLEASE NOTE: THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

(6) MARINE MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION

E from: Lucinda Robinson, Marine Management Organisation
Rec'd: 28 April 2022
Subject: Mendlesham N'hood Plan - Focused consultation ending 29 Apr 2022

Thank you for including the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) in your recent consultation submission. The MMO will review your document and respond to you directly should a bespoke response be required. If you do not receive a bespoke response from us within your deadline, please consider the following information as the MMO's formal response.

Kind regards,

The Marine Management Organisation

Marine Management Organisation Functions

The MMO is a non-departmental public body responsible for the management of England's marine area on behalf of the UK government. The MMO's delivery functions are: marine planning, marine licensing, wildlife licensing and enforcement, marine protected area management, marine emergencies, fisheries management and issuing grants.

Marine Planning and Local Plan development

Under delegation from the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (the marine planning authority), the MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for English inshore and offshore waters. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the Mean High Water Springs (MHWS) mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine plan boundaries extend up to the level of MHWS, there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans, which generally extend to the Mean Low Water Springs (MLWS) mark. To work together in this overlap, the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) created the [Coastal Concordat](#). This is a framework enabling decision-makers to co-ordinate processes for coastal development consents. It is designed to streamline the process where multiple consents are required from numerous decision-makers, thereby saving time and resources. Defra encourage coastal authorities to sign up as it provides a road map to simplify the process of consenting a development, which may require both a terrestrial planning consent and a marine licence. Furthermore, marine plans inform and guide decision-makers on development in marine and coastal areas.

Under Section 58(3) of [Marine and Coastal Access Act \(MCAA\) 2009](#) all public authorities making decisions capable of affecting the UK marine area (but which are not for authorisation or enforcement) must have regard to the relevant marine plan and the UK [Marine Policy Statement](#). This includes local authorities developing planning documents for areas with a coastal influence. We advise that all marine plan objectives and policies are taken into consideration by local planning authorities when plan-making. It is important to note that individual marine plan policies do not work in isolation, and decision-makers should consider a whole-plan approach. Local authorities may also wish to refer to our [online guidance](#) and the [Planning Advisory Service: soundness self-assessment checklist](#). We have also produced a [guidance note](#) aimed at local authorities who wish to consider how local plans could have regard to marine plans. For any other information please contact your local marine planning officer. You can find their details on our [gov.uk page](#).

See [this map on our website to locate](#) the marine plan areas in England. For further information on how to apply the marine plans and the subsequent policies, please visit our [Explore Marine Plans](#) online digital service.

The adoption of the [North East](#), [North West](#), [South East](#), and [South West Marine Plans](#) in 2021 follows the adoption of the [East Marine Plans](#) in 2014 and the [South Marine Plans](#) in 2018. All marine plans for English waters are a material consideration for public authorities with decision-making functions and provide a framework for integrated plan-led management.

Marine Licensing and consultation requests below MHWS

Activities taking place below MHWS (which includes the tidal influence/limit of any river or estuary) may require a [marine licence](#) in accordance with the MCAA. Such activities include the construction, alteration or improvement of any works, dredging, or a deposit or removal of a substance or object. Activities between MHWS and MLWS may also require a local authority planning permission. Such permissions would need to be in accordance with the relevant marine plan under section 58(1) of the MCAA. Local authorities may wish to refer to our [marine licensing guide for local planning authorities](#) for more detailed information. We have produced a [guidance note](#) (worked example) on the decision-making process under S58(1) of MCAA, which decision-makers may find useful. The licensing team can be contacted at: marine.consents@marinemanagement.org.uk.

Consultation requests for development above MHWS

If you are requesting a consultee response from the MMO on a planning application, which your authority considers will affect the UK marine area, please consider the following points:

- The UK Marine Policy Statement and relevant marine plan are material considerations for decision-making, but Local Plans may be a more relevant consideration in certain circumstances. This is because a marine plan is not a 'development plan' under the [Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004](#). Local planning authorities will wish to consider this when determining whether a planning application above MHWS should be referred to the MMO for a consultee response.
- It is for the relevant decision-maker to ensure s58 of MCAA has been considered as part of the decision-making process. If a public authority takes a decision under s58(1) of MCAA that is not in accordance with a marine plan, then the authority must state its reasons under s58(2) of the same Act.
- If the MMO does not respond to specific consultation requests then please use the above guidance to assist in making a determination on any planning application.

Minerals and Waste Local Plans and Local Aggregate Assessments

If you are consulting on a minerals and waste local plan or local aggregate assessment, the MMO recommends reference to marine aggregates, and to the documents below, to be included:

- The [Marine Policy Statement \(MPS\)](#), Section 3.5 which highlights the importance of marine aggregates and its supply to England's (and the UK's) construction industry.
- The [National Planning Policy Framework \(NPPF\)](#), which sets out policies for national (England) construction mineral supply.
- [The minerals planning practice guidance](#) which includes specific references to the role of marine aggregates in the wider portfolio of supply.
- [The national and regional guidelines for aggregates provision in England 2005-2020](#) predict likely aggregate demand over this period, including marine supply.

The minerals planning practice guidance requires local mineral planning authorities to prepare Local Aggregate Assessments. These assessments must consider the opportunities and constraints of all mineral supplies into their planning regions – including marine sources. This means that even land-locked counties may have to consider the role that marine-sourced supplies

(delivered by rail or river) have – particularly where land-based resources are becoming increasingly constrained.

If you wish to contact the MMO regarding our response, please email us at consultations@marinemanagement.org.uk or telephone us on 0208 0265 325.

Lucinda Robinson, MSc (She/Her) | Marine Planner | Marine Management Organisation

+ [Nobel House | 17 Smith Square | London | SW1P 3JR]

8 lucinda.robinson@marinemanagement.org.uk | ([02087200083] |  [07464522334])

Do you want to tell us what you think of the Marine Plans? Then we'd appreciate your views through our voluntary [North East](#), [North West](#), [East](#), [South](#), [South East](#) or [South West](#) monitoring survey.

To receive marine planning updates and our newsletter enter your details [here](#).

Our MMO Values: Together we are **Accountable**, **Innovative**, **Engaging** and **Inclusive**

[Website](#) [Blog](#) [Twitter](#) [Facebook](#) [LinkedIn](#) [YouTube](#)



[PLEASE NOTE: THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

(7) RESIDENT – Mr STIFF

MSDC Note: This representations consists of two separate e-mails and a follow-up comment. All are published below in the order received.

E rec'd on: 31 March 2022

Subject: Consultation on Mendlesham Neighbourhood Development Plan

Good afternoon

I trust that you will make the inspector aware of the following comments.

I understand that you are reviewing the consultation arrangements that were undertaken for the proposed modification to the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Development Plan. I wish to make you aware of what I consider to be flaws in the Plan and how it has been reported as a response to the parish consultation. I speak as a Chartered Engineer with over 40 years' experience as a highway engineer.

The Traffic Report appended to the Plan as SD25¹ is purely a position statement on traffic conditions in 2019. No attempt has been made to predict traffic conditions into the future and most importantly no attempt has been made to predict the traffic conditions after the new bypass/link road connecting Old Station Road and Church Road referenced in Policy MP1 has been constructed. This will see a significant worsening of the quality of live for the residents of Glebe Way and Freelands.

In the parish consultation, a concern was raised about future traffic and the parish council response is to acknowledge that the new road connecting Old Station Road to Church Road will provide opportunities to relieve pressure on the conservation area and it acknowledges there will be an increase in traffic in Glebe Way, but claim that this will be inconsequential as a result of traffic calming. It is not possible to truthfully make such statements without knowing the resulting traffic along Glebe Way, nor being specific about the form of traffic calming.

The wording in the parish council response is vague and seems to seek to provide reassurances by overstating what can be achieved by traffic calming. If traffic calming could reduce the expected traffic flows along Glebe Way there would be no reduction in the conservation area. The parish council needs to state what speed reduction it considers acceptable, what it expects to achieve and needs to identify the traffic calming that will achieve that. Such traffic calming does not exist. The most effective means of reducing traffic speeds is a series of road humps which would provide a significant noise impact on nearby residents.

A further issue not covered in the original traffic report was to consider whether Glebe Way would be suitable as a bypass. Glebe Way was built over 40 years ago, designed geometrically and structurally as a cul-de-sac. The design of a cul-de-sac is different to that for a through road. Firstly the safety requirements of visibility for the two types of road are different. There is a tight bend in Glebe Way that has low visibility which is acceptable for a cul-de-sac, but the visibility is not sufficient for a through road. Similarly visibility requirements at junctions are less for cul-de-sacs than for through roads. As a result, safety will be compromised. Additionally construction of Glebe Way was suitable for a cul-de-sac but will be unsuitable for a through road carrying large vehicles.

¹ **MSDC Note:** See: <https://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Neighbourhood-Planning/Mendlesham-NP-SD25-TrafficReport.pdf>

Flowing from the lack of prediction of traffic along Glebe Way, no attempt has been made to assess the impact on the quality of life for the residents living along Glebe Way and Freelands.

I am happy to discuss any details.

Kind regards

Mr D Stiff C.Eng, M.I.C.E,

* * * * *

E rec'd on: 28 April 2022

Subject: Consultation on Mendlesham Neighbourhood Development Plan

Dear Sir,

I trust that you will pass this to the examiner of the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Plan (MNDP). I will be grateful if you confirm that this has occurred. [\[MSDC: See also note at end of this e-mail\]](#).

Dear Examiner,

I am writing to you to make you aware of my concerns about the MNDP. I wrote to you previously in a rush as I thought that responses were required by 4th April. I had misread 4pm on 29th April as 4th April.

I was not made aware of the consultation taking place and so could not add my concerns to other comments received. In its Consultation Statement it is stated that the parish Council made residents aware of the consultation. This did not occur with me despite me writing to the parish council with some of my concerns in April 2021.

I will respond to my concerns about the response to the consultation and then add my concerns about the matters I would have commented on if I had been aware of the consultation. I make the following comments as a chartered highway engineer with over 40 years' experience.

In the consultation statement, reference is made to the new road connection between Old Station Road and Church Road via Glebe Way. The PC says there will be an increase in traffic along Glebe Way but offers no suggestion on what this will be nor what the impact will be on the residents.

The PC also say that traffic calming will need to be carefully designed but again offers no suggestion on what traffic calming would be appropriate. As such no costs nor impacts on residents is given.

I respectfully request that you ask the PC what will be the change in traffic flow along Glebe Way, how that will affect the residents, what form of traffic calming does it consider appropriate, its cost and how it will impact the residents.

I think that the PCs reaction to the impact on Glebe Way is to not take the issue seriously. It wants to reduce the traffic in Front Street significantly and this would be at the expense of the residents in Glebe Way. It tries to play down the impact on Glebe Way, but if the impact on Glebe Way is small there will be little benefit for Front Street. Thus the PC would want the traffic calming in Glebe Way to be useless.

The consultation document refers to the minutes of meetings of the group preparing the MNDP are available to the public. That is not correct. The minutes are not available on the parish Council website and I obtained some under a Freedom of Information request. I was denied copies of some meetings. Thus it is not correct to say minutes are available to anybody. I argue that it has been made difficult to obtain some minutes and some were denied, making me say that some meetings took place secretly.

Turning to the suitability of Glebe Way as a bypass. Glebe Way is designed as a cul-de-sac. That is both geometrically and structurally. Roads that are designed to carry greater volumes of traffic have different design standards geometrically and structurally.

Geometrically the visibility would be sub-standard for both forward visibility and for drivers leaving junctions and accesses. This would lead to the road being a safety hazard.

Structurally Glebe Way is unsuitable to carry heavy traffic. To make it a suitable standard would entail a major reconstruction of the carriageway. That would be a major cost that I suspect had not been allowed for. (Has the cost of traffic calming also been omitted?)

If you would like me to expand on any of the above points please let me know.

Kind regards

Mr D Stiff

MSDC note: In confirming to Mr Stiff that all of his representations will be passed on to the Examiner we received the following additional comment:

Dated: 29 Apr 2022

“Thank you for confirming receipt of my email yesterday. Please can all my emails be passed to the examiner. The one I wrote yesterday was the result of a receipt of information from the parish council.

Can you please also make the examiner aware that the parish council has not demonstrated what options were considered for a bypass. It is usual practice to investigate different options and to show that this has been done, so that decisions are made after considering all relevant facts.”

[Ends]