

# **MARTLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

## **Submission Draft Version**

**Questions to Martlesham Parish Council and  
Suffolk Coastal District Council  
into the examination of the  
Martlesham Parish Neighbourhood Plan**

Rosemary Kidd, Dip TP MRTPI  
NPIERS Independent Examiner  
8 November 2017

## **Martlesham Parish Neighbourhood Plan – Examiner’s Questions.**

I should be grateful for further information and clarification on the following matters from the Parish Council and/or Local Planning Authority as appropriate.

1. Paragraph 1.3 states that the NP policies will “replace” some of the saved policies. Would the LPA comment on whether they consider this is a correct interpretation as the policies will only apply in the plan area and will not replace the saved policies elsewhere.
2. The Policies Map shows an area of housing along Deben Avenue that is outside the Physical Limits boundary. However Suffolk Coastal DC’s Map 40 for Kesgrave shows a Physical Limits Boundary around this area. Would you clarify the position please.
3. Would the LPA and QB comment on whether the proposed revisions to paragraphs 2.16 and 2.17 proposed by PRC should be made.
4. Policy MAR3, paragraph 4 refers to “if any existing leisure uses are accessible to the public”. Would the QB confirm whether or not there are any such uses and whether the word “if” is necessary.
5. Would the LPA provide an update on the proposed provision of health care facilities for the expanded population. Is the final paragraph of Policy MAR3 concerning the expansion of the health care facility at The Square deliverable? Would this policy unduly restrict the use of the adjacent land for other uses? It is not clear which land is referred to in paragraph 4.20.
6. Would the QB provide the evidence to justify the mix of dwellings in Policy MAR5 and the statement in paragraph 5.11 that a significant majority of 2 and 3 bedroomed properties should be sheltered housing, bungalows and flats. With the advent of care in the community sheltered housing is usually developed for a specialised housing need eg in the form of extra care housing. It is not clear what a significant majority of development amounts to or how the housing mix would be applied to small scale infill development. Moreover, the Housing Technical Standards have introduced optional standards in the Buildings Regulations for accessible and adaptable housing. The PPG advises that “Where a local planning authority adopts a policy to provide enhanced accessibility or adaptability they should do so only by reference to Requirement M4(2) and/or M4(3) of the optional requirements in the Building Regulations” and this should be supported by evidence of need. I would welcome the LPA’s views on whether the second part of Policy MAR5 can be implemented.
7. Is the area covered by Policy MAR8 the same as that covered by Policy SSP38?
8. Policy MAR10 refers to walking and cycle linkages to new leisure uses in Adastral Park. Is this an aspirational policy or have routes been identified within the Neighbourhood Plan area?

9. Would the QB explain the intention of the second part of Policy MAR12 concerning community growing areas “supporting residential development”. How is this policy to be implemented bearing in mind that the NP only provides for infill development? Should a minimum site threshold be set? If so, what should it be?
10. Has the QB published any evidence to demonstrate the significance of the sites identified under the new Appendix 2 proposed as non-designated heritage assets? Have the owners been consulted on the proposed designation as non-designated heritage assets? Paragraph 6.25 refers to the remains that are still visible being locally listed and registered with SCDC. Would the LPA confirm the status of assets listed in the proposed new Appendix 2.
11. The County Council has questioned the source of the evidence for figures 7.1 and 7.2. Would the QB confirm the source.
12. There appears to be some text missing from the first line of Policy MAR15. Should this read “*within and adjacent to the Martlesham Heath Retail Park*”? Would the QB provide a map to show how the area covered by this policy could be shown on the Policies Map. Would the LPA comment on whether it would be feasible and deliverable to require new development proposals to provide or contribute to additional crossing points, given that the problems highlighted are existing problems.
13. It is not clear how the first bullet point of Policy MAR18 is to be applied. Would the LPA and QB comment on the wording proposed in the representations by Planning Potential and Lichfields. Would the following wording be clearer and provide sufficient flexibility? “**it has been demonstrated that there are no sites that are suitable or available in or on the edge of a Retail Centre.....Policy SP9;**”
14. Will the QB supply a map showing the boundary of the Retail Park covered by Policy MAR18 to be included in the Policies Map. A consequential revision should be shown to the boundary of the employment area.
15. Policy MAR19 refers to “Areas” in the plural. Does this policy only relate to the Martlesham Heath Business Park? Is there any reason why the policy should not be entitled “Martlesham Heath Business Park”? It is noted that the Policies Map key incorrectly refers to Policy MAR18.
16. Policy MAR19 incorporates an old form of policy wording and refers to earlier descriptions of the use classes and retail uses as Classes A1 to A3. In view of the current mix of uses on the area to the west of Gloster Road and the car related sui generis uses throughout the business park should the policy be more flexible towards other employment and leisure uses? If so, would the LPA and QB propose a revision to the wording of the policy. Would the LPA comment on whether the second part of Policy MAR19 would be deliverable.
17. Policy MAR20 has the same wording as saved Policy AP213 and incorporates an old form of policy wording. Would the LPA and QB comment on the effectiveness of the policy in managing the re-use of buildings in the area. The first section refers to “a comprehensive scheme for the whole complex”. Has this been prepared and made publicly available? If not who is responsible for preparing it?

18. The first section and first bullet point refers to buildings being retained in the western part of the site and the remainder being removed and the land restored. The eighth bullet refers to the demolition and restoration of the area. The whole area is built up. Which area is it intended to continue to be built up and which restored? Are these parts of the policy deliverable?
19. The second bullet refers to buildings being in keeping with the exposed location of the AONB. The third states it should reflect the location in the AONB. How are these bullets to be interpreted given that the buildings and extent of the site have been in existence for some time?
20. Has bullet point 5 already been implemented? Would it be preferable to state that no additional accesses onto Sandy Lane are to be provided?
21. Does the fourth section permitting only B1 uses set out clear guidance? The area includes buildings with a wider range of uses including the sale of car parts and car repairs.
22. Is the final part of section five preferring businesses providing jobs and services to the local community enforceable?
23. Would the QB explain what is meant in Table 9.1 by “improve co-ordination between fragmented interests at Martlesham Heath Retail Park and Business Park”.

Rosemary Kidd

Independent Examiner

8 November 2017