

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8069 - 4558 - Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22) - None

8069 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

Respondent: Anglian Water (Hannah Wilson) [4558] Agent: N/A

Full Text: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the modifications. Anglian Water has considered the modifications and have no issues or concerns to raise in this regard.

Summary: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the modifications. Anglian Water has considered the modifications and have no issues or concerns to raise in this regard.

Change to Plan N/A

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Yes	Not Specified	N/A

Attachments:

Note: The composite reference number in the box at the top of the page is made up of the following information: Object/Support - Representation Number - Respondent Number - Plan Reference - Soundness Tests (if applicable).

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8066 - 2742 - MM1 - None

8066 Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM1

Respondent: Michael & Barbara Shout [2742]

Agent: STAG (Mr Ian Cowan) [312]

Full Text: Consultation Response By Ian Cowan To "Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan - Main Modifications And Additional Changes" Document

Summary: According to Abraham Lincoln: "You can fool some of the people all of the time." It is to be hoped that Planning Inspector Hill will not ignore credible evidence presented by myself on behalf of Mike and Barbara Shout at various sessions of the recent Independent Planning Inquiry. If evidence that does not suit the purposes of SCDC is discarded, Abraham Lincoln's aphorism will rightly be applied. Therefore, it is to be hoped that Inspector Hill ignores and amends some of their Main Modifications and recognises our very genuine concerns, as described below.

Important Note: The following major matters given in evidence by the writer on behalf of Mike and Barbara Shout have not been addressed by any of SCDC's Main Modifications, and are still outstanding -

1. There is no evidence to support the claim that at least 1,760 new houses are needed on the Felixstowe Peninsula.
2. In fact, evidence from the 2011 Census confirms that houses already built or in the pipeline are more than enough to satisfy the Peninsula's needs for the foreseeable future.
3. Worryingly, SCDC have failed to address various very important Creeping Baseline issues, including: (a) traffic congestion (b) education, social and medical needs (c) dangerously deteriorating air quality (d) various infrastructure requirements.

Soundness: Failure to address these material matters will mean that SCDC's "Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan - Main Modifications And Additional Changes" Document is unsound.

Housing Numbers: Policy FPP1 has been amended to read: "Trimley St Mary 150 Total 1,170." In addition, the Introduction to Policy FPP8 has been amended to read: "4.47ha of land, south of Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary, as shown on the Policies Map, is identified for approximately 150 residential units. In FPP1 and FPP8 the housing numbers have been increased by 50 units.

Comment: A reasonable person in possession of the facts could reasonably conclude that housing numbers have been specifically increased in order to facilitate the progress of Outline Planning Application DC/16/2122/OUT for 50 dwellings on greenfield land adjacent to Mill Farm, Thomas Avenue, Trimley St Mary. This Application was received by SCDC on 21 May 2016 but, so far as I can remember, no mention of its existence was made by SCDC during Inspector Hill's Independent Inquiry, nor was there any suggestion that overall housing numbers needed to be increased by 50 units. If SCDC are willing to blatantly manipulate the evidence base and increase housing numbers by less than 3% (50 / 1,760), giving the inevitable impression that they are doing so in order to accommodate a particular landowner, then the public can have no confidence in the credibility and objectivity of any future housing needs figures they produce.

Physical Limits Boundaries: The following additional wording has been inserted by SCDC at Paragraph 3.24: "Physical limits boundaries are therefore an important policy for the supply of housing. In order to implement Core Strategy policies SP19 and SP2 and Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan Policy FPP1, physical limits boundaries have been re-drafted to incorporate sites of 5 or more units where the principle of housing has been accepted and new housing allocations.

These sites and the revised physical limits boundaries are shown on the Inset Maps." In addition, the following addition has been made to Paragraph 3.28: "Outside of the physical limits boundary, opportunities for housing development are considerably more restricted limited as countryside policies of restraint will apply (Core Strategy policies SP28 and SP29)."

Comment: Regrettably, Physical Limits Boundary constraints were cynically ignored at the Planning Committee Meeting of 5 September 2016 with regards to the approval of Application DC/16/1919/FUL for 69 houses on farmland adjacent to Seamark Nunn off High Road, Trimley St Martin. If SCDC Officers and Members blithely ignore pre-existing Local Development Plan requirements, when they all know there is no need for these houses, there is no guarantee that the amended requirements will be honoured. At the recent Independent Planning Inquiry, Inspector Hill was reminded by me of the fact that SCDC had already blatantly ignored firm promises to update the housing needs evidence base, including taking account of the 2011 Census, which showed that the population of Felixstowe and the Trimley Villages was in decline. In other words, if previous promises can be cynically broken there is no guarantee that current promises and commitments will be kept. It is to be hoped that Inspector Hill will bear both my warnings and SCDC's blatant failure to keep firm, written promises in mind.

Although consideration of so-called Additional Changes are not within Inspector Hill's remit, I feel it is worth highlighting and bringing to her attention the following addition to Paragraph 1.15: "Work on the evidence base is well advanced and is co-ordinated via the Ipswich Policy Area Board. An important element of this work will be to identify an updated Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAN) for the housing market area looking forward to 2036 and from that, a housing requirement for each local planning authority area."

Comment: It is very far from the truth to claim that "work on the evidence base is well advanced", because no evidence of this was presented at the recent Inquiry. As I pointed out at the time, the real truth is that "work on the evidence

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8066 - 2742 - MM1 - None

8066 Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM1

base" is well overdue, and promises made to produce an updated evidence base by 2015 at the latest have been cynically and deliberately ignored. If SCDC continue to perpetuate this false claim, a reasonable person in possession of the facts could reasonably have great difficulty in believing anything they say. The previous commitment to take account of the 2011 Census is also noticeable by its absence. A reasonable person in possession of the facts could reasonably conclude that this deliberate omission is due to SCDC's predetermined intention to build at least 1,760 new homes on the Felixstowe Peninsula, and any evidence to the contrary is therefore being cynically and dishonestly ignored. Any so-called evidence that ignores this declining population could not be described as an "Objectively Assessed Housing Need". Therefore, Inspector Hill should insist that: (a) the evidence base for housing needs must be published as soon as possible (b) its assumptions and calculations must also be published (c) specific justification must be given for increasing this figure by 50 dwellings in order to facilitate Planning Application DC/16/2122/OUT and (d) it must be an overarching requirement that the results of the 2011 Census are properly taken into account. Ensuring that all relevant evidence is taken into account is surely a Main Modification and not an Additional Change!

Possible Lack Of Independence: When, at the recent Inquiry, I raised the issue with Inspector Hill that firm promises to update the housing needs evidence base had not been kept by SCDC, including failing to take account of the 2011 Census, her surprisingly dismissive response was that it was where we were and things have to move on. This indicates an acceptance by her that promises made in the Local Plan, which was declared to be sound by Planning Inspector Mike Moore in 2013, were worthless. It also indicated her acceptance of housing needs figures that were out of date and wrong! A reasonable person in possession of the facts would reasonably have expected Inspector Hill to back up her predecessor, rather than appear to condone SCDC's failings! SCDC's failure to keep such important promises shows contempt for the LDF process, and if Inspector Hill accepts housing needs figures that are not objectively assessed, and not based on updated evidence which takes account of the 2011 Census, a reasonable person in possession of the facts could reasonably conclude that she was biased in favour of SCDC. This would render the whole process unsound.

Summary:

A reasonable person in possession of the facts could reasonably conclude that housing numbers have been specifically increased in order to facilitate the progress of Outline Planning Application DC/16/2122/OUT for 50 dwellings. If SCDC are willing to blatantly manipulate the evidence base and increase housing numbers by less than 3% (50 / 1,760), giving the inevitable impression that they are doing so in order to accommodate a particular landowner, then the public can have no confidence in the credibility and objectivity of any future housing needs figures they produce.

Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	No	Not Specified	None

Attachments:

FelixstoweMods_Redacted.pdf

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8103 - 551 - MM1 - i, ii, iii, iv

8103 Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM1

Respondent: Hopkins Homes [551]

Agent: Armstrong Rigg Planning (Mr Geoff Armstrong)
[3897]

Full Text: Suffolk Coastal District Council Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Local Plan
Main Modifications Consultation

I refer to the above and am pleased to enclose brief representations on behalf of our client Hopkins Homes.

Hopkins Homes have maintained an active involvement in the preparation of the Plan from the outset and appeared at the Examination Hearing Sessions in August 2016. Despite the extensive representations made and evidence provided from Hopkins Homes and others, it is disappointing to note that no significant changes have been made in response to the fundamental objections made throughout that:

☐ The Plan is not considered to be legally compliant and is therefore unsound in the absence of an agreed habitat protection strategy (which is still under preparation) to ensure that potential adverse impacts on European designated sites can be adequately mitigated. This remains a significant legal failing and the Plan should not proceed until there is certainty that appropriate habitat mitigation for the development required over the Plan period can be provided; and

☐ The Plan is not considered to be legally compliant and is therefore unsound as it fails to take account of the full, objectively assessed housing needs of the District and would therefore fail to boost significantly the supply of housing. The Plan should allocate additional sites such as those promoted by Hopkins Homes to ensure that there is a continual supply of suitable and available housing land. In its current form, the Plan will prevent the delivery of sustainable development contrary to the requirements of national planning guidance

Whilst it is noted that modifications have been made to the Physical Limits Boundaries SSP2 Paragraphs 2.16 - 2.21 (Mod Ref: SAASPD - MM1) following evidence presented at the relevant Hearing session by Hopkins Homes, these are not considered sufficient to provide the necessary flexibility to allow sustainable development to take place on the edge of settlements which will enable the national objective of boosting significantly the supply of housing to be met and to adapt to changing circumstances over the Plan period as required by paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

The following paragraph should therefore be added as a Main Modification, as requested in a submission made to the Inspector following the Examination:

2.21 When assessing proposals for new residential development outside but adjoining the physical limits boundaries of the Major Centres, Towns, Key and Local Service Centres where the relevant policies are out of date by reason of the Council being unable to demonstrate the requisite five-year supply of housing land, a positive approach will be taken reflecting the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy SP1A of the Core Strategy. The presumption in favour of sustainable development will also apply where a proposed housing scheme is demonstrated to meet a proven local need appropriate to the particular community. In these circumstances, the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise taking into account whether (1) any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF (or its successor) taken as a whole and (2) specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.

As stated continually throughout previous representations, the emerging Plan is considered to be unsound in that it has not been positively prepared, is ineffective and unjustified and further modifications should be incorporated to rectify these failings.

We trust the above will be taken into account as the preparation of the Plan progresses.

Summary: Whilst it is noted that modifications have been made to the Physical Limits Boundaries SSP2 Paragraphs 2.16 - 2.21 (Mod Ref: SAASPD - MM1) following evidence presented at the relevant Hearing session by Hopkins Homes, these are not considered sufficient to provide the necessary flexibility to allow sustainable development to take place on the edge of settlements which will enable the national objective of boosting significantly the supply of housing to be met and to adapt to changing circumstances over the Plan period as required by paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

Change to Plan The following paragraph should therefore be added as a Main Modification, as requested in a submission made to the Inspector following the Examination:

2.21 When assessing proposals for new residential development outside but adjoining the physical limits boundaries of the Major Centres, Towns, Key and Local Service Centres where the relevant policies are out of date by reason of the Council being unable to demonstrate the requisite five-year supply of housing land, a positive approach will be taken reflecting the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy SP1A of the Core Strategy. The presumption in favour of sustainable development will also apply where a proposed housing scheme is demonstrated to meet a proven local need appropriate to the particular community. In these circumstances, the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise taking into account whether (1) any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF (or its successor) taken as a whole and (2) specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8103 - 551 - MM1 - i, ii, iii, iv

8103 Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22) MM1

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	No	No	No	i, ii, iii, iv

Attachments:
L0005 - reps to Main Modifications_Redacted.pdf

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8116 - 2442 - MM1 - None

8116 Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM1

Respondent: Suffolk County Council (James Cutting) [2442]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan - Main Modifications

I write to confirm Suffolk County Council's position following consultation on the main modifications. Before turning to the main modifications, I consider that attention needs to be made to changes that have occurred since the hearing sessions at the beginning of September that are relevant to the County Council's interests with regard to the Main Modifications, this includes:

- recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee, and
- inquiry hearing sessions into the appeal at Candlet Road.

Recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee

On Friday 2 September 2016, I provided further evidence on the resultant needs for early years and primary school places in support of Suffolk Coastal District Council's Area Action Plan (AAP) for the Felixstowe Peninsula. I restated the long-held position of the County Council that a new primary school is needed to accommodate the likely growth in the number of primary-aged pupils and the needs for early years facilities, including which sites would be expected to provide on-site provision for early years.

During the session, I responded to questions and there was no disagreement from the District Council, landowners, developers or their agents to the approach, including on-site provision and the need for financial contributions to be secured through s106 agreements.

However, since the examination hearing sessions, minutes from the 29 June 2016 meeting of Suffolk Coastal's Planning Committee were released on 7 September 2016 providing its resolution for part of the Thurmans Lane site (FPP8). The County Council then received confirmation of same Committee's 5 September resolution for an application not included in the AAP (land at High Road, Trimley St Martin, application DC/16/1919/FUL).

These decisions resolved to grant permission without financial contributions towards a new early years setting or towards a new primary school, which has implications for the AAP and for future decisions. The case officer's report for 5 September Planning Committee for planning application DC/16/1919/FUL (for 69 dwellings at Land at High Road, Trimley St Martin) cited the lack of a specific site as a reason and suggested an alternative education strategy, for temporary accommodation being stationed at Trimley St Martin. These and other points were contested by the County Council in writing to the Committee.

The District Council's central point, but also related to the timescales of delivery, is that a site has not been identified. The County Council has the statutory duty to secure sufficient places and, in extreme cases, can compulsorily purchase land under section 530 of the Education Act 1996. The fact that a site has not been identified does not prevent contributions being secured because the contributions are necessary to mitigate the direct impact of development. In terms of timescales, new homes build before a new school is built will reduce available capacity, which should be considered in combination with the AAP.

A very similar situation arose during a recovered appeal in Buntingford, Hertfordshire (Appeal references: APP/J1915/A/14/2220854 & APP/J1915/A/14/2220859), which the Secretary of State determined in March 2016. In this case, East Hertfordshire District Council was seeking to use the absence of a school site to resist residential development. In recommending allowing the appeal, the Inspector concluded (in paragraph 26) on the relationship between a lack of a site and the use of planning obligations thus:

"The second sustainability objection relates to lack of education facilities (a new 2FE primary school). It flies in the face of the Education Authority's consultation response to the applications. Indeed, it is hard to see how such a facility will be provided without developer contributions. Moreover there is absolutely no evidence to show that the Education Authority will not deliver as and when necessary."

During the hearing sessions on the AAP I explained that, owing to the dispersed approach to housing growth, the most sustainable location for the new school depends on the actual rate and location of homes. I also explained that, in order to allocate a primary school site within the AAP, there would need to be considerable certainty that that particular site could be delivered and that it would be the most sustainable.

This issue of certainty was discussed with Suffolk Coastal's officers during the preparation of the AAP and, as I described during the hearing, a location between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary may be the most accessible. This is, however, dependent upon the resultant pattern of development being as set out in the AAP, the rate of development being as predicted and there being no changes in the number and distribution of pupils throughout the Peninsula. If any of these conditions is not as envisaged, the most appropriate site for a new primary school may be elsewhere in the Peninsula. Notwithstanding this point, the county council is already exploring the potential for sites between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary.

The County Council's preference for a site might change if other developments come forward (such as the 560 home proposed at Candlet Road which is subject to an appeal) and if development around Trimley St Mary and Trimley St

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8116 - 2442 - MM1 - None

8116 Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM1

Martin does not progress. The County Council requires certainty, beyond the simple allocation of a site, about the site's availability and suitability to commit its own and others resources towards delivering a new primary school, which can cost at least £4.35m to build (without land costs being included).

Inquiry hearing sessions into the appeal at Candlet Road.

Between 27 - 30 September, Mr Clive Hughes held evidence sessions into the appeal by Christchurch Land & Estates against Suffolk Coastal District Council's refusal to grant planning permission for 560 dwellings and other development (including a 60-bed care home) on land adjacent to Candlet Road, Felixstowe (Appeal Ref: APP/J3530/W/15/3138710).

This appeal is relevant to the consideration of the AAP because, if allowed, the addition of the 560 dwellings will add around 45% more homes to those already permitted or allocated. This has implications for the provision of transport and education infrastructure needed to support the appeal site and the implementation of the AAP.

Transport

In terms of transport considerations, the AECOM report - "Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan (AAP) Cumulative Impact Assessment" - did include the Candlet Road proposal in the assessment (AECOM, paras 1.3.8 and 2.5.2). AECOM highlighted several measures, particularly at the Candlet Road/Grove Road and Garrison Lane roundabout that could be implemented to mitigate traffic impact on junctions. This includes realignment and removing the hatched area (AECOM, para. 5.2.3), which was installed to reduce traffic speed entering the roundabout.

The minor change reversing the hatching changes on Candlet Road / Garrison Road roundabout can be implemented once the 40 mph Traffic Regulation Order along Candlet Road has been formally agreed. The s.278 works associated with the Candlet Road Development could be used to deliver this work.

Education

The situation for education infrastructure is similar. During the inquiry, the appellant agreed to the county council's requirements which took account of the emerging AAP. The county council secured contributions towards land and build costs for early years and primary education and the reservation of land for both types of facility was secured on site.

In contrast to the two decisions above, during the inquiry Suffolk Coastal District Council formally accepted and endorsed the need for appropriate and proportionate contributions towards the new primary school. The district council did, however, raise a concern over the suitability of this location for the school.

Notwithstanding the reservation on the Candlet Road site, and as noted above, the county council is already exploring the potential for sites between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary because the Candlet Road site might not present an optimum solution for the Felixstowe Peninsula as a whole. However, there remains a residual risk that a better site may not be available and that, owing to phasing and the actual demand generated if the Candlet Road site is delivered, this location may be preferred.

The relationship between the Candlet Road and High Road developments is shown in the table below. The total pupil yields are based on houses with 2 or more bedrooms, the calculation for pupil yields does vary for the size and type of dwelling permitted. This table shows the constraint in the availability of places within primary schools throughout Felixstowe but particularly at Kingsfleet, Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary Primary Schools.

If the Candlet Road appeal is dismissed, the total deficit will be reduced by 140 places to -125. This highlights the complexity in considering the most appropriate location for a primary school within the Peninsula.

Based on the catchment areas covering the Candlet Road site, the county council assumed that 45 pupils would attend Maidstone Infants, 60 at Causton Junior and 35 Kingsfleet. Contributions towards the land and build costs have been agreed based on the lack of capacity at Kingsfleet. This has impacted on the consideration of the available capacity at FPP4 (Land North of High Street, Walton), which would then become available if the appeal is dismissed.

Table 1. Capacity, Forecast Pupil Rolls and Pupil Yields from developments in the Felixstowe Peninsula.

[SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT]

The AAP highlights the requirement for a new primary school to be one form entry (210 places). The above figures do not take into account the final mixture of housing sizes and types. The indicative size mix set out in table 3.6 in the Core Strategy does provide a general rule. If this were to be followed (with assumptions on flats and houses (The assumed flats/houses splits being a 50/50 one bed, 30/70 two bed and 5/95 three bed and 0/100 four bed.)) the resultant deficit of primary school places is likely to be below 200.

The Candlet Road appeal also affects the consideration of the availability of secondary school places. However, financial contributions to increasing the available capacity can only be secured through the Community Infrastructure

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8116 - 2442 - MM1 - None

8116 Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM1

Levy. If the Secretary of State allows the appeal and grants planning permission, there will be an overall deficit in 2020 of -126 secondary and sixth form places, which increases to -141 with the High Road site included. This is a worst case scenario as a mixture of housing types and sizes is likely to reduce the overall deficit.

Main Modifications

MM1

The total increase from 1,120 to 1,170 is made to reflect 50 additional dwellings at the Thurmans Lane sites (FPP8). However, this does not include the applications for which there is a resolution to grant permission at High Road, Trimley St Martin.

MM4 - MM6

These changes are welcome and provide clarity to decision makers. This addresses the county council's above concerns over recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee.

MM20

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through a planning obligation rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

A further addition is necessary to reflect the need to reserve a 2.1ha site for the new school, pending the final location being secured. This was requested in the county council's response to planning application ref 16/2778/OUT and is in accordance with para. 3.44 of the AAP.

MM21

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through planning obligations for this and other sites rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

MM22

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through a planning obligation rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

A further addition is necessary to reflect the need to reserve a 2.1ha site for the new school, pending the final location being secured. This is in accordance with para. 3.44 of the AAP.

Additional Changes

AC13

The amendment to the area for the new primary school and early years settling is welcome and no further amendments are necessary. Whilst the required size of a 210 place school is likely to be sufficient for the resultant growth taking account of potential mixture of dwellings, a new school provides a significant and long-term piece of community infrastructure which is likely to need further expansion in the future. This likelihood is reinforced by the facts that: the housing numbers in the AAP are minimums, that Suffolk Coastal District Council needs to review its Core Strategy to reflect housing need and that, if the prevailing pattern of growth is followed, Felixstowe is likely to be a location for further residential development beyond that outlined in the current AAP.

The County Council's requirement, which is acknowledged in the AAP (para. 3.43), is for the reservation of land for a new primary school, which will include an early years setting. The required area to provide sufficient flexibility is based on being able to accommodate up to a 420 place school and a 60 place early years facility.

I trust that the above provides a suitable account of recent circumstances and provides you with an understanding of the County Council's position on the main modifications and additional changes.

Summary:

The total increase from 1,120 to 1,170 is made to reflect 50 additional dwellings at the Thurmans Lane sites (FPP8). However, this does not include the applications for which there is a resolution to grant permission at High Road, Trimley St Martin.

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8116 - 2442 - MM1 - None

8116 Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM1

Change to Plan

Appear at exam?

Not Specified

Legal?

Not Specified

Sound?

Not Specified

Duty to Cooperate?

Not Specified

Soundness Tests

None

Attachments:

2016-11-28.FinalMainModificationsResponse.pdf

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8067 - 2742 - MM2 - None

8067 Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM2

Respondent: Michael & Barbara Shout [2742]

Agent: STAG (Mr Ian Cowan) [312]

Full Text: Consultation Response By Ian Cowan To "Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan - Main Modifications And Additional Changes" Document

Summary: According to Abraham Lincoln: "You can fool some of the people all of the time." It is to be hoped that Planning Inspector Hill will not ignore credible evidence presented by myself on behalf of Mike and Barbara Shout at various sessions of the recent Independent Planning Inquiry. If evidence that does not suit the purposes of SCDC is discarded, Abraham Lincoln's aphorism will rightly be applied. Therefore, it is to be hoped that Inspector Hill ignores and amends some of their Main Modifications and recognises our very genuine concerns, as described below.

Important Note: The following major matters given in evidence by the writer on behalf of Mike and Barbara Shout have not been addressed by any of SCDC's Main Modifications, and are still outstanding -

1. There is no evidence to support the claim that at least 1,760 new houses are needed on the Felixstowe Peninsula.
2. In fact, evidence from the 2011 Census confirms that houses already built or in the pipeline are more than enough to satisfy the Peninsula's needs for the foreseeable future.
3. Worryingly, SCDC have failed to address various very important Creeping Baseline issues, including: (a) traffic congestion (b) education, social and medical needs (c) dangerously deteriorating air quality (d) various infrastructure requirements.

Soundness: Failure to address these material matters will mean that SCDC's "Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan - Main Modifications And Additional Changes" Document is unsound.

Housing Numbers: Policy FPP1 has been amended to read: "Trimley St Mary 150 Total 1,170." In addition, the Introduction to Policy FPP8 has been amended to read: "4.47ha of land, south of Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary, as shown on the Policies Map, is identified for approximately 150 residential units. In FPP1 and FPP8 the housing numbers have been increased by 50 units.

Comment: A reasonable person in possession of the facts could reasonably conclude that housing numbers have been specifically increased in order to facilitate the progress of Outline Planning Application DC/16/2122/OUT for 50 dwellings on greenfield land adjacent to Mill Farm, Thomas Avenue, Trimley St Mary. This Application was received by SCDC on 21 May 2016 but, so far as I can remember, no mention of its existence was made by SCDC during Inspector Hill's Independent Inquiry, nor was there any suggestion that overall housing numbers needed to be increased by 50 units. If SCDC are willing to blatantly manipulate the evidence base and increase housing numbers by less than 3% (50 / 1,760), giving the inevitable impression that they are doing so in order to accommodate a particular landowner, then the public can have no confidence in the credibility and objectivity of any future housing needs figures they produce.

Physical Limits Boundaries: The following additional wording has been inserted by SCDC at Paragraph 3.24: "Physical limits boundaries are therefore an important policy for the supply of housing. In order to implement Core Strategy policies SP19 and SP2 and Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan Policy FPP1, physical limits boundaries have been re-drafted to incorporate sites of 5 or more units where the principle of housing has been accepted and new housing allocations.

These sites and the revised physical limits boundaries are shown on the Inset Maps." In addition, the following addition has been made to Paragraph 3.28: "Outside of the physical limits boundary, opportunities for housing development are considerably more restricted limited as countryside policies of restraint will apply (Core Strategy policies SP28 and SP29)."

Comment: Regrettably, Physical Limits Boundary constraints were cynically ignored at the Planning Committee Meeting of 5 September 2016 with regards to the approval of Application DC/16/1919/FUL for 69 houses on farmland adjacent to Seamark Nunn off High Road, Trimley St Martin. If SCDC Officers and Members blithely ignore pre-existing Local Development Plan requirements, when they all know there is no need for these houses, there is no guarantee that the amended requirements will be honoured. At the recent Independent Planning Inquiry, Inspector Hill was reminded by me of the fact that SCDC had already blatantly ignored firm promises to update the housing needs evidence base, including taking account of the 2011 Census, which showed that the population of Felixstowe and the Trimley Villages was in decline. In other words, if previous promises can be cynically broken there is no guarantee that current promises and commitments will be kept. It is to be hoped that Inspector Hill will bear both my warnings and SCDC's blatant failure to keep firm, written promises in mind.

Although consideration of so-called Additional Changes are not within Inspector Hill's remit, I feel it is worth highlighting and bringing to her attention the following addition to Paragraph 1.15: "Work on the evidence base is well advanced and is co-ordinated via the Ipswich Policy Area Board. An important element of this work will be to identify an updated Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAN) for the housing market area looking forward to 2036 and from that, a housing requirement for each local planning authority area."

Comment: It is very far from the truth to claim that "work on the evidence base is well advanced", because no evidence of this was presented at the recent Inquiry. As I pointed out at the time, the real truth is that "work on the evidence

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8067 - 2742 - MM2 - None

8067 Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM2

base" is well overdue, and promises made to produce an updated evidence base by 2015 at the latest have been cynically and deliberately ignored. If SCDC continue to perpetuate this false claim, a reasonable person in possession of the facts could reasonably have great difficulty in believing anything they say. The previous commitment to take account of the 2011 Census is also noticeable by its absence. A reasonable person in possession of the facts could reasonably conclude that this deliberate omission is due to SCDC's predetermined intention to build at least 1,760 new homes on the Felixstowe Peninsula, and any evidence to the contrary is therefore being cynically and dishonestly ignored. Any so-called evidence that ignores this declining population could not be described as an "Objectively Assessed Housing Need". Therefore, Inspector Hill should insist that: (a) the evidence base for housing needs must be published as soon as possible (b) its assumptions and calculations must also be published (c) specific justification must be given for increasing this figure by 50 dwellings in order to facilitate Planning Application DC/16/2122/OUT and (d) it must be an overarching requirement that the results of the 2011 Census are properly taken into account. Ensuring that all relevant evidence is taken into account is surely a Main Modification and not an Additional Change!

Possible Lack Of Independence: When, at the recent Inquiry, I raised the issue with Inspector Hill that firm promises to update the housing needs evidence base had not been kept by SCDC, including failing to take account of the 2011 Census, her surprisingly dismissive response was that it was where we were and things have to move on. This indicates an acceptance by her that promises made in the Local Plan, which was declared to be sound by Planning Inspector Mike Moore in 2013, were worthless. It also indicated her acceptance of housing needs figures that were out of date and wrong! A reasonable person in possession of the facts would reasonably have expected Inspector Hill to back up her predecessor, rather than appear to condone SCDC's failings! SCDC's failure to keep such important promises shows contempt for the LDF process, and if Inspector Hill accepts housing needs figures that are not objectively assessed, and not based on updated evidence which takes account of the 2011 Census, a reasonable person in possession of the facts could reasonably conclude that she was biased in favour of SCDC. This would render the whole process unsound.

Summary:

At the recent Independent Planning Inquiry, Inspector Hill was reminded by me of the fact that SCDC had already blatantly ignored firm promises to update the housing needs evidence base, including taking account of the 2011 Census, which showed that the population of Felixstowe and the Trimley Villages was in decline. In other words, if previous promises can be cynically broken there is no guarantee that current promises and commitments will be kept. It is to be hoped that Inspector Hill will bear both my warnings and SCDC's blatant failure to keep firm, written promises in mind.

Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	No	Not Specified	None

Attachments:

FelixstoweMods_Redacted.pdf

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8079 - 3892 - MM2 - None

8079Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)MM2

Respondent: Margaret Morris [3892]

Agent: N/A

Full Text:

I wish to comment on the Felixstowe Area Action Plan. Your form seems designed to put people off commenting.

Points:

With the considerable new build already being planned for the Trimleys, I consider the High Road will not be able to cope with the amount of traffic that will be generated.

Page 24 - 3.28: Outside the physical limits, opportunities for new housing - my concern is the impact on the SSSI, RAMSAR. These are internationally important sites and should be dealt with accordingly.

Page 26 - para 3.35 We need to build more affordable housing, as well as more social housing Developers should not be allowed by SCDC to get out of the amount they should be providing.

I am firmly against the Tory Government's Policy of selling Social Housing to existing tenants. We need more social housing in Felixstowe, not less.

The report Hidden Needs from the Suffolk Community Foundation indicates clearly the need in Felixstowe and the Trimleys for social housing.

I note that SCC wants the developer to build any new schools that are needed.

Anglian Water must be MADE to sort out the foul sewage, to prevent Walton High Road being continuously dug up.

Rifle Club - the road surface needs to be smooth to enable people with visual impairments to use it safely. Our Rifle club is of national importance.

There is no reference to the increasing number of second homes being bought within Suffolk Coastal.

Summary:

Page 24 - 3.28: Outside the physical limits, opportunities for new housing - my concern is the impact on the SSSI, RAMSAR. These are internationally important sites and should be dealt with accordingly.

Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	None

Attachments:

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8078 - 4559 - MM3 - None

8078Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)MM3

Respondent: Krystyna Smithers [4559]Agent: N/A

Full Text:Hi

I find the presentation of the document - and the way the proposed changes are presented - extremely confusing. However, I would like to make three points here which I feel strongly about.

1 I do not think it is appropriate for developers to make a financial contribution to Council funds. Their contribution should be a significant element of affordable housing or an important facility for the use of the people to be newly housed e.g. a school, health or sports centre.

2 I may have misunderstood, but won't one particular change mean that there may be a tendency for developers easily to get through batches of five homes with little responsibility for affordable housing or improving the area with, say, useable outside space?

2 There seems to be no mention of social housing. This is vital. Also this housing should not be separate from "private" housing but incorporated. We need to work towards a mixed and vibrant society not ghettos.

I do hope you can take my comments on board.

Summary:I do not think it is appropriate for developers to make a financial contribution to Council funds. Their contribution should be a significant element of affordable housing or an important facility for the use of the people to be newly housed e.g. a school, health or sports centre. I may have misunderstood, but won't one particular change mean that there may be a tendency for developers easily to get through batches of five homes with little responsibility for affordable housing or improving the area with, say, useable outside space?

Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	None

Attachments:

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8080 - 3892 - MM3 - None

8080Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)MM3

Respondent: Margaret Morris [3892]Agent: N/A

Full Text:

I wish to comment on the Felixstowe Area Action Plan. Your form seems designed to put people off commenting.

Points:

With the considerable new build already being planned for the Trimleys, I consider the High Road will not be able to cope with the amount of traffic that will be generated.

Page 24 - 3.28: Outside the physical limits, opportunities for new housing - my concern is the impact on the SSSI, RAMSAR. These are internationally important sites and should be dealt with accordingly.

Page 26 - para 3.35 We need to build more affordable housing, as well as more social housing Developers should not be allowed by SCDC to get out of the amount they should be providing.

I am firmly against the Tory Government's Policy of selling Social Housing to existing tenants. We need more social housing in Felixstowe, not less.

The report Hidden Needs from the Suffolk Community Foundation indicates clearly the need in Felixstowe and the Trimleys for social housing.

I note that SCC wants the developer to build any new schools that are needed.

Anglian Water must be MADE to sort out the foul sewage, to prevent Walton High Road being continuously dug up.

Rifle Club - the road surface needs to be smooth to enable people with visual impairments to use it safely. Our Rifle club is of national importance.

There is no reference to the increasing number of second homes being bought within Suffolk Coastal.

Summary:

Page 26 - para 3.35 We need to build more affordable housing, as well as more social housing Developers should not be allowed by SCDC to get out of the amount they should be providing.

I am firmly against the Tory Government's Policy of selling Social Housing to existing tenants. We need more social housing in Felixstowe, not less.

The report Hidden Needs from the Suffolk Community Foundation indicates clearly the need in Felixstowe and the Trimleys for social housing.

Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	None

Attachments:

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8091 - 4562 - MM3 - None

8091	Object
------	--------

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM3

Respondent: Brenda Shelley [4562]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Dear Sir/Madam - I am very concerned about the lack of affordable housing in the Area Action Plan for Felixstowe. I am further concerned about the water supply and sewage system being adequate for the numbers of new houses planned for several areas in Felixstowe.

I strongly suggest that these two areas are given further consideration before any developments happen.

Summary: Dear Sir/Madam - I am very concerned about the lack of affordable housing in the Area Action Plan for Felixstowe. I am further concerned about the water supply and sewage system being adequate for the numbers of new houses planned for several areas in Felixstowe.

I strongly suggest that these two areas are given further consideration before any developments happen.

Change to Plan

Appear at exam?

Legal?

Sound?

Duty to Cooperate?

Soundness Tests

Not Specified

Not Specified

Not Specified

Not Specified

None

Attachments:

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8117 - 2442 - MM4 - None

8117 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM4

Respondent: Suffolk County Council (James Cutting) [2442]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan - Main Modifications

I write to confirm Suffolk County Council's position following consultation on the main modifications. Before turning to the main modifications, I consider that attention needs to be made to changes that have occurred since the hearing sessions at the beginning of September that are relevant to the County Council's interests with regard to the Main Modifications, this includes:

- recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee, and
- inquiry hearing sessions into the appeal at Candlet Road.

Recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee

On Friday 2 September 2016, I provided further evidence on the resultant needs for early years and primary school places in support of Suffolk Coastal District Council's Area Action Plan (AAP) for the Felixstowe Peninsula. I restated the long-held position of the County Council that a new primary school is needed to accommodate the likely growth in the number of primary-aged pupils and the needs for early years facilities, including which sites would be expected to provide on-site provision for early years.

During the session, I responded to questions and there was no disagreement from the District Council, landowners, developers or their agents to the approach, including on-site provision and the need for financial contributions to be secured through s106 agreements.

However, since the examination hearing sessions, minutes from the 29 June 2016 meeting of Suffolk Coastal's Planning Committee were released on 7 September 2016 providing its resolution for part of the Thurmans Lane site (FPP8). The County Council then received confirmation of same Committee's 5 September resolution for an application not included in the AAP (land at High Road, Trimley St Martin, application DC/16/1919/FUL).

These decisions resolved to grant permission without financial contributions towards a new early years setting or towards a new primary school, which has implications for the AAP and for future decisions. The case officer's report for 5 September Planning Committee for planning application DC/16/1919/FUL (for 69 dwellings at Land at High Road, Trimley St Martin) cited the lack of a specific site as a reason and suggested an alternative education strategy, for temporary accommodation being stationed at Trimley St Martin. These and other points were contested by the County Council in writing to the Committee.

The District Council's central point, but also related to the timescales of delivery, is that a site has not been identified. The County Council has the statutory duty to secure sufficient places and, in extreme cases, can compulsorily purchase land under section 530 of the Education Act 1996. The fact that a site has not been identified does not prevent contributions being secured because the contributions are necessary to mitigate the direct impact of development. In terms of timescales, new homes build before a new school is built will reduce available capacity, which should be considered in combination with the AAP.

A very similar situation arose during a recovered appeal in Buntingford, Hertfordshire (Appeal references: APP/J1915/A/14/2220854 & APP/J1915/A/14/2220859), which the Secretary of State determined in March 2016. In this case, East Hertfordshire District Council was seeking to use the absence of a school site to resist residential development. In recommending allowing the appeal, the Inspector concluded (in paragraph 26) on the relationship between a lack of a site and the use of planning obligations thus:

"The second sustainability objection relates to lack of education facilities (a new 2FE primary school). It flies in the face of the Education Authority's consultation response to the applications. Indeed, it is hard to see how such a facility will be provided without developer contributions. Moreover there is absolutely no evidence to show that the Education Authority will not deliver as and when necessary."

During the hearing sessions on the AAP I explained that, owing to the dispersed approach to housing growth, the most sustainable location for the new school depends on the actual rate and location of homes. I also explained that, in order to allocate a primary school site within the AAP, there would need to be considerable certainty that that particular site could be delivered and that it would be the most sustainable.

This issue of certainty was discussed with Suffolk Coastal's officers during the preparation of the AAP and, as I described during the hearing, a location between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary may be the most accessible. This is, however, dependent upon the resultant pattern of development being as set out in the AAP, the rate of development being as predicted and there being no changes in the number and distribution of pupils throughout the Peninsula. If any of these conditions is not as envisaged, the most appropriate site for a new primary school may be elsewhere in the Peninsula. Notwithstanding this point, the county council is already exploring the potential for sites between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary.

The County Council's preference for a site might change if other developments come forward (such as the 560 home proposed at Candlet Road which is subject to an appeal) and if development around Trimley St Mary and Trimley St

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8117 - 2442 - MM4 - None

8117 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM4

Martin does not progress. The County Council requires certainty, beyond the simple allocation of a site, about the site's availability and suitability to commit its own and others resources towards delivering a new primary school, which can cost at least £4.35m to build (without land costs being included).

Inquiry hearing sessions into the appeal at Candlet Road.

Between 27 - 30 September, Mr Clive Hughes held evidence sessions into the appeal by Christchurch Land & Estates against Suffolk Coastal District Council's refusal to grant planning permission for 560 dwellings and other development (including a 60-bed care home) on land adjacent to Candlet Road, Felixstowe (Appeal Ref: APP/J3530/W/15/3138710).

This appeal is relevant to the consideration of the AAP because, if allowed, the addition of the 560 dwellings will add around 45% more homes to those already permitted or allocated. This has implications for the provision of transport and education infrastructure needed to support the appeal site and the implementation of the AAP.

Transport

In terms of transport considerations, the AECOM report - "Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan (AAP) Cumulative Impact Assessment" - did include the Candlet Road proposal in the assessment (AECOM, paras 1.3.8 and 2.5.2). AECOM highlighted several measures, particularly at the Candlet Road/Grove Road and Garrison Lane roundabout that could be implemented to mitigate traffic impact on junctions. This includes realignment and removing the hatched area (AECOM, para. 5.2.3), which was installed to reduce traffic speed entering the roundabout.

The minor change reversing the hatching changes on Candlet Road / Garrison Road roundabout can be implemented once the 40 mph Traffic Regulation Order along Candlet Road has been formally agreed. The s.278 works associated with the Candlet Road Development could be used to deliver this work.

Education

The situation for education infrastructure is similar. During the inquiry, the appellant agreed to the county council's requirements which took account of the emerging AAP. The county council secured contributions towards land and build costs for early years and primary education and the reservation of land for both types of facility was secured on site.

In contrast to the two decisions above, during the inquiry Suffolk Coastal District Council formally accepted and endorsed the need for appropriate and proportionate contributions towards the new primary school. The district council did, however, raise a concern over the suitability of this location for the school.

Notwithstanding the reservation on the Candlet Road site, and as noted above, the county council is already exploring the potential for sites between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary because the Candlet Road site might not present an optimum solution for the Felixstowe Peninsula as a whole. However, there remains a residual risk that a better site may not be available and that, owing to phasing and the actual demand generated if the Candlet Road site is delivered, this location may be preferred.

The relationship between the Candlet Road and High Road developments is shown in the table below. The total pupil yields are based on houses with 2 or more bedrooms, the calculation for pupil yields does vary for the size and type of dwelling permitted. This table shows the constraint in the availability of places within primary schools throughout Felixstowe but particularly at Kingsfleet, Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary Primary Schools.

If the Candlet Road appeal is dismissed, the total deficit will be reduced by 140 places to -125. This highlights the complexity in considering the most appropriate location for a primary school within the Peninsula.

Based on the catchment areas covering the Candlet Road site, the county council assumed that 45 pupils would attend Maidstone Infants, 60 at Causton Junior and 35 Kingsfleet. Contributions towards the land and build costs have been agreed based on the lack of capacity at Kingsfleet. This has impacted on the consideration of the available capacity at FPP4 (Land North of High Street, Walton), which would then become available if the appeal is dismissed.

Table 1. Capacity, Forecast Pupil Rolls and Pupil Yields from developments in the Felixstowe Peninsula.

[SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT]

The AAP highlights the requirement for a new primary school to be one form entry (210 places). The above figures do not take into account the final mixture of housing sizes and types. The indicative size mix set out in table 3.6 in the Core Strategy does provide a general rule. If this were to be followed (with assumptions on flats and houses (The assumed flats/houses splits being a 50/50 one bed, 30/70 two bed and 5/95 three bed and 0/100 four bed.)) the resultant deficit of primary school places is likely to be below 200.

The Candlet Road appeal also affects the consideration of the availability of secondary school places. However, financial contributions to increasing the available capacity can only be secured through the Community Infrastructure

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8117 - 2442 - MM4 - None

8117 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM4

Levy. If the Secretary of State allows the appeal and grants planning permission, there will be an overall deficit in 2020 of -126 secondary and sixth form places, which increases to -141 with the High Road site included. This is a worst case scenario as a mixture of housing types and sizes is likely to reduce the overall deficit.

Main Modifications

MM1

The total increase from 1,120 to 1,170 is made to reflect 50 additional dwellings at the Thurmans Lane sites (FPP8). However, this does not include the applications for which there is a resolution to grant permission at High Road, Trimley St Martin.

MM4 - MM6

These changes are welcome and provide clarity to decision makers. This addresses the county council's above concerns over recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee.

MM20

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through a planning obligation rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

A further addition is necessary to reflect the need to reserve a 2.1ha site for the new school, pending the final location being secured. This was requested in the county council's response to planning application ref 16/2778/OUT and is in accordance with para. 3.44 of the AAP.

MM21

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through planning obligations for this and other sites rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

MM22

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through a planning obligation rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

A further addition is necessary to reflect the need to reserve a 2.1ha site for the new school, pending the final location being secured. This is in accordance with para. 3.44 of the AAP.

Additional Changes

AC13

The amendment to the area for the new primary school and early years settling is welcome and no further amendments are necessary. Whilst the required size of a 210 place school is likely to be sufficient for the resultant growth taking account of potential mixture of dwellings, a new school provides a significant and long-term piece of community infrastructure which is likely to need further expansion in the future. This likelihood is reinforced by the facts that: the housing numbers in the AAP are minimums, that Suffolk Coastal District Council needs to review its Core Strategy to reflect housing need and that, if the prevailing pattern of growth is followed, Felixstowe is likely to be a location for further residential development beyond that outlined in the current AAP.

The County Council's requirement, which is acknowledged in the AAP (para. 3.43), is for the reservation of land for a new primary school, which will include an early years setting. The required area to provide sufficient flexibility is based on being able to accommodate up to a 420 place school and a 60 place early years facility.

I trust that the above provides a suitable account of recent circumstances and provides you with an understanding of the County Council's position on the main modifications and additional changes.

Summary:

These changes are welcome and provide clarity to decision makers. This addresses the county council's above concerns over recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee.

Change to Plan

N/A

Note: The composite reference number in the box at the top of the page is made up of the following information: Object/Support - Representation Number - Respondent Number - Plan Reference - Soundness Tests (if applicable).

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8117 - 2442 - MM4 - None				
------------------------------	--	--	--	--

8117 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22) MM4

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	N/A

Attachments:
2016-11-28.FinalMainModificationsResponse.pdf

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8118 - 2442 - MM5 - None

8118 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM5

Respondent: Suffolk County Council (James Cutting) [2442]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan - Main Modifications

I write to confirm Suffolk County Council's position following consultation on the main modifications. Before turning to the main modifications, I consider that attention needs to be made to changes that have occurred since the hearing sessions at the beginning of September that are relevant to the County Council's interests with regard to the Main Modifications, this includes:

- recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee, and
- inquiry hearing sessions into the appeal at Candlet Road.

Recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee

On Friday 2 September 2016, I provided further evidence on the resultant needs for early years and primary school places in support of Suffolk Coastal District Council's Area Action Plan (AAP) for the Felixstowe Peninsula. I restated the long-held position of the County Council that a new primary school is needed to accommodate the likely growth in the number of primary-aged pupils and the needs for early years facilities, including which sites would be expected to provide on-site provision for early years.

During the session, I responded to questions and there was no disagreement from the District Council, landowners, developers or their agents to the approach, including on-site provision and the need for financial contributions to be secured through s106 agreements.

However, since the examination hearing sessions, minutes from the 29 June 2016 meeting of Suffolk Coastal's Planning Committee were released on 7 September 2016 providing its resolution for part of the Thurmans Lane site (FPP8). The County Council then received confirmation of same Committee's 5 September resolution for an application not included in the AAP (land at High Road, Trimley St Martin, application DC/16/1919/FUL).

These decisions resolved to grant permission without financial contributions towards a new early years setting or towards a new primary school, which has implications for the AAP and for future decisions. The case officer's report for 5 September Planning Committee for planning application DC/16/1919/FUL (for 69 dwellings at Land at High Road, Trimley St Martin) cited the lack of a specific site as a reason and suggested an alternative education strategy, for temporary accommodation being stationed at Trimley St Martin. These and other points were contested by the County Council in writing to the Committee.

The District Council's central point, but also related to the timescales of delivery, is that a site has not been identified. The County Council has the statutory duty to secure sufficient places and, in extreme cases, can compulsorily purchase land under section 530 of the Education Act 1996. The fact that a site has not been identified does not prevent contributions being secured because the contributions are necessary to mitigate the direct impact of development. In terms of timescales, new homes build before a new school is built will reduce available capacity, which should be considered in combination with the AAP.

A very similar situation arose during a recovered appeal in Buntingford, Hertfordshire (Appeal references: APP/J1915/A/14/2220854 & APP/J1915/A/14/2220859), which the Secretary of State determined in March 2016. In this case, East Hertfordshire District Council was seeking to use the absence of a school site to resist residential development. In recommending allowing the appeal, the Inspector concluded (in paragraph 26) on the relationship between a lack of a site and the use of planning obligations thus:

"The second sustainability objection relates to lack of education facilities (a new 2FE primary school). It flies in the face of the Education Authority's consultation response to the applications. Indeed, it is hard to see how such a facility will be provided without developer contributions. Moreover there is absolutely no evidence to show that the Education Authority will not deliver as and when necessary."

During the hearing sessions on the AAP I explained that, owing to the dispersed approach to housing growth, the most sustainable location for the new school depends on the actual rate and location of homes. I also explained that, in order to allocate a primary school site within the AAP, there would need to be considerable certainty that that particular site could be delivered and that it would be the most sustainable.

This issue of certainty was discussed with Suffolk Coastal's officers during the preparation of the AAP and, as I described during the hearing, a location between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary may be the most accessible. This is, however, dependent upon the resultant pattern of development being as set out in the AAP, the rate of development being as predicted and there being no changes in the number and distribution of pupils throughout the Peninsula. If any of these conditions is not as envisaged, the most appropriate site for a new primary school may be elsewhere in the Peninsula. Notwithstanding this point, the county council is already exploring the potential for sites between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary.

The County Council's preference for a site might change if other developments come forward (such as the 560 home proposed at Candlet Road which is subject to an appeal) and if development around Trimley St Mary and Trimley St

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8118 - 2442 - MM5 - None

8118 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM5

Martin does not progress. The County Council requires certainty, beyond the simple allocation of a site, about the site's availability and suitability to commit its own and others resources towards delivering a new primary school, which can cost at least £4.35m to build (without land costs being included).

Inquiry hearing sessions into the appeal at Candlet Road.

Between 27 - 30 September, Mr Clive Hughes held evidence sessions into the appeal by Christchurch Land & Estates against Suffolk Coastal District Council's refusal to grant planning permission for 560 dwellings and other development (including a 60-bed care home) on land adjacent to Candlet Road, Felixstowe (Appeal Ref: APP/J3530/W/15/3138710).

This appeal is relevant to the consideration of the AAP because, if allowed, the addition of the 560 dwellings will add around 45% more homes to those already permitted or allocated. This has implications for the provision of transport and education infrastructure needed to support the appeal site and the implementation of the AAP.

Transport

In terms of transport considerations, the AECOM report - "Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan (AAP) Cumulative Impact Assessment" - did include the Candlet Road proposal in the assessment (AECOM, paras 1.3.8 and 2.5.2). AECOM highlighted several measures, particularly at the Candlet Road/Grove Road and Garrison Lane roundabout that could be implemented to mitigate traffic impact on junctions. This includes realignment and removing the hatched area (AECOM, para. 5.2.3), which was installed to reduce traffic speed entering the roundabout.

The minor change reversing the hatching changes on Candlet Road / Garrison Road roundabout can be implemented once the 40 mph Traffic Regulation Order along Candlet Road has been formally agreed. The s.278 works associated with the Candlet Road Development could be used to deliver this work.

Education

The situation for education infrastructure is similar. During the inquiry, the appellant agreed to the county council's requirements which took account of the emerging AAP. The county council secured contributions towards land and build costs for early years and primary education and the reservation of land for both types of facility was secured on site.

In contrast to the two decisions above, during the inquiry Suffolk Coastal District Council formally accepted and endorsed the need for appropriate and proportionate contributions towards the new primary school. The district council did, however, raise a concern over the suitability of this location for the school.

Notwithstanding the reservation on the Candlet Road site, and as noted above, the county council is already exploring the potential for sites between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary because the Candlet Road site might not present an optimum solution for the Felixstowe Peninsula as a whole. However, there remains a residual risk that a better site may not be available and that, owing to phasing and the actual demand generated if the Candlet Road site is delivered, this location may be preferred.

The relationship between the Candlet Road and High Road developments is shown in the table below. The total pupil yields are based on houses with 2 or more bedrooms, the calculation for pupil yields does vary for the size and type of dwelling permitted. This table shows the constraint in the availability of places within primary schools throughout Felixstowe but particularly at Kingsfleet, Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary Primary Schools.

If the Candlet Road appeal is dismissed, the total deficit will be reduced by 140 places to -125. This highlights the complexity in considering the most appropriate location for a primary school within the Peninsula.

Based on the catchment areas covering the Candlet Road site, the county council assumed that 45 pupils would attend Maidstone Infants, 60 at Causton Junior and 35 Kingsfleet. Contributions towards the land and build costs have been agreed based on the lack of capacity at Kingsfleet. This has impacted on the consideration of the available capacity at FPP4 (Land North of High Street, Walton), which would then become available if the appeal is dismissed.

Table 1. Capacity, Forecast Pupil Rolls and Pupil Yields from developments in the Felixstowe Peninsula.

[SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT]

The AAP highlights the requirement for a new primary school to be one form entry (210 places). The above figures do not take into account the final mixture of housing sizes and types. The indicative size mix set out in table 3.6 in the Core Strategy does provide a general rule. If this were to be followed (with assumptions on flats and houses (The assumed flats/houses splits being a 50/50 one bed, 30/70 two bed and 5/95 three bed and 0/100 four bed.)) the resultant deficit of primary school places is likely to be below 200.

The Candlet Road appeal also affects the consideration of the availability of secondary school places. However, financial contributions to increasing the available capacity can only be secured through the Community Infrastructure

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8118 - 2442 - MM5 - None

8118 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM5

Levy. If the Secretary of State allows the appeal and grants planning permission, there will be an overall deficit in 2020 of -126 secondary and sixth form places, which increases to -141 with the High Road site included. This is a worst case scenario as a mixture of housing types and sizes is likely to reduce the overall deficit.

Main Modifications

MM1

The total increase from 1,120 to 1,170 is made to reflect 50 additional dwellings at the Thurmans Lane sites (FPP8). However, this does not include the applications for which there is a resolution to grant permission at High Road, Trimley St Martin.

MM4 - MM6

These changes are welcome and provide clarity to decision makers. This addresses the county council's above concerns over recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee.

MM20

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through a planning obligation rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

A further addition is necessary to reflect the need to reserve a 2.1ha site for the new school, pending the final location being secured. This was requested in the county council's response to planning application ref 16/2778/OUT and is in accordance with para. 3.44 of the AAP.

MM21

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through planning obligations for this and other sites rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

MM22

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through a planning obligation rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

A further addition is necessary to reflect the need to reserve a 2.1ha site for the new school, pending the final location being secured. This is in accordance with para. 3.44 of the AAP.

Additional Changes

AC13

The amendment to the area for the new primary school and early years settling is welcome and no further amendments are necessary. Whilst the required size of a 210 place school is likely to be sufficient for the resultant growth taking account of potential mixture of dwellings, a new school provides a significant and long-term piece of community infrastructure which is likely to need further expansion in the future. This likelihood is reinforced by the facts that: the housing numbers in the AAP are minimums, that Suffolk Coastal District Council needs to review its Core Strategy to reflect housing need and that, if the prevailing pattern of growth is followed, Felixstowe is likely to be a location for further residential development beyond that outlined in the current AAP.

The County Council's requirement, which is acknowledged in the AAP (para. 3.43), is for the reservation of land for a new primary school, which will include an early years setting. The required area to provide sufficient flexibility is based on being able to accommodate up to a 420 place school and a 60 place early years facility.

I trust that the above provides a suitable account of recent circumstances and provides you with an understanding of the County Council's position on the main modifications and additional changes.

Summary:

These changes are welcome and provide clarity to decision makers. This addresses the county council's above concerns over recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee.

Change to Plan

N/A

Note: The composite reference number in the box at the top of the page is made up of the following information: Object/Support - Representation Number - Respondent Number - Plan Reference - Soundness Tests (if applicable).

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8118 - 2442 - MM5 - None				
------------------------------	--	--	--	--

8118 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22) MM5

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	N/A

Attachments:
2016-11-28.FinalMainModificationsResponse.pdf

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8084 - 3785 - MM6 - None

8084 Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM6

Respondent: Stephen Wyatt [3785]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: I wish to make the following comments on the changes and modifications.

Boundaries

2.20 I am not happy with the change from "restricted" to "limited". I would like the wording to strengthen the force of physical boundaries. The suggested change weakens it.

Affordable Housing

2.27 b) I oppose the suggestion that cash tariffs are acceptable. We need properly affordable housing and it is more important to increase the stock than to gather cash payments which may be used for other purposes

The change of wording to evidence of need is weaker and less clear than the original reference to "informed by appropriate local housing needs survey" I would like the original wording to be retained.

I am also concerned that the plan does not seem to address issues in the rented sector or the need for social housing.

Other comments (not sure of which paragraph)

School

The Plan expects developers to provide a new school in large developments but does not require identification of where such a school should be located. The Plan should identify site(s) and costs

Sewage outlet (pp30 and 51?)

References to foul sewage outlets have now omitted the need in some cases to improve capacity and replaced it with a simple requirement for Anglian Water to confirm that capacity is adequate. I oppose this change. Need for improvement should be independently identified.

Core Strategy

There is a change in wording to say that the Area local plan is at a lower level than the core strategy rather than co-existent with it (the original wording). The change devalues the importance of local consultation and views and therefore I would like the original wording restored

Summary:

School

The Plan expects developers to provide a new school in large developments but does not require identification of where such a school should be located. The Plan should identify site(s) and costs

Change to Plan

Appear at exam?

Not Specified

Legal?

Not Specified

Sound?

Not Specified

Duty to Cooperate?

Not Specified

Soundness Tests

None

Attachments:

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8119 - 2442 - MM6 - None

8119 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM6

Respondent: Suffolk County Council (James Cutting) [2442]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan - Main Modifications

I write to confirm Suffolk County Council's position following consultation on the main modifications. Before turning to the main modifications, I consider that attention needs to be made to changes that have occurred since the hearing sessions at the beginning of September that are relevant to the County Council's interests with regard to the Main Modifications, this includes:

- recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee, and
- inquiry hearing sessions into the appeal at Candlet Road.

Recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee

On Friday 2 September 2016, I provided further evidence on the resultant needs for early years and primary school places in support of Suffolk Coastal District Council's Area Action Plan (AAP) for the Felixstowe Peninsula. I restated the long-held position of the County Council that a new primary school is needed to accommodate the likely growth in the number of primary-aged pupils and the needs for early years facilities, including which sites would be expected to provide on-site provision for early years.

During the session, I responded to questions and there was no disagreement from the District Council, landowners, developers or their agents to the approach, including on-site provision and the need for financial contributions to be secured through s106 agreements.

However, since the examination hearing sessions, minutes from the 29 June 2016 meeting of Suffolk Coastal's Planning Committee were released on 7 September 2016 providing its resolution for part of the Thurmans Lane site (FPP8). The County Council then received confirmation of same Committee's 5 September resolution for an application not included in the AAP (land at High Road, Trimley St Martin, application DC/16/1919/FUL).

These decisions resolved to grant permission without financial contributions towards a new early years setting or towards a new primary school, which has implications for the AAP and for future decisions. The case officer's report for 5 September Planning Committee for planning application DC/16/1919/FUL (for 69 dwellings at Land at High Road, Trimley St Martin) cited the lack of a specific site as a reason and suggested an alternative education strategy, for temporary accommodation being stationed at Trimley St Martin. These and other points were contested by the County Council in writing to the Committee.

The District Council's central point, but also related to the timescales of delivery, is that a site has not been identified. The County Council has the statutory duty to secure sufficient places and, in extreme cases, can compulsorily purchase land under section 530 of the Education Act 1996. The fact that a site has not been identified does not prevent contributions being secured because the contributions are necessary to mitigate the direct impact of development. In terms of timescales, new homes build before a new school is built will reduce available capacity, which should be considered in combination with the AAP.

A very similar situation arose during a recovered appeal in Buntingford, Hertfordshire (Appeal references: APP/J1915/A/14/2220854 & APP/J1915/A/14/2220859), which the Secretary of State determined in March 2016. In this case, East Hertfordshire District Council was seeking to use the absence of a school site to resist residential development. In recommending allowing the appeal, the Inspector concluded (in paragraph 26) on the relationship between a lack of a site and the use of planning obligations thus:

"The second sustainability objection relates to lack of education facilities (a new 2FE primary school). It flies in the face of the Education Authority's consultation response to the applications. Indeed, it is hard to see how such a facility will be provided without developer contributions. Moreover there is absolutely no evidence to show that the Education Authority will not deliver as and when necessary."

During the hearing sessions on the AAP I explained that, owing to the dispersed approach to housing growth, the most sustainable location for the new school depends on the actual rate and location of homes. I also explained that, in order to allocate a primary school site within the AAP, there would need to be considerable certainty that that particular site could be delivered and that it would be the most sustainable.

This issue of certainty was discussed with Suffolk Coastal's officers during the preparation of the AAP and, as I described during the hearing, a location between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary may be the most accessible. This is, however, dependent upon the resultant pattern of development being as set out in the AAP, the rate of development being as predicted and there being no changes in the number and distribution of pupils throughout the Peninsula. If any of these conditions is not as envisaged, the most appropriate site for a new primary school may be elsewhere in the Peninsula. Notwithstanding this point, the county council is already exploring the potential for sites between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary.

The County Council's preference for a site might change if other developments come forward (such as the 560 home proposed at Candlet Road which is subject to an appeal) and if development around Trimley St Mary and Trimley St

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8119 - 2442 - MM6 - None

8119 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM6

Martin does not progress. The County Council requires certainty, beyond the simple allocation of a site, about the site's availability and suitability to commit its own and others resources towards delivering a new primary school, which can cost at least £4.35m to build (without land costs being included).

Inquiry hearing sessions into the appeal at Candlet Road.

Between 27 - 30 September, Mr Clive Hughes held evidence sessions into the appeal by Christchurch Land & Estates against Suffolk Coastal District Council's refusal to grant planning permission for 560 dwellings and other development (including a 60-bed care home) on land adjacent to Candlet Road, Felixstowe (Appeal Ref: APP/J3530/W/15/3138710).

This appeal is relevant to the consideration of the AAP because, if allowed, the addition of the 560 dwellings will add around 45% more homes to those already permitted or allocated. This has implications for the provision of transport and education infrastructure needed to support the appeal site and the implementation of the AAP.

Transport

In terms of transport considerations, the AECOM report - "Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan (AAP) Cumulative Impact Assessment" - did include the Candlet Road proposal in the assessment (AECOM, paras 1.3.8 and 2.5.2). AECOM highlighted several measures, particularly at the Candlet Road/Grove Road and Garrison Lane roundabout that could be implemented to mitigate traffic impact on junctions. This includes realignment and removing the hatched area (AECOM, para. 5.2.3), which was installed to reduce traffic speed entering the roundabout.

The minor change reversing the hatching changes on Candlet Road / Garrison Road roundabout can be implemented once the 40 mph Traffic Regulation Order along Candlet Road has been formally agreed. The s.278 works associated with the Candlet Road Development could be used to deliver this work.

Education

The situation for education infrastructure is similar. During the inquiry, the appellant agreed to the county council's requirements which took account of the emerging AAP. The county council secured contributions towards land and build costs for early years and primary education and the reservation of land for both types of facility was secured on site.

In contrast to the two decisions above, during the inquiry Suffolk Coastal District Council formally accepted and endorsed the need for appropriate and proportionate contributions towards the new primary school. The district council did, however, raise a concern over the suitability of this location for the school.

Notwithstanding the reservation on the Candlet Road site, and as noted above, the county council is already exploring the potential for sites between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary because the Candlet Road site might not present an optimum solution for the Felixstowe Peninsula as a whole. However, there remains a residual risk that a better site may not be available and that, owing to phasing and the actual demand generated if the Candlet Road site is delivered, this location may be preferred.

The relationship between the Candlet Road and High Road developments is shown in the table below. The total pupil yields are based on houses with 2 or more bedrooms, the calculation for pupil yields does vary for the size and type of dwelling permitted. This table shows the constraint in the availability of places within primary schools throughout Felixstowe but particularly at Kingsfleet, Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary Primary Schools.

If the Candlet Road appeal is dismissed, the total deficit will be reduced by 140 places to -125. This highlights the complexity in considering the most appropriate location for a primary school within the Peninsula.

Based on the catchment areas covering the Candlet Road site, the county council assumed that 45 pupils would attend Maidstone Infants, 60 at Causton Junior and 35 Kingsfleet. Contributions towards the land and build costs have been agreed based on the lack of capacity at Kingsfleet. This has impacted on the consideration of the available capacity at FPP4 (Land North of High Street, Walton), which would then become available if the appeal is dismissed.

Table 1. Capacity, Forecast Pupil Rolls and Pupil Yields from developments in the Felixstowe Peninsula.

[SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT]

The AAP highlights the requirement for a new primary school to be one form entry (210 places). The above figures do not take into account the final mixture of housing sizes and types. The indicative size mix set out in table 3.6 in the Core Strategy does provide a general rule. If this were to be followed (with assumptions on flats and houses (The assumed flats/houses splits being a 50/50 one bed, 30/70 two bed and 5/95 three bed and 0/100 four bed.)) the resultant deficit of primary school places is likely to be below 200.

The Candlet Road appeal also affects the consideration of the availability of secondary school places. However, financial contributions to increasing the available capacity can only be secured through the Community Infrastructure

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8119 - 2442 - MM6 - None

8119 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM6

Levy. If the Secretary of State allows the appeal and grants planning permission, there will be an overall deficit in 2020 of -126 secondary and sixth form places, which increases to -141 with the High Road site included. This is a worst case scenario as a mixture of housing types and sizes is likely to reduce the overall deficit.

Main Modifications

MM1

The total increase from 1,120 to 1,170 is made to reflect 50 additional dwellings at the Thurmans Lane sites (FPP8). However, this does not include the applications for which there is a resolution to grant permission at High Road, Trimley St Martin.

MM4 - MM6

These changes are welcome and provide clarity to decision makers. This addresses the county council's above concerns over recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee.

MM20

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through a planning obligation rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

A further addition is necessary to reflect the need to reserve a 2.1ha site for the new school, pending the final location being secured. This was requested in the county council's response to planning application ref 16/2778/OUT and is in accordance with para. 3.44 of the AAP.

MM21

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through planning obligations for this and other sites rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

MM22

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through a planning obligation rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

A further addition is necessary to reflect the need to reserve a 2.1ha site for the new school, pending the final location being secured. This is in accordance with para. 3.44 of the AAP.

Additional Changes

AC13

The amendment to the area for the new primary school and early years settling is welcome and no further amendments are necessary. Whilst the required size of a 210 place school is likely to be sufficient for the resultant growth taking account of potential mixture of dwellings, a new school provides a significant and long-term piece of community infrastructure which is likely to need further expansion in the future. This likelihood is reinforced by the facts that: the housing numbers in the AAP are minimums, that Suffolk Coastal District Council needs to review its Core Strategy to reflect housing need and that, if the prevailing pattern of growth is followed, Felixstowe is likely to be a location for further residential development beyond that outlined in the current AAP.

The County Council's requirement, which is acknowledged in the AAP (para. 3.43), is for the reservation of land for a new primary school, which will include an early years setting. The required area to provide sufficient flexibility is based on being able to accommodate up to a 420 place school and a 60 place early years facility.

I trust that the above provides a suitable account of recent circumstances and provides you with an understanding of the County Council's position on the main modifications and additional changes.

Summary:

These changes are welcome and provide clarity to decision makers. This addresses the county council's above concerns over recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee.

Change to Plan

N/A

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8119 - 2442 - MM6 - None				
------------------------------	--	--	--	--

8119 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22) MM6

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	N/A

Attachments:
2016-11-28.FinalMainModificationsResponse.pdf

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8085 - 3785 - MM7 - None

8085 Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM7

Respondent: Stephen Wyatt [3785]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: I wish to make the following comments on the changes and modifications.

Boundaries

2.20 I am not happy with the change from "restricted" to "limited". I would like the wording to strengthen the force of physical boundaries. The suggested change weakens it.

Affordable Housing

2.27 b) I oppose the suggestion that cash tariffs are acceptable. We need properly affordable housing and it is more important to increase the stock than to gather cash payments which may be used for other purposes

The change of wording to evidence of need is weaker and less clear than the original reference to "informed by appropriate local housing needs survey" I would like the original wording to be retained.

I am also concerned that the plan does not seem to address issues in the rented sector or the need for social housing.

Other comments (not sure of which paragraph)

School

The Plan expects developers to provide a new school in large developments but does not require identification of where such a school should be located. The Plan should identify site(s) and costs

Sewage outlet (pp30 and 51?)

References to foul sewage outlets have now omitted the need in some cases to improve capacity and replaced it with a simple requirement for Anglian Water to confirm that capacity is adequate. I oppose this change. Need for improvement should be independently identified.

Core Strategy

There is a change in wording to say that the Area local plan is at a lower level than the core strategy rather than co-existent with it (the original wording). The change devalues the importance of local consultation and views and therefore I would like the original wording restored

Summary:

Sewage outlet (pp30 and 51?)

References to foul sewage outlets have now omitted the need in some cases to improve capacity and replaced it with a simple requirement for Anglian Water to confirm that capacity is adequate. I oppose this change. Need for improvement should be independently identified.

Change to Plan

Appear at exam?

Legal?

Sound?

Duty to Cooperate?

Soundness Tests

Not Specified

Not Specified

Not Specified

Not Specified

None

Attachments:

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8092 - 4562 - MM8 - None

8092ObjectMain Modifications (MM1 to MM22)MM8

Respondent: Brenda Shelley [4562]Agent: N/A

Full Text:Dear Sir/Madam - I am very concerned about the lack of affordable housing in the Area Action Plan for Felixstowe. I am further concerned about the water supply and sewage system being adequate for the numbers of new houses planned for several areas in Felixstowe.

Summary:I strongly suggest that these two areas are given further consideration before any developments happen.
Dear Sir/Madam - I am very concerned about the lack of affordable housing in the Area Action Plan for Felixstowe. I am further concerned about the water supply and sewage system being adequate for the numbers of new houses planned for several areas in Felixstowe.
I strongly suggest that these two areas are given further consideration before any developments happen.

Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	None

Attachments:

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8047 - 3060 - MM9 - None

8047Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)MM9

Respondent: Felixstowe Town Council (Mr Ash Tadjirishi) [3060] Agent: N/A

Full Text: Please note that Felixstowe Town Council's Planning & Environment Committee considered that the Main Modifications and Additional Changes to the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan would satisfactorily address matters of soundness and legal compliance.

However, concerns were raised about modifications to FPP4 as detailed under Main Modification FPAAP-MM9. This proposes to remove the need for "any alternative venue for the Rifle Club to be equivalent (or greater) in terms of...accessibility in comparison to the existing facility". Committee understood that the Rifle Club facility is well-used by members of the East Suffolk Association for the Blind and the accessibility of any new venue would be critical to this community. As such, Committee did not agree that this requirement should be removed from policy FPP4.

Please confirm receipt of this as our submission to the Proposed Main Modifications and Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment Consultation.

Summary: Concerns were raised about modifications to FPP4 as detailed under Main Modification FPAAP-MM9. This proposes to remove the need for "any alternative venue for the Rifle Club to be equivalent (or greater) in terms of...accessibility in comparison to the existing facility". Committee understood that the Rifle Club facility is well-used by members of the East Suffolk Association for the Blind and the accessibility of any new venue would be critical to this community. As such, Committee did not agree that this requirement should be removed from policy FPP4.

Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	None

Attachments:

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8061 - 3880 - MM9 - i, ii

8061 Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM9

Respondent: East Suffolk Association for the Blind (Mr Mike Deacon) [3880]

Agent: N/A

Full Text:

FPP4 Bullet point 1

I write in my capacity as Chairperson of the East Suffolk Association for the Blind (Felixstowe). My committee was very concerned that it is proposed to remove the "and accessibility" statement from the Master Plan. It is very important to those of our members using the Blind Shooters facility at the club that they should be able to travel independently if they so wish using public transport. The existing club is on an excellent 'bus route which provides a very regular service. There is also a pedestrian crossing in close proximity to the club. Therefore any replacement facility should be equally well served. For these reasons the Association did not agree that the wording "and accessibility" should be removed from policy FPP4.

Summary:

It is very important to those of our members using the Blind Shooters facility at the club that they should be able to travel independently if they so wish using public transport. The existing club is on an excellent 'bus route which provides a very regular service. There is also a pedestrian crossing in close proximity to the club. Therefore any replacement facility should be equally well served. For these reasons the Association did not agree that the wording "and accessibility" should be removed from policy FPP4.

Change to Plan

Appear at exam?

Not Specified

Legal?

Not Specified

Sound?

No

Duty to Cooperate?

Not Specified

Soundness Tests

i, ii

Attachments:

East Suffolk Association for the Blind.pdf

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8081 - 3892 - MM9 - None

8081Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)MM9

Respondent: Margaret Morris [3892]

Agent: N/A

Full Text:

I wish to comment on the Felixstowe Area Action Plan. Your form seems designed to put people off commenting.

Points:

With the considerable new build already being planned for the Trimleys, I consider the High Road will not be able to cope with the amount of traffic that will be generated.

Page 24 - 3.28: Outside the physical limits, opportunities for new housing - my concern is the impact on the SSSI, RAMSAR. These are internationally important sites and should be dealt with accordingly.

Page 26 - para 3.35 We need to build more affordable housing, as well as more social housing Developers should not be allowed by SCDC to get out of the amount they should be providing.

I am firmly against the Tory Government's Policy of selling Social Housing to existing tenants. We need more social housing in Felixstowe, not less.

The report Hidden Needs from the Suffolk Community Foundation indicates clearly the need in Felixstowe and the Trimleys for social housing.

I note that SCC wants the developer to build any new schools that are needed.

Anglian Water must be MADE to sort out the foul sewage, to prevent Walton High Road being continuously dug up.

Rifle Club - the road surface needs to be smooth to enable people with visual impairments to use it safely. Our Rifle club is of national importance.

There is no reference to the increasing number of second homes being bought within Suffolk Coastal.

Summary:

Anglian Water must be MADE to sort out the foul sewage, to prevent Walton High Road being continuously dug up.

Rifle Club - the road surface needs to be smooth to enable people with visual impairments to use it safely. Our Rifle club is of national importance.

Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	None

Attachments:

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8088 - 348 - MM9 - ii

8088 Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM9

Respondent: Trinity College Cambridge [348]

Agent: Bidwells (Sam Metson) [1328]

Full Text: Q4. Please provide details as to why you consider the Local Plan document with the Proposed Main Modification / Additional Change is not sound and/or why it has not been prepared in accordance with legal and procedural requirements?

Relocation of existing Rifle Range

Trinity College Cambridge fully supports the amendments made to draft policy FPP4 relating to the location of a replacement rifle range facility.

The amendments will ensure that there is no threat to the deliverability of the replacement rifle range facilities already granted planning permission by the Council on land that it owns to the north of the railway line off Nicholas Road, Trimley St Mary. As the Inspector is aware, the College has been actively working with the committee of Felixstowe Rifle Club, the tenant at the existing rifle range at the High Street, Walton site, to progress proposals for this site. Outline planning permission with all matters reserved except access was granted for a new rifle range off Nicholas Road in 2014 (ref: C/13/0967) and a reserved matters application is currently pending consideration by the District Council (ref: DC/16/3199/ARM). Both of these applications have been submitted jointly by the College and the Rifle Club. The replacement facilities will be at least equivalent in terms of quantity and quality as the existing range and are likely to be a significant enhancement in comparison.

The changes will also ensure that draft policy FPP4 is consistent with national and higher order local planning policy on the replacement of sporting facilities displaced by development and is therefore sound. Neither the NPPF (para 74) or the Council's adopted Core Strategy (policy DM32) unduly constrain proposals by requiring replacement sporting facilities to be equally as accessible as those they replace.

Instead they merely emphasise that the location of a replacement facility should be suitable and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The Council has already determined that the Nicholas Road site meets both of these criteria by granting outline planning permission. The following extracts from the Officer's Report to Committee for the outline application confirm why the new location was deemed to be suitable:

"The...site is on land owned by the College and therefore they are able to fulfil their objective to assist the club relocate and offer all necessary assistance, including negotiating a suitable rent. This would not be possible if the land was outside of the College's control. Furthermore, the selected site is close to the existing site, accessible, and maintains sufficient distance from established residential properties so as to limit any harm to amenity. At early discussions it was suggested by the Local Planning Authority that access would be preferable off Nicholas Road so as to avoid additional traffic on Cordys Lane, which may give rise to concerns. This has been achieved and the proposed route from Nicholas Road seeks to divert cars away from residential properties."

"The application will secure the long term future of a valuable sporting facility which serves not only the immediate area but also regionally and nationally. Its future is comprised by the fate of land where they are currently located and significant dialogue between the club and Trinity College has taken place to secure an appropriate, and improved, facility in an appropriate location that meets all their requirements."

The proposed amendments to draft policy FPP4 will ensure there is no conflict with this decision and they are welcomed by the College.

Timing of rifle range re-provision

The College also fully supports the amendments to FPP4 requiring the new facility to be provided "ahead of the use of the existing facility ceasing, to allow for redevelopment". This will ensure that the activities of the Club can continue whilst housing is constructed on other parts of the site and will avoid any delay to the delivery of the proposed allocation.

Provision of early years education setting

Whilst the College fully accepts the need to provide infrastructure to support new development, including additional education provision where it is necessary, specific requirements should be confirmed in consultation with the Education Authority at the time planning applications are submitted and determined, based on up-to-date evidence of need, rather than stipulated rigidly in the Local Plan. Whilst the College understands the objective of seeking to provide certainty to prospective purchasers of the allocated land, it objects to the inclusion of the requirement to provide an on-site early years setting as an extra bullet point in draft policy FPP4 without the qualification that it should be confirmed at the planning application stage. Such an approach is unduly rigid, unjustified and unsound without qualification in this regard. We would therefore request the following amendment to the final bullet of draft policy FPP4 (as amended by MM9):

Provision of on-site early years setting (subject to confirmation at the planning application stage based on latest evidence).

Summary: Whilst the College fully accepts the need to provide infrastructure to support new development, including additional

Note: The composite reference number in the box at the top of the page is made up of the following information: Object/Support - Representation Number - Respondent Number - Plan Reference - Soundness Tests (if applicable).

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

8088	Object				
Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)		MM9			
	<p>education provision where it is necessary, specific requirements should be confirmed in consultation with the Education Authority at the time planning applications are submitted and determined, based on up-to-date evidence of need, rather than stipulated rigidly in the Local Plan. Whilst the College understands the objective of seeking to provide certainty to prospective purchasers of the allocated land, it objects to the inclusion of the requirement to provide an on-site early years setting as an extra bullet point in draft policy FPP4 without the qualification that it should be confirmed at the planning application stage. Such an approach is unduly rigid, unjustified and unsound without qualification in this regard.</p>				
Change to Plan	<p>We would therefore request the following amendment to the final bullet of draft policy FPP4 (as amended by MM9):</p> <div><input type="checkbox"/></div> <p>Provision of on-site early years setting (subject to confirmation at the planning application stage based on latest evidence).</p> <p>We would request that similar amendment is made to paragraph 3.40 to reflect this approach and ensure consistency.</p>				
Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests	
Not Specified	Yes	No	Not Specified	ii	
Attachments:					
Main Mods Representation Form - Walton North_Redacted.pdf					

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8106 - 3950 - MM9 - None

8106 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM9

Respondent: Felixstowe Rifle Club (R S Waldron) [3950]

Agent: N/A

Full Text:

(1) Felixstowe Rifle Club (FRC) accept that the current accessibility of their range is exceptional being adjacent to a bus service giving excellent accessibility to all, in particular to people who have a visual impairment (we have a strong involvement with audio shooting) or have a physical disability and no personal transport other than a wheel-chair. To get a replacement site with equal accessibility is not practical locally, bearing in mind that pressure from future development on any chosen site could effect that site; the proposed new site is probably in the optimum location. However the accessibility for anybody without transport, particularly Visually-Impaired, or Wheel-chair users, would be untenable due to the need to cross the main access road to Felixstowe docks and then to cross with no pedestrian crossing another road within the dock complex.

To overcome this very real problem, it will be necessary to set up a system where these members can be transported to the club from the nearest public transport. We feel this should not become the sole responsibility of FRC but be built into the whole arrangement for relocating the club as part of the legal requirement for accessibility.

(2) FRC accepted that the requirement to fully relocate them before any work started on the current site as a whole was difficult for Trinity College. However FRC feels that the relocation should not be unduly delayed and should be carried out during an early stage of the redevelopment of the current site. FRC has a strong involvement in the training of potential pistol shooters in the Paralympic games and the National Coach would like to base this training at FRC. On the current site, this would require some structural work, which is not practical due to the short time they will be on the current site, which we have occupied for over 60 years (current lease expires 2019). Thus an Indeterminate delay is untenable and FRC's Relocation should be a priority in planning the time schedule for the development of the current site and this should be at an early stage in the overall development.

Summary:

Felixstowe Rifle Club accept that the current accessibility of their range is exceptional giving excellent accessibility to all, in particular to people who have a visual impairment. Bearing in mind pressure from future development on any chosen site could effect that site; the proposed new site is probably in the optimum location. FRC accepted that the requirement to fully relocate them before any work started on the site was difficult for Trinity College. However FRC feels that the relocation should not be unduly delayed and should be carried out during an early stage of the redevelopment of the current site.

Change to Plan

N/A

Appear at exam?

Not Specified

Legal?

Not Specified

Sound?

Not Specified

Duty to Cooperate?

Not Specified

Soundness Tests

N/A

Attachments:

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8054 - 747 - MM10 - None

8054 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM10

Respondent: National Grid [747]

Agent: Amec Foster Wheeler (Mr Robert Deanwood) [4184]

Full Text: Suffolk Coastal District Council: Felixstowe Area Action Plan Consultation
SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL GRID

National Grid has appointed Amec Foster Wheeler to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regard to the current consultation on the above document.

National Grid owns and operates the high voltage electricity transmission system in England and Wales and operates the Scottish high voltage transmission system. National Grid also owns and operates the gas transmission system. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the distribution networks at high pressure. It is then transported through a number of reducing pressure tiers until it is finally delivered to our customers. National Grid own four of the UK's gas distribution networks and transport gas to 11 million homes, schools and businesses through 81,000 miles of gas pipelines within North West, East of England, West Midlands and North London.

To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets.

National Grid infrastructure within Suffolk Coastal District Council

Electricity Transmission

National Grid has two high voltage overhead lines (listed below) within Suffolk Coastal District Council's administrative area. These form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales.

Line Ref. Description

4ZX Route 400kV two circuit route from Sizewell substation in Suffolk Coastal to Bramford substation in Mid Suffolk.

4ZW Route 400kV two circuit route from Sizewell substation in Suffolk Coastal to Bramford substation in Mid Suffolk

National Grid has provided information in relation to electricity transmission assets via the following internet link:
<http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/>

Gas Distribution

National Grid has a high number of gas distribution apparatus within the administrative area of Suffolk Coastal District Council.

This includes:

- * Low Pressure (LP) and Medium Pressure (MP) (below 2 bar) Gas Pipes and associated equipment
- * Six High Pressure (HP) (above 2 bar) and two Intermediate Pressure Gas Pipelines and associated equipment as listed below:

Pipe Pressure Description

HP 1680 Wissett Lodge - Saxmundham
HP 2752 Martlesham - Harleston Pipeline
HP 1682 Bredfield - Bramford
HP 1691great Bealings - Trimley
IP 1437z Kesgrave 7 Bar
HP 1690 Great Bealings - Playford Road
IP 9770b Playford Road Prs To Rushmere
HP 1692 Martlesham - Trimley

The first point of contact for all works within the vicinity of gas distribution assets is Plant Protection (plantprotection@nationalgrid.com).

Please note that Gas pipeline diversions may take up to three years, please bear this in mind when engaging with National Grid.

National Grid may have a Deed of Grant Easement for each asset which prevents the erection of permanent/temporary buildings, or structures, changes to existing ground levels, storage of materials etc. Additionally written permission will be required before any works commence within the National Grid easement strip, and a deed of consent is required for any crossing of the easement. In the first instance please consider checking with the Land Registry for the development area. If further information is required in relation to an easement please contact Spencer Jefferies, Development Liaison Officer, box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com

Electricity Distribution

Uk Power Networks owns and operates the local electricity distribution network in Suffolk Coastal District Council.

Note: The composite reference number in the box at the top of the page is made up of the following information: Object/Support - Representation Number - Respondent Number - Plan Reference - Soundness Tests (if applicable).

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8054 - 747 - MM10 - None

8054 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM10

Contact details can be found at www.energynetworks.org.uk

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Gas Distribution

The following sites have been identified as being crossed by or within close proximity to IP/ HP apparatus:

- * FPP4 - Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe
- * FPP12 - Land at Haven Exchange, Felixstowe

National Grid Gas Distribution would like to take this opportunity to advise prospective land developers and the local authority of the following:

Crossing of assets: Construction traffic should only cross the pipeline at locations agreed with National Grid. To facilitate these crossings protection or diversion may be required; depending on site condition and pipe parameters.

Cable Crossings: For all assets, the contractor / developer will need to consider the clearance and necessary protection measures. The crossing must be perpendicular to the asset. The crossing may require a deed of consent to be agreed prior to work commencing.

Piling: No piling should take place within 15m of gas distribution assets without prior agreement from a National Grid Representative.

Pipeline Safety: National Grid will need to ensure that access to the pipelines is maintained during and after construction.

Our HP/IP pipelines are normally buried to a depth cover of 1.1 metres, however; actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation to be monitored by a National Grid representative. Ground cover above gas distribution mains should not be reduced or increased. Our MP/LP mains will not be as deep as the pipelines.

A National Grid representative may be required to monitor any excavations or any embankment or dredging works within 3 metres of a HP/IP pipeline or within 10 metres of an Above Ground Installations (AGI). Monitoring of works in relation to MP/LP assets may be required by a National Grid representative.

National Grid steel pipelines are cathodically protected to prevent corrosion to the pipeline. For further information please refer to SSW/22 (see further advice section below).

If you require any further information in relation to the above please contact National Grid's Plant Protection team via the email address at the top of this letter.

Appendices - National Grid Assets

Please find attached in:

- * Appendix 1 provides maps of the sites referenced above in relation to the affected National Grid Gas Distribution (Intermediate Pressure /High Pressure) assets outlined above.

Further Advice

National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning our networks. If we can be of any assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during your policy development, please do not hesitate to contact us. In addition the following publications are available from the National Grid website or by contacting us at the address overleaf:

- * National Grid's commitments when undertaking works in the UK - our stakeholder, community and amenity policy;
 - * Specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of National Grid High Pressure Gas Pipelines and Associated Installations - Requirements for Third Parties; and
 - * A sense of place - design guidelines for development near high voltage overhead lines.
 - * T/SP/SSW22 - Specification for safe working in the vicinity of National Grid high pressure gas pipelines and associated installations - requirements for third parties.
- <http://www2.nationalgrid.com/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=33968>
- * IGE/SR/18 - Safe working practices to ensure the integrity of gas pipelines and associated installations.
 - * HS(G)47 - Avoiding Danger from Underground Services.

Please remember to consult National Grid on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database:

Robert Deanwood
Consultant Town Planner

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8054 - 747 - MM10 - None

8054 Support
Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22) MM10

n.grid@amecfw.com

Amec Foster Wheeler E&I UK
Gables House
Kenilworth Road
Leamington Spa
Warwickshire
CV32 6JX

Spencer Jefferies
Development Liaison Officer, National Grid

box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com

National Grid House
Warwick Technology Park
Gallows Hill
Warwick
CV34 6DA

I hope the above information is useful. If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully
[via email]
Robert Deanwood
Consultant Town Planner
cc. Spencer Jefferies, National Grid

Summary: The following sites have been identified as being crossed by or within close proximity to IP/ HP apparatus:
☐
FPP4 - Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe

Our HP/IP pipelines are normally buried to a depth cover of 1.1 metres, however; actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation to be monitored by a National Grid representative. Ground cover above gas distribution mains should not be reduced or increased. Our MP/LP mains will not be as deep as the pipelines. If you require any further information please contact National Grid's Plant Protection team

Change to Plan N/A

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	N/A

Attachments:
Felixstowe AAP REP 17.11.16 +plans.pdf

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8096 - 4189 - MM12 - None

8096 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM12

Respondent: Historic England (Debbie Mack) [4189]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan Proposed Main Modifications and Additional Changes Oct - Nov 2016 and Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Proposed Main Modifications and Additional Changes Oct - Nov 2016

Thank you for consulting us on the Proposed Main Modifications and Additional Changes to the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan and Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment, Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Therefore we welcome the opportunity to comment on the Proposed Main Modifications and Additional Changes.

We attach the 6 response forms and a continuation sheet and summarise our comments below:

FPAAP - MM12

FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)
Historic England welcomes this Main Modification.

FPAAP - MM14

FPP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary
Historic England welcomes the amendment to bullet point 8 but has concerns regarding this modification in respect of the dwelling capacity as set out in our response form.

FPAAP-AC25

Tourism and Sea Front Activities
Historic England welcomes this proposed modification.

SAASPD - MM12

Historic England welcomes this proposed modification which refers to preserving and enhancing the character of the conservation Area and listed buildings.

FPP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary

In our previous responses to you we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We advised that the policy should also state that any new development should be of a high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings. We therefore welcome the amended bullet point 8 in FPAAP - MM14. However, Historic England is particularly concerned about the increase in proposed capacity of the site from 100 to 150 dwellings. As we advised in our e-mail to you dated 13th September, the eastern end of the site is the most sensitive in historic terms given the presence of the grade II listed 18th century farmhouse. To that end, we would be cautious and concerned about substantially increasing the number of dwellings indicated in the policy from 100 to 150 dwellings.

Continued on separate sheet

FPAAP - MM14 continued

FPP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary

It might be more appropriate to limit the capacity of the site to between 120 and 130 in recognition of the need to protect and enhance the setting of the grade II listed building. In addition, it may be helpful to add comment in the policy to the effect that the eastern end of the site closest to the listed building should be left open to provide a buffer and to help mitigate the impact of the development upon the setting of the asset.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. We consider that this dwelling capacity is not consistent with the NPPF (para 132) given that development of this scale on the site would lead to the harm of the setting of a heritage asset.

Paragraph 157 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Plans to provide detail with site allocations where appropriate (fifth bullet point), with the Planning Practice Guidance stating "where sites are proposed for allocation, sufficient detail should be given to provide clarity to developers, local communities and other interests about the nature and scale of development (addressing the 'what, where, when and how' questions)" (PPG Reference ID: 12-010-20140306 (last revised 06/03/2014)). Paragraph 154 of the NPPF also states that only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan.

Conservation of the historic environment is a core planning principle (Paragraph 17) and Local Plans should set out a positive strategy in this respect (Paragraph 126).

This clearly has implications for other proposed modifications including FPAAP-AC5, AC6, AC8, AC9 and AC10.

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8096 - 4189 - MM12 - None

8096 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM12

Thank you for consulting Historic England on the Sustainability Appraisal Report Addendums for Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan and Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies October 2016.

We have no additional comments to make at this stage on the Main Modifications and Additional Changes to the Sustainability Appraisals.

Summary:

FPAAP - MM12

FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)
Historic England welcomes this Main Modification.

Change to Plan

N/A

Appear at exam?

Not Specified

Legal?

Yes

Sound?

Yes

Duty to Cooperate?

Yes

Soundness Tests

N/A

Attachments:

16.11.23 Main-Mods-Form FPAAP MM14_Redacted.pdf

16.11.28 CONCASE Letter HERef_PL00020745_275021__Redacted.pdf
_HERef_Places - S_L275037_Redacted.pdf

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8051 - 3767 - MM13 - i, ii, iii, iv

8051Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)MM13

Respondent: Rebecca Atherstone [3767]Agent: N/A

Full Text:Environmental considerations have not been taken into account.

Summary:Environmental considerations have not been taken into account.

Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	No	No	Not Specified	i, ii, iii, iv

Attachments:

R Atherstone Comments 11.11.16_Redacted.pdf

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

8124

Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM13

Respondent: Trinity College Cambridge [348]

Agent: Bidwells (Mr Darren Cogman) [1138]

Full Text:

Provision of on-site early years setting

Whilst the College fully accepts the need to provide infrastructure to support new development, including additional education provision where it is necessary, specific requirements should be confirmed in consultation with the Education Authority at the time planning applications are submitted and determined, based on up-to-date evidence of need, rather than stipulated rigidly in the Local Plan. Whilst the College understands the objective of seeking to provide certainty to prospective purchasers of the allocated land, it objects to the inclusion of the requirement to provide an on-site early years setting as an extra bullet point in draft policy FPP7 without the qualification that it should be confirmed at the planning application stage. Such an approach is unduly rigid, unjustified and unsound without qualification in this regard. We would therefore request the following amendment to the final bullet of draft policy FPP7 (as amended by MM13):

* Provision of on-site early years setting (subject to confirmation at the planning application stage based on latest evidence).

We would request that similar amendment is made to paragraph 3.40 to reflect this approach and ensure consistency.

Summary:

Whilst the College understands the objective of seeking to provide certainty to prospective purchasers of the allocated land, it objects to the inclusion of the requirement to provide an on-site early years setting as an extra bullet point in draft policy FPP7 without the qualification that it should be confirmed at the planning application stage. Such an approach is unduly rigid, unjustified and unsound without qualification in this regard.

Change to Plan

We would therefore request the following amendment to the final bullet of draft policy FPP7 (as amended by MM13):

* Provision of on-site early years setting (subject to confirmation at the planning application stage based on latest evidence).

We would request that similar amendment is made to paragraph 3.40 to reflect this approach and ensure consistency.

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Yes	No	Yes	ii

Attachments:

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8097 - 4189 - MM14 - iii, iv

8097 Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM14

Respondent: Historic England (Debbie Mack) [4189]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan Proposed Main Modifications and Additional Changes Oct - Nov 2016 and Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Proposed Main Modifications and Additional Changes Oct - Nov 2016

Thank you for consulting us on the Proposed Main Modifications and Additional Changes to the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan and Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment, Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Therefore we welcome the opportunity to comment on the Proposed Main Modifications and Additional Changes.

We attach the 6 response forms and a continuation sheet and summarise our comments below:

FPAAP - MM12

FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)
Historic England welcomes this Main Modification.

FPAAP - MM14

FPP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary
Historic England welcomes the amendment to bullet point 8 but has concerns regarding this modification in respect of the dwelling capacity as set out in our response form.

FPAAP-AC25

Tourism and Sea Front Activities
Historic England welcomes this proposed modification.

SAASPD - MM12

Historic England welcomes this proposed modification which refers to preserving and enhancing the character of the conservation Area and listed buildings.

FPP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary

In our previous responses to you we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We advised that the policy should also state that any new development should be of a high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings. We therefore welcome the amended bullet point 8 in FPAAP - MM14. However, Historic England is particularly concerned about the increase in proposed capacity of the site from 100 to 150 dwellings. As we advised in our e-mail to you dated 13th September, the eastern end of the site is the most sensitive in historic terms given the presence of the grade II listed 18th century farmhouse. To that end, we would be cautious and concerned about substantially increasing the number of dwellings indicated in the policy from 100 to 150 dwellings.

Continued on separate sheet

FPAAP - MM14 continued

FPP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary

It might be more appropriate to limit the capacity of the site to between 120 and 130 in recognition of the need to protect and enhance the setting of the grade II listed building. In addition, it may be helpful to add comment in the policy to the effect that the eastern end of the site closest to the listed building should be left open to provide a buffer and to help mitigate the impact of the development upon the setting of the asset.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. We consider that this dwelling capacity is not consistent with the NPPF (para 132) given that development of this scale on the site would lead to the harm of the setting of a heritage asset.

Paragraph 157 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Plans to provide detail with site allocations where appropriate (fifth bullet point), with the Planning Practice Guidance stating "where sites are proposed for allocation, sufficient detail should be given to provide clarity to developers, local communities and other interests about the nature and scale of development (addressing the 'what, where, when and how' questions)" (PPG Reference ID: 12-010-20140306 (last revised 06/03/2014)). Paragraph 154 of the NPPF also states that only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan.

Conservation of the historic environment is a core planning principle (Paragraph 17) and Local Plans should set out a positive strategy in this respect (Paragraph 126).

This clearly has implications for other proposed modifications including FPAAP-AC5, AC6, AC8, AC9 and AC10.

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8097 - 4189 - MM14 - iii, iv

8097 Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM14

Thank you for consulting Historic England on the Sustainability Appraisal Report Addendums for Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan and Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies October 2016.

We have no additional comments to make at this stage on the Main Modifications and Additional Changes to the Sustainability Appraisals.

Summary:

Historic England is particularly concerned about the increase in proposed capacity of the site from 100 to 150 dwellings. As we advised in our e-mail to you dated 13th September, the eastern end of the site is the most sensitive in historic terms given the presence of the grade II listed 18th century farmhouse. To that end, we would be cautious and concerned about substantially increasing the number of dwellings indicated in the policy from 100 to 150 dwellings.

Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Yes	No	Yes	iii, iv

Attachments:

_HERef_Places - S_L275037_Redacted.pdf

16.11.23 Main-Mods-Form FPAAP MM14_Redacted.pdf

16.11.28 CONCASE Letter HERef_PL00020745_275021__Redacted.pdf

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8125 - 348 - MM14 - None

8125 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM14

Respondent: Trinity College Cambridge [348]

Agent: Bidwells (Mr Darren Cogman) [1138]

Full Text: 4.47ha of land, south of Thurmans Lane, Trimley St. Mary, as shown on the Policies Map, is identified for approximately 100 150 residential units.

Trinity College, Cambridge fully supports the policy introduction amendments made to draft policy FPP8 relating to the identification of the collective site for approximately 150 residential units.

This position now reflects the fact that two separate planning applications have been submitted independently on this site, that collectively could provide up to 148 dwellings. The western parcel of the site received a resolution to grant detailed planning permission for 98 dwellings on 29 June 2016 (LPA Ref. DC/16/1107/FUL), whilst the eastern parcel received a resolution to grant outline planning permission for up to 50 dwellings on 23 November 2016 (LPA Ref. DC/16/2122/OUT).

As such, the Main Modifications version of draft policy FPP8 accords with the number of residential units that will accrue from the site.

Summary: This position now reflects the fact that two separate planning applications have been submitted independently on this site, that collectively could provide up to 148 dwellings. The western parcel of the site received a resolution to grant detailed planning permission for 98 dwellings on 29 June 2016 (LPA Ref. DC/16/1107/FUL), whilst the eastern parcel received a resolution to grant outline planning permission for up to 50 dwellings on 23 November 2016 (LPA Ref. DC/16/2122/OUT). As such, the Main Modifications version of draft policy FPP8 accords with the number of residential units that will accrue from the site.

Change to Plan N/A

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A

Attachments:

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

O - 8086 - 3785 - MM16 - None

8086 Object

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22) MM16

Respondent: Stephen Wyatt [3785] Agent: N/A

Full Text: I wish to make the following comments on the changes and modifications.

Boundaries
2.20 I am not happy with the change from "restricted" to "limited". I would like the wording to strengthen the force of physical boundaries. The suggested change weakens it.

Affordable Housing
2.27 b) I oppose the suggestion that cash tariffs are acceptable. We need properly affordable housing and it is more important to increase the stock than to gather cash payments which may be used for other purposes

The change of wording to evidence of need is weaker and less clear than the original reference to "informed by appropriate local housing needs survey" I would like the original wording to be retained.

I am also concerned that the plan does not seem to address issues in the rented sector or the need for social housing.

Other comments (not sure of which paragraph)
School
The Plan expects developers to provide a new school in large developments but does not require identification of where such a school should be located. The Plan should identify site(s) and costs

Sewage outlet (pp30 and 51?)
References to foul sewage outlets have now omitted the need in some cases to improve capacity and replaced it with a simple requirement for Anglian Water to confirm that capacity is adequate. I oppose this change. Need for improvement should be independently identified.

Core Strategy
There is a change in wording to say that the Area local plan is at a lower level than the core strategy rather than co-existent with it (the original wording). The change devalues the importance of local consultation and views and therefore I would like the original wording restored

Summary: Sewage outlet (pp30 and 51?)
References to foul sewage outlets have now omitted the need in some cases to improve capacity and replaced it with a simple requirement for Anglian Water to confirm that capacity is adequate. I oppose this change. Need for improvement should be independently identified.

Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	None

Attachments:

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8055 - 747 - MM18 - None

8055 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM18

Respondent: National Grid [747]

Agent: Amec Foster Wheeler (Mr Robert Deanwood) [4184]

Full Text: Suffolk Coastal District Council: Felixstowe Area Action Plan Consultation
SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL GRID

National Grid has appointed Amec Foster Wheeler to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regard to the current consultation on the above document.

National Grid owns and operates the high voltage electricity transmission system in England and Wales and operates the Scottish high voltage transmission system. National Grid also owns and operates the gas transmission system. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the distribution networks at high pressure. It is then transported through a number of reducing pressure tiers until it is finally delivered to our customers. National Grid own four of the UK's gas distribution networks and transport gas to 11 million homes, schools and businesses through 81,000 miles of gas pipelines within North West, East of England, West Midlands and North London.

To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets.

National Grid infrastructure within Suffolk Coastal District Council

Electricity Transmission

National Grid has two high voltage overhead lines (listed below) within Suffolk Coastal District Council's administrative area. These form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales.

Line Ref. Description

4ZX Route 400kV two circuit route from Sizewell substation in Suffolk Coastal to Bramford substation in Mid Suffolk.

4ZW Route 400kV two circuit route from Sizewell substation in Suffolk Coastal to Bramford substation in Mid Suffolk

National Grid has provided information in relation to electricity transmission assets via the following internet link:
<http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/>

Gas Distribution

National Grid has a high number of gas distribution apparatus within the administrative area of Suffolk Coastal District Council.

This includes:

- * Low Pressure (LP) and Medium Pressure (MP) (below 2 bar) Gas Pipes and associated equipment
- * Six High Pressure (HP) (above 2 bar) and two Intermediate Pressure Gas Pipelines and associated equipment as listed below:

Pipe Pressure Description

HP 1680 Wissett Lodge - Saxmundham
HP 2752 Martlesham - Harleston Pipeline
HP 1682 Bredfield - Bramford
HP 1691great Bealings - Trimley
IP 1437z Kesgrave 7 Bar
HP 1690 Great Bealings - Playford Road
IP 9770b Playford Road Prs To Rushmere
HP 1692 Martlesham - Trimley

The first point of contact for all works within the vicinity of gas distribution assets is Plant Protection (plantprotection@nationalgrid.com).

Please note that Gas pipeline diversions may take up to three years, please bear this in mind when engaging with National Grid.

National Grid may have a Deed of Grant Easement for each asset which prevents the erection of permanent/temporary buildings, or structures, changes to existing ground levels, storage of materials etc. Additionally written permission will be required before any works commence within the National Grid easement strip, and a deed of consent is required for any crossing of the easement. In the first instance please consider checking with the Land Registry for the development area. If further information is required in relation to an easement please contact Spencer Jefferies, Development Liaison Officer, box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com

Electricity Distribution

UK Power Networks owns and operates the local electricity distribution network in Suffolk Coastal District Council.

Note: The composite reference number in the box at the top of the page is made up of the following information: Object/Support - Representation Number - Respondent Number - Plan Reference - Soundness Tests (if applicable).

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8055 - 747 - MM18 - None

8055 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM18

Contact details can be found at www.energynetworks.org.uk

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Gas Distribution

The following sites have been identified as being crossed by or within close proximity to IP/ HP apparatus:

- * FPP4 - Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe
- * FPP12 - Land at Haven Exchange, Felixstowe

National Grid Gas Distribution would like to take this opportunity to advise prospective land developers and the local authority of the following:

Crossing of assets: Construction traffic should only cross the pipeline at locations agreed with National Grid. To facilitate these crossings protection or diversion may be required; depending on site condition and pipe parameters.

Cable Crossings: For all assets, the contractor / developer will need to consider the clearance and necessary protection measures. The crossing must be perpendicular to the asset. The crossing may require a deed of consent to be agreed prior to work commencing.

Piling: No piling should take place within 15m of gas distribution assets without prior agreement from a National Grid Representative.

Pipeline Safety: National Grid will need to ensure that access to the pipelines is maintained during and after construction.

Our HP/IP pipelines are normally buried to a depth cover of 1.1 metres, however; actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation to be monitored by a National Grid representative. Ground cover above gas distribution mains should not be reduced or increased. Our MP/LP mains will not be as deep as the pipelines.

A National Grid representative may be required to monitor any excavations or any embankment or dredging works within 3 metres of a HP/IP pipeline or within 10 metres of an Above Ground Installations (AGI). Monitoring of works in relation to MP/LP assets may be required by a National Grid representative.

National Grid steel pipelines are cathodically protected to prevent corrosion to the pipeline. For further information please refer to SSW/22 (see further advice section below).

If you require any further information in relation to the above please contact National Grid's Plant Protection team via the email address at the top of this letter.

Appendices - National Grid Assets

Please find attached in:

- * Appendix 1 provides maps of the sites referenced above in relation to the affected National Grid Gas Distribution (Intermediate Pressure /High Pressure) assets outlined above.

Further Advice

National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning our networks. If we can be of any assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during your policy development, please do not hesitate to contact us. In addition the following publications are available from the National Grid website or by contacting us at the address overleaf:

- * National Grid's commitments when undertaking works in the UK - our stakeholder, community and amenity policy;
 - * Specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of National Grid High Pressure Gas Pipelines and Associated Installations - Requirements for Third Parties; and
 - * A sense of place - design guidelines for development near high voltage overhead lines.
 - * T/SP/SSW22 - Specification for safe working in the vicinity of National Grid high pressure gas pipelines and associated installations - requirements for third parties.
- <http://www2.nationalgrid.com/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=33968>
- * IGE/SR/18 - Safe working practices to ensure the integrity of gas pipelines and associated installations.
 - * HS(G)47 - Avoiding Danger from Underground Services.

Please remember to consult National Grid on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database:

Robert Deanwood
Consultant Town Planner

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

8055Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)MM18

n.grid@amecfw.com

Amec Foster Wheeler E&I UK
Gables House
Kenilworth Road
Leamington Spa
Warwickshire
CV32 6JX

Spencer Jefferies
Development Liaison Officer, National Grid

box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com

National Grid House
Warwick Technology Park
Gallows Hill
Warwick
CV34 6DA

I hope the above information is useful. If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully
[via email]
Robert Deanwood
Consultant Town Planner
cc. Spencer Jefferies, National Grid

Summary: The following sites have been identified as being crossed by or within close proximity to IP/ HP apparatus:
☐
FPP12 - Land at Haven Exchange, Felixstowe

Our HP/IP pipelines are normally buried to a depth cover of 1.1 metres, however; actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation to be monitored by a National Grid representative. Ground cover above gas distribution mains should not be reduced or increased. Our MP/LP mains will not be as deep as the pipelines. If you require any further information please contact National Grid's Plant Protection team

Change to Plan N/A

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	N/A

Attachments:
Felixstowe AAP REP 17.11.16 +plans.pdf

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8120 - 2442 - MM20 - None

8120 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM20

Respondent: Suffolk County Council (James Cutting) [2442]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan - Main Modifications

I write to confirm Suffolk County Council's position following consultation on the main modifications. Before turning to the main modifications, I consider that attention needs to be made to changes that have occurred since the hearing sessions at the beginning of September that are relevant to the County Council's interests with regard to the Main Modifications, this includes:

- recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee, and
- inquiry hearing sessions into the appeal at Candlet Road.

Recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee

On Friday 2 September 2016, I provided further evidence on the resultant needs for early years and primary school places in support of Suffolk Coastal District Council's Area Action Plan (AAP) for the Felixstowe Peninsula. I restated the long-held position of the County Council that a new primary school is needed to accommodate the likely growth in the number of primary-aged pupils and the needs for early years facilities, including which sites would be expected to provide on-site provision for early years.

During the session, I responded to questions and there was no disagreement from the District Council, landowners, developers or their agents to the approach, including on-site provision and the need for financial contributions to be secured through s106 agreements.

However, since the examination hearing sessions, minutes from the 29 June 2016 meeting of Suffolk Coastal's Planning Committee were released on 7 September 2016 providing its resolution for part of the Thurmans Lane site (FPP8). The County Council then received confirmation of same Committee's 5 September resolution for an application not included in the AAP (land at High Road, Trimley St Martin, application DC/16/1919/FUL).

These decisions resolved to grant permission without financial contributions towards a new early years setting or towards a new primary school, which has implications for the AAP and for future decisions. The case officer's report for 5 September Planning Committee for planning application DC/16/1919/FUL (for 69 dwellings at Land at High Road, Trimley St Martin) cited the lack of a specific site as a reason and suggested an alternative education strategy, for temporary accommodation being stationed at Trimley St Martin. These and other points were contested by the County Council in writing to the Committee.

The District Council's central point, but also related to the timescales of delivery, is that a site has not been identified. The County Council has the statutory duty to secure sufficient places and, in extreme cases, can compulsorily purchase land under section 530 of the Education Act 1996. The fact that a site has not been identified does not prevent contributions being secured because the contributions are necessary to mitigate the direct impact of development. In terms of timescales, new homes build before a new school is built will reduce available capacity, which should be considered in combination with the AAP.

A very similar situation arose during a recovered appeal in Buntingford, Hertfordshire (Appeal references: APP/J1915/A/14/2220854 & APP/J1915/A/14/2220859), which the Secretary of State determined in March 2016. In this case, East Hertfordshire District Council was seeking to use the absence of a school site to resist residential development. In recommending allowing the appeal, the Inspector concluded (in paragraph 26) on the relationship between a lack of a site and the use of planning obligations thus:

"The second sustainability objection relates to lack of education facilities (a new 2FE primary school). It flies in the face of the Education Authority's consultation response to the applications. Indeed, it is hard to see how such a facility will be provided without developer contributions. Moreover there is absolutely no evidence to show that the Education Authority will not deliver as and when necessary."

During the hearing sessions on the AAP I explained that, owing to the dispersed approach to housing growth, the most sustainable location for the new school depends on the actual rate and location of homes. I also explained that, in order to allocate a primary school site within the AAP, there would need to be considerable certainty that that particular site could be delivered and that it would be the most sustainable.

This issue of certainty was discussed with Suffolk Coastal's officers during the preparation of the AAP and, as I described during the hearing, a location between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary may be the most accessible. This is, however, dependent upon the resultant pattern of development being as set out in the AAP, the rate of development being as predicted and there being no changes in the number and distribution of pupils throughout the Peninsula. If any of these conditions is not as envisaged, the most appropriate site for a new primary school may be elsewhere in the Peninsula. Notwithstanding this point, the county council is already exploring the potential for sites between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary.

The County Council's preference for a site might change if other developments come forward (such as the 560 home proposed at Candlet Road which is subject to an appeal) and if development around Trimley St Mary and Trimley St

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8120 - 2442 - MM20 - None

8120 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM20

Martin does not progress. The County Council requires certainty, beyond the simple allocation of a site, about the site's availability and suitability to commit its own and others resources towards delivering a new primary school, which can cost at least £4.35m to build (without land costs being included).

Inquiry hearing sessions into the appeal at Candlet Road.

Between 27 - 30 September, Mr Clive Hughes held evidence sessions into the appeal by Christchurch Land & Estates against Suffolk Coastal District Council's refusal to grant planning permission for 560 dwellings and other development (including a 60-bed care home) on land adjacent to Candlet Road, Felixstowe (Appeal Ref: APP/J3530/W/15/3138710).

This appeal is relevant to the consideration of the AAP because, if allowed, the addition of the 560 dwellings will add around 45% more homes to those already permitted or allocated. This has implications for the provision of transport and education infrastructure needed to support the appeal site and the implementation of the AAP.

Transport

In terms of transport considerations, the AECOM report - "Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan (AAP) Cumulative Impact Assessment" - did include the Candlet Road proposal in the assessment (AECOM, paras 1.3.8 and 2.5.2). AECOM highlighted several measures, particularly at the Candlet Road/Grove Road and Garrison Lane roundabout that could be implemented to mitigate traffic impact on junctions. This includes realignment and removing the hatched area (AECOM, para. 5.2.3), which was installed to reduce traffic speed entering the roundabout.

The minor change reversing the hatching changes on Candlet Road / Garrison Road roundabout can be implemented once the 40 mph Traffic Regulation Order along Candlet Road has been formally agreed. The s.278 works associated with the Candlet Road Development could be used to deliver this work.

Education

The situation for education infrastructure is similar. During the inquiry, the appellant agreed to the county council's requirements which took account of the emerging AAP. The county council secured contributions towards land and build costs for early years and primary education and the reservation of land for both types of facility was secured on site.

In contrast to the two decisions above, during the inquiry Suffolk Coastal District Council formally accepted and endorsed the need for appropriate and proportionate contributions towards the new primary school. The district council did, however, raise a concern over the suitability of this location for the school.

Notwithstanding the reservation on the Candlet Road site, and as noted above, the county council is already exploring the potential for sites between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary because the Candlet Road site might not present an optimum solution for the Felixstowe Peninsula as a whole. However, there remains a residual risk that a better site may not be available and that, owing to phasing and the actual demand generated if the Candlet Road site is delivered, this location may be preferred.

The relationship between the Candlet Road and High Road developments is shown in the table below. The total pupil yields are based on houses with 2 or more bedrooms, the calculation for pupil yields does vary for the size and type of dwelling permitted. This table shows the constraint in the availability of places within primary schools throughout Felixstowe but particularly at Kingsfleet, Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary Primary Schools.

If the Candlet Road appeal is dismissed, the total deficit will be reduced by 140 places to -125. This highlights the complexity in considering the most appropriate location for a primary school within the Peninsula.

Based on the catchment areas covering the Candlet Road site, the county council assumed that 45 pupils would attend Maidstone Infants, 60 at Causton Junior and 35 Kingsfleet. Contributions towards the land and build costs have been agreed based on the lack of capacity at Kingsfleet. This has impacted on the consideration of the available capacity at FPP4 (Land North of High Street, Walton), which would then become available if the appeal is dismissed.

Table 1. Capacity, Forecast Pupil Rolls and Pupil Yields from developments in the Felixstowe Peninsula.

[SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT]

The AAP highlights the requirement for a new primary school to be one form entry (210 places). The above figures do not take into account the final mixture of housing sizes and types. The indicative size mix set out in table 3.6 in the Core Strategy does provide a general rule. If this were to be followed (with assumptions on flats and houses (The assumed flats/houses splits being a 50/50 one bed, 30/70 two bed and 5/95 three bed and 0/100 four bed.)) the resultant deficit of primary school places is likely to be below 200.

The Candlet Road appeal also affects the consideration of the availability of secondary school places. However, financial contributions to increasing the available capacity can only be secured through the Community Infrastructure

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8120 - 2442 - MM20 - None

8120 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM20

Levy. If the Secretary of State allows the appeal and grants planning permission, there will be an overall deficit in 2020 of -126 secondary and sixth form places, which increases to -141 with the High Road site included. This is a worst case scenario as a mixture of housing types and sizes is likely to reduce the overall deficit.

Main Modifications

MM1

The total increase from 1,120 to 1,170 is made to reflect 50 additional dwellings at the Thurmans Lane sites (FPP8). However, this does not include the applications for which there is a resolution to grant permission at High Road, Trimley St Martin.

MM4 - MM6

These changes are welcome and provide clarity to decision makers. This addresses the county council's above concerns over recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee.

MM20

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through a planning obligation rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

A further addition is necessary to reflect the need to reserve a 2.1ha site for the new school, pending the final location being secured. This was requested in the county council's response to planning application ref 16/2778/OUT and is in accordance with para. 3.44 of the AAP.

MM21

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through planning obligations for this and other sites rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

MM22

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through a planning obligation rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

A further addition is necessary to reflect the need to reserve a 2.1ha site for the new school, pending the final location being secured. This is in accordance with para. 3.44 of the AAP.

Additional Changes

AC13

The amendment to the area for the new primary school and early years settling is welcome and no further amendments are necessary. Whilst the required size of a 210 place school is likely to be sufficient for the resultant growth taking account of potential mixture of dwellings, a new school provides a significant and long-term piece of community infrastructure which is likely to need further expansion in the future. This likelihood is reinforced by the facts that: the housing numbers in the AAP are minimums, that Suffolk Coastal District Council needs to review its Core Strategy to reflect housing need and that, if the prevailing pattern of growth is followed, Felixstowe is likely to be a location for further residential development beyond that outlined in the current AAP.

The County Council's requirement, which is acknowledged in the AAP (para. 3.43), is for the reservation of land for a new primary school, which will include an early years setting. The required area to provide sufficient flexibility is based on being able to accommodate up to a 420 place school and a 60 place early years facility.

I trust that the above provides a suitable account of recent circumstances and provides you with an understanding of the County Council's position on the main modifications and additional changes.

Summary:

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through a planning obligation rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8120 - 2442 - MM20 - None				
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--

8120 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22) MM20

Change to Plan N/A

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	N/A

Attachments:

2016-11-28.FinalMainModificationsResponse.pdf

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8121 - 2442 - MM21 - None

8121 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM21

Respondent: Suffolk County Council (James Cutting) [2442]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan - Main Modifications

I write to confirm Suffolk County Council's position following consultation on the main modifications. Before turning to the main modifications, I consider that attention needs to be made to changes that have occurred since the hearing sessions at the beginning of September that are relevant to the County Council's interests with regard to the Main Modifications, this includes:

- recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee, and
- inquiry hearing sessions into the appeal at Candlet Road.

Recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee

On Friday 2 September 2016, I provided further evidence on the resultant needs for early years and primary school places in support of Suffolk Coastal District Council's Area Action Plan (AAP) for the Felixstowe Peninsula. I restated the long-held position of the County Council that a new primary school is needed to accommodate the likely growth in the number of primary-aged pupils and the needs for early years facilities, including which sites would be expected to provide on-site provision for early years.

During the session, I responded to questions and there was no disagreement from the District Council, landowners, developers or their agents to the approach, including on-site provision and the need for financial contributions to be secured through s106 agreements.

However, since the examination hearing sessions, minutes from the 29 June 2016 meeting of Suffolk Coastal's Planning Committee were released on 7 September 2016 providing its resolution for part of the Thurmans Lane site (FPP8). The County Council then received confirmation of same Committee's 5 September resolution for an application not included in the AAP (land at High Road, Trimley St Martin, application DC/16/1919/FUL).

These decisions resolved to grant permission without financial contributions towards a new early years setting or towards a new primary school, which has implications for the AAP and for future decisions. The case officer's report for 5 September Planning Committee for planning application DC/16/1919/FUL (for 69 dwellings at Land at High Road, Trimley St Martin) cited the lack of a specific site as a reason and suggested an alternative education strategy, for temporary accommodation being stationed at Trimley St Martin. These and other points were contested by the County Council in writing to the Committee.

The District Council's central point, but also related to the timescales of delivery, is that a site has not been identified. The County Council has the statutory duty to secure sufficient places and, in extreme cases, can compulsorily purchase land under section 530 of the Education Act 1996. The fact that a site has not been identified does not prevent contributions being secured because the contributions are necessary to mitigate the direct impact of development. In terms of timescales, new homes build before a new school is built will reduce available capacity, which should be considered in combination with the AAP.

A very similar situation arose during a recovered appeal in Buntingford, Hertfordshire (Appeal references: APP/J1915/A/14/2220854 & APP/J1915/A/14/2220859), which the Secretary of State determined in March 2016. In this case, East Hertfordshire District Council was seeking to use the absence of a school site to resist residential development. In recommending allowing the appeal, the Inspector concluded (in paragraph 26) on the relationship between a lack of a site and the use of planning obligations thus:

"The second sustainability objection relates to lack of education facilities (a new 2FE primary school). It flies in the face of the Education Authority's consultation response to the applications. Indeed, it is hard to see how such a facility will be provided without developer contributions. Moreover there is absolutely no evidence to show that the Education Authority will not deliver as and when necessary."

During the hearing sessions on the AAP I explained that, owing to the dispersed approach to housing growth, the most sustainable location for the new school depends on the actual rate and location of homes. I also explained that, in order to allocate a primary school site within the AAP, there would need to be considerable certainty that that particular site could be delivered and that it would be the most sustainable.

This issue of certainty was discussed with Suffolk Coastal's officers during the preparation of the AAP and, as I described during the hearing, a location between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary may be the most accessible. This is, however, dependent upon the resultant pattern of development being as set out in the AAP, the rate of development being as predicted and there being no changes in the number and distribution of pupils throughout the Peninsula. If any of these conditions is not as envisaged, the most appropriate site for a new primary school may be elsewhere in the Peninsula. Notwithstanding this point, the county council is already exploring the potential for sites between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary.

The County Council's preference for a site might change if other developments come forward (such as the 560 home proposed at Candlet Road which is subject to an appeal) and if development around Trimley St Mary and Trimley St

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8121 - 2442 - MM21 - None

8121 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM21

Martin does not progress. The County Council requires certainty, beyond the simple allocation of a site, about the site's availability and suitability to commit its own and others resources towards delivering a new primary school, which can cost at least £4.35m to build (without land costs being included).

Inquiry hearing sessions into the appeal at Candlet Road.

Between 27 - 30 September, Mr Clive Hughes held evidence sessions into the appeal by Christchurch Land & Estates against Suffolk Coastal District Council's refusal to grant planning permission for 560 dwellings and other development (including a 60-bed care home) on land adjacent to Candlet Road, Felixstowe (Appeal Ref: APP/J3530/W/15/3138710).

This appeal is relevant to the consideration of the AAP because, if allowed, the addition of the 560 dwellings will add around 45% more homes to those already permitted or allocated. This has implications for the provision of transport and education infrastructure needed to support the appeal site and the implementation of the AAP.

Transport

In terms of transport considerations, the AECOM report - "Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan (AAP) Cumulative Impact Assessment" - did include the Candlet Road proposal in the assessment (AECOM, paras 1.3.8 and 2.5.2). AECOM highlighted several measures, particularly at the Candlet Road/Grove Road and Garrison Lane roundabout that could be implemented to mitigate traffic impact on junctions. This includes realignment and removing the hatched area (AECOM, para. 5.2.3), which was installed to reduce traffic speed entering the roundabout.

The minor change reversing the hatching changes on Candlet Road / Garrison Road roundabout can be implemented once the 40 mph Traffic Regulation Order along Candlet Road has been formally agreed. The s.278 works associated with the Candlet Road Development could be used to deliver this work.

Education

The situation for education infrastructure is similar. During the inquiry, the appellant agreed to the county council's requirements which took account of the emerging AAP. The county council secured contributions towards land and build costs for early years and primary education and the reservation of land for both types of facility was secured on site.

In contrast to the two decisions above, during the inquiry Suffolk Coastal District Council formally accepted and endorsed the need for appropriate and proportionate contributions towards the new primary school. The district council did, however, raise a concern over the suitability of this location for the school.

Notwithstanding the reservation on the Candlet Road site, and as noted above, the county council is already exploring the potential for sites between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary because the Candlet Road site might not present an optimum solution for the Felixstowe Peninsula as a whole. However, there remains a residual risk that a better site may not be available and that, owing to phasing and the actual demand generated if the Candlet Road site is delivered, this location may be preferred.

The relationship between the Candlet Road and High Road developments is shown in the table below. The total pupil yields are based on houses with 2 or more bedrooms, the calculation for pupil yields does vary for the size and type of dwelling permitted. This table shows the constraint in the availability of places within primary schools throughout Felixstowe but particularly at Kingsfleet, Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary Primary Schools.

If the Candlet Road appeal is dismissed, the total deficit will be reduced by 140 places to -125. This highlights the complexity in considering the most appropriate location for a primary school within the Peninsula.

Based on the catchment areas covering the Candlet Road site, the county council assumed that 45 pupils would attend Maidstone Infants, 60 at Causton Junior and 35 Kingsfleet. Contributions towards the land and build costs have been agreed based on the lack of capacity at Kingsfleet. This has impacted on the consideration of the available capacity at FPP4 (Land North of High Street, Walton), which would then become available if the appeal is dismissed.

Table 1. Capacity, Forecast Pupil Rolls and Pupil Yields from developments in the Felixstowe Peninsula.

[SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT]

The AAP highlights the requirement for a new primary school to be one form entry (210 places). The above figures do not take into account the final mixture of housing sizes and types. The indicative size mix set out in table 3.6 in the Core Strategy does provide a general rule. If this were to be followed (with assumptions on flats and houses (The assumed flats/houses splits being a 50/50 one bed, 30/70 two bed and 5/95 three bed and 0/100 four bed.)) the resultant deficit of primary school places is likely to be below 200.

The Candlet Road appeal also affects the consideration of the availability of secondary school places. However, financial contributions to increasing the available capacity can only be secured through the Community Infrastructure

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8121 - 2442 - MM21 - None

8121 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM21

Levy. If the Secretary of State allows the appeal and grants planning permission, there will be an overall deficit in 2020 of -126 secondary and sixth form places, which increases to -141 with the High Road site included. This is a worst case scenario as a mixture of housing types and sizes is likely to reduce the overall deficit.

Main Modifications

MM1

The total increase from 1,120 to 1,170 is made to reflect 50 additional dwellings at the Thurmans Lane sites (FPP8). However, this does not include the applications for which there is a resolution to grant permission at High Road, Trimley St Martin.

MM4 - MM6

These changes are welcome and provide clarity to decision makers. This addresses the county council's above concerns over recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee.

MM20

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through a planning obligation rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

A further addition is necessary to reflect the need to reserve a 2.1ha site for the new school, pending the final location being secured. This was requested in the county council's response to planning application ref 16/2778/OUT and is in accordance with para. 3.44 of the AAP.

MM21

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through planning obligations for this and other sites rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

MM22

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through a planning obligation rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

A further addition is necessary to reflect the need to reserve a 2.1ha site for the new school, pending the final location being secured. This is in accordance with para. 3.44 of the AAP.

Additional Changes

AC13

The amendment to the area for the new primary school and early years settling is welcome and no further amendments are necessary. Whilst the required size of a 210 place school is likely to be sufficient for the resultant growth taking account of potential mixture of dwellings, a new school provides a significant and long-term piece of community infrastructure which is likely to need further expansion in the future. This likelihood is reinforced by the facts that: the housing numbers in the AAP are minimums, that Suffolk Coastal District Council needs to review its Core Strategy to reflect housing need and that, if the prevailing pattern of growth is followed, Felixstowe is likely to be a location for further residential development beyond that outlined in the current AAP.

The County Council's requirement, which is acknowledged in the AAP (para. 3.43), is for the reservation of land for a new primary school, which will include an early years setting. The required area to provide sufficient flexibility is based on being able to accommodate up to a 420 place school and a 60 place early years facility.

I trust that the above provides a suitable account of recent circumstances and provides you with an understanding of the County Council's position on the main modifications and additional changes.

Summary:

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through planning obligations for this and other sites rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8121 - 2442 - MM21 - None				
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--

8121 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22) MM21

Change to Plan N/A

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	N/A

Attachments:

2016-11-28.FinalMainModificationsResponse.pdf

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8122 - 2442 - MM22 - None

8122 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM22

Respondent: Suffolk County Council (James Cutting) [2442]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan - Main Modifications

I write to confirm Suffolk County Council's position following consultation on the main modifications. Before turning to the main modifications, I consider that attention needs to be made to changes that have occurred since the hearing sessions at the beginning of September that are relevant to the County Council's interests with regard to the Main Modifications, this includes:

- recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee, and
- inquiry hearing sessions into the appeal at Candlet Road.

Recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee

On Friday 2 September 2016, I provided further evidence on the resultant needs for early years and primary school places in support of Suffolk Coastal District Council's Area Action Plan (AAP) for the Felixstowe Peninsula. I restated the long-held position of the County Council that a new primary school is needed to accommodate the likely growth in the number of primary-aged pupils and the needs for early years facilities, including which sites would be expected to provide on-site provision for early years.

During the session, I responded to questions and there was no disagreement from the District Council, landowners, developers or their agents to the approach, including on-site provision and the need for financial contributions to be secured through s106 agreements.

However, since the examination hearing sessions, minutes from the 29 June 2016 meeting of Suffolk Coastal's Planning Committee were released on 7 September 2016 providing its resolution for part of the Thurmans Lane site (FPP8). The County Council then received confirmation of same Committee's 5 September resolution for an application not included in the AAP (land at High Road, Trimley St Martin, application DC/16/1919/FUL).

These decisions resolved to grant permission without financial contributions towards a new early years setting or towards a new primary school, which has implications for the AAP and for future decisions. The case officer's report for 5 September Planning Committee for planning application DC/16/1919/FUL (for 69 dwellings at Land at High Road, Trimley St Martin) cited the lack of a specific site as a reason and suggested an alternative education strategy, for temporary accommodation being stationed at Trimley St Martin. These and other points were contested by the County Council in writing to the Committee.

The District Council's central point, but also related to the timescales of delivery, is that a site has not been identified. The County Council has the statutory duty to secure sufficient places and, in extreme cases, can compulsorily purchase land under section 530 of the Education Act 1996. The fact that a site has not been identified does not prevent contributions being secured because the contributions are necessary to mitigate the direct impact of development. In terms of timescales, new homes build before a new school is built will reduce available capacity, which should be considered in combination with the AAP.

A very similar situation arose during a recovered appeal in Buntingford, Hertfordshire (Appeal references: APP/J1915/A/14/2220854 & APP/J1915/A/14/2220859), which the Secretary of State determined in March 2016. In this case, East Hertfordshire District Council was seeking to use the absence of a school site to resist residential development. In recommending allowing the appeal, the Inspector concluded (in paragraph 26) on the relationship between a lack of a site and the use of planning obligations thus:

"The second sustainability objection relates to lack of education facilities (a new 2FE primary school). It flies in the face of the Education Authority's consultation response to the applications. Indeed, it is hard to see how such a facility will be provided without developer contributions. Moreover there is absolutely no evidence to show that the Education Authority will not deliver as and when necessary."

During the hearing sessions on the AAP I explained that, owing to the dispersed approach to housing growth, the most sustainable location for the new school depends on the actual rate and location of homes. I also explained that, in order to allocate a primary school site within the AAP, there would need to be considerable certainty that that particular site could be delivered and that it would be the most sustainable.

This issue of certainty was discussed with Suffolk Coastal's officers during the preparation of the AAP and, as I described during the hearing, a location between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary may be the most accessible. This is, however, dependent upon the resultant pattern of development being as set out in the AAP, the rate of development being as predicted and there being no changes in the number and distribution of pupils throughout the Peninsula. If any of these conditions is not as envisaged, the most appropriate site for a new primary school may be elsewhere in the Peninsula. Notwithstanding this point, the county council is already exploring the potential for sites between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary.

The County Council's preference for a site might change if other developments come forward (such as the 560 home proposed at Candlet Road which is subject to an appeal) and if development around Trimley St Mary and Trimley St

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8122 - 2442 - MM22 - None

8122 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM22

Martin does not progress. The County Council requires certainty, beyond the simple allocation of a site, about the site's availability and suitability to commit its own and others resources towards delivering a new primary school, which can cost at least £4.35m to build (without land costs being included).

Inquiry hearing sessions into the appeal at Candlet Road.

Between 27 - 30 September, Mr Clive Hughes held evidence sessions into the appeal by Christchurch Land & Estates against Suffolk Coastal District Council's refusal to grant planning permission for 560 dwellings and other development (including a 60-bed care home) on land adjacent to Candlet Road, Felixstowe (Appeal Ref: APP/J3530/W/15/3138710).

This appeal is relevant to the consideration of the AAP because, if allowed, the addition of the 560 dwellings will add around 45% more homes to those already permitted or allocated. This has implications for the provision of transport and education infrastructure needed to support the appeal site and the implementation of the AAP.

Transport

In terms of transport considerations, the AECOM report - "Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan (AAP) Cumulative Impact Assessment" - did include the Candlet Road proposal in the assessment (AECOM, paras 1.3.8 and 2.5.2). AECOM highlighted several measures, particularly at the Candlet Road/Grove Road and Garrison Lane roundabout that could be implemented to mitigate traffic impact on junctions. This includes realignment and removing the hatched area (AECOM, para. 5.2.3), which was installed to reduce traffic speed entering the roundabout.

The minor change reversing the hatching changes on Candlet Road / Garrison Road roundabout can be implemented once the 40 mph Traffic Regulation Order along Candlet Road has been formally agreed. The s.278 works associated with the Candlet Road Development could be used to deliver this work.

Education

The situation for education infrastructure is similar. During the inquiry, the appellant agreed to the county council's requirements which took account of the emerging AAP. The county council secured contributions towards land and build costs for early years and primary education and the reservation of land for both types of facility was secured on site.

In contrast to the two decisions above, during the inquiry Suffolk Coastal District Council formally accepted and endorsed the need for appropriate and proportionate contributions towards the new primary school. The district council did, however, raise a concern over the suitability of this location for the school.

Notwithstanding the reservation on the Candlet Road site, and as noted above, the county council is already exploring the potential for sites between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary because the Candlet Road site might not present an optimum solution for the Felixstowe Peninsula as a whole. However, there remains a residual risk that a better site may not be available and that, owing to phasing and the actual demand generated if the Candlet Road site is delivered, this location may be preferred.

The relationship between the Candlet Road and High Road developments is shown in the table below. The total pupil yields are based on houses with 2 or more bedrooms, the calculation for pupil yields does vary for the size and type of dwelling permitted. This table shows the constraint in the availability of places within primary schools throughout Felixstowe but particularly at Kingsfleet, Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary Primary Schools.

If the Candlet Road appeal is dismissed, the total deficit will be reduced by 140 places to -125. This highlights the complexity in considering the most appropriate location for a primary school within the Peninsula.

Based on the catchment areas covering the Candlet Road site, the county council assumed that 45 pupils would attend Maidstone Infants, 60 at Causton Junior and 35 Kingsfleet. Contributions towards the land and build costs have been agreed based on the lack of capacity at Kingsfleet. This has impacted on the consideration of the available capacity at FPP4 (Land North of High Street, Walton), which would then become available if the appeal is dismissed.

Table 1. Capacity, Forecast Pupil Rolls and Pupil Yields from developments in the Felixstowe Peninsula.

[SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT]

The AAP highlights the requirement for a new primary school to be one form entry (210 places). The above figures do not take into account the final mixture of housing sizes and types. The indicative size mix set out in table 3.6 in the Core Strategy does provide a general rule. If this were to be followed (with assumptions on flats and houses (The assumed flats/houses splits being a 50/50 one bed, 30/70 two bed and 5/95 three bed and 0/100 four bed.)) the resultant deficit of primary school places is likely to be below 200.

The Candlet Road appeal also affects the consideration of the availability of secondary school places. However, financial contributions to increasing the available capacity can only be secured through the Community Infrastructure

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8122 - 2442 - MM22 - None

8122 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22)

MM22

Levy. If the Secretary of State allows the appeal and grants planning permission, there will be an overall deficit in 2020 of -126 secondary and sixth form places, which increases to -141 with the High Road site included. This is a worst case scenario as a mixture of housing types and sizes is likely to reduce the overall deficit.

Main Modifications

MM1

The total increase from 1,120 to 1,170 is made to reflect 50 additional dwellings at the Thurmans Lane sites (FPP8). However, this does not include the applications for which there is a resolution to grant permission at High Road, Trimley St Martin.

MM4 - MM6

These changes are welcome and provide clarity to decision makers. This addresses the county council's above concerns over recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee.

MM20

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through a planning obligation rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

A further addition is necessary to reflect the need to reserve a 2.1ha site for the new school, pending the final location being secured. This was requested in the county council's response to planning application ref 16/2778/OUT and is in accordance with para. 3.44 of the AAP.

MM21

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through planning obligations for this and other sites rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

MM22

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through a planning obligation rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

A further addition is necessary to reflect the need to reserve a 2.1ha site for the new school, pending the final location being secured. This is in accordance with para. 3.44 of the AAP.

Additional Changes

AC13

The amendment to the area for the new primary school and early years settling is welcome and no further amendments are necessary. Whilst the required size of a 210 place school is likely to be sufficient for the resultant growth taking account of potential mixture of dwellings, a new school provides a significant and long-term piece of community infrastructure which is likely to need further expansion in the future. This likelihood is reinforced by the facts that: the housing numbers in the AAP are minimums, that Suffolk Coastal District Council needs to review its Core Strategy to reflect housing need and that, if the prevailing pattern of growth is followed, Felixstowe is likely to be a location for further residential development beyond that outlined in the current AAP.

The County Council's requirement, which is acknowledged in the AAP (para. 3.43), is for the reservation of land for a new primary school, which will include an early years setting. The required area to provide sufficient flexibility is based on being able to accommodate up to a 420 place school and a 60 place early years facility.

I trust that the above provides a suitable account of recent circumstances and provides you with an understanding of the County Council's position on the main modifications and additional changes.

Summary:

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through a planning obligation rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

1) Felixstowe Area Action Plan Main Modifications Schedule (Comments before the Inspector)

S - 8122 - 2442 - MM22 - None				
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--

8122 Support

Main Modifications (MM1 to MM22) MM22

Change to Plan N/A

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	N/A

Attachments:
2016-11-28.FinalMainModificationsResponse.pdf

3) Additional Changes Schedule (Comments not before the Inspector)

8087 Object

Additional Changes (AC1 to AC46) AC1

Respondent: Stephen Wyatt [3785] Agent: N/A

Full Text: I wish to make the following comments on the changes and modifications.

Boundaries
2.20 I am not happy with the change from "restricted" to "limited". I would like the wording to strengthen the force of physical boundaries. The suggested change weakens it.

Affordable Housing
2.27 b) I oppose the suggestion that cash tariffs are acceptable. We need properly affordable housing and it is more important to increase the stock than to gather cash payments which may be used for other purposes

The change of wording to evidence of need is weaker and less clear than the original reference to "informed by appropriate local housing needs survey" I would like the original wording to be retained.

I am also concerned that the plan does not seem to address issues in the rented sector or the need for social housing.

Other comments (not sure of which paragraph)
School
The Plan expects developers to provide a new school in large developments but does not require identification of where such a school should be located. The Plan should identify site(s) and costs

Sewage outlet (pp30 and 51?)
References to foul sewage outlets have now omitted the need in some cases to improve capacity and replaced it with a simple requirement for Anglian Water to confirm that capacity is adequate. I oppose this change. Need for improvement should be independently identified.

Core Strategy
There is a change in wording to say that the Area local plan is at a lower level than the core strategy rather than co-existent with it (the original wording). The change devalues the importance of local consultation and views and therefore I would like the original wording restored

Summary: Core Strategy
There is a change in wording to say that the Area local plan is at a lower level than the core strategy rather than co-existent with it (the original wording). The change devalues the importance of local consultation and views and therefore I would like the original wording restored

Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	None

Attachments:

3) Additional Changes Schedule (Comments not before the Inspector)

O - 8068 - 2742 - AC2 - None

8068 Object

Additional Changes (AC1 to AC46)

AC2

Respondent: Michael & Barbara Shout [2742]

Agent: STAG (Mr Ian Cowan) [312]

Full Text: Consultation Response By Ian Cowan To "Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan - Main Modifications And Additional Changes" Document

Summary: According to Abraham Lincoln: "You can fool some of the people all of the time." It is to be hoped that Planning Inspector Hill will not ignore credible evidence presented by myself on behalf of Mike and Barbara Shout at various sessions of the recent Independent Planning Inquiry. If evidence that does not suit the purposes of SCDC is discarded, Abraham Lincoln's aphorism will rightly be applied. Therefore, it is to be hoped that Inspector Hill ignores and amends some of their Main Modifications and recognises our very genuine concerns, as described below.

Important Note: The following major matters given in evidence by the writer on behalf of Mike and Barbara Shout have not been addressed by any of SCDC's Main Modifications, and are still outstanding -

1. There is no evidence to support the claim that at least 1,760 new houses are needed on the Felixstowe Peninsula.
2. In fact, evidence from the 2011 Census confirms that houses already built or in the pipeline are more than enough to satisfy the Peninsula's needs for the foreseeable future.
3. Worryingly, SCDC have failed to address various very important Creeping Baseline issues, including: (a) traffic congestion (b) education, social and medical needs (c) dangerously deteriorating air quality (d) various infrastructure requirements.

Soundness: Failure to address these material matters will mean that SCDC's "Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan - Main Modifications And Additional Changes" Document is unsound.

Housing Numbers: Policy FPP1 has been amended to read: "Trimley St Mary 150 Total 1,170." In addition, the Introduction to Policy FPP8 has been amended to read: "4.47ha of land, south of Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary, as shown on the Policies Map, is identified for approximately 150 residential units. In FPP1 and FPP8 the housing numbers have been increased by 50 units.

Comment: A reasonable person in possession of the facts could reasonably conclude that housing numbers have been specifically increased in order to facilitate the progress of Outline Planning Application DC/16/2122/OUT for 50 dwellings on greenfield land adjacent to Mill Farm, Thomas Avenue, Trimley St Mary. This Application was received by SCDC on 21 May 2016 but, so far as I can remember, no mention of its existence was made by SCDC during Inspector Hill's Independent Inquiry, nor was there any suggestion that overall housing numbers needed to be increased by 50 units. If SCDC are willing to blatantly manipulate the evidence base and increase housing numbers by less than 3% (50 / 1,760), giving the inevitable impression that they are doing so in order to accommodate a particular landowner, then the public can have no confidence in the credibility and objectivity of any future housing needs figures they produce.

Physical Limits Boundaries: The following additional wording has been inserted by SCDC at Paragraph 3.24: "Physical limits boundaries are therefore an important policy for the supply of housing. In order to implement Core Strategy policies SP19 and SP2 and Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan Policy FPP1, physical limits boundaries have been re-drafted to incorporate sites of 5 or more units where the principle of housing has been accepted and new housing allocations.

These sites and the revised physical limits boundaries are shown on the Inset Maps." In addition, the following addition has been made to Paragraph 3.28: "Outside of the physical limits boundary, opportunities for housing development are considerably more restricted limited as countryside policies of restraint will apply (Core Strategy policies SP28 and SP29)."

Comment: Regrettably, Physical Limits Boundary constraints were cynically ignored at the Planning Committee Meeting of 5 September 2016 with regards to the approval of Application DC/16/1919/FUL for 69 houses on farmland adjacent to Seamark Nunn off High Road, Trimley St Martin. If SCDC Officers and Members blithely ignore pre-existing Local Development Plan requirements, when they all know there is no need for these houses, there is no guarantee that the amended requirements will be honoured. At the recent Independent Planning Inquiry, Inspector Hill was reminded by me of the fact that SCDC had already blatantly ignored firm promises to update the housing needs evidence base, including taking account of the 2011 Census, which showed that the population of Felixstowe and the Trimley Villages was in decline. In other words, if previous promises can be cynically broken there is no guarantee that current promises and commitments will be kept. It is to be hoped that Inspector Hill will bear both my warnings and SCDC's blatant failure to keep firm, written promises in mind.

Although consideration of so-called Additional Changes are not within Inspector Hill's remit, I feel it is worth highlighting and bringing to her attention the following addition to Paragraph 1.15: "Work on the evidence base is well advanced and is co-ordinated via the Ipswich Policy Area Board. An important element of this work will be to identify an updated Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAN) for the housing market area looking forward to 2036 and from that, a housing requirement for each local planning authority area."

Comment: It is very far from the truth to claim that "work on the evidence base is well advanced", because no evidence of this was presented at the recent Inquiry. As I pointed out at the time, the real truth is that "work on the evidence

3) Additional Changes Schedule (Comments not before the Inspector)

base" is well overdue, and promises made to produce an updated evidence base by 2015 at the latest have been cynically and deliberately ignored. If SCDC continue to perpetuate this false claim, a reasonable person in possession of the facts could reasonably have great difficulty in believing anything they say. The previous commitment to take account of the 2011 Census is also noticeable by its absence. A reasonable person in possession of the facts could reasonably conclude that this deliberate omission is due to SCDC's predetermined intention to build at least 1,760 new homes on the Felixstowe Peninsula, and any evidence to the contrary is therefore being cynically and dishonestly ignored. Any so-called evidence that ignores this declining population could not be described as an "Objectively Assessed Housing Need". Therefore, Inspector Hill should insist that: (a) the evidence base for housing needs must be published as soon as possible (b) its assumptions and calculations must also be published (c) specific justification must be given for increasing this figure by 50 dwellings in order to facilitate Planning Application DC/16/2122/OUT and (d) it must be an overarching requirement that the results of the 2011 Census are properly taken into account. Ensuring that all relevant evidence is taken into account is surely a Main Modification and not an Additional Change!

Possible Lack Of Independence: When, at the recent Inquiry, I raised the issue with Inspector Hill that firm promises to update the housing needs evidence base had not been kept by SCDC, including failing to take account of the 2011 Census, her surprisingly dismissive response was that it was where we were and things have to move on. This indicates an acceptance by her that promises made in the Local Plan, which was declared to be sound by Planning Inspector Mike Moore in 2013, were worthless. It also indicated her acceptance of housing needs figures that were out of date and wrong! A reasonable person in possession of the facts would reasonably have expected Inspector Hill to back up her predecessor, rather than appear to condone SCDC's failings! SCDC's failure to keep such important promises shows contempt for the LDF process, and if Inspector Hill accepts housing needs figures that are not objectively assessed, and not based on updated evidence which takes account of the 2011 Census, a reasonable person in possession of the facts could reasonably conclude that she was biased in favour of SCDC. This would render the whole process unsound.

Summary: It is very far from the truth to claim that "work on the evidence base is well advanced", because no evidence of this was presented at the recent Inquiry. The real truth is that "work on the evidence base" is well overdue, and promises made to produce an updated evidence base by 2015 at the latest have been cynically and deliberately ignored. If SCDC continue to perpetuate this false claim, a reasonable person could reasonably have great difficulty in believing anything they say. The previous commitment to take account of the 2011 Census is also noticeable by its absence.

Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	No	Not Specified	None

Attachments:
FelixstoweMods_Redacted.pdf

3) Additional Changes Schedule (Comments not before the Inspector)

S - 8123 - 2442 - AC13 - None

8123 Support

Additional Changes (AC1 to AC46)

AC13

Respondent: Suffolk County Council (James Cutting) [2442]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan - Main Modifications

I write to confirm Suffolk County Council's position following consultation on the main modifications. Before turning to the main modifications, I consider that attention needs to be made to changes that have occurred since the hearing sessions at the beginning of September that are relevant to the County Council's interests with regard to the Main Modifications, this includes:

- recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee, and
- inquiry hearing sessions into the appeal at Candlet Road.

Recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee

On Friday 2 September 2016, I provided further evidence on the resultant needs for early years and primary school places in support of Suffolk Coastal District Council's Area Action Plan (AAP) for the Felixstowe Peninsula. I restated the long-held position of the County Council that a new primary school is needed to accommodate the likely growth in the number of primary-aged pupils and the needs for early years facilities, including which sites would be expected to provide on-site provision for early years.

During the session, I responded to questions and there was no disagreement from the District Council, landowners, developers or their agents to the approach, including on-site provision and the need for financial contributions to be secured through s106 agreements.

However, since the examination hearing sessions, minutes from the 29 June 2016 meeting of Suffolk Coastal's Planning Committee were released on 7 September 2016 providing its resolution for part of the Thurmans Lane site (FPP8). The County Council then received confirmation of same Committee's 5 September resolution for an application not included in the AAP (land at High Road, Trimley St Martin, application DC/16/1919/FUL).

These decisions resolved to grant permission without financial contributions towards a new early years setting or towards a new primary school, which has implications for the AAP and for future decisions. The case officer's report for 5 September Planning Committee for planning application DC/16/1919/FUL (for 69 dwellings at Land at High Road, Trimley St Martin) cited the lack of a specific site as a reason and suggested an alternative education strategy, for temporary accommodation being stationed at Trimley St Martin. These and other points were contested by the County Council in writing to the Committee.

The District Council's central point, but also related to the timescales of delivery, is that a site has not been identified. The County Council has the statutory duty to secure sufficient places and, in extreme cases, can compulsorily purchase land under section 530 of the Education Act 1996. The fact that a site has not been identified does not prevent contributions being secured because the contributions are necessary to mitigate the direct impact of development. In terms of timescales, new homes build before a new school is built will reduce available capacity, which should be considered in combination with the AAP.

A very similar situation arose during a recovered appeal in Buntingford, Hertfordshire (Appeal references: APP/J1915/A/14/2220854 & APP/J1915/A/14/2220859), which the Secretary of State determined in March 2016. In this case, East Hertfordshire District Council was seeking to use the absence of a school site to resist residential development. In recommending allowing the appeal, the Inspector concluded (in paragraph 26) on the relationship between a lack of a site and the use of planning obligations thus:

"The second sustainability objection relates to lack of education facilities (a new 2FE primary school). It flies in the face of the Education Authority's consultation response to the applications. Indeed, it is hard to see how such a facility will be provided without developer contributions. Moreover there is absolutely no evidence to show that the Education Authority will not deliver as and when necessary."

During the hearing sessions on the AAP I explained that, owing to the dispersed approach to housing growth, the most sustainable location for the new school depends on the actual rate and location of homes. I also explained that, in order to allocate a primary school site within the AAP, there would need to be considerable certainty that that particular site could be delivered and that it would be the most sustainable.

This issue of certainty was discussed with Suffolk Coastal's officers during the preparation of the AAP and, as I described during the hearing, a location between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary may be the most accessible. This is, however, dependent upon the resultant pattern of development being as set out in the AAP, the rate of development being as predicted and there being no changes in the number and distribution of pupils throughout the Peninsula. If any of these conditions is not as envisaged, the most appropriate site for a new primary school may be elsewhere in the Peninsula. Notwithstanding this point, the county council is already exploring the potential for sites between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary.

The County Council's preference for a site might change if other developments come forward (such as the 560 home proposed at Candlet Road which is subject to an appeal) and if development around Trimley St Mary and Trimley St

3) Additional Changes Schedule (Comments not before the Inspector)

S - 8123 - 2442 - AC13 - None

8123 Support

Additional Changes (AC1 to AC46)

AC13

Martin does not progress. The County Council requires certainty, beyond the simple allocation of a site, about the site's availability and suitability to commit its own and others resources towards delivering a new primary school, which can cost at least £4.35m to build (without land costs being included).

Inquiry hearing sessions into the appeal at Candlet Road.

Between 27 - 30 September, Mr Clive Hughes held evidence sessions into the appeal by Christchurch Land & Estates against Suffolk Coastal District Council's refusal to grant planning permission for 560 dwellings and other development (including a 60-bed care home) on land adjacent to Candlet Road, Felixstowe (Appeal Ref: APP/J3530/W/15/3138710).

This appeal is relevant to the consideration of the AAP because, if allowed, the addition of the 560 dwellings will add around 45% more homes to those already permitted or allocated. This has implications for the provision of transport and education infrastructure needed to support the appeal site and the implementation of the AAP.

Transport

In terms of transport considerations, the AECOM report - "Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan (AAP) Cumulative Impact Assessment" - did include the Candlet Road proposal in the assessment (AECOM, paras 1.3.8 and 2.5.2). AECOM highlighted several measures, particularly at the Candlet Road/Grove Road and Garrison Lane roundabout that could be implemented to mitigate traffic impact on junctions. This includes realignment and removing the hatched area (AECOM, para. 5.2.3), which was installed to reduce traffic speed entering the roundabout.

The minor change reversing the hatching changes on Candlet Road / Garrison Road roundabout can be implemented once the 40 mph Traffic Regulation Order along Candlet Road has been formally agreed. The s.278 works associated with the Candlet Road Development could be used to deliver this work.

Education

The situation for education infrastructure is similar. During the inquiry, the appellant agreed to the county council's requirements which took account of the emerging AAP. The county council secured contributions towards land and build costs for early years and primary education and the reservation of land for both types of facility was secured on site.

In contrast to the two decisions above, during the inquiry Suffolk Coastal District Council formally accepted and endorsed the need for appropriate and proportionate contributions towards the new primary school. The district council did, however, raise a concern over the suitability of this location for the school.

Notwithstanding the reservation on the Candlet Road site, and as noted above, the county council is already exploring the potential for sites between Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary because the Candlet Road site might not present an optimum solution for the Felixstowe Peninsula as a whole. However, there remains a residual risk that a better site may not be available and that, owing to phasing and the actual demand generated if the Candlet Road site is delivered, this location may be preferred.

The relationship between the Candlet Road and High Road developments is shown in the table below. The total pupil yields are based on houses with 2 or more bedrooms, the calculation for pupil yields does vary for the size and type of dwelling permitted. This table shows the constraint in the availability of places within primary schools throughout Felixstowe but particularly at Kingsfleet, Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary Primary Schools.

If the Candlet Road appeal is dismissed, the total deficit will be reduced by 140 places to -125. This highlights the complexity in considering the most appropriate location for a primary school within the Peninsula.

Based on the catchment areas covering the Candlet Road site, the county council assumed that 45 pupils would attend Maidstone Infants, 60 at Causton Junior and 35 Kingsfleet. Contributions towards the land and build costs have been agreed based on the lack of capacity at Kingsfleet. This has impacted on the consideration of the available capacity at FPP4 (Land North of High Street, Walton), which would then become available if the appeal is dismissed.

Table 1. Capacity, Forecast Pupil Rolls and Pupil Yields from developments in the Felixstowe Peninsula.

[SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT]

The AAP highlights the requirement for a new primary school to be one form entry (210 places). The above figures do not take into account the final mixture of housing sizes and types. The indicative size mix set out in table 3.6 in the Core Strategy does provide a general rule. If this were to be followed (with assumptions on flats and houses (The assumed flats/houses splits being a 50/50 one bed, 30/70 two bed and 5/95 three bed and 0/100 four bed.)) the resultant deficit of primary school places is likely to be below 200.

The Candlet Road appeal also affects the consideration of the availability of secondary school places. However, financial contributions to increasing the available capacity can only be secured through the Community Infrastructure

3) Additional Changes Schedule (Comments not before the Inspector)

S - 8123 - 2442 - AC13 - None

8123 Support

Additional Changes (AC1 to AC46)

AC13

Levy. If the Secretary of State allows the appeal and grants planning permission, there will be an overall deficit in 2020 of -126 secondary and sixth form places, which increases to -141 with the High Road site included. This is a worst case scenario as a mixture of housing types and sizes is likely to reduce the overall deficit.

Main Modifications

MM1

The total increase from 1,120 to 1,170 is made to reflect 50 additional dwellings at the Thurmans Lane sites (FPP8). However, this does not include the applications for which there is a resolution to grant permission at High Road, Trimley St Martin.

MM4 - MM6

These changes are welcome and provide clarity to decision makers. This addresses the county council's above concerns over recent decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council's Planning Committee.

MM20

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through a planning obligation rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

A further addition is necessary to reflect the need to reserve a 2.1ha site for the new school, pending the final location being secured. This was requested in the county council's response to planning application ref 16/2778/OUT and is in accordance with para. 3.44 of the AAP.

MM21

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through planning obligations for this and other sites rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

MM22

The acknowledgement of the need for an early years setting on site is welcome. Given that this would be a new facility, the county council anticipated that funding for which would be through a planning obligation rather than the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, there does remain the potential for CIL to be used to increase the capacity further should other development come forward beyond the AAP.

A further addition is necessary to reflect the need to reserve a 2.1ha site for the new school, pending the final location being secured. This is in accordance with para. 3.44 of the AAP.

Additional Changes

AC13

The amendment to the area for the new primary school and early years settling is welcome and no further amendments are necessary. Whilst the required size of a 210 place school is likely to be sufficient for the resultant growth taking account of potential mixture of dwellings, a new school provides a significant and long-term piece of community infrastructure which is likely to need further expansion in the future. This likelihood is reinforced by the facts that: the housing numbers in the AAP are minimums, that Suffolk Coastal District Council needs to review its Core Strategy to reflect housing need and that, if the prevailing pattern of growth is followed, Felixstowe is likely to be a location for further residential development beyond that outlined in the current AAP.

The County Council's requirement, which is acknowledged in the AAP (para. 3.43), is for the reservation of land for a new primary school, which will include an early years setting. The required area to provide sufficient flexibility is based on being able to accommodate up to a 420 place school and a 60 place early years facility.

I trust that the above provides a suitable account of recent circumstances and provides you with an understanding of the County Council's position on the main modifications and additional changes.

Summary:

The amendment to the area for the new primary school and early years settling is welcome and no further amendments are necessary. Whilst the required size of a 210 place school is likely to be sufficient for the resultant growth taking account of potential mixture of dwellings, a new school provides a significant and long-term piece of community infrastructure which is likely to need further expansion in the future.

The County Council's requirement, which is acknowledged in the AAP (para. 3.43), is for the reservation of land for a

3) Additional Changes Schedule (Comments not before the Inspector)

S - 8123 - 2442 - AC13 - None

8123 Support

Additional Changes (AC1 to AC46) AC13

new primary school, which will include an early years setting.

Change to Plan N/A

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	N/A

Attachments:
2016-11-28.FinalMainModificationsResponse.pdf

3) Additional Changes Schedule (Comments not before the Inspector)

S - 8098 - 4189 - AC25 - None

8098 Support

Additional Changes (AC1 to AC46)

AC25

Respondent: Historic England (Debbie Mack) [4189]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan Proposed Main Modifications and Additional Changes Oct - Nov 2016 and Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Proposed Main Modifications and Additional Changes Oct - Nov 2016

Thank you for consulting us on the Proposed Main Modifications and Additional Changes to the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan and Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment, Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Therefore we welcome the opportunity to comment on the Proposed Main Modifications and Additional Changes.

We attach the 6 response forms and a continuation sheet and summarise our comments below:

FPAAP - MM12

FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)
Historic England welcomes this Main Modification.

FPAAP - MM14

FPP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary
Historic England welcomes the amendment to bullet point 8 but has concerns regarding this modification in respect of the dwelling capacity as set out in our response form.

FPAAP-AC25

Tourism and Sea Front Activities
Historic England welcomes this proposed modification.

SAASPD - MM12

Historic England welcomes this proposed modification which refers to preserving and enhancing the character of the conservation Area and listed buildings.

FPP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary

In our previous responses to you we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We advised that the policy should also state that any new development should be of a high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings. We therefore welcome the amended bullet point 8 in FPAAP - MM14. However, Historic England is particularly concerned about the increase in proposed capacity of the site from 100 to 150 dwellings. As we advised in our e-mail to you dated 13th September, the eastern end of the site is the most sensitive in historic terms given the presence of the grade II listed 18th century farmhouse. To that end, we would be cautious and concerned about substantially increasing the number of dwellings indicated in the policy from 100 to 150 dwellings.

Continued on separate sheet

FPAAP - MM14 continued

FPP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary

It might be more appropriate to limit the capacity of the site to between 120 and 130 in recognition of the need to protect and enhance the setting of the grade II listed building. In addition, it may be helpful to add comment in the policy to the effect that the eastern end of the site closest to the listed building should be left open to provide a buffer and to help mitigate the impact of the development upon the setting of the asset.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. We consider that this dwelling capacity is not consistent with the NPPF (para 132) given that development of this scale on the site would lead to the harm of the setting of a heritage asset.

Paragraph 157 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Plans to provide detail with site allocations where appropriate (fifth bullet point), with the Planning Practice Guidance stating "where sites are proposed for allocation, sufficient detail should be given to provide clarity to developers, local communities and other interests about the nature and scale of development (addressing the 'what, where, when and how' questions)" (PPG Reference ID: 12-010-20140306 (last revised 06/03/2014)). Paragraph 154 of the NPPF also states that only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan. Conservation of the historic environment is a core planning principle (Paragraph 17) and Local Plans should set out a positive strategy in this respect (Paragraph 126).

This clearly has implications for other proposed modifications including FPAAP-AC5, AC6, AC8, AC9 and AC10.

3) Additional Changes Schedule (Comments not before the Inspector)

S - 8098 - 4189 - AC25 - None

8098 Support

Additional Changes (AC1 to AC46)

AC25

Thank you for consulting Historic England on the Sustainability Appraisal Report Addendums for Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan and Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies October 2016.

We have no additional comments to make at this stage on the Main Modifications and Additional Changes to the Sustainability Appraisals.

Summary:

FPAAP-AC25
Tourism and Sea Front Activities
Historic England welcomes this proposed modification.

Change to Plan N/A

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A

Attachments:

16.11.28 CONCASE Letter HERef_PL00020745_275021__Redacted.pdf
16.11.23 Main-Mods-Form FPAAP MM14_Redacted.pdf
_HERef_Places - S_L275037_Redacted.pdf