

Kesgrave Neighbourhood Plan (KNP) Examination
Reply by Kesgrave Town Council to
the Initial Comments of the Independent Examiner

Regulation 16 Comments

5. Please refer to the appendix: Response to Regulation 16 Representations by Kesgrave Town Council.

Questions for Kesgrave Town Council

6. Policy KE2 is setting out uses that would be considered appropriate in the District Centre and that if residential uses were to come forward (at above ground floor level) this would contribute to meeting the minimum housing requirement for Kesgrave. In this regard, it is not a site allocation as such because it deliberately does not state the quantum of development expected or any other specific considerations.

The District Centre is already established through Policy SSP30 of the 2017 Suffolk Coastal Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD and is being carried forward under Policy SCLP4.12 in the emerging Suffolk Coastal Local Plan. It is therefore not a new designation in the KNP. The two sites mentioned have had sales hoardings in place for several years. As covered in paragraph 5.11 in KNP, the Kesgrave Neighbourhood Plan Subcommittee and subsequently KTC has consulted with the landowner's agent and this has confirmed that mixed use (ground floor business with dwellings over) is an option the landowner will consider for the development of both plots. In this regard, any residential use above ground floor on these sites in the District Centre would contribute further towards meeting the housing requirement for Kesgrave.

7. Policy KE4 is seeking to secure provision of growing spaces where open space is to be provided on site under Policy SP17 Green Space in the Suffolk Coastal Core Strategy and Policy SCLP8.2 Open Space in the emerging Suffolk Coastal Local Plan. There is no threshold because it would be difficult to justify an arbitrary figure. However, reference to 'communal areas' is intended to make clear that this is only relevant where development is of a scale that it provides communal space. Clearly a development of one or two dwellings would not provide communal space therefore the policy would not apply.
8. As paragraph 3.1 in KNP explains that the issues being addressed were identified through several means, survey reports being one but consideration was also given to information and opinions from, in particular, town councillors and town council employees based on their day-to-day interaction with the people of Kesgrave, and their experience in reviewing the objections of residents when compiling their responses to relevant planning applications (specific examples are provided in Evidence Document 08 'Review of impact of policy in reference to Policy KE1'). Section 5 sets out the available evidence to show the detrimental effects from a progressive loss of amenity, green space and wildlife habitats and noting, in particular, the comments from residents in the areas affected that a lack of nearby open, recreational space has on their well-being. A higher frequency of flash flooding generates many complaints and increasing concerns on the part of residents that climate change will exacerbate the problem.

APPENDIX: Response to Regulation 16 Representations

Kesgrave Town Council (KTC) has only responded on matters where it is considered appropriate in order to assist the Examiner with ascertaining whether the Kesgrave Neighbourhood Plan (KNP) meets the Basic Conditions. We would observe that a number of comments from Gladman and Grainger PLC appear to be more relevant to the emerging Local Plan and any subsequent review, especially matters of housing supply. These issues are best addressed to officers at East Suffolk Council.

East Suffolk Council

1. Policy KE1 and development in residential gardens, p2:
 - KTC observes that the test of a policy to resist development in residential gardens in paragraph 70 of the NPPF is where "...development would cause harm to the local area." It is considered that the supporting text to Policy KE1, Appendices A and E of KNP and Evidence Document 08 ('Review of impact of policy in reference to Policy KE1') make clear the ways in which harm has been caused in Kesgrave by such development.
 - KTC would also wish to make clear that the housing requirement in the emerging Local Plan for Kesgrave has been met by completions and sites in the planning pipeline and KNP identifies further opportunities for housing development in the District Centre through Policy KE2. KNP is therefore providing for more growth than is proposed in the emerging Local Plan. Indeed, the limited scale of growth proposed for Kesgrave in the emerging Local Plan reflects its existing built-up nature, the restricted opportunities for further development this creates and the detrimental impacts that such development would be likely to have.

Gladman

2. Previous representations, p9:
 - The statement, "Whilst Gladman support the fact that the Town Council has amended the KNP in light of our previous representations..." is incorrect. Gladman did not make representations to the Pre-Submission (Regulation 14) Consultation or at any stage in the preparation of KNP.
3. Policy KE3, p9:
 - Views and general openness where they exist beyond the settlement boundaries in Kesgrave are highly valued by residents (see paragraph 5.12 of KNP) in the context of a town very largely built up within its Settlement Boundary. However, no mention is made in the analysis (09 Landscape Identity Analysis Report) that they are valued on a national scale nor are they required to be out of the ordinary or embrace defined landmarks. The views have been highlighted by independent landscape specialists simply as those that encompass the most important characteristics of the landscapes that define Kesgrave.
 - The suggestion is that coalescence of settlements should only be considered through the Local Plan process. Paragraph 5.13 of KNP refers to policy SCLP Policy SCLP10.5 (Settlement Coalescence) in the emerging Suffolk Coastal Local Plan which indeed includes that development between settlements will only be permitted where it does not lead to the coalescence of settlements through a reduction in openness and space or the creation of urbanising effects between settlements. It also states that "neighbourhood plans may include policies addressing local issues related to settlement

coalescence" and this is what KNP does. In reference also to Objective 11 Protecting and Enhancing the Physical Environment and paragraphs 3.143 and 3.159 of the Suffolk Coastal Core Strategy 2013, Strategic Policy SP15 Landscape and Townscape sets out policy to extend protection to towns where development would lead to coalescence and locations may be designated, amongst other things through a Neighbourhood Development Plan Document.

4. Policy KE5 – insufficient evidence, p10

- Supporting evidence to justify the Local Green Space designations is contained in Evidence Document 11 ('Local green space – Analysis, designation maps and consultation').

Grainger PLC (Turnberry)

5. Housing supply, site allocations and Policy KE2, p12:

- The housing requirement in the emerging Local Plan for Kesgrave has been met by completions and sites in the planning pipeline and KNP identifies further opportunities for housing development in the areas identified in Policy KE2 (the District Centre). These are not site allocations and it is clear that this is the case. The intention is to identify areas where opportunities are available for further development. In this regard, the policy meets the Basic Conditions and certainly cannot be described as 'illegal', which is not a planning test.

6. Policy KE3, p13:

- Views and general openness where they exist beyond the settlement boundaries in Kesgrave are highly valued by residents (see paragraph 5.12 of KNP) in the context of a town very largely built up within its Settlement Boundary. However, no mention is made in the analysis (09 Landscape Identity Analysis Report) that they are valued on a national scale nor are they required to be out of the ordinary or embrace defined landmarks. The views have been highlighted by independent landscape specialists simply as those that encompass the most important characteristics of the landscapes that define Kesgrave.
- The suggestion is that coalescence of settlements should only be considered through the Local Plan process. Paragraph 5.13 of KNP refers to policy SCLP Policy SCLP10.5 (Settlement Coalescence) in the emerging Suffolk Coastal Local Plan which indeed includes that development between settlements will only be permitted where it does not lead to the coalescence of settlements through a reduction in openness and space or the creation of urbanising effects between settlements. It also states that "neighbourhood plans may include policies addressing local issues related to settlement coalescence" and this is what KNP does. In reference also to Objective 11 Protecting and Enhancing the Physical Environment and paragraphs 3.143 and 3.159 of the Suffolk Coastal Core Strategy 2013, Strategic Policy SP15 Landscape and Townscape sets out policy to extend protection to towns where development would lead to coalescence and locations may be designated, amongst other things through a Neighbourhood Development Plan Document.
- A detailed response to the rebuttal of the analysis (09 Landscape Identity Analysis Report) is not considered necessary in the context of the above remarks.

7. Policy KE5, additional text regarding pruning and removal of trees and vegetation, p14:

- It is not considered that pruning and removal of trees is a planning matter per se. The only circumstances where it might be relates to matters relating to trees of significance, such as those with a Tree Preservation Order on them. This is why the wording “unless under the jurisdiction of other policies related to trees and landscape.” This is considered to provide important context to possible activities on local green spaces which is why it is included in the supporting text. Currently there is safe access to the land in question. Clearly therefore, if circumstances changed – perhaps a tree was damaged in a storm – and it made that access unsafe, then it should be removed. Under no circumstances could the wording be interpreted to mean anything other than this.

8. Policy KE5 and future reviews of Local Plan housing need:

- KTC would simply observe that, if it was the intention of Government to ensure that local planning authorities protected areas for possible future housing growth in unspecified future reviews over unspecified periods, then it would express that in Planning Practice Guidance.

Suffolk County Council

9. Health and Wellbeing, p47:

- The KNP is not obliged to cover matters expressly related to health and wellbeing.