



# UFFORD PARISH COUNCIL

Mrs. Judi Hallett, *Clerk to the Council*  
C/o Manor Farm, Hollesley  
Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3NB

Tel: 01394 411405 / 07739 411927 [ufford.pc@hotmail.com](mailto:ufford.pc@hotmail.com)

28<sup>th</sup> October 2017

Planning Policy and Delivery Team  
Suffolk Coastal District Council  
East Suffolk House  
Station Road,  
Melton  
Suffolk  
IP12 1RT

Dear Planning Policy and Delivery Team,

**Subject: Issues and Options Consultation 2017**

With reference to the above consultation, Ufford Parish Council would like to make the following observations:

## Part 1 – Strategic cross boundary issues for Ipswich Borough Council and Suffolk Coastal

### How much growth?

Our suggestion is that Scenario A –Baseline – should be planned for. This is mainly as we cannot foresee the national economy growing well for some time, indeed we believe there may even be a possibility of a recession.

### Where should the growth go?

Ufford Parish Council would prefer Option 5, that growth is concentrated on Ipswich and the A14 corridor due to the existing infrastructure.

### The provision of retail and leisure development

It is Ufford Parish Council's view that no further retail or light industry outlets are required in East Suffolk. There are a number of new units already under construction in nearby villages and towns and a quantity still unoccupied.

### Infrastructure

The Ipswich Northern Route will be essential to keep traffic moving on the A12 and A14, with additional new developments already due for construction, especially at Adastral Park in Martlesham and further expansion of Melton and Woodbridge. However, there could be significant impact upon Ufford and Bredfield of any Northern Route. Options on previous plans have indicated a northern route to link in at the beginning of the dual carriageway A12 Wickham Market by-pass. In the event that the Orwell Bridge is closed it would mean traffic diverting around the northern loop and then back around the Woodbridge and Martlesham bypass to link into the dual carriage way at Tesco and Adastral Park, Martlesham. This would cause significant congestion on the south bound A12 carriageway past Ufford, Bredfield and Woodbridge.

## Part 2 – Suffolk Coastal Issues and Options

### Vision

In the period to 2036 we accept that there needs to be an increase in housing, and this should ideally be located near to where jobs are; firstly redeveloping brownfield sites and secondly increasing the urban areas.

The character of the rural areas should be preserved for the enjoyment of everyone as a recreational area and for the continuation of the tourism which is attracted to an area with distinct character, and will be put off by every village being an urban sprawl.

### Housing

In the last decade or so the village of Ufford has increased in size by between 50 and 70 houses (some still under construction) which should equate to a population increase of up to 20% (compared with a national average of around 8%). Some of this development has taken place outside the village development boundary, contrary to the SCDC Local Plan and against the wishes of the Parish Council and residents.

### Business and Industry

The local industry of Suffolk is arable farming and an increasing population in the UK and independence from EU requires us to ensure food security. The character and importance of rural Suffolk should not be lost by introducing inappropriate industry. Infrastructure needs to be good to attract and keep local business

### Tourism

We feel there is a definite tension between increasing housebuilding and maintaining or even increasing tourism to the Suffolk Coastal area. Tourists want to see the lovely Suffolk villages, market towns, and coastal areas. They will not come if it looks the same old urban sprawl as everywhere else. Also they will be deterred if the road network becomes so busy that journey times are long and tedious in traffic queues.

Too much tourism in such a rural area can be at the expense of residents and businesses, a balance needs to be struck.

### Vehicle Parking

Many developments have insufficient parking spaces for the needs of residents and their visitors. Streets lined by parked cars look unsightly and are dangerous for other road users, particularly cyclists and pedestrians crossing roads. SCDC must ensure adequate parking is in place when any development (be it retail or residential) is approved.

### Community Facilities

Although designated as a Local Service Centre, Ufford does not fulfil the remit of this status. It does have a Village Community hall, recreation ground with play-park and a Church Hall together with two excellent public houses. However there are no shops, schools, doctors, dentists or businesses serving the parishioners daily needs and only a sporadic bus service along one street in the village.

It is not a sustainable place for more houses.

### Healthy Communities

In Ufford we have about 950 residents and many community activities available for people to join. We have a reputation for being a welcoming village to newcomers. Villages like Ufford need to grow gradually as they have for centuries. We now have 34 houses being built, the largest single development Ufford has ever seen. A community cannot be cohesive if the population increases by more than 10% in 2 years.

## Climate Change

Regarding the increased risk of flooding, this is particularly relevant to Ufford with low lying water meadows in the Deben valley. Any loss of green-field or trees and vegetation, replaced with roads and buildings and driveways will increase the risk of flooding further. Whatever our beliefs about causes of climate change there is evidence of global warming, and changes in weather patterns with more “storm weather events” with heavy rain and increased wind.

With reference to Air Quality Management, the vast majority of traffic destined for Ufford from the south must transit the Melton/ Woods Lane traffic lights, likewise Ufford, and indeed Wickham Market and Pettistree traffic bound for Woodbridge cross over the junction in Melton, which is a junction closely monitored with borderline air quality. Any increase in traffic passing that junction towards Ufford (and elsewhere) could reduce air quality, and in close proximity to a primary school this must be a major concern for all involved.

## Design

Too many new housing developments have designs which appear the same nationwide. Design should reflect the nuance of local architecture and housing density should again reflect the local pattern; recent developments in Ufford are very overcrowded, boring and unattractive.

In addition, the Physical Limits Boundaries must be maintained and any development should be within these limitations. Building outside the PLB will mean Ufford is swallowed up and will become just an extension of Woodbridge and Melton.

## Heritage

The International Institute for Sustainable Development describes sustainable development as “...development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (<http://www.iisd.org/topic/sustainable-development>).

These words should make us careful not to destroy our precious heritage. By spoiling the landscape, the character of our ancient villages will disappear and we will deprive future generations of the farmland to grow food.

## Landscape

Simply put, if building is allowed outside the physical limits boundary of villages, it will have an adverse impact on the surrounding landscape.

## Infrastructure

Over the past 12 years the volume of traffic in Ufford has increased dramatically. The noise level has increased and the traffic movements are heavy from 5:30 am onwards. Traffic surveys have demonstrated a significant percentage of vehicles exceed the speed limit of 30mph through the village.

Building additional dwellings will increase this further. We are certain that Wickham Market will also be adding yet further properties. Any Wickham Market residents wanting to travel south will generally travel through Ufford to access the A12 or Woodbridge. There needs to be better access to the A12 from Wickham Market southbound to ease the volume of traffic through the Ufford and Melton villages.

Furthermore, the village does not have the infrastructure to cope with any further development of any sort at any of the proposed 16 sites. The road network in the village is already overstretched with various routes through the village (e.g. School Lane, The Avenue, Lower Street, Crownfields etc.) already being used as a “cut-through” by residents of Rendlesham, Eyke and Wickham Market; with many cars travelling at high speed along unsuitable single track country roads.

Many of the roads do not have associated pavements and footpaths and they are already dangerous for pedestrians and especially children who live in the village. We now feel it is unsafe for children to move around Ufford unaccompanied because of the current rapidly increasing traffic load. This makes access to the Play Park dangerous for children on their own. Any further increase in housing (and associated traffic increase) would make the village roads all the more dangerous and more unsuitable for pedestrians.

## Potential Land for Development

It is noted that virtually all sites in Ufford are identified (in the 'Initial Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessments' document) as having the following negative attributes:

- **Air quality** – Development likely to result in an increase in emissions through increases in associated traffic movements
- **Waste management** – Likely to result in an increase in waste production
- **Greenhouse gases** – Overall emissions in the District could rise as a result of an increase in development
- **Safeguard of the coast and estuaries** – Potential impact from increased recreational pressure on the estuary

In addition we would like to offer the following comment on the 16 sites identified in the document for potential development in Ufford:

Site Number	Description of Site	Comments (from Ufford Parish Council, Ufford Residents and taken from the 'Initial Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessments' document)	'Suitable' or 'Unsuitable' for development (in the opinion of UPC)
44	Adjacent to Bridge Cottage, Yarmouth Road,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We were notified by Laura Mundy (SCDC) that this site refers to the parcel of land next to Hillside Cottage which is currently under construction (DC/16/0836/FUL)</li> </ul>	Suitable (under construction)
143	Land at Spring Lane and Yarmouth Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Southern parts of the site lie in areas of SWF. To the very south is an area of FZ3 and 2</li> <li>• Local Landscapes – Site is in SLA. The south east corner of the site is within 'Ufford Parklands' (Green infrastructure)</li> <li>• This site is unclear from the plan and the exact location requires clarification</li> </ul>	Unsuitable
177	Land opposite the depot, Yarmouth Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ufford Parish Council was involved in the preliminary consultation on discussions regarding the relocation of Woodbridge Town Football Club and St Audry's Sports and Social Club to this site in 2014. UPC strongly object to this proposal on the grounds of:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Increase in traffic especially through Melton, and at the dangerous junction in Ufford</li> <li>○ Potential noise and light pollution because of plans for social club and functions</li> <li>○ Site is outside village physical limits,</li> <li>○ Ecological harm would almost certainly occur due to the nature tracks from Parklands Woods to Old Hospital Woods.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Such a large development would further exacerbate the Melton Traffic Lights issue</li> <li>• Ufford Parish Council have been made aware that the move of Woodbridge Town Football Club and St Audrys Sports and Social Club to this site has now been postponed indefinitely.</li> <li>• Should the move of WTFC and SAS&amp;SC not happen, any other commercial use would be very strongly opposed by UPC and local residents</li> </ul>	Unsuitable

420	Land East of Crownfields	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation of soil and minerals – Site in agricultural use. Potential loss of high quality agricultural land.</li> <li>• Flooding – The eastern edge of the site is in FZ 2 and 3. SWF covers the eastern and northern sides of the site</li> <li>• Local Landscapes – Site is in SLA</li> <li>• This site lies in Ufford’s water meadows which carry excess surface water from the upper village (and farmland beyond) down to the river Deben. The meadows flood regularly in winter rising up to a level around 3 feet below surrounding properties.</li> <li>• This field is part of the village landscape and fabric. It is an area of outstanding natural beauty when viewed from many different locations and as such is completely integral to the character and nature of the village. Any development on this land would completely destroy the special landscape and character of the village.</li> <li>• Even when not flooded the field is clearly important to the drainage of local land and properties surrounding it and any development of it may lead to flooding of other existing properties in the village as well as flooding any dwellings constructed on the land itself.</li> <li>• Furthermore the land is an important habitat for local wildlife and rare plants. In particular the field is home to a considerable number of Swallows and Swifts in season. All year round the field is home to owls and other birds of prey and in the evenings and at night there are bats hunting over it. There are old and important trees surrounding the field. Because of all these factors it is completely unsuitable for development of any kind</li> </ul>	Unsuitable
424	Land off Barrack Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation of soil and minerals – Site in agricultural use. Potential loss of high quality agricultural land</li> <li>• Flooding – Majority of the site is within SWF. Half of the site is in FZ 2 and 3b</li> <li>• Area of historical and architectural importance – Site within 100m of three Grade II Listed buildings</li> <li>• Local Landscapes – Site is in SLA</li> <li>• The water meadows which carry excess surface water from the upper village (and farmland beyond) down to the river Deben. The meadows flood regularly in winter rising up to a level around 3 feet below surrounding properties</li> <li>• Development here would impinge on views described in the Ufford Conservation Area Review. It is the LA’s duty to preserve the Conservation Area</li> </ul>	Unsuitable

425	Land off Barrack Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the water meadows which carry excess surface water from the upper village (and farmland beyond) down to the river Deben. The meadows flood regularly in winter rising up to a level around 3 feet below surrounding properties</li> <li>• Would adversely impact the character of Midsummer Cottage which is a 16<sup>th</sup> century listed building in a conservation area</li> <li>• Any development here would impinge on views described in the Ufford Conservation Area Review. It is the LA's duty to preserve the Conservation Area</li> </ul>	Unsuitable
426	Land at East Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East Lane, a no through road, runs along the base of a large escarpment to its north. Water percolates down the hill to emerge as a line of springs on the south side of the lane. The result is instability of the subsoil under the lane, which was built for horses and carts. The weight of the modern agricultural machinery and large delivery vehicles has led to subsidence and surface cracking along half of the lane's entire length. As three main services (gas, water &amp; sewage) run directly under the lane future subsidence could well cause damage to the services. These springs particularly affect site Ref 426 creating a large boggy area along the northern edge of the meadow. It would preclude house construction unless stilts are envisaged!</li> </ul>	Unsuitable
472	Land Adjacent to Keeper's Cottage High Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Landscapes – Site is in SLA</li> <li>• This site is poorly related to the village and outside the physical limits boundary</li> </ul>	Unsuitable
488	Land South of 'Cambrai', Yarmouth Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation of soil and minerals – Site in agricultural use. Potential loss of high quality agricultural land. North east corner of the site is within a mineral consultation area</li> <li>• Flooding – there is some SWF in the north east corner of the site</li> <li>• This site is poorly related to the village and outside the physical limits boundary</li> </ul>	Unsuitable
512	Land at Lodge Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation of soil and minerals – Site in agricultural use. Potential loss of high quality agricultural land</li> <li>• Area of historical and architectural importance – Late medieval to post medieval features and small pottery scatter</li> <li>• Local Landscapes – Part of site is in an area to be protected from development</li> <li>• Please See Appeal APP/J3530/W/16/3152153 Contrary to SP15, SP27 and SP29 “ a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area”</li> </ul>	Unsuitable
556	Grove Farm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation of soil and minerals – Site in agricultural use. Potential loss of high quality agricultural land</li> <li>• Local Landscapes – The site (both 788 and 4130) border a CWS (ancient woodland) to the East</li> <li>• This site is poorly related to the village and outside the physical limits boundary</li> </ul>	Unsuitable

561	Crown Nursery, High Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation of soil and minerals – Site in agricultural use. Potential loss of high quality agricultural land</li> <li>• Flooding – SWF runs through the site and the site also houses a pond crucial to the migration of frogs and toads around the village</li> <li>• Local Landscapes – Site is in SLA</li> <li>• The development of Crown Nurseries (even before completion) has demonstrated that Ufford is completely unsuited to further development. It has caused significant traffic chaos even before completion and has destroyed once spectacular landscapes (views from the top of the village to the south east) and already severely damaged the character of the village. Any further development of this area is completely inappropriate</li> <li>• If permitted this would be clear over-development of the site. This site is poorly related to the village, outside the physical limits boundary and development would be harmful to character of the village</li> </ul>	Unsuitable
811	Land adj. to houses at Lodge Road, High Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation of soil and minerals – Site in agricultural use. Potential loss of high quality agricultural land</li> <li>• Flooding – SWF has been recorded on the north of the site</li> <li>• Local Landscapes – Site is adjacent to a SLA Part of the site is in an area to be protected from development</li> <li>• We refer SCDC to the recent decision by the inspector to dismiss the appeal on this development</li> <li>• We refer you to the decision of the Planning Inspector in APP/J3530/W/16/3152153 and the following specific comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ...the introduction of the dwellings would erode the contribution the site makes the open character in this edge of settlement location</li> <li>○ ...provision of new dwellings would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would be in conflict with policies SP15 and SP27 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Development Management Policies</li> <li>○ ...proposal would be contrary to development plan policies in terms of its location.</li> <li>○ ...development would harm the character and appearance of the area</li> <li>○ ...the adverse impacts of granting permission that I have identified would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefit of the provision of dwellings in this case</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Unsuitable



908	Land west of Yarmouth Road and east of A12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flooding – A strip in the middle of the site is subject to SWF</li> <li>• This site is unrelated to the village and it is a greenfield site</li> </ul>	Unsuitable
909	Land in between A12 and Yarmouth Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation of soil and minerals – Site in agricultural use. Potential loss of high quality agricultural land</li> <li>• Flooding – The SE of the site is subject to SWF</li> <li>• This site is unrelated to the village and it is a greenfield site</li> </ul>	Unsuitable
1054	Land adj. Copse Corner, Byng Hall Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation of soil and minerals – Site in agricultural use. Potential loss of high quality agricultural land</li> <li>• Flooding – Southern edge of the site is at risk from SWF</li> <li>• Biodiversity and Geodiversity – Trees and hedges along the southern edges of the site may contain biodiversity value. Bat species identified on the site</li> <li>• This site is unrelated to the village and it is a greenfield site</li> </ul>	Unsuitable

#### KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS:

- *SLA = Special Landscape Area*
- *SWF = Surface Water Flooding*
- *FZ 3 = Flood Zone 3 (High Risk)*
- *FZ 2 = Flood Zone 3 (Medium Risk)*
- *FZ 1 = Flood Zone 3 (Low Risk)*
- *CWS = County Wildlife Site*
- *BAP = Biodiversity Action Plan*

## Conclusions

Over the past 10 years Ufford has endured many more new dwellings than was planned for in the last Local Plan documentation. In 2013 it was quantified by SCDC that Ufford need only take 27 more dwellings in the period between 2010 and 2026. In fact we have so far seen permission for 44 houses with an additional 6 currently under an appeal, within the last 4 years.

Ufford is fully aware that the burden of houses must be shared among the villages and towns of Suffolk Coastal district. However, we feel to heap more growth on to an already 'at capacity' village would be massively detrimental to the existing residents and infrastructure.

Finally, we would like to thank you for the opportunity to take part in this consultation and for the assistance your staff have offered us throughout the process.

Yours sincerely,

*J Hallett*

**Mrs Judi Hallett**

Clerk to Ufford Parish Council

CC. County Councillor Alexander Nicoll,  
District Councillor James Bidwell  
District Councillor Jane Day