

Supporter Against Fressingfield Expansion (SAFE)

As last year's meeting did not materialise, I will remind you of the history and aims of SAFE.

In early 2017 Mid Suffolk published its Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) document which identified significant parcels of land in our village for potential, major developments. In February 2016 two hybrid schemes, including 46 houses were approved- the new Baptist chapel and the scout hut. A month later planning approval was sought for 3 further sites totally 208 houses. We decided to become active and SAFE was formed with a small committee. Our aim was to limit major development in Fressingfield. We arranged a scientifically sound petition visiting every house in the central area of the village and found 94% of villagers were against major development. This gave us a mandate to be active. Generally residents were unaware what was happening so we set up our own web site fressingfieldhousing.org

We recently revisited the chapel scheme because, although almost complete, it was found **not to have been built** to the approval given by the Local Planning Authority in 2016. These non-approved elements have a significant impact on people living near the site and subsequent re-consultation has taken place. SAFE members have produced many detailed objective papers and publicised the loss of amenity for nearby residents. SAFE became involved as there were very major points of principle. Planning approvals given by the Local Planning Authority should be adhered to and approved plans not amended without seeking approval from the Local Authority and re-consultation if indicated.

The original 3 applications for 208 houses came to committee in November 2018 and SAFE took an active role by producing lobbying papers, writing objections and presenting at the planning hearings. All three were refused.

Subsequently the Post Mill development went to Appeal. Again, SAFE was involved and the Appeal was rejected. A new Application was made with reduced house numbers. The Local Authority supported the Application (whereas SAFE did not) but at committee in November 2020 it was deferred for Counsel opinion regarding the status of the Neighbourhood Development Plan. Counsel's opinion, together with the answers to Parliamentary questions tabled in the Lords (generated by SAFE) supported the NDP and as a result the Application was refused. A further Appeal has been lodged and SAFE is playing an active role in the response to this. This may well go to a Public Inquiry. If this is the case SAFE will be working with the Local Authority and apply to be a Rule 6 party.

We communicate with people of influence and have written an invited, full length article for Suffolk View, this being the publication of the Suffolk Preservation Society (issue 133).

The objectives of SAFE have been to investigate and publicise the infrastructure deficiencies of the village and the effect of major development upon them. We aim to publicise our views in a polite and objective way. To clearly state the facts without bias or emotion and to take an active role in planning decisions as an interested party.

John Castro (Chair) - on behalf of SAFE members- John Kelsall (Vice chair) Pam Castro, Charles Comins, Elizabeth Manero, Abi Maydon, Paul McCann, Jenny Morris-Bradshaw, Michael Miles.