



Green Ixworth Objection to the Development
as Proposed in Persimmon plc Application –
DC/25/0666/HYB

October 2025, Suffolk

Table of Contents

<i>Introduction.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Proposals.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Climate Change.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Objections and Suggestions.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>1.Energy efficiency.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>2.Minimise pollutant production.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>3.Minimise potable water consumption.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>4.Housing.....</i>	<i>6</i>
4.1.Housing density.....	6
4.2.Housing design.....	7
<i>5.Parking.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>6.Design and location of green open space.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>7.Minimise acoustic challenges.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>8.Noise and footpaths.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>9.Transport.....</i>	<i>10</i>
9.1.Roads.....	10
9.2.Public Rights of Way and cycle paths.....	11
9.3.Active Travel.....	11
9.4.WS Local Plan.....	11
<i>10.Improving Biodiversity.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>11.Security.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Conclusions.....</i>	<i>14</i>

Introduction

This Objection to the Development as proposed in the documentation is on behalf of Green Ixworth, an environmental body covering the area of the proposed Development.

We welcome the provision of housing in rural areas, particularly for local people and their children as they leave home. Such housing helps to maintain services and employment in rural areas and to minimise travel by car.

We fully support appropriate development, as disrupting as that may be. Our objections to elements of this application should not be seen as an objection to the provision of more housing. We are concerned that the proposed housing should be viable in all respects for the lifetime of the dwellings, so the maximum efficiency possible should be built in and not left as a more expensive add on.

The design has many positive features. However there are a number of areas where we are significantly concerned. We have some changes to suggest which would resolve a number of these concerns.

We therefore have to reluctantly object to the proposals overall in the hope that the issues outlined below may be resolved.

However, to be effective and ensure a beneficial impact on the effects of Climate Change, and other issues this requires the development to fully reflect the following requirements:

Houses to:

1. Maximise Energy efficiency
1. Minimise pollutant production
2. Minimise mains water consumption

The setting to reflect best standards for:

1. Housing
1. Room for and design of green open space and walking routes
2. Minimise acoustic challenges
3. Increase the range and numbers of beneficial trees and plants
4. Minimise disturbance of old soil
5. Improve Biodiversity

Proposals

The proposals are an improvement on those of several years ago as they broadly protect the established tree cover. As to the local consultation in 2025, little notice seems to have

been taken of the comments made, a number of which could have been incorporated into the new plan with little cost or difficulty. In addition, there is little help to identify any changes to the earlier 2025 documents, so it is necessary to start afresh.

The decision by the applicant to only fit ASHP in those homes constructed under the new regulations from January 2027 and use expensive gas with a limited life span of delivery is a cynical and opportunist approach leading to the occupants having much higher energy costs until gas is no longer available and then being very expensive to retrofit particularly with terraced houses. If this is widely known, it could lead prospective purchasers to wait for further releases of fully compliant properties.

The first homes, if built before January 2027 will be under the old regulations not the new. However, none may be covered by the old regulations if, from previous experience of Persimmon applications on this site, the company procrastinates as it has done previously. Perhaps this is why they submitted the application, in a way which conflicted with the wishes of WSC to clear the Masterplan first before considering the detailed plan and so receive permission earlier than otherwise. By the time these properties are occupied they will be obsolete requiring upgrades.

Climate Change

Since the beginning of 2025 we have seen confirmation of further adverse impacts of Climate Change, each time they are reviewed the prospect worsens. Average temperatures are rising faster than anticipated, creating problems for people, farmers and energy consumption; Rainfall, when it occurs is heavier than in the past creating more flooding and damage to agriculture; Overall rainfall levels are tending to decrease and being more unreliable. If the least optimistic view of the future of North Atlantic currents is anything to go by, our winters will become colder as summers become hotter. We surely cannot build today something which we know will be surpassed within two or three decades, well within the life of the property.

No opportunity for reducing energy or water consumption should be missed.

Objections and Suggestions

1. Energy efficiency

- 1.1. We fully concur with the West Suffolk Council's Energy and Sustainability Team response. We can find no reasoned explanation of why most houses will be heated by ASHP and others by gas with solar panels without a battery. The whole tenor of the report is to minimise energy use, not just to comply with a minimum interpretation of standards. We know that gas supplies may not be available in the medium term which will then require ASHP heating. In this case provision should be made for underfloor heating at the original build "*Homes built under the Future Homes Standard will be "zero carbon ready", which means that in the longer term, no further retro-fit work for energy efficiency will be necessary to enable them to become zero carbon homes as the electricity grid continues to decarbonise.*" In the case of a retrofit, apart from the disturbance the most expensive part of installing a subsequent ASHP will be underfloor pipework and a new hot water tank. The installation of ASHP is better done at the side of the property to minimise disturbance. This requires a good distance between the houses, more than is generally provided for in the drawings.

From the government's Future Home Standard in 2021: "*Currently electrification is one of the few proven scalable options for decarbonising heat. As set out in the consultation, we expect heat pumps will become the primary heating technology for new homes under the Future Homes Standard.*"

- 1.2. Gov advice – "*Under this proposal, [the 2025 regulations] it would be a functional requirement of the Building Regulations that new homes, with rare exceptions, are built with renewable electricity generation. In the vast majority of cases, we expect this would be solar panels.*"
- 1.3. The team's response that "*It is difficult to understand why this decision has been made as there is no explanation provided. The JSP Sustainability report makes clear that the WSC policy WSP 1 is "Measures that go above development plan policy requirements and building regulation standards are encouraged."*" As far as the purchaser of the properties is concerned it is cheaper for both heat pumps and solar panels to be installed and incorporated into the original house price/mortgage. If the reason is that solar panels require a broadly south facing roof and the design does not provide this then the applicant should change the design criteria in order to comply instead of using roof orientation as an excuse not to fit them.
- 1.4. ***New homes should be oriented to benefit from passive solar gain as well as make effective use of solar panels.*** This is a problem when developers design the layout to maximise housing numbers with little concern to how that would limit solar gain or solar panel electrical output.
- 1.5. The majority of houses will not be provided with solar panels and those that are - will have no storage batteries from which they can gain the full benefit. They should be fitted as standard.

- 1.6. As well as the reasons above for this decision, it is an attempt to reduce the initial cost/price and leave it to the owners to fund the more expensive option of retrofit at a later date.
- 1.7. ***We strongly believe that the Government and West Suffolk's position is that ASHP, Solar Panels and Batteries are an essential requirement to comply with Climate Change policies. That is also the view of Green Ixworth.***

2. Minimise pollutant production

Some house designs are fitted with a chimney. Fireplaces or flue connections are not visible in the plan drawings e.g. for the Cambridge design. We must assume therefore that they are for venting waste or foul water stacks or general ventilation. If they were not then this could be a significant cause of pollution. Recently published research has shown PM2.5 particles produced from fossil fuel fires no matter how efficient, are a major contributor to dementia and a well-established cause of serious breathing problems.

More information required.

3. Minimise potable water consumption

- 3.1. Water consumption in East Anglia is greater than its overall provision. This deficit will in time increase and only by the mid 30's be partly satisfied by new reservoirs and pipelines, from northern and western rivers. The levels of water consumption are being determined by more efficient basins, toilets, etc. However, a more significant reduction needs to be made.
- 3.2. "Rainwater harvesting" is being provided but only by external garden water butts not connected to the house plumbing. Rainwater can be used for washing machines, dishwashers etc. Grey water can be used to flush toilets. These two sources should be recruited to reduce the overall level of potable water used and thus by reuse, reduce the total amount of wastewater entering the sewers. Just because Anglian Water has a responsibility to take rainwater put in the sewer. We all have a public responsibility to improve the water quality of our rivers and thus reduce pollution from sewage overflows, which is already significant in the Black Bourn catchment area. Retrofit is expensive and disruptive.
- 3.3. ***A full grey water and rainwater harvesting system be installed in the plumbing of each property.***

4. Housing

- 4.1. **Housing density**

- 4.1.1. The proposals seek to construct a nearly 50% increase in dwellings over the number included in the Ixworth Neighbourhood Plan, agreed by the Inspector, subsequently supported in a referendum and now in the WSC Local Plan.
- 4.1.2. The only justification for this density is that the design was reflecting the Ixworth High Street, interpreted as a reflection of tradition. Slums were a tradition for centuries with which Ixworth residents were familiar and a reason why Ixworth was the first location in England to build rural Council Houses, in 1893, now over 130 years old, and built to a much lower density than the applicant's proposals. The High Street properties were largely built over several centuries for commerce, including retailing, many being the result of infill and only a few with access to reasonable parking spaces.
- 4.1.3. No justification is provided for the increase in proposed dwelling numbers, and it produces a density akin to that of Micklesmere and Thistledown estates. These are notorious for the lack of space, vehicle parking and green landscaping, made worse by the number of working adult children living at home and thus having to drive. The only reason the proposals are not even more dense is that the crest of the hill towards the North of the site, cannot be used for housing. Green Ixworth, as much of the village, has accepted, in the referendum, the dwelling numbers in the Neighbourhood Plan, including the Pigeon Development, a 30% increase in Ixworth housing. To now suggest another 10% increase is unacceptable, in part because the infrastructure improvements required were unlikely to be sufficient. This density is unacceptable for a rural environment.
- 4.1.4. We are not convinced that the Persimmon approach to S106 finance will even cover the needs of the original 145 dwelling increase in community-based infrastructure.

4.1.5. The numbers of properties should be significantly reduced particularly in the southern part of the development.

4.2. Housing design

- 4.2.1. Whilst the numbers of affordable housing are satisfactory there is no reference to social housing, which was strongly supported in the Ixworth Neighbourhood plan and in the WS Local Plan. The results of the 2020 Housing Survey conducted by the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group showed a need for houses with fewer bedrooms, we are pleased that this has been addressed. It also showed a need for social housing. Unfortunately, many rural employments are on wages lower than in urban areas and if a worker should lose their job an alternative, local to their home, is less likely to be available. For these reasons social housing is in desperate need.
- 4.2.2. We understand that there are social housing providers willing to invest in West Suffolk and they should be contacted in conjunction with WSC in order to facilitate the provision of social homes in this development.
- 4.2.3. An important issue with house design remains our concern over height with the provision of attic bedrooms. There are no buildings nearby with over two floors so would reject the idea of 2½ floors, particularly as all the houses on the site will still be on higher land than the rest of the village.

5. Parking

- 5.1. Garage width has not been addressed as far as we can see - reference our comments to your previous proposals. The width of 3m between walls is too narrow and not complying with the SCC standard of 3m between pillars. Which, given the increase in width of vehicles will still be unsatisfactory.

6. Design and location of green open space

- 6.1. The open green areas are broadly acceptable. However as expressed in the response from the Parks Department *“The play area should also be positioned to enable unrestricted natural surveillance from adjacent residential properties and passing foot traffic.”*
- 6.2. Further the southern, approx. third of the development by area, with two thirds of the population/housing, is largely bereft of green open space compared to the northern third of population. The southern end needs several more examples of green space, in the centre of the main housing area or Crown Lane, on which children can play whilst being observed by parents rather than just the SuDS basin. Otherwise, younger children in particular, will be confined to the shared surface roads putting them in considerable danger where vehicles parked on the highway may mask, from drivers, children playing. Children need to learn how to benefit from communal space and sharing.
- 6.3. ***In the southern area in addition to creating observable green space for play, a Myawaki forest should be created near the foot/cycle bridge landing.***

7. Minimise acoustic challenges

- 7.1. Road noise is a major feature of the site. The Defra “Noise Policy Statement for England”, makes clear the damage to “Health and quality of life” caused by noise (Paras 2.11 to 2.18.). The mental and physical health of people submitted to constant or intermittent disturbance by noise is well established and does not go away with otherwise subdued levels.
- 7.2. The Design and Access Statement (DAS) comments on p49, suggest that BS8233 guideline values of noise may be exceeded in *“city centres and urban areas adjoining main roads”*. This site is neither in a city centre nor an urban area thus does not comply with that description, therefore the applicant's treatment of noise is unacceptable.
- 7.3. Experience of those living in the Micklesmere Estate bordering the A143 leads one to question the results and recommendations of the Acoustic Consultants. They have mistaken the A1088 as being to the south of the site and in a reference to the acoustic recordings, picking up the nearby train line which could be clearly heard – being over 6km away. This hardly validates the acoustic benefits of the existing trees even in the summer.

- 7.4. The standard way of measuring noise is to average over a period and only taking particular notice of very loud maximums. There is undoubtedly less road traffic between 9.00pm and 6.00am. The daily average is therefore relatively low and just within limits, in which circumstances, recorded levels as high as 84dB, will be very noticeable and likely to wake sleepers, particularly shift workers – 24 hour availability being a much more common work pattern than in the past. Increased numbers of people working from home would suffer from even higher noise levels during the day and would make using the garden to relax at any time, very painful. All the locations at which noise was monitored showed high levels of maxima even at the western boundary of the site.
- 7.5. Self-employment and working from home have increased over expectations from the pre-Covid period. Workers on the employer's premises would be protected by law from noxious levels of sound, so noise abatement is needed for safe and comfortable working conditions.
- 7.6. The report recognises that those dwellings next to the boundary wood, require acoustic shielding around their gardens (too low shielding does not protect the 1st floor), additional sound insulation in the walls and triple glazed windows facing the road. This raises issues concerning the energy efficiency of the houses. The passive approach to cooling, day or night, should be paramount. Air conditioning should be avoided where possible, however if active cooling is required, Air to Air Heat Pumps address high temperatures as well as low and need to be installed in the original design, they are difficult to retrofit. Open windows are not possible with the anticipated acoustic levels. It is not so much the average noise level which disturbs a sleeper or someone working at home, but the maxima and rapid change.
- 7.7. The consultants were on site over a long weekend, 12th to 17th July, 2024. They took into account, as is common throughout the application, that trees growing on the embankment were a useful acoustic barrier to add to the boundary woodland. We agree with that conclusion to an extent, however, the trees on the embankment are cut back to one metre or so in height by UKPN every 3 to 4 years to avoid interfering with the 11kV overhead cables under their statutory rights. The trees are close to the cables now so we can expect them to be cut back in the very near future. They cannot be considered as part of any permanent protection from road noise and pollution.
- 7.8. When the survey took place, the deciduous trees were in full leaf. Over the winter period the leafless branches offer little acoustic attenuation. Further, the trees in the northern 2/3rds of the A143 barrier woodland are primarily firs which have had their lower branches and undergrowth removed thus limiting their acoustic attenuation. We note that Persimmon have indicated planting to create a more balanced mix of evergreen and deciduous. ***We should expect that proposal to be better defined.***
- 7.9. The Environmental Officer says in their response that *“A post-completion noise assessment shall be carried out and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to confirm compliance with the BS 8233 sound criteria above and additional steps to mitigate noise shall be taken, as necessary. Approved details shall be implemented prior to first use of the development and thereafter be permanently retained.”*

We believe that the evidence in the acoustic report fully justifies the provision of full acoustic amelioration by acoustic fencing for the additional reasons below. Subsequent proof of sufficiency can be carried out as the Environment Officer suggests.

8. Noise and footpaths

- 8.1. A solution to both problems, of noise and footpath location, could be resolved by placing the path along the western edge of the boundary wood with a lower separating fence to the gardens perhaps with a trellis top, as suggested by the Design Out Crime Officer (DOCO), providing residents a view of trees rather than a high wooden fence. That would in turn permit the installation of a substantial acoustic barrier at the top of the embankment for its full length between the roundabouts, higher than the 1.8m originally suggested for selected gardens. The resulting improved visibility would also satisfy the DOCO recommendations for lower fences and provide a more sophisticated approach to noise rather than choosing a few properties to be better protected and leaving others still to suffer and not being able to sleep/rest or make adequate use of private or public green space. The existing open and damaged fencing along the embankment will need replacing in any event. Acoustic fencing should be overlapping in places to enable movement of wildlife.
- 8.2. The A1088 boundary is somewhat quieter currently with less traffic but a similar solution could be implemented here to reflect the increase in traffic due to development.
 - 8.2.1. The site at present presents three popular walking routes, with variations, used by many Ixworth residents, especially dog walkers, with a large area of past biodiversity which encouraged walkers; one route by the cemetery, a rarely used one along the embankment top and the most popular to the west of the tree boundary. The lack of current formal recognition of these routes is no reason to discount them. The applicant's design of the site provides routes, albeit with hard surfaces. The only exception to this is the proposed route within the tree barrier.
 - 8.2.2. The problem arising from this is that the applicant is seeking to create the new route running close to the embankment. We know from low usage of the existing embankment path that this is the least popular of the routes. The plan shows the location of the new footpath, along the length of the site, within the woodland. This single path would be closer to the embankment and to the source of noise and pollution and involving the removal of at least a two-metre width of existing trees requiring regular maintenance.
 - 8.2.3. The containment of the footpath within trees is a clear security hazard. The alternative we propose much less so.
 - 8.2.4. *Move the proposed PRow from the top of the embankment within the tree boundary to the western edge against the lowered fences of the houses.***
 - 8.2.5. *Install minimum 2m high acoustic fencing along the top of the embankment between the two roundabouts.***

9. Transport

9.1. Roads

- 9.1.1. Whilst we are still of the view that the proposed ghost junction is unsatisfactory, especially with increased use from the other Ixworth development and the three developments in Stanton (two commercial and one residential), we welcome the improvement to public and road safety which will emanate from the Highways response of June 2025. In particular the attention to improve the roundabouts and the proposed speed limit, providing that limit covers the A1088 from the roundabout to beyond the High Street/Bardwell Road/A1088 junction.
- 9.1.2. It is clear that the two roundabouts are currently unsatisfactory. Accidents on the southern (Mulley's Roundabout) are numerous and can be serious. The most frequent can block access to the roundabout, which in the case of Micklesmere Drive can remove access for residents and emergency vehicles. Increased traffic requires more than the welcome proposed extra lane for Norton bound traffic. We believe that most of the HGV and Tractor accidents are from Norton and BSE and additional traffic will undoubtedly lead to more.

9.2. Public Rights of Way and cycle paths

SCC Transport assessment, refers.

9.3. Active Travel

NATIONAL POLICY: Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (NPPF) outlines that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places, stating that this should be achieved through:

- *Understanding and addressing the potential impacts of development on transport networks*
- *Identifying and pursuing opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use.*

When assessing development proposals, Paragraph 115 requires decision makers to ensure that:

- a) *Sustainable transport modes are prioritised taking account of the vision for the site, the type of development and its location;*
- b) *Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;*
- c) *Any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree through a vision-led approach.*

9.4. WS Local Plan

*Sustainable travel provision including facilities for pedestrians and cyclists should be made with links to local destinations within Ixworth village and nearby public rights of way and the **countryside** in accordance with policy LP57. In addition, the*

masterplan process for the site should consider whether facilities for pedestrian and cyclists should include a foot/cycle bridge from the site across the A143 to link to existing public rights of way in the countryside to the east.

9.4.1. Two principles of the Government's Active Travel Policy are that:

- exercise in the open air, maintains and improves physical and mental health;
- it reduces travel by car thus reducing pollution and energy usage.

9.4.2. We welcome the proposed provision of the bridleway along each side of the A143 from Crown Lane to the A1088 roundabout plus a link along the A1088 to Bailey Pool Lane. A large safe island immediately to the north of the roundabout would be required.

9.4.3. *However, this is with the important proviso that an acoustic fence be placed at the top of the western embankment to compensate existing householders for the removal of between 2 and 3 metres of trees, between approx. a quarter and a third of the existing tree barrier.*

9.4.4. Apart from the one new footpath described below there is no contribution to the footpath network. The Highways proposal for a bridleway goes some way to correcting this but a significant contribution to the foot/cycle bridge across the A143 would create a major benefit to the development.

9.4.5. A feature of the Highways response to the application, which we welcome both for pedestrians and cyclists, is support for the proposed bridge across the A143, reconnecting Crown Lane, to resolve isolation from the countryside. The applicant has understood this and complied with the WSC Local Plan by making allowance for a landing site at the western A143 end of Crown Lane. A similar landing site is being provided on the other side of the A143. We are very concerned that the applicant sees no need for the bridge, so restricting access to the countryside for new residents as well as existing ones, leaving only the village centre available. Not providing a bridge would be discrimination against the elderly, those with mobility problems and young families at best relying on active helpers and at worst preventing their enjoyment and the demonstrable health benefits of open countryside. Ixworth is a village with improved mobility for those with restricted options. The biggest obstacle to be overcome is the A143.

9.4.6. ***We expect all developers who build locally, whose residents would expect to make use of the A143, to contribute to the costs of a bridge over the road which they collectively make more hazardous.***

9.4.7. The road is already hazardous for pedestrians but the additional traffic of some 600 proposed houses in total, will be an additional 3,600 plus vehicle movements per day. The additional commercial traffic from Shepherds Grove is not yet calculable but will be significant. The impact of so many more vehicles will lead to reducing distance between vehicles, make the available time for crossing shorter. The current access to the road surface by steep steps makes crossing difficult to those with cycles, pushchairs and mobility scooters and therefore the additional vehicle numbers from this development should warrant a significant financial contribution towards the cost of the bridge. The bridge is required by the Ixworth Neighbourhood Plan, West Suffolk Local Plan, Suffolk County Council and the favourable

Green Ixworth Objection to Persimmon plc Application - DC/25/0666/HYB
comments of the Designing out Crime Officer and would finally make the open countryside safely available to all.

We strongly believe that the applicant should make a significant contribution to the construction costs of a new bridge capable of accommodating pedestrians of all abilities and cyclists.

9.4.8. As well as the trees, largely conifers, planted by the previous landowners, the Ixworth Parish Council with St Edmundsbury Council and the owner's permission, planted a large and deep area of deciduous trees at the southern end of the site, along the embankment. ***This should be reinforced with native evergreens.*** We recognise that the applicant has accepted the importance of this area along with the wide bramble hedge, including its trees, along Crown Lane and has agreed to their retention.

10. Improving Biodiversity

10.1. The claimed improvement in biodiversity is difficult to understand, perhaps because the larger part of the site was intensively and traditionally managed arable land until this year with very low biodiversity. The southern part had already been scalped and the topsoil stacked in several heaps of a height which will have reduced the invertebrate load in the soil. In a very short time soil over 20cm deep will contain few invertebrates.

10.2. ***Although now rather late, every effort should be made to minimise the disturbance of any more old soil.*** This matters significantly as the habitat is vitally important for appropriate levels of fertility, as a home for a host of life and immediately increase the recovery.

10.3. The increase in biodiversity, if compared to the land prior to topsoil removal, is more difficult to achieve. However, by recruiting much of the open land for nature to run its course and some intensive areas of biodiversity, these problems may be resolved. The Infiltration SuDS, if well managed, can provide a big improvement, less so in the other two basins which are acting primarily as short-term storage vessels.

10.4. The biggest contributor to improving biodiversity would be the planting of a "Miyawaki forest", which are already promoted by a number of UK local authorities. A small but very dense and therefore fast-growing wood of native trees and understorey, which can be as small as a tennis court, approx. 200m². After 2 or 3 years it is self-maintaining yet adds enormously to biodiversity. The wide variety of shrubs and trees planted ensures survival of most during the period of Climate Change.

10.5. Planting of such mini forest on or near the hill crest or between any necessary breaches of the boundary trees and acoustic fencing and housing, could further reduce noise interference. A further location which could benefit from Miyawaki improvement in biodiversity would be on the Crown Lane boundary next to the bridge landing thus benefiting the southern third of the site. See article below.

- 10.6. Thus, there is a heavy reliance on the woodland, hedges and new social planting. The hedges, particularly the wide bramble hedge on Crown Lane could benefit from more trees, particularly fruiting ones, being planted within it to provide for a wide range of vertebrates and invertebrates. Green Ixworth has already planted an extensive hedge on the Micklesmere side of Crown Lane, anticipating the development, with trees to provide partial noise and dust breaks and a food source. They have now been fruiting for two years.
- 10.7. Areas of grass with wildflowers in relatively undisturbed environments will be a distinct benefit.**
- 10.8. The new tree and shrub planting, particularly in the swales or rain gardens would benefit from fruiting trees both for wildlife and humans. Rain Gardens would be beneficial at the A1088 end to absorb water otherwise discharged to Anglian Water sewers**
- 10.9. Varieties which may remain healthy in a period of climate change should be selected.**
- 10.10. We welcome your proposed nesting boxes and bricks for birds and bats, they will be a distinct advantage and speed up the rate of re-establishing nesting.
- 10.11. We can expect that residents will have both dogs and cats which will create a hazard for ground nesting birds which have previously made good use of the arable land. The buzzards, kestrels and red kites will need a replacement source of food. **Wood piles and covered places would provide nests for prey animals.**
- 10.12. In constructing fences, "hedgehog street" access points should be built into the fences permitting free access to neighbouring homes.**

11. Security

- 11.1. **Green Ixworth fully support the very well-argued response and proposals from the Designing Out Crime Officer.** We believe that this will help remove the fear of crime as well as crime itself. However, we are disturbed that most of the improvements requested in her June response are, in large part, not incorporated into the latest iteration of the application.

Conclusions

The development has some attractive features. However, this has been diminished by the very high density in the southern part coupled with the almost complete absence of convenient Public Open Space. The outlook for most residents will be other houses, which by the narrowness of shared surface "roads" will be very close. Reducing the number of dwellings would provide opportunities for widening those roads and/or increasing the number of green spaces.

Green Ixworth Objection to Persimmon plc Application - DC/25/0666/HYB

For future residents it is crucial to address: noise, biodiversity, energy, water, footpaths, security, open space. We note that Persimmon have already incorporated some suggestions made by Green Ixworth and hope that the dialogue between West Suffolk Council and the company will produce a development of which we can all be proud.

RS051025

[Home | Miyawaki Forest Project](#)