

**Notes of the Public Meeting held in the Sancroft Hall, Fressingfield  
on Tuesday 17 February 2015  
to inform residents about a possible planning proposal for the development of land  
off Priory Road**

**The meeting was chaired by Prue Rush, Chairman of Fressingfield Parish Council**

**In Attendance:** Michael Pickstock, representing the land-owners; Andrew Aalders-Dunthorne, representing 1<sup>st</sup> Fressingfield Scouts, Carol A Smy (Clerk)  
90 members of the public

**15.1 The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and expressed the wish that it would be conducted in a respectful and open manner and immediately invited questions. Surprisingly, following the manner of the meeting held on 18 November 2014 concerning an alternative planning application for development, members of the public present seemed strangely reluctant to pose questions about the proposal that had been presented throughout the day prior to the meeting but after a slow start people spoke up.**

15.2 Questions from the floor:

1. It was stated that expansion was welcomed (?) but this depended on where and infrastructure. Had the landowner made enquiries about whether or not the sewage provision was adequate to the task and if not perhaps this should have been undertaken in the first instance  
*Such examination had not been undertaken*
2. A resident of New Street stated the proposed site was prime arable land outside the settlement boundary and that any proposed houses would block the light into her bungalow and houses should not be built in close proximity to bungalows  
*The Chairman explained that the settlement boundary was no longer a given and the land in question was not as described by the questioner. Information provided as to the site's history was incorrect. **MP demurred stating the number of houses for the land was, as yet, undecided and light to properties should be kept. NOTE: for a piece of land this size the number of dwellings would be iro 30/35***
3. Would the Planning Department wait until the results of the Housing Needs Survey were returned before making a decision on the various proposals?  
*The Clerk had asked the Senior Planning Officer if the decisions on the potential development proposals for Fressingfield could be deferred until the results of the HNS were known but this request was refused and the Planning Department would consider each application on merit as it was received.*
4. Would the developer submit a request for outline or full planning permission in the first instance and had the required assessments been undertaken?  
*Outline permission would be sought first for the Scout Hut followed, in due course, by planning permission for the housing development. An environmental impact and archaeological assessments had been completed and nothing of note had been found.*
5. Concerns were raised about the impact of extra street lighting and footpaths leading from the proposed development on that part of the village
6. One questioner asked of all three proposed developments could go through before the HNS was complete and was referred to the previous answer (3).
7. It was stated that there was support for Scouting in the village but was there any way the building of a Scout Hut could proceed without the housing development?  
*The gift of one acre of land for the Scout Hut was wholly dependent on the housing development going ahead. **It was stated that the Scouts had been searching for a piece of land for two years and that offered by George Barrett was the most sensible being available for a nominal £1. The Group required its own facilities suitable for a modern age. The anxieties were appreciated but it was deemed not possible to look at leased land as then grant funding would not be available to the Group for the building costs if it did not own the land. AFTERNOTE: grant funding is often available for projects if a lease is for a long (generally 25 years or more) period.***
8. Scouting and its aims had support but there was concern about the housing with worries that there might not be anything built that would be suitable for older residents.
9. It was thought that speculation through a 'sweetener' to the Scouts was the thin end of the wedge for development in the village.  
*The Scouts had approached Mr Barrett.*

10. What percentage of the proposed housing would be affordable?

*30/40%*

11. Who would own the affordable housing land?

*Whichever Housing Association was involved*

***It was felt the positive aspects of the proposed development had not been put forward. The primary school was in need of more children to remain viable. A roll of 200 was deemed the optimum number. Development was often difficult to come to terms with but must happen to avoid stagnation. There were benefits for the school and the wider community.***

12. New developments tend to favour larger properties not those aimed at families with young children

*There were various sizes of property in the village but a variety was always needed as were smaller ones to suit down-sizers*

13. It was stated that people could not be compelled to have more children to feed the school and the Scouts.

14. One member of the audience felt the site was not the right one for a Scout Hut and that there were probably one or two others more suitable.

*A new access road would be constructed from the proposed Scout Hut to New Street, coming by Carpenters Yard. This would take heavy traffic away from New Street to Weybread Woodcraft. The proposal included 25 parking spaces.*

15. A village plan was required.

*This would be for the next Parish Council to decide*

16. The comment was made that there were 4 potential proposals and all were financially speculative for the land owners and exceptional need for housing should be proved by each developer.

***The Chairman reminded those present that Fressingfield was one of ten villages required to take a share of the proposed 540 new houses required for the area but although there was not a defined number for each village a share would have to be taken.***

**The meeting closed at 20.22hrs.**

***C A Smy***

**Carol A Smy MILCM  
Clerk to the Council**

**18 February 2015**