

Economic Issues

Q1: Are there any other issues that the Local Plan should consider?

There is reference to supporting growth in key employment sectors and, whilst this is generally supported, any developments must be based on a clear statement of need and not on opportunist landowners seizing on a windfall income.

There is also reference to the road and rail [passenger and freight] network and the provision of public transport infrastructure. There is no doubt that road traffic, both cars and HGVs, will be greatly increased and road infrastructure must be in place before developments are allowed. In rural areas public transport has been significantly reduced over several years and there must be clear detail on how this will change for the better.

There should be a direct reference to the Orwell Bridge and clarity on how it will cope with increasing volumes of traffic when it is already at capacity at various times in the day.

What is the vision for the Ipswich HMA and Ipswich FEA?

Q2: What are the advantages of your area that should be protected through local plans?

Much of our area is included in the Suffolk Coasts and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty plus various additionally designated sites of national and international importance, and protection of these must be maintained. Additionally, areas outside these designated should be maintained as hinterland by continued use for livery businesses and agriculture which are complementary to this natural environment.

Consideration should be given to increasing the natural environment between the rivers Orwell and Deben which would encourage natural diversity, productive agricultural land, a wildlife corridor, and attract tourists. Large areas of land submitted for development along the A14 is in conflict with the biodiversity of the Felixstowe Peninsula. It could be time when SCDC in conjunction with Suffolk Coasts and Heaths Unit consider extending the current AONB areas to protect the natural environment for incursion by built development.

The Parish Council is totally opposed to the urbanisation of the land between Ipswich and Felixstowe, and by maintaining a clear separation between the two towns, this area will be protected as it provides environmentally important breaks and gaps in the landscape between two large urban towns. This open and natural vista needs to be maintained for the greater good of the population of the southern part of the district and those who travel through and visit it.

Q3: What are the disadvantages of your area that the local plans could try to address through the way land is used or developed?

As mentioned in Q2, much of our area should be maintained in its natural environment with a balance of the built, business and natural habitat. If the land submitted for use along the A14 was ever to be developed it would it would unbalance the natural existing harmony of this area.

Q4: What are the key priorities you would like to be addressed by 2036 – in the places across Ipswich and Suffolk Coastal where you live, work or study?

Avoiding a situation where local communities are not overwhelmed by large residential and/or business development which greatly reduces their quality of life, development which recognises this and is not ahead of national trends [see following ‘Scenario’]. One of the key factors in the consultation document is the sprawl of Ipswich Town. SCDC must be clear and indicate where it predicts the new town boundary will be in 2036 especially where this engulfs large areas of the neighbouring district councils and greenfield sites. This could result in places such as Kesgrave, Martlesham, Woodbridge and Felixstowe becoming, to all effect, suburbs of Ipswich Town.

There must also be improved road infrastructure in advance of further developments in this strategic period to cope with developments in the current Local Plan, better communication in broadband and mobile phones networks to enable more people the opportunity of working from home, and public services which are in place before any population increase.

Q5: What is your vision for the Ipswich HMA and Ipswich FEA by 2036?

A balance between maintaining the natural green space, estuaries, heathland, and unspoilt coast which are the character of East Suffolk and attract tourists, with housing and business development that does not intrude on the local character.

Growth Scenarios

Q6: Which growth scenario should we plan for across the Ipswich Housing Market Area?

Scenario A – Baseline

The Parish takes issue with the District Council on the comment on page 17 – *“the Felixstowe/A14 Corridor [characterised by a high concentration of distribution related activities linked to shipping and sea freight]”*. This is completely wrong and dangerously misleading. It should be withdrawn. This corridor is characterised by open countryside mainly of agriculture with dispersed villages. The only concentration of distribution related activities is in the urban areas of East Ipswich [mainly Ransomes Europark] and Felixstowe [mainly around the Port of Felixstowe]

Scenarios B and C use the predictions of Scenario A, and just add an arbitrary % increase; or course they should not be implemented.

Q7: Do you have evidence to suggest that the housing and/or jobs targets should be different from the forecasts or scenarios outlined above – either higher or lower?

In respect of the claimed “evidence base” the Parish Council has severe reservations about the reliability of this. There are so many variables and changing circumstances, that the “evidence” only amounts to predictions over a 20 years period which are unreliable over such a time. The Baseline information emanating from various sources is a reasonable start but this must be treated with

caution and be reviewed frequently, possibly now with the impact of Brexit being taken into account.

Q8: Would communities be prepared to accept more growth if that growth meant that significant new or enhanced infrastructure could be provided?

This should be provided now with the developments contained in the current Local Plan plus proposed developments in the new Local Plan. It doesn't need more growth to justify enhanced infrastructure as we are currently at a low baseline.

Q9: What key pieces of transport infrastructure should be sought? Would it be roads such as an Ipswich northern route, or sustainable transport infrastructure (public transport, park and ride, cycling), or both?

Both as they have been largely ignored so far.

Q10: Should the Local Plan Review seek to address the issue of temporary closure of the Orwell Bridge by planning for a scale of development that can help to deliver infrastructure?

See Q8

Q11: Do you agree that providing a high growth scenario would help to deliver the affordable housing required?

On a 1 to 3 ratio this would obviously be the case but this would be at the detriment to the character of many areas and not based on more dwellings needed than in Scenario A.

Q12: Are there alternative scenarios which should be considered?

No

B Where should the growth go?

Q13: Which distribution options do you think would be most appropriate to take forward?

Option 6 as this would spread development more equally throughout the district and not just rely on the southern area. This would be to the benefit of more communities in the district and the Suffolk Villages Gateway Scheme – A12 Four Villages Bypass would support this development and add weight to the Ipswich Northern Route.

Q14: Are there any other distribution options that the Councils should consider, including across the whole of the Ipswich Housing Market Area?

It is possible to permutate any number of variations but the options stated cover the main possibilities.

Q15: Should the spatial distribution of jobs growth align with housing growth or should we take a different approach which focuses on improving accessibility between homes and work places?

In Levington, as an example, the local light industrial site employs more people than are resident in the parish, yet no residents work at the site. This could be replicated elsewhere to some degree. Therefore, improving accessibility is important as no guarantee can be given that those living near employment facilities will actually work there.

Q16: Do you have evidence which indicates that building at higher densities in Ipswich and Suffolk Coastal would be viable financially?

No

Q17: Should the policy approach of maintaining the physical separation of villages from Ipswich be continued or should infill in gaps between settlements be considered a source of housing land?

It is important to keep physical separation to maintain and improve quality of life by avoiding high density living through merging of settlements.

Q18: If development cannot be accommodated within Ipswich, should it be focused within the communities close to Ipswich or distributed within the larger Ipswich Housing Market Area? What criteria should guide its location?

Most development should be located within Ipswich and other can be distributed widely. Both in Ipswich and a wider distribution the criteria should be determined by reasonable access to facilities.

Q19: Should Ipswich switch employment land to housing use, even though the Borough has a high jobs target? Where should the Council prioritise protecting employment land?

No comment

Q20: Is there other land within Ipswich Borough which should be considered for residential development? Is the approach to protecting open space the right one?

Open space is important for a beneficial quality of life.

Gypsies, Travellers, Travelling Show people and Boat Dwellers

Q21: Where do you think the most appropriate locations are to meet this need?

In accordance with guidance on the provision of sites, these should be with good access to nearby facilities [school, health care, shops, public transport etc] preferably within walking distance or reliable and frequent public transport. They should be located at the edge or within Ipswich, or the market towns which have such facilities.

Retail floorspace

Q22: Which town centres should we plan to expand?

Those that are likely to attract increased development. Rather than looking to expand centres perhaps there should be more attention to attracting retailers into the existing centres.

Q23: Are there town centres that should be reduced in size?

No

Q24: Which sites should be identified through the Local Plan reviews for future retail growth?

No comment

Q25: How do we increase the range of uses or activities in Ipswich town centre, given its role as a regional centre, and what should they be?

No comment

Q26: What range of uses or activities would you like to see in the smaller town centres?

No comment

Q27: What approach should be taken to further out of centre shopping? Does out of centre shopping complement or compete with the existing town centres?

They both complement and are in competition. The out of town centres have free parking and can provide larger stores. Town centres need to attract shoppers/users by carefully considering parking charges and better public transport. Both types of shopping need to be more competitive to challenge the rise in e-shopping and increased road traffic by delivery companies.

Q28: Should the existing retail parks be considered as centres in their own right, or should town centres continue to be the first choice location for new shops and leisure uses?

Should be a mixture of both.

D Infrastructure

Q29: What infrastructure is currently required in your area and what additional infrastructure do you think would be needed, and where, to support the future distribution and levels of growth outlined?

Road and Rail infrastructure. The road network needs to be able to accommodate both present volume of traffic and increased numbers of vehicles created by further development, and the rail network needs increased freight capacity if the Port of Felixstowe grows, although this is uncertain at present.

SCC appear to have severe reservations about suggested road infrastructure to support planning application DC/17/1435/OUT for 2,000 dwellings on Adastral Park so problems such as this must be sorted out before there is any additional developments.

Q30: How can the strategic transport connections be enhanced and improved?

Upgrade existing roads and connections and surface with quiet running material to avoid noise pollution.

Q31: In which areas should “super surgeries” be considered?

These should be situated in areas of largest growth and transport, either public or voluntary, needs to be provided.

Q32: Is there a need for additional education provision in certain areas of the Housing Market Area, including early years and special educational facilities, and if so what is the need and where?

Like Q31, to be located where there is the largest growth, with transport for those living at distance from the educational facilities.

Q33: What kind of outdoor recreational spaces would you like and where should we locate them to reduce pressure on the more sensitive coastal areas? What other measures could be put in place to protect sensitive environments?

Planning consents should require the provision of usable green spaces by developers. As most, if not all, sensitive areas can only be accessed by car via narrow lanes; there should be no provision of car parks.

Vision

Q34: What makes a successful community in Suffolk Coastal?

Communities are not homogeneous and will differ in various locations. Some residents join in community activities whilst others prefer a more private life. A meeting place is important for gatherings, a church can be helpful for some, a public house can be a useful place for gathering [although many now rely on visitor custom], and a sense of belonging through good communication, a sense of well being in the built and natural environment, and generally supporting each other through personal contact.

Q35: What services / facilities / developments are needed to make a community successful?

See Q34

Q36: What is your vision for your local community?

Our community has been in existence for many centuries by adapting to various social changes. It is believed our community is content with where it lives and does not require major changes and will work hard to preserve the built [both housing and business] and natural environment, and particularly the nationally/internationally designated areas.

Neighbourhood Plans

Q37: How should the Council define housing requirement figures for Neighbourhood Plan groups?

No comment

Housing

Q38: Are the existing policy approaches and planning policies operating appropriately in relation to affordable housing?

They appear to be as the ratio of affordable housing in all the developments will continue to increase their number.

Q39: Is the existing affordable housing policy coverage and scope sufficient? Do you have any suggestions for what else might be included in a comprehensive approach to affordable housing?

No comment

Q40: Where provision for affordable housing on an 'exception site' is supported by, and can be shown to meet the needs of, that local community should planning policy be sufficiently flexible to allow for this?

Yes

Q41: Should we continue to allow market housing to enable the delivery of affordable housing where the financial viability of a development is challenging?

Yes, but close scrutiny and flexibility by the planning authority is required of the developers to achieve the balance of continuing to provide market rate housing and adjust the number of affordable housing away from the set ratio if necessary.

Rural Housing and settlement clusters

Q42: Do you consider it appropriate for the Council to consider directing growth to a cluster of villages?

It is preferable to seek growth in 'service centres' which have many facilities close by. Although there is informal clustering by sharing some facilities, there remains the problem of travelling some distance along narrow country lanes which would not support formal developments.

Q43: What criteria should be used to identify a cluster of villages?

These should be those that determined the Hierarchy of settlements.

Self Build and Custom Build

Q44: How can the Council encourage the provision of fully serviced building plots for self build / custom build properties?

No comment

Q45: Should these serviced plots be provided as part of a larger housing development?

No comment

Housing type and mix

Q46: Should we continue with the current policy approach to housing size or take a more flexible approach that reflects the site location and characteristics?

Site location and characteristics that blend with the environment should be important elements in decisions.

Q47: How can the Local Plan promote an increase in smaller units to meet specific needs?

By looking at the demography and identifying this potential need in site allocations and then refining through planning applications.

Q48: What more could be done to help ensure that more housing is provided specifically to meet the needs of older people, or those with specialist care needs?

No comment

Q49: Should starter homes be part of the type and mix of units required?

Yes

Q50: Should the Council encourage greater use of modular construction to provide a range of residential accommodation?

If this is more cost effective and energy efficient, then yes.

Specialist Housing

Q51: Should specialist housing be delivered on specific sites or alongside other forms of residential development?

Alongside other forms of residential development.

Q52: Are there any other specific types of residential use that need to be planned for?

No comment

Houseboats

Q53: The district contains a small number of houseboats. Existing planning policies limit the areas within which houseboats are permitted and the number of houseboats within those areas. Do you think this type of approach remains appropriate?

Yes

Physical Limits Boundaries

Q54: Should the physical limits boundaries be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely defined to allow for small scale development in communities?

Continue to be defined but with a degree of flexibility to allow development of a proportionate size where it has local support.

Q55: Can criteria based policies more appropriately deal with growth in the rural areas than physical limits boundaries?

Growth should be directed to those settlements as set out in the Hierarchy of Settlements.

Q56: Do all settlements require physical limits boundaries?

Not when the local community supports their removal.

Rural housing clusters

Q57: Do you think the current policy approach to development in housing clusters is working successfully or does it need to be amended?

No comment

Conversion of rural buildings in the countryside

Q58: How should the Council consider applications for the re-use of redundant buildings in the countryside?

On a case by case basis and dependent on the details in the planning application.

Q59: Should the Council introduce a sequential approach to the re-use of redundant buildings with priority given to, for example employment or tourism use?

Not necessarily, some might be perfectly suitable for residential use.

Existing Employment Land

Q60: Should we continue to identify both strategic and general employment areas?

Yes.

Q61: Should we continue to stipulate the uses on sites allocated for employment or should policies be more flexible to allow a wider variety of uses?

They should be stipulated so that local communities are aware in advance of potential use.

New Employment Land

Q62: Should planning policies take a flexible approach to new employment development where there is an identified need by allowing development outside of allocated sites and physical limits boundaries?

This seems like a development creep in an unplanned way and should be avoided.

Q63: Should the Local Plan allocate more land than is required for employment uses or should we only allocate what is needed?

What is needed. The consultation document predicts a need of 14.4ha of land required for employment use yet locally land submitted amounts to 386ha. Therefore much of this submitted land is not needed and continued development on existing sites [Ransomes – Sheperd and Dog piggeries site of 11.2ha] would fulfil much of this requirement, plus Martlesham is a key development area.

Supporting main economic drivers

Q64: What land is required to support the main economic sectors across the district?

See Q64 above

Q65: In which locations or specific economic sectors would a co-locating policy be appropriate?

See above

Rural Business Opportunities

Q66: Should the Council continue to identify rural employment sites?

Yes, in exceptional cases.

Q67: What criteria should be used to define a rural employment site?

Suitable road connection and size and design which is sympathetic and in proportion to the rural environment. Strict controls on light, noise and air pollution.

Town Centres

Q68: Are the existing boundaries of town centres, primary shopping areas, primary shopping frontages and secondary shopping frontages still appropriate?

Don't know

Q69: What areas or locations should be considered for inclusion or exclusion from these boundaries?

Don't know

Q70: Should the Council introduce a local impact assessment threshold to help demonstrate no impact on existing town centres in an objective way?

Don't know

District and local centres

Q71: Should the Local Plan continue to protect retail provision within district and local centres?

Yes

Q72: What uses are appropriate within district and local centres?

Don't know

Q73: What areas or locations should be considered for inclusion or exclusion from a district or local centre?

Don't know

Commercial Leisure

Q74: Are there particular opportunities in relation to commercial leisure across the district?

Don't know

Q75: Do the existing Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policy boundaries assist opportunities for accessible new leisure provision?

Don't know

Q76: What is a successful mix of retail and commercial leisure uses across the district?

Don't know

Felixstowe, Woodbridge and Martlesham

Q77: Where is the best place for new retail development to meet the needs of areas east of Ipswich?

Martlesham

Q78: Does out of town retail at Martlesham affect your town centre or local area? If so how?

No

Other Market Towns

Q79: Are the existing policy approaches and planning policies operating appropriately in relation to retail?

Don't know

Q80: Is the existing town centre and leisure policy coverage and scope sufficient? Do you have any suggestions for what else might be included in a more comprehensive approach?

Don't know

Tourist Accommodation

Q81: What specific types of tourism accommodation are required across the district and in which locations?

Don't know

Q82: Should tourist accommodation be encouraged across the whole district or just in specific areas?

As Suffolk Coastal has many interesting areas then accommodation across the whole district would seem appropriate.

Q83: Do we need to protect existing tourist accommodation from conversion and redevelopment to other uses?

Depends on whether it is used very much.

Q84: What is the most effective way of ensuring that tourism accommodation is not occupied for full time residential use?

Not sure that it can be controlled but maybe a register is kept of all tourism accommodation and changes of use have to be applied for. All very time consuming and bureaucratic and probably not worthwhile. let market forces dictate.

As an example of control problems, an elderly couple ran a bed and breakfast in the village but stopped this when they got too old to cope. They continue to live in the house. How would this feature in controlling tourist accommodation?

Resort Activities

Q85: How can planning policy better facilitate the development of tourism attractions to support the resort of Felixstowe?

Don't know

Q86: What type of resort activities will help extend the tourism season and increase visitor spend?

Don't know

High quality landscapes

Q87: Do we need a different approach to tourism development in the AONB as opposed to areas outside the AONB?

There is much that is said in the consultation document about the AONB which must be protected, and there is particular mention of the importance of peace and tranquillity, and the retention of the landscape character. This is important in the hinterland to the areas of AONB where SCDC needs to strictly minimise, or preferably, avoid any nuisance of noise, light, traffic and air pollution which have a negative impact on the AONBs and adjoining landscape character.

Car Parking Standards

Q88: Are the current SCC parking standards appropriate in the context of Suffolk Coastal? If not, what changes would you wish to see and why?

Yes

Parking Policy Approach

Q89: Is the need for and the importance of, vehicle parking sufficiently reflected in existing planning policies?

Don't know

How should we define community facilities

Q90: Should we continue to protect all existing community services and facilities?

Yes, provided they are financially viable and well supported.

Q91: Should some types of services and facilities be given more protection than others?

The local plan lists, amongst other, health centres, education, and public transport, and these should be protected, subject to Q90.

Q92: Where it is not possible to retain the existing community use should we require an alternative community use to be investigated prior to allowing redevelopment?

Yes

Future delivery of community facilities

Q93: Which areas lack appropriate provision of community facilities?

Don't know

Q94: Should the Council continue to use CIL or section 106 agreements or a mixture of both?

Mixture

Q95: Should specific sites be allocated for community facilities?

Depends on the local circumstances

Assets of Community Value

Q96: Should future Local Plan policies provide greater protection for facilities identified as assets of community value?

Yes

Leisure Facilities

Q97: How can the Local Plan assist the enhancing and re-development of modern leisure centres and sports hubs facilities across the district?

Don't know

Q98: What policies are needed to ensure that appropriate leisure provision is provided across the district?

Don't know

Q99: Is the provision of a new modern leisure facility for Felixstowe, enabled through the redevelopment of the existing facilities for other uses, better than seeking to refurbish the existing ageing leisure facilities?

Seems to depend on cost, the range of leisure facilities that will be provided, and accessibility.

Open Space and Green Infrastructure

Q100: Should we continue with the existing standards, or should the provision of new open space and play space be guided by the deficiencies identified in the Leisure Strategy.

If the existing standards are effective, then continue with them.

Q101: What type of facilities/provision should be considered as Open Space?

Any green space within new developments and public rights of way.

Q102: Under what circumstances may it be acceptable to allow the loss of open space to development?

If it can be re-provided nearby and is accessible.

Q103: What type or size of development should provide new on-site Open Space?

Any new development should have a relatively sized green space or gardens in smaller developments dependent on dwelling size

Healthcare

Q104: Which areas of the district experience deficiencies in health facilities?

Rural areas but this is known when living in the countryside.

Broadband and other communication networks

Q105: How can the Local Plan Review further promote the provision of high speed broadband and communication networks across the district?

Presumably by working with the existing SCC/BT team to reach rural areas, and with network providers for improved mobile signals. Sympathetic planning approach to the erection of transmitters may help, but this all probably comes down to financial viability and profit margins, so unlikely to be influenced by the Local Plan.

Safe and Accessible communities

Q106: How can the Local Plan Review create safe and accessible communities which do not undermine the quality of life across the district?

Not sure that it can. Better achieved by a close working relationship with Suffolk Constabulary.

Development within the CCMA

Q107: Should we continue with the CCMA existing policy approach?

Yes

Q108: What types of development should be considered appropriate within a CCMA?

Very limited ones, perhaps seasonal usage, as there is a lack of permanency.

Q109: Should the CCMA boundaries also be redrawn to reflect the topography and infrastructure?

Yes

Coastal Adaptation

Q110: If required, should the Council proactively allocate land for the relocation of property at risk from erosion?

Yes

Q111: Could houseboats, floating homes or caravans be used as an alternative or temporary means of re-housing those affected by coastal erosion?

Could be

Coastal Protection

Q112: How can the council attract buy-in from coastal business owners to contribute to the costs of coastal protection?

Don't know

Q113: Should the CCMA be defined in an area where the SMP policy is to 'hold the line', subject to evidence of how coastal protection can be funded in this area?

From local experience, there appears to be no funds to implement the SMP to 'hold the line' so the SMP has little relevance to managing the shoreline; it seems to be not much use at all.

Flood Risk

Q114: What wider sustainability benefits to the community could justify development taking place in an area of flood risk?

There should be no developments in a flood risk area. These areas flood for a reason and to build on them not only jeopardises the development, but others in the community to where the flood risk may be transferred.

Q115: Are there any particular uses that land at risk of flooding could be used for?

Depends where it is.

Renewable Energy and Sustainable Construction

Q116: Should the Local Plan Review identify sites for renewable energy development across the district? Which areas across the district would be appropriate and for which types of technology?

Yes. Given the flat landscape of Suffolk Coastal, low profile structures

Q117: How can the Local Plan Review encourage new residential developments to reduce carbon emissions?

Through the planning application and building regulations

Q118: Should the Local Plan Review require other kinds of development like employment, retail, leisure and tourism to meet higher standards of energy efficiency?

Yes

Securing high quality design

Q119: How can we improve the design and quality of estate scale development?

Through the planning system, and consultation with the Town/Parish Council

Q120: How can we improve design quality through planning policy?

See Q119

Q121: How do we promote locally distinctive design?

See Q119

Q122: Is it possible to secure high quality design which is locally distinctive through factory build development?

Don't know

Q123: Should large scale developments be required to follow the "Garden City" principles?

Yes

Q124: Should the principles of "Building for Life 12" be used as a tool to improve the design quality of new development?

Yes

Housing Density

Q125: Should local housing densities be set for new developments?

Yes

Q126: Should different design principles be applied to housing developments at high/low densities? For example, avoid using detached housing at higher densities in order to maintain sufficient space between buildings?

Yes

Residential back gardens

Q127: When would development of residential back gardens be inappropriate?

If there is insufficient space and it would create high density living.

Optional standards – accessibility, internal space and water efficiency

Q128: Should the Council adopt additional optional standards in respect of accessibility, internal space and water efficiency?

Yes

Heritage

Q129: What should be included in a positive strategy for the protection of heritage assets across the district?

Protection should be imposed via the planning development process.

Heritage assets

Q130: What does the Council need to include in a positive strategy for the protection and enhancement of heritage assets?

Shouldn't it seek some form of compulsory action, maybe via the legal system to protect endangered heritage assets so that owners have to maintain them.

Non designated heritage assets

Q131: What level of protection should be given to non designated heritage assets and locally listed buildings?

Pretty much the same as Q130.

Landscape Character

Q132: Is a Landscape Character approach to considering the impact of development on the landscape preferable to retaining Special Landscape Areas for this purpose?

No

Q133: Other than those protected as part of the AONB and Heritage Coast, which other sensitive landscapes require special protection?

River estuaries, the hinterland around the AONBs and Heritage Coast, and other countryside worthy of protection.

Q134: Should areas of tranquillity be identified and protected and if so, which areas should be considered?

Yes, see Q133

Breaks and Gaps in the landscape

Q135: In which areas should development be resisted to avoid settlement coalescence?

The area between Ipswich and Felixstowe

Q136: Which areas require special protection from development?

See Q 133, Q134 and Q135

Q137: Do breaks and gaps in-between buildings need to be given specific protection against development?

There needs to be breaks and gaps between rural settlements.

Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Q138: Should development be promoted in areas which are deficient in Green Infrastructure provision with respect to biodiversity and geodiversity?

No

Q139: Should the Council explore further options to work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities and Natural England to determine a consistent policy approach to biodiversity and geodiversity?

Yes

Q140: What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?

High

Biodiversity in new development

Q140: Should the Council consider a policy which requires the creation of new habitats and enhancement of wildlife corridors on new development sites?

Yes

Q141: Do you have any suggestions for Local Plan policies to support biodiversity retention and enhancement?

By making it a requirement in planning applications

Other

Q142: Do you have any other comments on how current Local Plan policies are working and whether they need to be amended?

No

Potential Land for Development

Q143: Which sites do you consider appropriate for future consideration by the Council?

In respect of our locality, The Sheperd and Dog piggeries site and land within the Port of Felixstowe.

The Question which is not asked is:

Which sites do you consider are inappropriate for future consideration by the Council?

The parish Council will respond to this question by stating which sites listed as “potential for development” it does not consider appropriate.

Site 15 Land adjacent Levington Park, Bridge Road [the site is actually adjacent to Red House Farm]

- I. The land does not meet the criteria for the village in the Hierarchy of Settlements of development only being permitted on in-fill sites;
- II. The land directly abuts the boundary of the AONB and does not provide any separation or hinterland to this specially protected area.
- III. SCDC issued a Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Development Plan Document in 2016. In referring to the nearby Levington Park the SCDC dismissed any possible developments for various reasons included the detrimental impact on the natural environment and concern about local sewerage treatment which is at full capacity. Any possible housing development would also be faced with these concerns.
- IV. The proposed 22 houses would be an increase of about 26% which would not be sufficient to add any further facilities to the village which would remain as minimal, hence the position of Levington in the Hierarchy of Settlements.

- V. The initial site assessment by SCDC rightly mentions the site being near a bus stop, What it doesn't mention is that the bus service only operates three mornings a week, only to Ipswich, and the bus has a turnaround time of about two hours.

Sites 288, 347,706, 852, and 853 – land abutting the A14

- I. Firstly, reference to what was said earlier in this response:

The Parish takes issue with the District Council on the comment on page 17 – *“the Felixstowe/A14 Corridor [characterised by a high concentration of distribution related activities linked to shipping and sea freight]”*. This is completely wrong and dangerously misleading. It should be withdrawn. This corridor is characterised by open countryside mainly of agriculture with dispersed villages. The only concentration of distribution related activities is in the urban areas of East Ipswich [mainly Ransomes Europark] and Felixstowe [mainly around the Port of Felixstowe]

- II. The vast area of land submitted by landowners would create massive urban sprawl joining Ipswich and Felixstowe and must be avoided to maintain the natural separation of these conurbations with green space, natural habitats, and productive agricultural land.
- III. Any developments on these areas would bring enormous increases in traffic, much of it HGVs, and place an unsustainable pressure on the local road infrastructure and the Orwell bridge
- IV. There would also be substantial increases in noise, light and air pollution which would have a detrimental impact on local residents and not be complementary with health life styles. The virtues of the AONB and Local Landscape Character of tranquillity and peace, as mentioned in the consultation document, would be ruined if this land was developed.
- V. There are residential houses in these areas and the foregoing would have a major impact on them and create a much reduced quality of life, which is contrary to what SCDC is trying to promote [see Suffolk Coastal [East Suffolk] Vision – page 12].
- VI. The Old A45 is used for parking HGVs when Operation Stack is in force which, in effect, closes the road so would disruptive to business and add to road traffic problems.

- VII. In the Issues and Options document the estimated requirement by SCDC in the Ipswich Functional Area is 14.4ha, with an unspecified requirement for key economic drivers such as the Port of Felixstowe. The area of land submitted [including Christmas Yard Wood – site 707 -40ha and Sheperd and Dog Piggeries – site 186 – 11.2ha] is a staggering 386ha, vastly beyond what is required.
- VIII. Any port related use of land must be firstly considered on a clear Statement of Need and not on some speculative venture by landowners or agents, vigorously scrutinised by SCDC using independent and expert consultants, and the use of brownfield land at the Port must also be taken into consideration.
- IX. The Parish Council would also oppose use of land to the west of Trimley St Martin [sites 30, 372, 756, and 978] and Kirton [654, 754, 755, 857, and 1077] as they, together with the potential use of land for commercial use, contribute to the urbanisation of the green space between Ipswich and Felixstowe.
- X. In making these comments, the Parish Council would draw you attention to:
 - I. The Parish Council is not anti business as there are employments sites within the parishes of Levington and Stratton Hall, namely the Levington Light Industrial site [ex Fisons] and the Levington Marina [the largest Marina on the East Coast and sited in the parish of Stratton Hall]. During the working week the numbers of employees at these work places outnumber the number of residents. If you add in the visitors to the Marina, especially in the summer months, then the resident population is even more outnumbered. See also Q15 above.
 - II. Although an area of 14.4ha is identified for business growth, there is a statement that says “Local planning authorities may choose to allocate or safeguard more land, in order to ensure a range of sizes and locations of sites for development, to support key economic drivers such as the Port of Felixstowe.....” [page 18]. This is like making available a blank land cheque and cannot be left as it is. SCDC must quantify this with a clear identification of proven need, site options and, in conjunction with local communities, then consider potential development.

Q144: Are there any other sites you are aware of which the Council should consider?

No