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Introduction

Full Text: Unjustified - Census 2001 - 2011 show a reduction in population on the Peninsula of 384. This was never considered - despite promises to do so. Housing figures represent 108% inward migration to the area. Felixstowe area already has a 5 year plan, other areas do not and FPAAP merely seeks to “mop up” shortfalls in other areas, where affordable houses are in greater need. Felixstowe is cheaper housing than in many other areas. This is a policy of no proven justification and should be stopped in its entirety. Councillors and officials have cherry-picked findings, many of them going against their desire to build, have been ignored. Consultees, with provable reasons to not support the LDF and Core Strategy have been ignored or treated with contempt. Poor representation by our elected and unelected officials has been rife. Sustainability Appraisal - see all comments on page 6. Air pollution from congestion has not been properly examined re the "creeping baseline" of so many new houses and their cars, etc. Loss of greenfield areas do not "enhance" an area. Neither does traffic congestion and air pollution "promote" it - both of which the FPAAP and SCDC state as an objective of new developments.

Summary: Air pollution from congestion has not been properly examined re the "creeping baseline" of so many new houses and their cars, etc. Loss of greenfield areas do not "enhance" an area. Neither does traffic congestion and air pollution "promote" it - both of which the FPAAP and SCDC state as an objective of new developments.

Change to Plan

Yes No No No i, ii


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).
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Full Text:
Unjustified - Census 2001 - 2011 show a reduction in population on the Peninsula of 384. This was never considered -
despite promises to do so. Housing figures represent 108% inward migration to the area.
Felixstowe area already has a 5 year plan, other areas do not and FPAAP merely seeks to "mop up" shortfalls in other
areas, where affordable houses are in greater need. Felixstowe is cheaper housing than in many other areas.
This is a policy of no proven justification and should be stopped in its entirety.
Councillors and officials have cherry-picked findings, many of them going against their desire to build, have been
ignored. Consultees, with provable reasons to not support the LDF and Core Strategy have been ignored or treated with
contempt.
Poor representation by our elected and unelected officials has been rife.
Sustainability Appraisal - see all comments on page 6.
Air pollution from congestion has not been properly examined re the "creeping baseline" of so many new houses and
their cars, etc.
Loss of greenfield areas do not "enhance" an area. Neither does traffic congestion and air pollution "promote" it - both of
which the FPAAP and SCDC state as an objective of new developments.

Summary:
Many consultation and evidence findings have been ignored including census population decline evidence.

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>i, ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).
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Respondent: Mr Michael Ninnmey [3451]
Agent: N/A

Full Text:
Note - no papers available at Felixstowe library.
(i) Following the recent decision made by planning inspector John Braithwaite that (a) Housing growth uncertain, not to national guidelines, (b) not having a five year supply of housing, should FPAAP continue at all?? When the position is clear it would be right to re-consult the community of FP. Not withstanding present position, some comments on AAP.
(ii) Fails to promote strengthening communities and highlighting lack of infrastructure particularly highways, following reduction of secondary schools is one at eastern side of Walton.
(iii) Failed to deliver the 1/3 affordable dwellings (added to local plan 2004/5?).
(iv) Fails to relate or encourage applicants to relate to SCDC "Housing needs survey".(v) No meaningful policy or guidance for end of life dwellings, whether partners or single. With community support and financially sound, thereby making existing family homes available and make best use of existing housing (see dwelling occupancy).
(vii) No policy on over provision of holiday and second homes (New build - South seafront Felixstowe, public land only 10% affordable) re St Ives, Cornwall.
Please enter above comments and inform me whether the process will be rerun (ref Braithwaite).

Summary: Following the recent decision made by planning inspector John Braithwaite that (a) Housing growth uncertain, not to national guidelines, (b) not having a five year supply of housing, should FPAAP continue at all?? When the position is clear it would be right to re-consult the community of FP. Not withstanding present position, some comments on AAP.

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>i, ii, iii, iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).
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Full Text:
Note - no papers available at Felixstowe library.
(i) Following the recent decision made by planning inspector John Braithwaite that (a) Housing growth uncertain, not to national guidelines, (b) not having a five year supply of housing, should FPAAP continue at all?? When the position is clear it would be right to re-consult the community of FP. Notwithstanding present position, some comments on AAP.
(ii) Fails to promote strengthening communities and highlighting lack of infrastructure particularly highways, following reduction of secondary schools is one at eastern side of Walton.
(iii) Failed to deliver the 1/3 affordable dwellings (added to local plan 2004/5?).
(iv) Fails to relate or encourage applicants to relate to SCDC "Housing needs survey".(v) No meaningful policy or guidance for end of life dwellings, whether partners or single. With community support and financially sound, thereby making existing family homes available and make best use of existing housing (see dwelling occupancy).
(vii) No policy on over provision of holiday and second homes (New build - South seafront Felixstowe, public land only 10% affordable) re St Ives, Cornwall.

Please enter above comments and inform me whether the process will be rerun (ref Braithwaite).

Summary:
Following the recent decision made by planning inspector John Braithwaite that (a) Housing growth uncertain, not to national guidelines, (b) not having a five year supply of housing, should FPAAP continue at all?? When the position is clear it would be right to re-consult the community of FP. Notwithstanding present position, some comments on AAP.

Change to Plan

No No No No i, ii, iii, iv

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).
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Respondent: Mr Michael Ninnmey [3451]  Agent: N/A

Full Text:  Note - no papers available at Felixstowe library.
(i) Following the recent decision made by planning inspector John Braithwaite that (a) Housing growth uncertain, not to national guidelines, (b) not having a five year supply of housing, should FPAAP continue at all?? When the position is clear it would be right to re-consult the community of FP. Not withstanding present position, some comments on AAP.
(ii) Fails to promote strengthening communities and highlighting lack of infrastructure particularly highways, following reduction of secondary schools is one at eastern side of Walton.
(iii) Failed to deliver the 1/3 affordable dwellings (added to local plan 2004/5?).
(iv) Fails to relate or encourage applicants to relate to SCDC "Housing needs survey".
(v) No meaningful policy or guidance for end of life dwellings, whether partners or single. With community support and financially sound, thereby making existing family homes available and make best use of existing housing (see dwelling occupancy).
(vii) No policy on over provision of holiday and second homes (New build - South seafront Felixstowe, public land only 10% affordable) re St Ives, Cornwall.

Summary: Fails to promote strengthening communities and highlighting lack of infrastructure particularly highways, following reduction of secondary schools is one at eastern side of Walton.

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>i, ii, iii, iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).
Object
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Response: Mr Michael Ninnmey [3451]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Note - no papers available at Felixstowe library.

(i) Following the recent decision made by planning inspector John Braithwaite that (a) Housing growth uncertain, not to national guidelines, (b) not having a five year supply of housing, should FPAAP continue at all?? When the position is clear it would be right to re-consult the community of FP. Notwithstanding present position, some comments on AAP.

(ii) Fails to promote strengthening communities and highlighting lack of infrastructure particularly highways, following reduction of secondary schools is one at eastern side of Walton.

(iii) Failed to deliver the 1/3 affordable dwellings (added to local plan 2004/5?).

(iv) Fails to relate or encourage applicants to relate to SCDC "Housing needs survey". (v) No meaningful policy or guidance for end of life dwellings, whether partners or single. With community support and financially sound, thereby making existing family homes available and make best use of existing housing (see dwelling occupancy).

(vi) No policy on over provision of holiday and second homes (New build - South seafront Felixstowe, public land only 10% affordable) re St Ives, Cornwall.

Please enter above comments and inform me whether the process will be rerun (ref Braithwaite).

Summary: Fails to deliver the 1/3 affordable dwellings (added to local plan 2004/5?). Fails to relate or encourage applicants to relate to SCDC "Housing needs survey".

Change to Plan

Appear at exam? No
Legal? No
Sound? No
Duty to Cooperate? No

Soundness Tests i, ii, iii, iv

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).
7894 Object
Vision and Objectives for Felixstowe Peninsula AAP 2.11

Respondent: Mr Michael Ninnmey [3451] Agent: N/A

Full Text: Note - no papers available at Felixstowe library.
(i) Following the recent decision made by planning inspector John Braithwaite that (a) Housing growth uncertain, not to national guidelines, (b) not having a five year supply of housing, should FPAAP continue at all?? When the position is clear it would be right to re-consult the community of FP. Not withstanding present position, some comments on AAP.
(ii) Fails to promote strengthening communities and highlighting lack of infrastructure particularly highways, following reduction of secondary schools is one at eastern side of Walton.
(iii) Failed to deliver the 1/3 affordable dwellings (added to local plan 2004/5?).
(iv) Fails to relate or encourage applicants to relate to SCDC "Housing needs survey".(v) No meaningful policy or guidance for end of life dwellings, whether partners or single. With community support and financially sound, thereby making existing family homes available and make best use of existing housing (see dwelling occupancy).
(vii) No policy on over provision of holiday and second homes (New build - South seafront Felixstowe, public land only 10% affordable) re St Ives, Cornwall.

Please enter above comments and inform me whether the process will be rerun (ref Braithwaite).

Summary: No meaningful policy or guidance for end of life dwellings, whether partners or single. With community support and financially sound, thereby making existing family homes available and make best use of existing housing (see dwelling occupancy).

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>i, ii, iii, iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Full Text: Support the AAP document.

Summary: Support the AAP document.

Change to Plan: N/A

No Yes Yes Yes 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).
Thank you for consulting Suffolk County Council on submission version for development in Felixstowe. Suffolk County Council responded previously to the preferred options stage in November 2015. This response does not rehearse all the issues as Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) has responded well to the points that the county council made at the time.

The following response relates to the ways in which the development of these sites affects county council responsibilities, and how our authorities will need to work together to bring these sites forward in a successful way.

This letter does not take into account the impact of sites which may come forward as windfall development, which may have significant impacts on local infrastructure.

Archaeology

Additional text has been systematically added in general information about archaeology, using the county council's previous comments. It introduces archaeology throughout the document and gives the plan a sound approach to archaeology.

Suffolk County Council Archaeology has reviewed the document and the only minor outstanding matters relate to suggested amendments and the terminology used in the following paragraphs:

Para. 3.74 (FPP4) - the site will require archaeological excavation rather than assessment, as it has already been assessed. Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service can provide a brief for the works and also discuss options for preservation in situ.

Paras. 3.82 (FPP5), 3.94 (FPP6), 3.101 (FPP7), 3.109 (FPP8) - Change the reference to archaeological assessment "prior to the development of the site" to "at an appropriate design stage prior to the granting of outline, technical details or full planning permission." This will allow for preservation in situ, where appropriate, of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed, for which conditions may or may not be sufficient.

With regard to FFP12 (Land at Haven Exchange), which is an enabling policy, archaeological investigation will be required, particularly for larger schemes.

Education

Early Education

The document reflects advice provided by the county council on the need for at least one additional facility for early years education (excluding the Candlet Road site subject to an appeal). The detail provided is paragraphs 3.39 to 3.41 is welcomed. During the previous stage, the county council highlighted ways in which policy FPP15 could be more supportive of early education in retail centres, as part of a balanced policy which also protects the vitality and viability of retail centres. The county raised the point that policy FPP16 (previously FPP17) would support early years provision, which SCDC has considered. Therefore, our councils agree that early years facilities can be considered as "other local services" within FPP16.

Primary Education

The challenge presented by the distribution of housing proposed for ensuring sufficient additional primary school places has been recognised in the submission version. Land needs to be identified for a new primary school in order to ensure that there can be confidence of a long term solution for primary school provision. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in identifying options for sites based on the pattern of development coming forward and the need to find a location that promotes sustainable travel choices. The two locations identified and other alternatives as stated in para. 3.44 provide a clear indication of how a site could be identified. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in keeping the expected size of school and the area of land required under review.

Transport

A report by AECOM, on behalf of Highways England and Suffolk County Council (SCC), to assess the cumulative impact of development proposed in the Area Action Plan on the local and strategic road networks is attached to this response. In addition to the sites identified, this report implicitly includes background growth port-related traffic and the growth throughout the district.

The Suffolk County Council supports the creation of a link road between Candlet Road and High Street Walton. The intention of this link is that it is designed to serve local journeys so that the impacts from rerouting are localised.

I hope that these comments are helpful. Please contact me via the details at the top of this letter, if we or any of our colleagues can be of assistance.
Support
Vision and Objectives for Felixstowe Peninsula AAP  2.11

Summary: A report by AECOM, on behalf of Highways England and Suffolk County Council (SCC), to assess the cumulative impact of development proposed in the Area Action Plan on the local and strategic road networks is attached to this response. In addition to the sites identified, this report implicitly includes background growth port-related traffic and the growth throughout the district.

Change to Plan  N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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).
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Respondent: Mr Michael Ninnmey [3451]  Agent: N/A

Full Text: Note - no papers available at Felixstowe library.
(i) Following the recent decision made by planning inspector John Braithwaite that (a) Housing growth uncertain, not to national guidelines, (b) not having a five year supply of housing, should FPAAP continue at all?? When the position is clear it would be right to re-consult the community of FP. Not withstanding present position, some comments on AAP.
(ii) Fails to promote strengthening communities and highlighting lack of infrastructure particularly highways, following reduction of secondary schools is one at eastern side of Walton.
(iii) Failed to deliver the 1/3 affordable dwellings (added to local plan 2004/5?).
(iv) Fails to relate or encourage applicants to relate to SCDC "Housing needs survey".(v) No meaningful policy or guidance for end of life dwellings, whether partners or single. With community support and financially sound, thereby making existing family homes available and make best use of existing housing (see dwelling occupancy).
(vi) No policy on over provision of holiday and second homes (New build - South seafront Felixstowe, public land only 10% affordable) re St Ives, Cornwall.
Please enter above comments and inform me whether the process will be rerun (ref Braithwaite).

Summary: No policy on over provision of holiday and second homes (New build - South seafront Felixstowe, public land only 10% affordable) re St Ives, Cornwall.

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>i, ii, iii, iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments:
This representation has been prepared by Strutt Parker LLP on behalf of Pigeon (Trimley) Ltd in respect of land at High Road, Trimley St Martin, also referred to as Alternative Option Site 3022a and now the subject of a planning application to Suffolk Coastal District Council (ref. DC/16/1919/FUL).

The land was put forward in the call for sites and identified as suitable for development in the SHLAA 2014. Representations were made to the earlier drafts of the Felixstowe Peninsular Area Action Plan on the basis that the site is sustainable, available and deliverable, would represent a logical extension to the development limits of the settlement and as such should be included as a Preferred Allocation. Significant site specific information was provided in support of the representation submitted in November 2015 which included the following documents:

* Site Plan;
* Indicative Layout Plan;
* Preliminary Drainage Appraisal October 2015;
* Desk-based Archaeological Assessment;
* Landscape and Visual Assessment;
* Preliminary Ecological Appraisal; and
* Transport Report
* Phase 1 Contamination Report

However, whilst the local planning authority has "noted" the representation they commented that:

"The site has been discounted in the AAP it is not appropriate to show this on the Policies Map which supports the written text."

We consider that this does not adequately assess the previous representation or provide sufficient justification why the Council considered that the site was not a sustainable location and should not be included as an additional allocation in the AAP.

Current Planning Proposal

A planning application for the site has now been submitted (DC/16/1919/FUL). It was made valid on 10th May 2016. The application is a full planning application for the erection of 69 new homes with associated access, landscaping and amenity space on land adjacent to High Road, Trimley St Martin, Suffolk. The application is supported by a series of documents including:

* Planning Statement (PS) prepared by Strutt & Parker;
* Design & Access Statement (DAS) prepared by Strutt & Parker;
* Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) prepared by Liz Lake Associates;
* Transport Statement (TS) prepared by MLM Consulting Engineers Ltd;
* Travel Plan (TP) prepared by MLM Consulting Engineers Ltd;
* Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA), Tree Survey Plan and Tree Protection Plan prepared by Hayden's Arboricultural Consultants;
* Preliminary Ecological Assessment prepared by Basecology;
* Plans and other drawings relevant to the planning application prepared by Parc Design Solutions;
* Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Drainage Strategy prepared by MLM Consulting Engineers Ltd;
* Utility Services Report prepared by MLM Consulting Engineers Ltd;
* Phase 1 Contamination Assessment Report prepared by MLM Consulting Engineers Ltd;
* Archaeological Assessment prepared by Archaeological Risk Management;
* Noise and Vibration Technical Report prepared by MLM Consulting Engineers Ltd;

These demonstrate that as the site is located adjacent to the north western edge of Trimley St Martin it will form a natural extension to the settlement with the proposals for structural landscaping enhancing the countryside edge of Trimley St Martin. Overall, the site lies in a sustainable location which is demonstrably suitable and appropriate to host new housing development.

There are no access or traffic issues identified that would prevent the proposed development coming forward. The application proposals can be accommodated without having an adverse impact on the local highway network in terms of road safety and capacity.

Information provided with the application confirms there are no other adverse impacts arising from development at this site. In fact, the planning application demonstrates that development would bring forward:

* Economic benefits;
* Much needed affordable housing, (41%) in excess of the policy requirement;
* Two large areas of publicly accessible open space, totalling 0.6 hectares, well in excess of the required standard, helping to meet a current deficiency in the area;
* Traffic calming measures in the form of a new pedestrian refuge island that will help to encourage sustainable living.
movement; and
* Possible improvements to an adjacent area of open space that has been the subject of anti-social behaviour.

The Development as proposed clearly constitutes sustainable development; the site is available, deliverable and developable.

On this basis it is considered that the site should be included as an additional site allocation in Table 2, and as an addition to those sites identified in Policies FPP3 to FPP8. Further justification to support this position is set out below.

Framlingham Appeal

For the purpose of these representations, since the publication of the Proposed Submission Documents, on 25th of April 2016 an Appeal Decision in respect of land at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, Suffolk was issued (APP/J3530/W/15/3011466). This decision related to a residential development of 163 dwellings and was allowed.

Paragraphs 13 to 28 of the decision are considered of particular relevance, in that they established that Core Strategy Policy SP2 is out of date and that, with a housing requirement based on an 0AN of 11,000 dwellings, the district has a housing land supply of less than 3.7 years. This is an important appeal decision and should be afforded significant weight as part of the consideration of these representations. It provides up-to-date evidence that the Proposed Submission Documents are fundamentally flawed and do not seek to allocate sufficient housing sites, to significantly boost the supply of housing over the plan period.

Legally Compliant

Section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, requires that a local planning authority must only submit a document to the Secretary of State for independent examination where:

a) they have complied with any relevant requirements contained in the regulations under this part, and
b) they think the document is ready for independent examination.

Firstly, the Council is required to demonstrate evidence of having effectively cooperated to plan for cross boundary issues with neighbouring authorities under the "duty to cooperate". It is unclear what evidence the Council has to demonstrate that there has been effective co-operation at this stage of the plan making process.

Secondly, for the reasons set out below in this representation, in respect of housing allocations the Proposed Submission Documents rely on Policy SP2 of the Core Strategy. This is considered to be out-of-date and not based on an up-to-date Objectively Assessed Housing Need for the Suffolk Coastal Council district. More detail on this specific point is set out below. We therefore question whether the proposed strategy is sound and whether the documents are ready for independent examination.

Soundness

For a local plan to be found sound at examination by an independent inspector the NPPF at paragraph 182 advises that it should satisfy a series of tests which are considered in turn below:

Positively Prepared

For a local plan to be considered positively prepared it must be based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed housing development requirements, including the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities.

At the strategic level housing numbers and distribution are set out in the Core Strategy. Objective 2 states:

To meet the minimum locally identified housing needs of the district for the period 2010 to 2027, taking into account existing and future economic, environmental and social opportunities and constraints

In respect of this objective there are two important points to note. Firstly, that the Core Strategy seeks to meet the minimum locally identified housing need, and secondly, that it is a locally identified housing need for the plan period.

Currently, Policy SP2 of the Core Strategy states that provision will be made for at least 7,900 new homes, distributed in accordance with the settlement hierarchy set out in policy SP19. The policy then goes on to commit to an early review in order to identify the full objectively assessed housing needs for the District, to ensure this is met in so far as this is consistent with the policies of the NPPF.

The Examining Inspector's report in respect of the Core Strategy Examination (June 2013) made it clear that an early review was essential because at the time:
"On available evidence at this point the 11,000 new dwellings should be taken as the full, objectively assessed housing need OAN for the District between 2010 and 2027."

At paragraph 46 of the Report the Inspector commented that:

"Even if the theoretical capacity of all the sites included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability assessment (SHLAA), existing commitments, potential brownfield opportunities, allocations carried forward from the previous Local Plan and a windfall allowance were taken into account, the provision would fall some way short of the 11,000 dwellings required."

At this point, the Inspector concluded that, as none of the adjoining Councils had objected to the scale of housing proposed, having a core strategy in place with an early review would be preferable to the alternative of suspension of the examination and the likely withdrawal of the plan.

While it is noted that the Site Allocations and Area Specific DPD Issues and Options consultation commenced in 2015, it is of significant concern that this occurred ahead of the objectively assessed housing needs for the District being reviewed, updated and firmly established. Policy CS2 states:

"An early review of the Core Strategy will be undertaken, commencing with the publication of an Issues and Options Report by 2015 at the latest. The review will identify the full, objectively assessed need for the District and proposals to ensure that this is met in so far as this is consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework."

This review has not been undertaken and we therefore consider that Policy CS2 is out of date and not a sound basis for the Proposed Submission Documents. In addition to Paragraph 47 of the NPPF, paragraph 158 requires that the Local Plan is "...based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence..."

Table 3.1 of the Core Strategy references the need for an extra 11,000 dwellings as identified in the work commission by Oxford Economics (OE) in 2010. It goes on to suggest that the review should identify land to meet the current acknowledged shortfall between the locally assessed requirement and the OE objectively assessed need (OAN).

However, this information remains unavailable and the Council does not appear to have published its understanding of the current OAN.

A more recent SHMA was produced in 2012 for the sub-region. This suggested that the need figure for Suffolk Coastal was greater still at 14,200. As a result, there is clearly some uncertainty about what the OAN is for the District.

These concerns were born out at the recent Framlingham Appeal (APP.J3530/W/15/3011466). In considering the Council's five-year housing land supply, the Inspector commented that:

"...not to accept that the requirement of 7,900 dwellings over the plan period is out of date would be contrary to the clear message in paragraph 47 of the NPPF that local planning authorities should seek to boost significantly the supply of housing."

"The 7,900 dwelling housing requirement is not based on an assessment of the OAN for the District, contrary to paragraph 47 of the NPPF, and is artificially low..."

The Inspector also noted that there was a persistent undersupply of housing against the core strategy requirement over the first five years of the plan period and it was therefore entirely appropriate to apply a 20% buffer to the housing requirement.

The Inspector also commented that:

"...the future for housing growth in the district is seriously uncertain and is not following the plan approach that is advocated in the first 12 core planning principle set out in the NPPF."

The examining Inspector's final conclusion was that:

"...based on an OAN of 11,000 dwellings, as established in the core strategy, or any other realistic prediction of what an OAN for the District is likely to be, housing land supply is less than 3.7 years."

We therefore consider that the Proposed Submission Document's reliance on Policy CS2 is unsound as it does not objectively address the development needs of the District, or neighbouring authorities, and as such cannot be considered to be positively prepared.

Justified

For the plan to be justified it should be the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence. As set out above the Proposed Submission Documents are not considered to be based on the most appropriate strategy. The plan also appears to be at odds with paragraph 47 of the NPPF, as it will
not boost significantly the supply of housing and does not meet the full objectively assessed needs of the district. As such, the publication of the Proposed Submission Documents would appear to be premature in the absence of an agreed assessment.

We consider that it would be appropriate for a focused review of the housing chapter and of the Core Strategy Policy SP2 to set out updated housing numbers and distribution should have occurred, as the Council had committed to at the Core Strategy Examination. This review should be based on a thorough understanding of the OAN, which would then allow sufficient additional, available and deliverable sites; such as our client's land at High Road, Trimley St Martin, which is available now to make a contribution to the delivery of housing within a five year period to be allocated. We therefore consider that Tables 1 & 2 of the AAP should be updated to show the additional contribution that the site could make to housing supply and that the site should be included as an additional allocation in addition to those sites identified in Policies FPP3 to FPP8.

As the Inspector noted in the Framlingham Appeal, an OAN of 11,000 was established in the Core Strategy and currently there is no other published review of what a realistic OAN for the District is likely to be. We therefore consider that at the very least, the Proposed Submission Documents should as a minimum be seeking to allocate sufficient sites to meet the 11,000 dwellings and not the 8,620 as set out in Table 1.

Effective

To be considered effective the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working and cross boundary strategic priorities. Currently, the plan does not include any allowance for cross boundary housing delivery. The unmet need of Ipswich is already known to be in the region of 3,300 dwellings, the Proposed Submission Documents are silent on how this evidenced short fall can be addressed. A 'Draft Memorandum of Understanding has been prepared for the Ipswich Housing Market Area and Ipswich Functional Economic Area. However, there does not appear to be any evidence on negotiations and progress towards completion of this agreement which demonstrates compliance with the duty to co-operate.

Whilst the Council has engaged in discussions with neighbouring councils in the Ipswich Housing Market Area these discussions still appear to be at an early stage. The Local Development Scheme 2015 (LDS) indicates that an Aligned or Joint Local Plan Review will commence in October 2016, with adoption in December 2020. The LDS actually indicated that background evidence gathering started in 2014. This LDS strategy is therefore considered to acknowledge that the adoption of the Proposed Submission Documents is not an effective, deliverable strategy for the plan period, as they are to be immediately replaced by Aligned or Joint Local Plan Review which it is anticipated will be adopted in 2019.

Consistent with National Policy

Paragraph 14 sets out that ‘a presumption in favour of sustainable development’ is at the heart of the Framework and describes this as ‘a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision taking.” It goes on to state that for plan-making this means:

* Local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area;
* Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change.’

There does not appear to be evidence which demonstrates that the Council has sought to positively meet the development needs of the area or to meet its objectively assessed needs.

These requirements are repeated in more detail throughout the Framework. Paragraph 15 requires the presumption in favour of sustainable development to be applied to local plan policies so that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay. We consider that failure to allocate land at High Road, Trimley St Martin, is at odds with this requirement.

The Core Planning Principles set out at paragraph 17 include a set of overarching objectives which should underpin plan making. Of particular relevance to this consultation response are that planning should be:

* Plan-led with up to date plans providing a practical framework for predictable and efficient decisions.
* Not be about scrutiny but be a creative exercise.
* Proactively drive sustainable development to deliver the homes the country needs.’

Every effort should be taken to objectively identify and meet the needs of the area. Sufficient land suitable for development, having regard to market signals, should be allocated and we consider that this should include our client's site.

The reliance on the Core Strategy Policy CS2 and in turn the housing allocations identified in Table 1 and Policy SSP1 does not appear to have full regard to the Core Planning Principles of the Framework.

Paragraph 47 sets out a clear challenge to local planning authorities 'to boost significantly the supply of housing..." In order to achieve this they should ensure that their Local Plan meets the full objectively assessed needs for the area and...
For plan making paragraph 159 reminds local planning authorities that they ‘...should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area.’

The Proposed Submission Documents as currently drafted do not appear to meet these national policy requirements. Actually, they restrict the supply of housing land; and by not taking the opportunity to identify further sites, such as our client’s land in Trimley St Martin, risk not fully addressing the District’s current lack of 5 year housing land supply.

For the reasons set out above it is considered that paragraphs 1.12, 1.14, 3.01, 3.03, 3.04, 3.05, 3.06 and 3.07, Table 1: Housing Provision 2010 - 2027 for the District & Table 2 Housing Contribution 2010 -2015 & Proposed New Housing Delivery and Policy FPP1: New Housing Delivery 2015 - 2027 of the Proposed Submission Document, as currently drafted, are inconsistent with the NPPF.

It is therefore contended that Tables 1 & 2 of the AAP, should be updated to show the additional contribution that land at High Road, Trimley St Martin (Alternative Option Site 3022a) could make to housing supply and that the site should be included as an allocation in addition to those sites identified in Policies FPP3 to FPP8. As set out above it is considered that the current strategy set out in the Proposed Submission Documents are unsound. The proposed submission of the document would appear to be premature and we consider that the Council should instead consider focusing its efforts on delivering its new Aligned or Joint Local Plan Review. We consider that the Council's priority should be to progress an up-to-date assessment of the objectively assessed housing needs within the Ipswich Housing Market Area so that the District's OAN, and the requirements to accommodate any unmet need of neighbouring authorities, can be fully quantified.

We consider that if the Proposed Submission Documents are to be progressed, then they should seek to allocate, as a minimum, sufficient sites to meet an OAN of 11,000 dwellings as established in the core strategy. This could be achieved by way of the allocation of further sites, such as our client's land at High Road, Trimley St Martin (Alternative Option Site 3022a), which is clearly available and deliverable as evidenced by the submission of the current planning application DC/16/1919/FUL.

Tables 1 & 2 of the AAP should therefore be updated to show the additional contribution that the site could make to housing supply and that the site should be included as an additional allocation in addition to those sites identified in Policies FPP3 to FPP8.

Summary:
The reliance on the Core Strategy Policy CS2 and in turn the housing allocations identified in Table 1 and Policy SSP1 does not appear to have full regard to the Core Planning Principles of the Framework. Paragraph 47 sets out a clear challenge to local planning authorities ‘to boost significantly the supply of housing...’ In order to achieve this they should ensure that their Local Plan meets the full objectively assessed needs for the area and they should identify and annually update their five year housing supply.

It is therefore contended that Tables 1 & 2 of the AAP, should be updated to show the additional contribution that land at High Road, Trimley St Martin (Alternative Option Site 3022a) could make to housing supply and that the site should be included as an allocation in addition to those sites identified in Policies FPP3 to FPP8.
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Respondent: Mr Michael Ninnmey [3451]  Agent: N/A

Full Text:
Note - no papers available at Felixstowe library.
(i) Following the recent decision made by planning inspector John Braithwaite that (a) Housing growth uncertain, not to national guidelines, (b) not having a five year supply of housing, should FPAAP continue at all?? When the position is clear it would be right to re-consult the community of FP. Not withstanding present position, some comments on AAP.
(ii) Fails to promote strengthening communities and highlighting lack of infrastructure particularly highways, following reduction of secondary schools is one at eastern side of Walton.
(iii) Failed to deliver the 1/3 affordable dwellings (added to local plan 2004/5?).
(iv) Fails to relate or encourage applicants to relate to SCDC "Housing needs survey".(v) No meaningful policy or guidance for end of life dwellings, whether partners or single. With community support and financially sound, thereby making existing family homes available and make best use of existing housing (see dwelling occupancy).
(vii) No policy on over provision of holiday and second homes (New build - South seafront Felixstowe, public land only 10% affordable) re St Ives, Cornwall.
Please enter above comments and inform me whether the process will be rerun (ref Braithwaite).

Summary:
No meaningful policy or guidance for end of life dwellings, whether partners or single. With community support and financially sound, thereby making existing family homes available and make best use of existing housing (see dwelling occupancy).

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>i, ii, iii, iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments: None

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).
The FPP fails to take account of the full, objectively assessed housing needs of the District and is thereby inconsistent with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (para.47) and National Planning Guidance. There is no available evidence that the Council has ever produced an assessment of need despite its undertaking to do so to the Inspector at the Examination of the Council's Core Strategy in 2012. Consequently to prepare a Site Specific Allocations document without up to date underlying housing needs evidence cannot be sound. The Plan has no credible evidence base.

Summary:
The FPP fails to take account of the full, objectively assessed housing needs of the District and is thereby inconsistent with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (para.47) and National Planning Guidance. There is no available evidence that the Council has ever produced an assessment of need despite its undertaking to do so to the Inspector at the Examination of the Council's Core Strategy in 2012. Consequently to prepare a Site Specific Allocations document without up to date underlying housing needs evidence cannot be sound. The Plan has no credible evidence base.

Change to Plan

Soundness Tests
i, ii, iii, iv

Attachments:
The Sustainability Appraisal of policy FPP1 identifies that the policy will have a minor negative impact on SA objective 17 (To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity). The implementation of adopted plan policies should not negatively affect biodiversity and the policy should therefore be revised to ensure that this is the case.

Site allocations and plan policies should ensure that impacts on biodiversity are properly assessed. Any identified adverse impacts must then be either avoided; mitigated or compensated in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy (as per the requirements of chapter 11 of the NPPF). Local Plans should also seek to enhance developments for biodiversity. This policy should therefore be revised to ensure that it does not result in an adverse biodiversity impact, to ensure that the plan is "Sound".

Summary:
SA objective 17 scores 'minor negative', policy should be revised to ensure that implementation does not result in an adverse impact on biodiversity.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Christchurch Land and Estates (Felixstowe) Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Christchurch") are the promoters of the land at Candlet Road Felixstowe (hereinafter referred to as "the site") edged red on the plan attached as Annexure 1. A planning application reference DC/15/1128/OUT was refused by the Council on 12th June 2015 and is now the subject of an appeal.

1.2 It is confirmed in paragraph 4.28 of the adopted Local Plan (July 2013) with our emphasis added that "4.28 Felixstowe with Walton is by far the largest town within the District and includes the port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, being of both regional and national significance....."

It is considered that the site is a potential urban extension to Felixstowe ("the largest town within the District").

1.3 The site is in a highly sustainable location for the growth of Felixstowe (to address housing need), and should therefore, in our opinion, be allocated as part of the preferred strategy in accordance with the principles of sustainability set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

1.4 Christchurch consider that the Council is failing to address the full objective assessment of housing need (FOAN) for the District, which contention is supported by the land at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, Suffolk appeal decision letter, appeal reference 3011466, paragraphs 14 to 28 (attached as Annexure 3).

1.5 Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework considers that for a plan to be considered "sound" it should be "positively prepared", and that it should meet objectively assessed development needs. In failing to address the objectively assessed need, the Area Action Plan is not "positively prepared".

1.6 The approach to distributing the growth of Felixstowe (one of dispersal), as the strategy in the Area Action Plan document, is not considered the appropriate strategy for the future development needs in the Peninsular. The Council has failed to advance any proper or sufficient analysis to support its proposed approach as opposed to allocation of a significant (and sustainable) urban extension such as the Candlet Road growth area (abutting the Felixstowe settlement boundary).

1.7 Accordingly, and by reference to paragraph 182 of the Framework, it cannot be concluded that the Area Action Plan is;
- "justified",
- "the most appropriate strategy",
- "consistent with national policy" (paragraph 52).

1.8 The submissions made by Christchurch earlier this year relating to the site also contained a detailed response to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (31st March 2014) and the corresponding consideration of site suitability in the emerging Plan.

1.9 The Candlet Road site has not been allocated in the Area Action Plan, therefore in terms of the emerging Plan, the site is an "omission site".

It is submitted that the Council has failed to properly assess appropriate alternative sites in their Sustainability Appraisal Report Proposed Submission Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Development Plan Document (April 2016) to ensure that the most sustainable sites come forward.

1.10 Thereby compounding our concern that the Area Action Plan is not "justified".

2. FULL OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED HOUSING NEED

2.1 The requirement of 7,900 dwellings as set out in Policy SP2 of the adopted Core Strategy is now considered to be out of date as the process of review stipulated within the policy (to review the Core Strategy by 2015 at the latest) has not been commenced. Given that the requirement of 7,900 is both out of date, and fails to reflect the full objectively assessed need for housing (FOAN), the emerging plan should be proceeding on the basis of an up to date review of housing need (as recognised by the Core Strategy itself). That the figure of 7,900 is out of date has been recognised by the Inspector in the Framlingham appeal decision. It is considered that the current FOAN for the District is between 15,000 (750 per annum) and 22,360 dwellings (1,118 per annum) for the period 2011 to 2031.

2.2 Sustainably located sites need to be identified to ensure that the FOAN is met.
2.3 The proposed approach in the Area Action Plan is neither justified nor positively prepared. The development needs of the District will not be met.

3. THE GROWTH STRATEGY IN THE AREA ACTION PLAN

3.1 The growth of Felixstowe, as proposed in the Area Action Plan, is not considered the most appropriate strategy for the future development needs in the Peninsular, and there is no proper or sufficient analysis to support the dispersed approach adopted by the Plan.

3.2 The site at Candlet Road, together with other land holdings, should be considered the most sustainable growth option for the town.

3.3 The adopted Local Plan (July 2013) confirms at paragraph 4.28;

"4.28 Felixstowe with Walton is by far the largest town within the District and includes the port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, being of both regional and national significance....."

3.4 Paragraph 4.31 of the adopted Local Plan confirms;

"4.31 The growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one...."

3.5 The site at Candlet Road Felixstowe (as part of a sustainable urban extension) is in a position to "redress" this imbalance identified at paragraph 4.31 of the adopted Local Plan.

3.6 It is, further acknowledged, at paragraph 4.35 of the adopted Local Plan that;

"4.35 Longer term, it is likely that additional housing will need to be provided......"

3.7 Strategic Policy SP21 of the adopted Local Plan confirms (with our emphasis added);

"The strategy for Felixstowe will be to reverse the recent trends towards a population in balance, threats to local services and a decline in the fortunes of the town in order to enable it to fulfil its role as a major centre...."

"Additional housing will be created. In the short to medium term, this will represent organic and evolutionary growth in the Felixstowe and Trimleys area over a mixture of sites immediately abutting existing built up areas......"

3.8 Whilst adopted Local Plan policy SP21 refers to a "strategy for a dispersed pattern of future development" it is submitted that such an approach is not sustainable and also does not accord with the thrust of strategic policy SP21 by recommending development "immediately abutting existing built up areas.....".

3.9 Policies SP1 and SP1A of the adopted Local Plan seek the achievement of sustainable development.

3.10 With regard to Felixstowe, the 2013 Local Plan confirms:

"4.28 Felixstowe with Walton is by far the largest town within the district and includes the Port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, being of both regional and national significance....." (with emphasis added).

"4.29 Felixstowe has more people of retirement age and fewer people of working age than the norm, either in the rest of Suffolk or across the UK......"

"Younger generations already have to look outside Felixstowe for careers and housing" (with emphasis added).

"4.30 The population of Felixstowe is increasing slowly although household size is falling. Despite slow population growth there are, therefore, even more people looking for homes, and Felixstowe has more small households - single people or couples - particularly those that are key workers or first time buyers. The number and type of new homes provided in the town over recent years has not matched this increase in demand".

"4.31 The growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one......" (with emphasis added).

3.11 On the 27th February 2015, Christchurch made submissions to the then emerging Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies and the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan, relating to the site.
3.12 The February submissions referred to a Council report to the Local Development Framework Task Group on the 4th August 2008 (LPTG11/08). The Council's consideration of the ("option 4") land north of Candlet Road Felixstowe stated:

"on the whole option 4 has significant merit. It represents a good sustainable option that benefits from existing formal and informal recreational areas to the east as well as access to the town centre. It is also the closest area to the town centre and development might also ensure a stronger and more viable town centre given the increased usage of facilities there...the landscape, particularly the western part, is the least sensitive of all of the option and the existing wildlife corridor in the east can be built upon as part of a strategy of enhancing green infrastructure".

3.13 The 2008 Council Report confirms Christchurch's contention that the site (combined with other land holdings) is a highly sustainable location for growth, being immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary and close to a range of services and facilities within walking and cycling distance, therefore should be an allocated site.

3.14 The site (combined with other land holdings) is not a preferred allocation for residential development despite Core Strategy Policy SP21 confirming that (with our emphasis added)

"additional housing will be created"

"over a mixture of sites immediately abutting existing built up areas" and to

"create a more sustainable balance between housing and employment thereby providing an opportunity to reduce commuting"

3.15 Paragraph 4.31 of the adopted 2013 Local Plan confirms:

"4.31 The growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one.

The 2001 Census revealed that there was a daily net inflow to Felixstowe of 2,719 workers. This comprised an outflow of 3,600 Felixstowe residents to jobs in Ipswich and elsewhere and an inflow of 6,319 who work in Felixstowe but live elsewhere".

3.16 The site (combined with other land holdings) abuts the urban area of Felixstowe, complies with the aims and objectives of adopted Local Plan and creates additional housing to address the "imbalance" set out in paragraph 4.31 (above), constituting "organic and evolutionary growth".

3.17 Whilst adopted Policy SP21 confirms;

"a strategy for a dispersed pattern of future development"

which is continued in the Area Action Plan (the site is not identified as a preferred allocation) it is considered that a "dispersed pattern" is not the most sustainable growth option for Felixstowe.

4. RESPONSE TO THE STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT ("SHLAA") (SITE SUITABILITY)

4.1 The site (potentially part of a larger land assembly) has previously been considered by the Local Planning Authority and with particular regard to the 'Core Strategy - Proposed location of strategic housing growth in Felixstowe and the Trimley villages'.

4.2 As noted above, a Report on this matter was presented to the Local Development Framework Task Group on 4th August 2008 (LPTG 11/08). A copy of the Report is attached as Annexure 2 to these Submissions.

4.3 The site formed one part of a number of recommendations as to which sites should be the preference to the Council for the location of housing growth, indicating a preference toward larger developments, with related infrastructure incorporated into those schemes.

4.4 Appendix 1 to LPTG 11/08 provided some background in reaching that conclusion. Within this Appendix, it is stated that the landscape

"is not particularly attractive. It is, however, visible from a number of locations. Most are close distance and with the introduction of mitigation planting are not significant. The exception will be from the east where the close proximity viewpoints are in elevated locations and the topography would still allow views in to the area'.

4.5 The Appendix also states that

"the landscape in the part of the area to the east of Gulpher Road is more sensitive and shows a lower capacity to
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absorb development than the west. It also already has some recreational/green infrastructure value. In an area of current and predicted deficiencies of accessible natural greenspace, this part of area 4 may provide opportunities to address this'.

4.6 Whilst only referenced in the Executive Summary to the Appendix, the report states that the site is 'separated from Felixstowe by the single carriageways of Candlet Road, but has Gulpher Road passing beneath it and the ability for crossings to be created. Development would be close to the town centre. Road access to the Port is easy although sustainable means of travel by cycle or on foot could need to be created'.

4.7 The Council's summary acknowledged that;

'on the whole option 4 has significant merit. It represents a good sustainable option that benefits from existing formal and informal recreational areas to the east as well as access to the town centre. It is also the closest area to the town centre and development might also ensure a stronger and more viable town centre given the increased usage of facilities there...the landscape, particularly the western part, is the least sensitive of all of the option and the existing wildlife corridor in the east can be built upon as part of a strategy of enhancing green infrastructure'.

4.8 The conclusion of the SHLAA and the (site suitability) emerging Plan and the Sustainability Report is clearly at odds with the Council's previous assessment of the site's merits.

5. THE SUSTAINABILITY OF THE CANDLET ROAD SITE/AREA AND THE COUNCIL'S SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

5.1 Christchurch commissioned Turley to carry out a detailed Sustainability Appraisal of the land north of Candlet Road (February 2015).

5.2 The Sustainability Appraisal confirms that this location is a highly sustainable location for residential development, abutting the main area of Felixstowe, the largest town in the District.

5.3 The Turley Sustainability Appraisal also references the recommendations contained in the 2008 Report where the current Head of Planning Services at the Council confirmed that the land north of Candlet Road Felixstowe presented the most appropriate and sustainable option for the growth of the town.

5.4 It is particularly noted, that officers did not favour the "dispersed pattern of development" as advocated by both the Local Plan (July 2013) and the emerging Plan.

5.5 The Council have prepared a Sustainability Appraisal Report. The Sustainability Appraisal is not adequate, particularly with regard to the way that the Sustainability Appraisal appraises the strategic alternatives. The reasons for selection of the Preferred Options (as opposed to alternatives) are not clear.

5.6 It cannot be concluded that the Council have properly taken into account reasonable alternatives, thereby undermining the soundness of the Plan.

6. ALTERNATIVE SITES (PREFERRED OPTIONS)

6.1 The focusing of housing growth adjacent to Felixstowe represents the most sustainable growth option.

6.2 The most sustainable strategy for accommodation of housing growth at Felixstowe is for new development to be accommodated within the existing limits of the urban area, and then sustainable urban extensions.

6.3 We have raised concerns with regard to the adequacy of the preferred options site selection procedure.

6.4 In addition, there is a concern that certain allocations may, in reality, be undelivered due to heritage constraints

Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") obliges the decision maker, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

6.5 In R (on the application of Forge Field Society) v Sevenoaks District Council [2014] EWHC 1896 (Admin), Lindblom J referred to this duty - and the parallel duty under Section 72(1) of the 1990 Act in relation to development within a conservation area - in the following terms with our emphasis added:

"... it is to recognise, as the Court of Appeal emphasised in [East Northamptonshire District Council v Secretary of
State for Communities and Local Government [2014] EWCA Civ 137, that a finding of harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area gives rise to a strong presumption against planning permission being granted. The presumption is a statutory one. It is not irrebuttable. It can be outweighed by material considerations powerful enough to do so.

But an authority can only properly strike the balance between harm to a heritage asset on the one hand and planning benefits on the other if it is conscious of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation and if it demonstrably applies that presumption to the proposal it is considering”.

6.6 Furthermore, paragraph 169 of the Framework requires the Local Planning Authority to have

"up to date evidence about the historic environment in their area and use it to assess the significance of heritage assets and the contribution they make to the environment....."

6.7 The following allocations suffer from serious constraints associated with designated heritage assets. We have seen no clear evidence which shows that those constraints can be overcome in respect of the following sites;

(a) Policy FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street Felixstowe

"development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street and their setting"

(b) Policy FPP5 Land north of Conway Close and Swallow Close Felixstowe

(c) Policy FPP7 Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin

7. CONCLUSIONS

7.1 It is considered, for the reasons outlined in this submission, that the land at Candlet Road should be allocated in the Area Action Plan.

7.2 By omitting the site, the Plan would fail to significantly boost housing supply and fail to meet the objectively assessed housing needs of the District (paragraphs 14 and 47 of the Framework).

7.3 It is submitted that the AAP document would be sound - in securing the necessary delivery for infrastructure, and an appropriate delivery of new housing - if land at Candlet Road is allocated for housing as part of an urban extension for Felixstowe.

7.4 The proposed release of land at Candlet Road represents the most sustainable, viable and ultimately deliverable option to achieve the required housing and infrastructure needs for Felixstowe and the surrounding area.

7.5 It is submitted, therefore, that the Candlet Road site should be a preferred location for housing, being an appropriate urban extension to Felixstowe where the other competing sites do not relate as well in terms of connections and accessibility to the town, that against this criteria the Candlet Road site is the most sustainable and appropriate option for the extension (growth) of Felixstowe.

Richard Brown MSc
27th May 2016

Annexures

1. Site plan

2. Local Development Framework Task Group Report on 04/08/08 (LPTG 11/08), together with Appendix 8

3. Land at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, Suffolk IP13 9LH, appeal reference 3011466

Summary: The Council are not addressing the full OAN and make reference to the Land at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, Suffolk IP13 9LH appeal reference 3011466.

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).
Felixstowe is the largest town in the district and the most sustainable strategy for accommodation of housing growth at Felixstowe is for new development to be accommodated within the existing limits of the urban area, and then sustainable urban extensions. The Candlet Road Site/area is an appropriate urban extension to Felixstowe. The reasons for selection of the Preferred Options (as opposed to alternatives) are not clear. It cannot be concluded that the Council have properly taken into account reasonable alternatives, thereby undermining the soundness of the Plan.
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Policy FPP1: New Housing Delivery 2015 - 2027

This representation is submitted, on behalf of the landowners, in respect of land at High Road, Trimley St Martin, Alternative Option Site 3022b.

Alternative Option Site 3022b was the subject of representations to the Preferred Options consultation in 2015. The representations to the earlier drafts of the Felixstowe Peninsular Area Action Plan were made on the basis that the site is sustainable, available and deliverable, and that it should be included within the Area Action Plan (AAP) either as an allocation or as a reserve site to come forward in the event that other identified sites fail to deliver housing during the plan period.

In response to these earlier representations, the authority has commented that: 'the site has been discounted in the AAP it is not appropriate to show this on the Policies Map which supports the written text'. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) report accompanying the AAP comments that the site is 'poorly related to existing settlement boundaries' and that 'allocation of the site would constitute development in the countryside'.

However, it is considered that this assessment provides insufficient justification for why the site has been omitted from the AAP, it does not accurately assess the site, and crucially it is based upon the housing growth requirements set out in the adopted Core Strategy, which do not provide the District's full objectively assessed housing need.

Site 3022b is in close proximity to employment opportunities and good public transport provision, a fact that is acknowledged in the SA, which scores the site well against SA objective 14. 'to reduce the effects of traffic on the environment'. The SA comments that the site scores well in terms of major positive effects due to its 'potential to encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth', reflecting its good access to local services and facilities. The SA identifies that the main negative effect associated with the site is that it 'appears remote from Trimley St Martin being surrounded by agricultural land and lying outside the built area'. However, this fails to acknowledge that the site lies opposite existing residential development (Nos. 410-414, High Road) and has well defined landscape boundaries.

It is clear from the SA that the site has many advantages over some of the proposed allocations, and it is considered that there are no known obstacles to it coming forward for development. It is in a sustainable location and could deliver much needed housing, including affordable housing.

It is therefore considered that site 3022b should be included on the basis that it is both sustainable and available. It is also considered that the AAP should be more ambitious in order to fully meet the District's objectively assessed housing need and in order to help boost housing supply in the area.

We consider that site 3022b has the potential to make a positive contribution towards housing delivery either as an additional allocation to help boost local housing supply, or alternatively as a reserve site to be brought forward in the event that other sites identified within the AAP fail to deliver the requisite amount of housing during the Plan period.

On this basis it is considered that the site should be included as an additional site allocation in Table 2 (or alternatively as a reserve site), and as an addition to those sites identified in Policies FPP3 to FPP8. Further justification to support this position is set out below.

Since the publication of the Proposed Submission Documents, on 25th of April 2016, an appeal in respect of land at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, Suffolk has been allowed (APP/J3530/W/15/3011466), relating to a residential development of 163 dwellings.

Paragraphs 13 to 28 of the appeal decision are considered of particular relevance, in that they established that Core Strategy Policy SP2 is out of date and that, based upon the Core Strategy housing target, the district has a housing land supply of 3.7 years. This highlights that the AAP does not seek to allocate sufficient housing sites to boost the supply of housing over the plan period. The decision also highlights that the Core Strategy does not provide for the District's full objectively assessed housing need.

For a local plan to be found sound at examination it should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy.

For a local plan to be positively prepared it must be based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed housing development requirements, including the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities.

Policy SP2 of the Core Strategy states that provision will be made for at least 7,900 new homes, distributed in accordance with the settlement hierarchy set out in policy SP19. The policy also commits to an early review in order to identify the full objectively assessed housing needs for the District, to ensure this is met in so far as this is consistent with the policies of the NPPF. However, at the time that these representations are submitted no such review has been undertaken and it is therefore considered that the plan, as currently drafted, has not been positively prepared.

This point was echoed at the recent Framlingham Appeal (APP/J3530/W/15/3011466) where the Inspector also noted that there was a persistent undersupply of housing against the core strategy requirement over the first five years of the plan period and it was therefore entirely appropriate to apply a 20% buffer to the housing requirement. This point reinforces the need to allocate additional sites to help boost housing supply and ensure that housing need is met in the event of under delivery.

For the plan to be justified it should be the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence. As set out above the Proposed Submission Documents are not considered to be based on the most appropriate strategy as they will not boost housing supply, as required by paragraph 47 of the NPPF, and are not based upon an up-to-date assessment of housing need in the District.
To be considered effective the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working and cross boundary strategic priorities. Whilst the Council has engaged in discussions with neighbouring councils in the Ipswich Housing Market Area these discussions still appear to be at an early stage. The Local Development Scheme 2015 (LDS) indicates that an Aligned or Joint Local Plan Review will commence in October 2016, with adoption in December 2020. The LDS strategy would therefore appear to reinforce that the adoption of the Proposed Submission Documents is not an effective, deliverable strategy, as they are proposed to be replaced by an Aligned or Joint Local Plan Review which it is anticipated will be adopted in 2019.

Paragraph 14 of the NPPF sets out that ‘a presumption in favour of sustainable development’ is at the heart of the Framework and describes this as ‘a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision taking.’ It goes on to state that for plan-making this means:

* Local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area;
* Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change...’

As stated above it does not appear that the AAP as currently drafted will meet the development needs of the area or the District’s objectively assessed needs.

We do not therefore consider that the Proposed Submission Documents can be considered to be consistent with national planning policy. The AAP as currently drafted appears to be restricting the supply of housing land; and by not taking the opportunity to identify further sites, such as site reference 3022b, will not resolve the Districts current lack of 5 year housing land supply.

In light of the above, it is considered that Policy FPP1: New Housing Delivery 2015 - 2027 of the Proposed Submission AAP, should be updated to show the additional contribution that land at High Road, Trimley St Martin (Alternative Option Site 3022b) could make to housing supply and that the site should either be included as an allocation in addition to those sites identified in Policies FPP3 to FPP8, or identified as a reserve housing site.

Please continue on a separate sheet if required.

Q5. Please set out what modifications (s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan document legally compliant or sound. Your response should have regard to the test you have identified at Q3 where it relates to soundness. You should state why your proposed modification will make the Local Plan document legally compliant or sound. If your modification includes suggested revised wording, it would be helpful if you would provide the suggested wording.

As set out above it is considered that the current Proposed Submission Documents are unsound.

If the Proposed Submission Documents are to be progressed, then they should seek to allocate, as a minimum, sufficient sites to meet an OAN of 11,000 dwellings as established in the Core Strategy. This could be achieved by way of the allocation of further sites, such as Alternative Option Site 3022b.

The AAP should therefore be updated to show the additional contribution that the site could make to housing supply and that the site should either be included as an allocation in addition to those sites identified in Policies FPP3 to FPP8, or identified as a reserve housing site.

It is considered necessary that we attend the examination hearing session so that we can contribute to discussions around the necessary modifications to the AAP that are referred to within this representation.

Finally, we would wish to be able to present evidence to the Inspector to demonstrate that land at High Road, Trimley St Martin (Alternative Option Site 3022b) represents a sustainable location for development, and that it is both available and deliverable.

The Sustainability Appraisal fails to adequately assess Alternative Option Site 3022b.

Summary: Insufficient justification for why the site 3022b has been omitted from the AAP, it does not accurately assess the site, and crucially it is based upon the housing growth requirements set out in the adopted Core Strategy, which do not provide the District's full objectively assessed housing need. This point was echoed at the recent Framlingham Appeal (APF.3530/W/15/3011466) where the Inspector also noted that there was a persistent undersupply of housing against the core strategy requirement over the first five years of the plan period and it was therefore entirely appropriate to apply a 20% buffer to the housing requirement.
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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).
This letter is in response to the above consultations and provides Gladman Developments’ representation. Gladman specialise in the promotion of strategic land for residential development with associated community infrastructure. From this experience, Gladman understand the need for the planning system to ensure that local communities have access to both decent homes and local employment opportunities.

The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has brought about fundamental changes to the planning process since its inception. One such change relates to the need to significantly boost the supply of housing and how this fundamental requirement of the Framework should be reflected in the plan making process. Gladman, who operate on a national basis, have considerable experience in contributing to the Local Plan preparation process since the Framework came into effect.

What continues to be clear from this experience is that many local authorities are not fully addressing the requirements of the Framework when preparing their Local Plans, this has led to significant concerns being expressed by Inspectors on the soundness of their plans in their current form. The main concerns centre upon the requirement addressed by paragraph 47 of the Framework to ‘use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) for market and affordable housing in the housing market area’.

Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD

Suffolk Coastal’s Core Strategy was adopted in July 2013 and sets the overall vision and strategic objectives for the district, including a target to deliver at least 7,900 dwellings between 2010 and 2027. It is intended that the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD (together with the Felixstowe Area Action Plan (FAAP)) defines sites for various types of development (including housing), defines the boundaries of built up areas and identifies local infrastructure requirements. The documents do not cover areas of the district that are advancing Neighbourhood Plans.

Gladman’s response to specific policies is set out below.

Policy SSP1: New Housing Delivery 2015-2027

The policy, with reference to the data set out in Table 2, sets out new housing delivery for the period 2015-2027 to meet the minimum requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy. The policy makes allocations in a number of settlements.

Table 2 sets out, across the major centres, market towns, key service centres and local service centres, the amount of housing that has already been delivered between 2010 and 2015, extant permissions (including resolutions to grant as of 31/03/15), and new allocations to be delivered between 2015 and 2027. Whilst policy SP2 of the adopted Core Strategy makes provision for ‘at least’ 7,900 dwellings over the plan period, the figures presented in Table 2 are not expressed in the same terms but rather appear to be development ceilings. The Site Allocations Plan needs to make it clear that the figures in Table 2 are minimum figures to ensure consistency with Core Strategy Policy SP2. It is interesting to note that the FAAP document does include recognition that the housing figures it allocates to settlements are minima, and there should be consistency across the two documents.

Objectively Assessed Need

Gladman have fundamental concerns that the Council is progressing with a Site Allocations document based on an out-of-date housing target from the Core Strategy that does not properly reflect the district’s full Objectively Assessed Need (OAN). When the Core Strategy was adopted, the Inspector at the time noted that the Council had to undertake a review of its OAN by 2015. This is acknowledged by the Council at paragraph 1.12 of the consultation document, which states the adopted figure of 7,900 was lower than the full OAN and therefore the Council made a commitment to undertake an early review to address the level of housing provision. The review has yet to be undertaken.

Despite this commitment, paragraph 1.13 goes on to state that the Site Allocations DPD and FAAP are important to completing the current phase of plan making based on the Core Strategy. The Council consider that both documents positively seek to boost the supply of housing with a ‘carefully planned’ over provision included as a contingency. Table 1 provides an overview of the housing numbers over the plan period and compared to the Core Strategy target of 7,900 allows for a total of 8,620 homes to come forward, a small oversupply of approximately 9%.

Gladman can see no reason as to why a full review of the Core Strategy, including its housing target, cannot be undertaken now. Failure do so means that the Council must accept that the Site Allocations DPD and FAAP will be out of date as soon as they are adopted.
The situation which has arisen in Suffolk Coastal is similar to other positions taken by Councils in Wokingham, Hinckley and Bosworth, Preston and Turbridge Wells, where Site Allocations documents have proceeded on the back of either pre NPPF Core Strategies or on principal planning documents which do not contain an assessment of full OAN. The Wokingham judgement [[2014] EWHC 2320 (Admin)] confirms such an approach may be lawful, but made clear it did nothing more than allocate sufficient sites for a housing requirement from a previous generation of planning policy. The reasons behind this have recently been upheld by the Court of Appeal in Oxford Residential v Tandridge District Council [[2016] EWCA Civ 414].

It should be noted that the issue of Suffolk Coastal's OAN was considered at the Fairfield Road, Framlingham appeal [APP/J3530/W/15/031466] where evidence was presented by the appellants in that case that suggested the OAN could be 11,000 dwellings between 2010 and 2027, a significant increase on the adopted requirement; the Council's own witness in that appeal conceded that they would have expected the OAN to have increased. This evidence suggests a requirement far in excess of the 'carefully planned over provision' allowed through the Site Allocations and FAAP.

Gladman contend that the Council's document cannot be seen to be positively prepared. Despite the availability of more recent evidence on housing need and an admission that the OAN is likely to have gone up, the Council is still proceeding with producing a Site Allocations Plan based on a lower figure, and only at the next stage will new housing evidence be considered in a review of the whole development plan. The consequences of this approach (assuming that the Allocations Plan is otherwise sound) would be to have an adopted Allocations Plan which would have to be reviewed in short order to take account of the emerging and subsequently adopted housing requirement. Moreover, even if sites were allocated in the Allocations Plan, it is highly likely that they would be insufficient to meet the updated OAN, as required by paragraph 47 of the Framework.

We do not therefore see how the delay in properly dealing with the full OAN for the district can be seen as positive planning. The Council have had since July 2013 to address this and in the time elapsed a full plan review could have been completed.

The process of undertaking an objective assessment is clearly set out in the Framework principally in paragraph 14, paragraph 47, paragraph 152 and paragraph 159 and should be undertaken in a systematic and transparent way to ensure that the plan is based on a robust evidence base.

The starting point for this assessment is set out in paragraph 159 which requires local planning authorities to have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. This involves the preparation of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative areas. The Framework goes on to set out the factors that should be included in a SHMA including identifying 'the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period which:

* Meets household and population projections taking account of migration and demographic change;
* Addresses the need for all types of housing including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and
* Caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand.'

Key points that are worth noting from the above is that the objective assessment should identify the full need for housing before you consider undertaking any process of assessing the ability to deliver this figure. In addition, paragraph 159 specifically relates to catering for both housing need and housing demand within the authority area. It is worth pointing out that any assessment of housing need and demand within a SHMA must also consider the following factors; falling household formation rates, net inward migration, the need to address the under provision of housing from the previous local plan period, the results of the Census 2011, housing vacancy rates including the need to factor in a 3% housing vacancy rate for churn in the housing market, economic factors to ensure that the economic forecasts for an area are supported by sufficient housing to deliver economic growth, off-setting a falling working age population by providing enough housing vacancy rates including the need to factor in a 3% housing vacancy rate for churn in the housing delivering the full need for affordable housing in an area.

It is our understanding that a majority of the SHMAs that were prepared under the current guidance on SHMA preparation are not Framework compliant and do not consider the full range of factors that are outlined in paragraph 159. This is causing significant problems for authorities currently at Examination and therefore, to avoid this issue, SHMAs should be updated to take account of the Framework and ensure plans are based on robust and up-to-date evidence. Indeed, the Government have noted the deficiency in SHMAs and are updating the guidance on SHMA preparation to fully reflect the guidance given in the Framework.

Following the exercise to identify the full, objectively assessed need for housing in an area, the local planning authority should then seek to undertake the assessment outlined in paragraph 152 of the Framework. This states that

Local planning authorities should seek opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, and net gains across all three. Significant adverse impacts on any of these dimensions should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued.

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).
Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate.’ This statement clearly sets out that local planning authorities should seek to deliver the full, objectively assessed need and that this should be tested through the evidence base. Only where the evidence shows that this is not achievable should they then test other options to see if any significant adverse impacts could be reduced or eliminated by pursuing these options. If this is not possible then they should test if the significant adverse impacts could be mitigated and where this is not possible, where compensatory measures may be appropriate.

The final stage of the process is outlined in paragraph 14 and involves a planning judgement as to whether, following all of the stages of the process outlined above, ‘any adverse impacts of meeting the objectively assessed needs would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole or specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.’ It is also worth noting that the final part of this sentence refers to footnote 9 which sets out the types of policies that the Government consider to be restrictive. These include ‘sites protected under the Birds and Habitat Directive (see paragraph 119) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Heritage Coast or within a National Park (or the Broads Authority); designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion’. Although this list is not exhaustive it is clear that local landscape designations, intrinsic value of the countryside, the character of areas, green gaps etc. are not specifically mentioned as constraints.

Assessment of Housing and Economic Development Needs - Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

As Suffolk Coastal will be aware, the Government issued a guidance note to support local authorities in objectively assessing and evidencing development needs for housing (both market and affordable) and economic development. This document supports and provides further guidance on the process of undertaking such assessments as set out in the Framework. Gladman highlight the following key points from this document:

- Plan makers should not apply constraints to the overall assessment of need, such as limitations imposed by the supply of land for new development, historic under performance, infrastructure or environmental constraints.
- Household projections published by the Department for Communities and Local Government should provide the starting point estimate of overall housing need.
- Household projection based estimates of housing need may need adjusting to reflect factors affecting local demography and household formation rates which are not captured by past trends, for example historic suppression by supply and worsening affordability of housing. The assessment will need to reflect the consequences of past under delivery and the extent to which household formation rates have been constrained by supply.
- Plan makers need to consider increasing their housing numbers where the supply of working age population is less than projected job growth, to prevent unsustainable commuting patterns and reduced local business resilience.
- If the historic rate of development shows that actual supply falls below planned supply, future supply should be increased to reflect the likelihood of under-delivery of a plan.
- Plan makers should take account of concealed households.
- Housing needs indicated by household projections should be adjusted to reflect appropriate market signals, as well as other market indicators of the balance between the demand for and supply of dwellings. Appropriate comparisons of indicators (land prices, house prices etc.) should be made - with longer term trends in the HMA, similar demographic and economic areas, and nationally. Divergence under any of these circumstances will require upward adjustment to planned housing numbers.
- The more significant the affordability constraints (as reflected in rising prices and rents, and worsening affordability ratio) and the stronger other indicators of high demand (e.g. the differential between land prices), the larger the improvement in affordability needed, and the larger the additional supply response should be.
- Market signals are affected by a number of economic factors. Plan makers should increase planned supply by an amount that, on reasonable assumptions and consistent with principles of sustainable development, could be expected to improve affordability.

The Framework is clear that Local Planning Authorities must consider market signals. It is one of the core planning principles considered in paragraph 17. The Framework states:

‘Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities.

Of critical importance is what the Framework goes on to say in paragraph 158 in the section discussing Plan Making. It states here:

Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals.

Market signals are therefore at the very core of what the Framework is trying to achieve in promoting sustainable development and boosting the supply of housing land.
The formal publication of the PPG in March 2014 gives further explanation to what the Framework means with regard to market signals, and sets out, in a range of paragraphs, the way in which local planning authorities should go about factoring in relevant market signals in arriving at their objectively assessed need. Paragraphs 19 and 20 of the PPG gives guidance on what market signals should be taken into account and how plan makers should respond to these market signals. The below extracts identify some particularly pertinent points.

The housing need number suggested by household projections (the starting point) should be adjusted to reflect appropriate market signals, as well as other market indicators of the balance between the demand for and supply of dwellings. Prices of rents rising faster than the national/local average may well indicate particular market undersupply relative to demand.

The paragraph goes on to indicate that these factors would include, but should not be limited to, land prices, house prices, rents, affordability, rates of development and overcrowding. However, given what the Framework says at paragraph 17, quoted above, it seems clear that particular consideration should be given to affordability.

In order to consider how market signals should be taken forward paragraph 20 identifies some key concepts:

- Appropriate comparisons of indicators should be made. This includes comparison with longer term trends (both in absolute levels and rates of change) in: the housing market area; similar demographic and economic areas; and nationally. A worsening trend in any of these indicators will require upward adjustment to planned housing numbers compared to ones based solely on household projections.

- It is therefore clear that where market signals are apparent there is an absolute and clear direction that an upward adjustment to housing numbers is required. It is also clear that both the absolute level of change and the rates of change are considerations, and that local planning authorities need to carefully bench mark themselves against other areas. This should not simply be a case of considering neighbouring authorities but should look at, as well as these, local authorities on a national basis, if the demographic and economic indicators are relevant. Gladman are firmly of the view that considering comparisons purely against neighbouring authorities is not sufficiently robust and does not address the underlying issues which both the Framework and PPG are trying to tackle with regard to housing.

- What is of further importance when considering these issues is the period of time analysed when considering both relative and absolute change. It has become apparent, in our consideration of a number of plans that many local authorities choose to look at periods of time which are not fully representative of the depth of the housing crisis which we are currently within.

- The problems are noted in Fixing the Foundations: Creating a more prosperous nation published by HM Treasury in July 2015. In paragraph 9.7 the report states:

> There remains more to do. As the London School of Economics (LSE) Growth Commission found, ‘under supply of housing, especially in high-growth areas of the country has pushed up house prices. The UK has been incapable of building enough homes to keep up with growing demand.’

- Gladman are therefore of the view that local planning authorities must take a long term view when considering affordability and consider the relative and absolute change over a long term 15-20 year period, which coincides with the normal time span of a Local Plan. Authorities should assess, as a constituent part of their OAN, how they can improve affordability over the life time of a plan to a point where affordability is more in line with average earnings and affordable mortgage lending rates. They should assess a level of housing over the 15-20 year plan period which would enable this step change and consider its deliverability in the plan. Only through planning for significant housing growth can local authorities realistically tackle market signals in the way advocated by the PPG and tackle the affordability and housing crisis.

- Gladman reserve the right to adduce further evidence on OAN at the appropriate time.

Location of New Housing

Gladman would point out that Suffolk Coastal has a number of different and distinct housing market areas. Each of these distinct areas will have their own requirement for housing and this should be reflected in the spatial distribution of housing supply within the Local Plan. This decision should be based on the findings of the evidence base and should not be a politically driven spatial strategy to put a disproportionate amount of housing in areas where people don’t want to (and will not) live. If the spatial distribution does not reflect need/demand as shown by the evidence base, then housing will not be delivered and the Plan will not be implemented.

Gladman would suggest a hybrid approach should be taken, with more sustainable settlements taking a greater proportion of growth than less sustainable locations. We would caution against too prescriptive a development strategy based solely on a development hierarchy that is itself based on too simplistic an understanding of sustainability (i.e. the number of services available). Whilst level of services is obviously an important criterion, the Framework is clear that development should be allowed where it is sustainable, when measured against the Framework as a whole and the three strands of sustainability (economic, social and environmental) in particular. When considering development in rural areas, Paragraph 55 of the Framework states that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the
vitality of rural communities.' Furthermore paragraph 17 states that planning should 'focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable'.

Para 55 of the Framework seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas to maintain and enhance rural vitality and viability. It is essential therefore, that the needs of the sustainable rural settlements across the district are assessed and a meaningful level of growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing vitality and viability. This will help to preserve and enhance rural services and facilities and allow local rural communities to meet their own needs for housing whilst providing much needed affordable housing in the parts of the district that suffer with the greatest affordable housing need.

In allocating sites, the Council should be mindful that to maximize housing supply the widest possible range of sites, by size and market location are required so that house builders of all types and sizes have access to suitable land in order to offer the widest possible range of products. The key to increased housing supply is the number of sales outlets. For any given time period, all else being equal, overall sales and build out rates are faster from 20 sites of 50 units than 10 sites of 100 units or 1 site of 1,000 units. The maximum delivery is achieved not just because there are more sales outlets but because the widest possible range of products and locations are available to meet the widest possible range of demand. In summary, a wider variety of sites in the widest possible range of locations ensures all I types of house builder have access to suitable land which in turn increases housing delivery.

New homes should be distributed in a way that enables the full OAN for the district to be met, rather than based too rigidly on percentages allocated to each town and village. This should take into account factors such as market conditions and viability - it is after all the private sector that will be expected to deliver the majority of the district's housing need and so it is important that the chosen distribution enables this to happen.

Regardless of the approach a sufficient range of sites need to be allocated (taking into account viability and market conditions) to ensure continuity of housing supply; more sites than needed to deliver the OAN should be allocated to account for slippage and delays. Whichever development strategy is adopted it is vital that the new Local Plan addresses this and that housing figures and distribution are aligned fully with economic growth aspirations.

Delivery Rates

The Council will have to ensure that they have applied realistic assumptions around lead-in times and build-out rates for the sites with permissions and especially for the sites with a resolution to grant, as there is a chance that some of these sites may never sign the s 106 agreement and begin to deliver.

Table 1 shows that 600 of the dwellings needed over the plan period will come through a windfall allowance (50dpa). The Council must be satisfied that, in line with Paragraph 48 of the Framework, they have 'compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply'. It is also important that 'any allowance should be realistic having regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens'.

Housing Allocations in Areas with Neighbourhood Plans

The plan sets out at paragraph 1.17 that several Neighbourhood Plans in the district have reached an advanced stage and cover a wide range of policy issues and therefore the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies document does not include allocations or additional policies covering these areas. This means that no sites are allocated for housing through the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD in settlements covered by an advanced Neighbourhood Plan. Gladman have some concerns with this approach.

There needs to be a mechanism in place to address situations where these Neighbourhood Plans fail and therefore do allocate the appropriate amount of housing as required by the Core Strategy. Should these Neighbourhood Plans not come forward as anticipated then the Council will be in danger of not having enough allocated housing land and therefore would be unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply. The Inspector for the Torbay Local Plan required Main Modifications that inserted wording that addressed this issue. The modification read 'If Neighbourhood Plans do not identify sufficient sites to provide the growth requirement of the Local Plan, the Council will bring forward sites through site allocations development plan documents. If it appears that a shortfall in five year supply of deliverable sites is likely to arise, the Council will bring forward additional sites'. The Council should consider inserting a similar provision into the Site Allocations Document.

Another danger of this approach is that if other sites elsewhere in the district fail to come forward in a timely fashion or do not deliver the number of units expected, then the Council will not have the flexibility to release land in sustainable locations that are covered by a Neighbourhood Plan to make up the shortfall, regain a robust housing supply and retain control of housing delivery in the district.

Finally, given the likelihood that the full OAN for the district will increase markedly once the review is finally carried out, there needs to be a process to ensure that areas with adopted Neighbourhood Plans do not prevent increased levels of growth coming forward in future. PPG is clear [Paragraph:084 Reference ID:41-084-201605 19] that 'policies in a neighbourhood plan may become out of date, for example if they conflict with policies in a Local Plan that is adopted after the making of the neighbourhood plan. In such cases, the more recent plan policy takes precedence.'
Policy SSP2: Physical Limits Boundaries

The policy sets boundaries for all settlements listed as Major Centres, Town, Key and Local Service Centres in accordance with Core Strategy policy SP19. The policy allows for development including housing within these limits, subject to proposals being in accordance with other policies, including Neighbourhood Plans. It notes that 'proposals for new residential development outside physical limits boundaries will be strictly controlled'.

As outlined above, Gladman consider the housing target in the adopted Core Strategy to be out of date as it does not represent the district’s full OAN. Since the settlement boundaries are set to accommodate the out of date level of housing growth contained in the adopted Core Strategy, the boundary policies are also out of date. Many of the settlement boundaries remain from the old Local Plan and are therefore time-expired. Furthermore, the Core Strategy policy upon which SSP2 relies (SP19) was found to be out of date in the Fairfield Road, Framlingham appeal as the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land.

Setting strict settlement boundaries does not allow adequate flexibility for development to come forward outside the settlement boundary if this is required (for example due to a shortfall of housing land).

Gladman would object to the use of settlement limits if these would preclude otherwise sustainable development coming forward. The Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead. The use of settlement limits to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements would not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework.

Gladman would be opposed to the definition of an urban edge if this would preclude appropriately sited and sustainable development coming forward to meet the district's housing needs, in accordance with the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development. Proposals that are sustainable should go ahead without delay. An overly restrictive approach could result in a plan that is not positively prepared or effective.

Policies SSP3 - SSP19

Gladman have no specific comments to make on the individual allocations within the plan except to note that many of the allocation policies place additional requirements on the delivery of sites, for example by requiring Development Briefs to be agreed or certain infrastructure to be provided before development can come forward. Gladman remind the Council of the guidance set out in Paragraph 173 of the Framework, which states that 'Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened'. This should be tested through a full plan viability assessment. Realistic and cautious delivery trajectories should be applied by the Council to sites requiring such infrastructure provisions.

In light of the judgement in FODC v. SSCLG and Gladman Developments Ltd [2016] EWHC 421 Admin ], Gladman consider it is necessary for the Site Allocations DPD to carry out an assessment of the potential impact of proposed development on heritage assets, as set out in paragraph 129 of the Framework. The judgement concerns the interaction between paragraph 14 and paragraph 134 of the Framework, and the issues of the balancing exercise to be undertaken to assess the harm of any proposals against the benefits of the identified proposed development in accordance with paragraphs 133, 134 and 135 of the Framework. Gladman consider that the implications of the judgement apply equally to both the decision making process and the plan making process. Paragraph 134 is clear in talking about 'development proposals', a phrase which can apply equally to planning applications and proposed allocations. Furthermore, footnote 29 of the Framework clearly states that ‘The principles and policies set out in this section apply to the heritage-related consent regimes for which local planning authorities are responsible under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as well as to plan-making and decision-taking’. It is therefore essential that the implications of the above judgment are fully considered in the context of both decision-taking and plan-making.

The table on page 133 of the consultation document sets out the expected completions per year of the sites allocated in these policies. The Council will have to ensure that they have applied realistic assumptions around lead-in times and build-out rates for these sites.

Policy SSP39: Areas to be Protected from Development

Gladman would query whether such a blanket protection policy is compliant with the Framework.

Gladman submit that new development can often be located in countryside gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character. In such circumstances we would question the purpose of a gap designation, particularly if this would prevent the development of otherwise sustainable and deliverable housing sites to meet the borough’s needs. Gladman note that there appears to be no robust evidence supporting the extent of the current countryside gap designations.

Para 55 of the Framework seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas to maintain and enhance rural vitality and viability. It is essential therefore, that the needs of the sustainable rural settlements across the district are assessed and a meaningful level of growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing vitality and viability. This will
help to preserve and enhance rural services and facilities and allow local rural communities to meet their own needs for housing whilst providing much needed affordable housing in the parts of the district that suffer with the greatest affordable housing need.

Gladman would be opposed to the use of Local Gaps if these would only serve to act as an arbitrary tool to prevent sustainable development. In this regard we submit that new development can often be located in local gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character.

Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan

The FAAP is intended to implement the adopted Core Strategy and will serve as a tool that can be used to direct sustainable development and investment in the FAAP area and identify land required to meet the level of growth identified in the Core Strategy. Table 1 summarises that 2,123 homes will come forward in the FAAP area, 1,120 from new allocations.

FPP1: New Housing Allocations

The policy distributes, with reference to Table 2, new housing allocations across the FAAP area. 590 are in Felixstowe itself whilst 430 are in Trimley St Martin and 100 in Trimley St Mary. Gladman are pleased that paragraph 3.22 makes clear that the figures in the policy are to be read as minima but wonder whether the wording of the policy itself should make this clearer. The fact the policy is for a minima allows for the possibility of further sustainable development to come forward.

Paragraph 3.23 states that the Council 'consider it necessary to over-allocate sites across the district to ensure that a five year land supply is maintained' and that this provides a range of sites, sizes and locations for development. We welcome the recognition that it takes into account the likely increase in the district's OAN in future. As Major Centres, areas like Felixstowe are inherently sustainable and its continued growth will make an important contribution to meeting the district's housing needs now and in the future; it is important that sustainable development can continue to take place here and is not arbitrarily constrained.

FPP2: Physical Limits Boundaries

As with policy SSP 2 in the Site Allocations DPD, this policy sets boundaries for all settlements listed as Major Centres, Town, Key and Local Service Centres in accordance with Core Strategy policy SP19. The policy allows for development including housing within these limits, subject to proposals being in accordance with other policies, including Neighbourhood Plans. It notes that 'proposals for new residential development outside physical limits boundaries will be strictly controlled'.

As outlined above Gladman consider the housing target in the adopted Core Strategy to be out of date as it does not represent the district's full OAN. Since the settlement boundaries are set to accommodate the out of date level of housing growth outlined in the adopted Core Strategy, the boundary policies are also out of date. Furthermore, the Core Strategy policy upon which SSP2 relies (SP19) was found out of date in the Fairfield Road, Framlingham appeal as the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land.

Setting strict settlement boundaries does not allow adequate flexibility for development to come forward outside the settlement boundary if this is required (for example due to a shortfall of housing land).

Gladman would object to the use of settlement limits if these would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. The Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead. The use of settlement limits to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements would not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework.

Gladman would be opposed to the definition of an urban edge if this would preclude appropriately sited and sustainable development coming forward to meet the borough's housing needs, in accordance with the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development. Proposals that are sustainable should go ahead without delay. An overly restrictive approach could result in a plan that is not positively prepared or effective.

Policy FPPS: Land North of Conway Close and Swallow Close, Felixstowe

Gladman support the allocation of land for new housing in this area. We welcome the recognition that 'the land to the north of Conway Close and Swallow Close can provide a natural extension to the built form of Felixstowe without causing a detrimental impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or important views of the Debdon Estuary'.

Gladman also welcome the recognition that the presence of the Grade II listed Park Farm Cottages to the west of the site does not preclude development in the area provided that it is sympathetic to the heritage asset.

We note that there are potential capacity issues regarding the foul sewerage network that need to be overcome. Gladman submit that it is the responsibility of Anglian Water to provide sufficient capacity to serve the needs of housing...
in the area and that this should not be used as an excuse to prevent or delay development coming forward. Anglian Water are consulted through the plan process and so must be aware of the capacity issue and should be putting funding in place to resolve it.

Gladman recognise that the area may have some archaeological potential. It is our view and experience that full archaeological investigations are not necessary prior to the grant of planning permission and that appropriately-worded pre-commencement conditions attached to planning applications are effective at securing any archaeological remains on site without delaying the granting of planning permission.

Gladman would caution against being too prescriptive regarding the mix of housing, the design and layout, or the route of the footpath through the site, as these will need to be established and refined through a thorough analysis of the constraints and opportunities of the site and through engagement with the public and stakeholders. The Council will no doubt be aware of the requirements set out in paragraph 59 of the Framework, which states:

Local planning authorities should consider using design codes where they could help deliver high quality outcomes. However, design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.

Furthermore, paragraph 60 goes on to add:

Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

Finally, paragraph 65 makes it clear that

Local planning authorities should not refuse planning permission for buildings or infrastructure which promote high levels of sustainability because of concerns about incompatibility with on existing townscape, if those concerns have been mitigated by good design (unless the concern relates to a designated heritage asset and the impact would cause material harm to the asset or its setting which is not outweighed by the proposal's economic, social and environmental benefits).

In general Gladman remind the Council of the guidance set out in Paragraph 173 of the Framework, which states that 'Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened'.

Gladman submit that policies which seek developer contributions should be properly tested for their effects on development viability and supported by an adequate evidence base. The Council should not set onerous policy obligations that could place an undue burden on the ability of developers to deliver sustainable development.

Gladman submit that a site larger than the proposed allocation is suitable, available and deliverable. A larger allocation in this area could contribute to the over-provision of housing across the district and provide a buffer/reserve should other sites within the FAAP or across the district not come forward as anticipated, enabling the district to maintain a robust five year supply of housing land. Given the recognition that the OAN for the district is likely to increase in future, a larger allocation here could make a valuable contribution to an increased housing requirement in an area outside the AONB, reducing pressure for development within the AONB.

Policies FPP1 - FPP8

Gladman have no specific comments to make on the individual allocations within the plan except to note that many of the allocations policies place burdens upon the delivery of sites, for example by requiring Development Briefs to be agreed or certain infrastructure to be provided before development can come forward. Gladman remind the Council of the guidance set out in Paragraph 173 of the Framework, which states that 'Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened'.

In light of the judgement in FODC v. SSCLG and Gladman Developments Ltd [(2016) EWHC 421 Admin], Gladman consider it is necessary for the FAAP to carry out an assessment of the potential impact of proposed development on heritage assets, as set out in paragraph 129 of the Framework. The judgement concerns the interaction between paragraph 14 and paragraph 134 of the Framework, and the issues of the balancing exercise to be undertaken to assess the harm of any proposals against the benefits of the identified proposed development in accordance with paragraphs 133, 134 and 135 of the Framework. Gladman consider that the implications of the judgement apply equally to both the decision making process and the plan making process. Paragraph 134 is clear in talking about ‘development proposals’, a phrase which can apply equally to planning applications and proposed allocations. Furthermore footnote 29 of the Framework clearly states that "The principles and policies set out in this section apply to the heritage-related consent regimes for which local planning authorities are responsible under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as well as to plan-making and decision-taking." It is therefore essential that the implications of the above judgment are fully considered in the context of both decision-taking and plan-making.
Policy FPP27: Access to the Countryside

The policy requires new residential developments in the Felixstowe Peninsular to make provision of accessible natural green spaces as agreed by the Council in conjunction with Natural England. Gladman would urge the Council to take a flexible and realistic approach to such provision, recognising that it could take a variety of forms. The Council should even consider payment of offsite contributions if this would be more appropriate given the constraints of a site and issues of viability.

Paragraph 173 of the Framework states that ‘Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened’.

Policy FPP28: Areas to be Protected from Development

As with our comments on the Site Allocations DPD, Gladman would query whether such a blanket protection policy is compliant with the Framework.

Gladman submit that new development can often be located in countryside gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character. In such circumstances we would question the purpose of a gap designation, particularly if this would prevent the development of otherwise sustainable and deliverable housing sites to meet the borough's needs. Gladman note that there appears to be no robust evidence supporting the extent of the current countryside gap designations.

Para 55 of the Framework seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas to maintain and enhance rural vitality and viability. It is essential therefore, that the needs of the sustainable rural settlements across the district are assessed and a meaningful level of growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing vitality and viability. This will help to preserve and enhance rural services and facilities and allow local rural communities to meet their own needs for housing whilst providing much needed affordable housing in the parts of the district that suffer with the greatest affordable housing need.

Gladman would be opposed to the use of Local Gaps if these would only serve to act as an arbitrary tool to prevent sustainable development. In this regard we submit that new development can often be located in local gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character.

General Comments

In addition to the above comments on the FAAP policies, Gladman have the following general points to make about the FAAP.

Delivery Rates

The table on page 105 of the FAAP consultation document sets out the expected completions per year of the sites allocated in these policies. The Council will have to ensure that they have applied realistic assumptions around lead-in times and build-out rates for these sites.

Location of New Housing

Gladman would point out that Suffolk Coastal has a number of different and distinct housing market areas. Each of these distinct areas will have their own requirement for housing and this should be reflected in the spatial distribution of housing supply within the Local Plan. This decision should be based on the findings of the evidence base and should not be a politically driven spatial strategy to put a disproportionate amount of housing in areas where people don't want to (and will not) live. If the spatial distribution does not reflect need/demand as shown by the evidence base, then housing will not be delivered and the Plan will not be implemented. Following a dispersed spatial distribution pattern across a large number of settlements is also undesirable as this approach is not likely to be sustainable, will not be delivered and cannot generate the level of community benefits that larger sites can to help make settlements more sustainable and fill important gaps in community provision.

Gladman would suggest a hybrid approach should be taken, with more sustainable settlements taking a greater proportion of growth thanless sustainable locations. We would caution against too prescriptive a development strategy based solely on a development hierarchy that is itself based on too simplistic an understanding of sustainability (i.e. the number of services available). Whilst level of services is obviously an important criterion, the Framework is clear that development should be allowed where it is sustainable, when measured against the Framework as a whole and the three strands of sustainability (economic, social and environmental) in particular. When considering development in rural areas, Paragraph 55 of the Framework states that 'housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.' Furthermore paragraph 17 states that planning should "focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable'.

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).
New homes should be distributed in a way that enables the full OAN for the district to be met, rather than based too rigidly on percentages allocated to each town and village. This should take into account factors such as market conditions and viability - it is after all the private sector that will be expected to deliver the majority of the district’s housing need and so it is important that the chosen distribution enables this to happen.

Regardless of the approach a sufficient range of sites need to be allocated (taking into account viability and market conditions) to ensure continuity of housing supply; more sites than needed to deliver the OAN should be allocated to account for slippage and delays. Whichever development strategy is adopted it is vital that the new Local Plan addresses this and that housing figures and distribution are aligned fully with economic growth aspirations.

Other Comments on Site Allocations and FAAP

Gladman have the following comments to make that apply to both the Site Allocations DPD and the FAAP document.

NPPF Changes

It is vital that the Site Allocations and FAAP fully reflect any revisions to the Framework, the recommendations of the Local Plan Expert Group when implemented, and any requirements relating to Starter Homes once these come into effect. Of particular importance will be the need to address possible changes to the Framework around ensuring housing is delivered on land allocated in plans through the introduction of a ‘housing delivery test’. The consultation document on the proposed changes set out that ‘where significant under-delivery is identified over a sustained period, action needs to be taken to address this’ and that one approach ‘could be to identify additional sustainable sites if the existing approach is demonstrably not delivering the housing required’. The Site Allocations DPD and FAAP will need to include a mechanism for dealing with any sustained under-delivery in a timely fashion.

Another area that the LAPP should consider is the widening of the definition of affordable housing ‘so that it encompasses a fuller range of products that can support people to access home ownership’. It is proposed that the wider definition includes Starter Homes and the Housing and Planning Act has introduced provisions to make regulations to require all suitable reasonably-sized housing developments to include a proportion of Starter Homes. The Plans will need to address how this requirement will impact on the amount of more traditional types of affordable housing that could be delivered, which may entail an adjustment of the housing target to ensure the district’s full OAN can be met.

Duty to Cooperate

The development of the Site Allocations DPD and FAAP represents another opportunity to consider and address cross-boundary issues.

Paragraph 178 of the Framework states that ‘public bodies have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries’ and paragraph 179 states that ‘local planning authorities should work collaboratively with other bodies to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual Local Plans’. It goes on to say that ‘joint working should enable local planning authorities to work together to meet development requirements which cannot wholly be met within their own areas - for instance, because of a lack of physical capacity.

Paragraph 181 of the Framework further sets out that ‘cooperation should be a continuous process of engagement from initial thinking through to implementation, resulting in a final position where plans are in place to provide the land and infrastructure necessary to support current and projected future levels of development’.

PPG provides further explanation of how the policies contained within the Framework should be interpreted and applied. In terms of the Duty to Cooperate, PPG sets out that ‘local planning authorities should make every effort to secure the necessary cooperation on strategic cross boundary matters BEFORE they submit their Local Plans for examination”(my emphasis).

Suffolk Coastal clearly needs to consider the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate. It is something that needs to be built into the entire plan-making process from the very beginning and failure to do so is not something that can be rectified retrospectively.

Sustainability Appraisal Interim Report and Sustainability Appraisal of Policies

Gladman have the following comments regarding the Sustainability Appraisal:

In accordance with Section 19 of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, policies set out in Local Plans must be subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Incorporating the requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, SA is a systematic process that should be undertaken at each stage of the Plan’s preparation, assessing the effects of the Local Plan’s proposals on sustainable development when judged against all reasonable alternatives.

The Council should ensure that the results of the SA process clearly justify its policy choices. In meeting the
development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of the assessment why some policy options have been progressed, and others have been rejected. Undertaking a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, in the same level of detail for both chosen and rejected alternatives, the Council’s decision making and scoring should be robust, justified and transparent.

Gladman remind the Council that there have now been a number of instances where the failure to undertake a satisfactory SA has resulted in Plans failing the test of legal compliance at Examination (South Somerset) or being subjected to later legal challenge (Heard vs Greater Norwich Development Plan).

Conclusions

What is clear from the Framework, and from the Government’s agenda to boost significantly the supply of housing, is that the premise of the whole process is the assessment and delivery of the full OAN for housing in an area unless there are adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. If the process set out in the Framework and PPG is not followed then the Council run the real risk of the plan being found unsound and this will create significant delay and uncertainty in the process.

All of our best interests are served by your authority getting a Local Plan found sound at the earliest possible opportunity, rather than us utilising considerable resources on preparing for and attending EIPs, preparing Judicial Reviews etc. This approach will put the authority back in control of planning in their area and will give the Members comfort and certainty over the level and location of development that will take place over the lifetime of the Plan.

Gladman have raised concerns in relation to the issues and options being considered by the Council which will fundamentally affect the ‘soundness’ of the Local Plan (with reference to tests of soundness outlined in paragraph 182 of the Framework). If the Local Plan is approached in such a way as presented it will not provide a positive policy approach and in a number of cases it is not consistent with national policy.

Gladman hope that you have found this representation constructive. If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact myself or a member of the Gladman team.

Summary:

The policy distributes, with reference to Table 2, new housing allocations across the FAAP area. 590 are in Felixstowe itself whilst 430 are in Trimley St Martin and 100 in Trimley St Mary. Gladman are pleased that paragraph 3.22 makes clear that the figures in the policy are to be read as minima but wonder whether the wording of the policy itself should make this clearer. The fact the policy is for a minima allows for the possibility of further sustainable development to come forward.

Paragraph 3.23 states that the Council ‘consider it necessary to over-allocate sites across the district to ensure that a five year land supply is maintained’ and that this provides a range of sites, sizes and locations for development. We welcome the recognition that it takes into account the likely increase in the district’s OAN in future. As Major Centres, areas like Felixstowe are inherently sustainable and its continued growth will make an important contribution to meeting the district’s housing needs now and in the future; it is important that sustainable development can continue to take place here and is not arbitrarily constrained.

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>i, ii, iii, iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments:

Scanned Representation
This representation has been prepared in respect of land adjacent to Reeve Lodge, 1 High Road, Trimley St Martin, Alternative Option Site 383b, together with adjoining land (identified on the attached plan).

Alternative Option Site 383b was the subject of representations to the Preferred Options consultation in 2015 and has been dismissed by the Council as a housing allocation in the current proposed submission Area Action Plan (AAP) document.

However, in light of the need for the Council to significantly boost housing supply, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), it is considered that a more ambitious approach to growth within the AAP area would be appropriate, and that this land should be reconsidered within this context.

Alternative Option Site 383b (and surrounding land) is located approximately 1.8 miles from strategic employment opportunities at the Port of Felixstowe as well as other local services and facilities. It is well served by public transport and new homes in this location and has the potential to reduce the need for car journeys and encourage sustainable transport behaviour.

The land also has many characteristics in common with sites that have been proposed for housing allocation within the submission version AAP and it is considered that the site is capable of contributing towards sustainable development. It is considered that the AAP should be more ambitious in order to meet local housing need and it would be appropriate for the site to be reconsidered based on the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the fact that the AAP, as currently drafted, will not fully meet the District's objectively assessed housing needs.

Since the publication of the Proposed Submission Documents, on 25th of April 2016, an Appeal Decision in respect of land at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, Suffolk was issued (APP/J3530/W/15/3011466). This decision related to a residential development of 163 dwellings and was allowed.

Paragraphs 13 to 28 of the decision are considered of particular relevance, in that they established that Core Strategy Policy SP2 is out of date and that, with a housing requirement based on an OAN of 11,000 dwellings, the district has a housing land supply of less than 3.7 years. This is an important appeal decision and should be afforded significant weight as part of the consideration of these representations. It provides up-to-date evidence that the Proposed Submission Documents allocate sufficient housing sites, to significantly boost the supply of housing over the plan period.

For a local plan to be found sound at examination by an independent inspector it should satisfy a series of tests which are considered in turn below:

Positively Prepared

For a local plan to be considered positively prepared it must be based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed housing development requirements, including the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities.

At the strategic level housing numbers and distribution are set out in the Core Strategy. Objective 2 states:

To meet the minimum locally identified housing needs of the district for the period 2010 to 2027, taking into account existing and future economic, environmental and social opportunities and constraints

In respect of this objective there are two important points to note. Firstly, that the Core Strategy seeks to meet the minimum locally identified housing need, and secondly, that it is a locally identified housing need for the plan period.

Currently, Policy SP2 of the Core Strategy states that provision will be made for at least 7,900 new homes, distributed in accordance with the settlement hierarchy set out in policy SP19. The policy then goes on to commit to an early review in order to identify the full objectively assessed housing needs for the District, to ensure this is met in so far as this is consistent with the policies of the NPPF.

The Examining Inspector's report in respect of the Core Strategy Examination (June 2013) made it clear that an early review was essential because at the time:

"On available evidence at this point the 11,000 new dwellings should be taken as the full, objectively assessed housing need OAN for the District between 2010 and 2027."

At paragraph 46 of the Report the Inspector commented that:

"Even if the theoretical capacity of all the sites included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability assessment (SHLAA), existing commitments, potential brownfield opportunities, allocations carried forward from the previous Local Plan and a windfall allowance were taken into account, the provision would fall some way short of the 11,000 dwellings required."
At this point, the Inspector gave consideration to suspending the Examination. However, he concluded that, as none of the adjoining Councils had objected to the scale of housing proposed, having a core strategy in place with an early review would be preferable to the alternative of suspension of the examination and the likely withdrawal of the plan.

While it is noted that the Site Allocations and Area Specific DPD Issues and Options consultation commenced in 2015, this occurred ahead of the objectively assessed housing needs for the District being reviewed, updated and firmly established. Policy CS2 states:

"An early review of the Core Strategy will be undertaken, commencing with the publication of an Issues and Options Report by 2015 at the latest. The review will identify the full, objectively assessed need for the District and proposals to ensure that this is met in so far as this is consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework."

This review has not been undertaken and Policy CS2 would therefore appear to be out of date and not a sound basis for the Proposed Submission Documents. In addition to Paragraph 47 of the NPPF, paragraph 158 requires that the Local Plan is "...based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence..."

Table 3.1 of the Core Strategy references the need for an extra 11,000 dwellings as identified in the work commissioned by Oxford Economics (OE) in 2010. It goes on to suggest that the review should identify land to meet the current acknowledged shortfall between the locally assessed requirement and the OE objectively assessed need (OAN). However, this information remains unavailable and the Council does not appear to have published its understanding of the current OAN.

A more recent SHMA was produced in 2012 for the sub-region. This suggested that the need figure for Suffolk Coastal was greater still at 14,200. As a result, there is clearly some uncertainty about what the OAN is for the District.

These concerns were born out at the recent Framlingham Appeal (APPJ3530/W/15/3011466). In considering the Council's five-year housing land supply, the Inspector commented that:

"...not to accept that the requirement of 7900 dwellings over the plan period is out of date would be contrary to the clear message in paragraph 47 of the NPPF that local planning authorities should seek to boost significantly the supply of housing."

"The 7,900 dwelling housing requirement is not based on an assessment of the OAN for the District, contrary to paragraph 47 of the NPPF, and is artificially low...."

The Inspector also noted that there was a persistent undersupply of housing against the core strategy requirement over the first five years of the plan period and it was therefore entirely appropriate to apply a 20% buffer to the housing requirement.

The Inspector also commented that:

"...the future for housing growth in the district is seriously uncertain and is not following the plan approach that is advocated in the first 12 core planning principle set out in the NPPF."

The examining Inspector's final conclusion was that:

"...based on an OAN of 11,000 dwellings, as established in the core strategy, or any other realistic prediction of what an OAN for the District is likely to be, housing land supply is less than 3.7 years."

It is therefore considered that the Proposed Submission Document's reliance on Policy CS2 is unsound as it does not objectively assess the development needs of the District, or neighbouring authorities, and as such cannot be considered to be positively prepared.

Justified

For the plan to be justified it should be the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence. As set out above the Proposed Submission Documents are not considered to be based on the most appropriate strategy. The plan also appears to be at odds with paragraph 47 of the NPPF, as it will not boost significantly the supply of housing and does not meet the full objectively assessed needs of the district. As such, the publication of the Proposed Submission Documents would appear to be premature in the absence of an agreed assessment.

We consider that it would be appropriate for a focused review of the housing chapter and of the Core Strategy Policy SP2 to set out updated housing numbers and distribution, as the Council had committed to at the Core Strategy Examination. This review should be based on a thorough understanding of the OAN, which would then allow sufficient additional, available and deliverable sites; such as Alternative Option Site 383b, together with adjoining land, to be...
considered for allocation.

As the Inspector noted in the Framlingham Appeal, an OAN of 11,000 was established in the Core Strategy and currently there is no other published review of what a realistic OAN for the District is likely to be. We therefore consider that at the very least, the Proposed Submission Documents should as a minimum be seeking to allocate sufficient sites to meet the 11,000 dwellings and not the 8,620 as set out in Table 1.

Effective

To be considered effective the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working and cross boundary strategic priorities. Currently, the plan does not include any allowance for cross boundary housing delivery. The unmet need of Ipswich is already known to be in the region of 3,300 dwellings, the Proposed Submission Documents are silent on how this evidenced short fall can be addressed. A 'Draft Memorandum of Understanding has been prepared for the Ipswich Housing Market Area and Ipswich Functional Economic Area. However, there does not appear to be any evidence on negotiations and progress towards completion of this agreement which demonstrates compliance with the duty to co-operate.

Whilst the Council has engaged in discussions with neighbouring councils in the Ipswich Housing Market Area these discussions still appear to be at an early stage. The Local Development Scheme 2015 (LDS) indicates that an Aligned or Joint Local Plan Review will commence in October 2016, with adoption in December 2020. The LDS actually indicated that background evidence gathering started in 2014. This LDS strategy is therefore considered to acknowledge that the adoption of the Proposed Submission Documents is not an effective, deliverable strategy for the plan period, as they are to be immediately replaced by an Aligned or Joint Local Plan Review which it is anticipated will be adopted in 2019.

Consistent with National Policy

Paragraph 14 sets out that 'a presumption in favour of sustainable development' is at the heart of the Framework and describes this as 'a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision taking.' It goes on to state that for plan-making this means:

* Local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area;
* Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change...

There does not appear to be evidence which demonstrates that the Council has sought to positively meet the development needs of the area or to meet its objectively assessed needs.

The Core Planning Principles set out at paragraph 17 include a set of overarching objectives which should underpin plan making. Of particular relevance to this consultation response are that planning should be:

* Plan-led with up to date plans providing a practical framework for predictable and efficient decisions.
  * Not be about scrutiny but be a creative exercise.
  * Proactively drive sustainable development to deliver the homes the country needs.'

Every effort should be taken to objectively identify and meet the needs of the area. Sufficient land suitable for development, having regard to market signals, should be allocated and this could include Alternative Option Site 383b, together with adjoining land.

The reliance on the Core Strategy Policy CS2 and in turn the housing allocations identified in Table 1 and Policy SSP1 does not appear to have full regard to the Core Planning Principles of the Framework.

Paragraph 47 sets out a clear challenge to local planning authorities 'to boost significantly the supply of housing...’ In order to achieve this they should ensure that their Local Plan meets the full objectively assessed needs for the area and they should identify and annually update their five year housing supply.’

For plan making paragraph 159 reminds local planning authorities that they ‘...should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area.’

The Proposed Submission Documents as currently drafted do not appear to meet these national policy requirements. Actually, they restrict the supply of housing land; and by not taking the opportunity to identify further sites, such as Alternative Option Site 383b, together with adjoining land, risk not fully addressing the District's current lack of 5 year housing land supply.

For the reasons set out above it is considered that the AAP, as currently drafted, is not consistent with the NPPF. As set out above it is considered that the proposed submission of the AAP document would appear to be premature and we consider that the Council should instead consider focusing its efforts on delivering its new Aligned or Joint Local Plan Review. We consider that the Council's priority should be to progress an up-to-date assessment of the objectively assessed housing needs within the Ipswich Housing Market Area so that the District's OAN, and the requirements to
accommodate any unmet need of neighbouring authorities, can be fully quantified.

We consider that if the Proposed Submission Documents are to be progressed, then they should seek to allocate, as a minimum, sufficient sites to meet an OAN of 11,000 dwellings as established in the core strategy. This could be achieved by way of the allocation of further sites, such as Alternative Option Site 383b, together with adjoining land. It is considered necessary that we attend the examination hearing session to contribute to the debate in respect of the soundness of the strategy set out in the LDS and discussions regarding the appropriate OAN for the District. In addition, we would want to be able to contribute to discussions around the necessary modifications to the AAP.

Finally, we would wish to be able to present evidence to the Inspector to demonstrate that Alternative Option Site 383b, together with adjoining land, represents a sustainable location for development, is available and deliverable. Yes, assessment of Alternative Option 383b within the SA does not adequately assess the site, which has the potential to contribute towards meeting the District's objectively assessed housing needs and help boost housing supply.

Summary: We consider that if the Proposed Submission Documents are to be progressed, then they should seek to allocate, as a minimum, sufficient sites to meet an OAN of 11,000 dwellings as established in the core strategy. This could be achieved by way of the allocation of further sites, such as Alternative Option Site 383b, together with adjoining land.

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>i, ii, iii, iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments:
This representation has been prepared by Strutt Parker LLP on behalf of Pigeon (Trimley) Ltd in respect of land at High Road, Trimley St Martin, also referred to as Alternative Option Site 3022a and now the subject of a planning application to Suffolk Coastal District Council (ref. DC/16/1919/FUL).

The land was put forward in the call for sites and identified as suitable for development in the SHLAA 2014. Representations were made to the earlier drafts of the Felixstowe Peninsular Area Action Plan on the basis that the site is sustainable, available and deliverable, would represent a logical extension to the development limits of the settlement and as such should be included as a Preferred Allocation. Significant site specific information was provided in support of the representation submitted in November 2015 which included the following documents:

* Site Plan;
* Indicative Layout Plan;
* Preliminary Drainage Appraisal October 2015;
* Desk-based Archaeological Assessment;
* Landscape and Visual Assessment;
* Preliminary Ecological Appraisal; and
* Transport Report
* Phase 1 Contamination Report

However, whilst the local planning authority has "noted" the representation they commented that:

"The site has been discounted in the AAP it is not appropriate to show this on the Policies Map which supports the written text."

We consider that this does not adequately assess the previous representation or provide sufficient justification why the Council considered that the site was not a sustainable location and should not be included as an additional allocation in the AAP.

Current Planning Proposal

A planning application for the site has now been submitted (DC/16/1919/FUL). It was made valid on 10th May 2016. The application is a full planning application for the erection of 69 new homes with associated access, landscaping and amenity space on land adjacent to High Road, Trimley St Martin, Suffolk. The application is supported by a series of documents including:

* Planning Statement (PS) prepared by Strutt & Parker;
* Design & Access Statement (DAS) prepared by Strutt & Parker;
* Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) prepared by Liz Lake Associates;
* Transport Statement (TS) prepared by MLM Consulting Engineers Ltd;
* Travel Plan (TP) prepared by MLM Consulting Engineers Ltd;
* Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA), Tree Survey Plan and Tree Protection Plan prepared by Hayden's Arboricultural Consultants;
* Preliminary Ecological Assessment prepared by Basecology;
* Plans and other drawings relevant to the planning application prepared by Parc Design Solutions;
* Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Drainage Strategy prepared by MLM Consulting Engineers Ltd;
* Utility Services Report prepared by MLM Consulting Engineers Ltd;
* Phase 1 Contamination Assessment Report prepared by MLM Consulting Engineers Ltd;
* Archaeological Assessment prepared by Archaeological Risk Management;
* Noise and Vibration Technical Report prepared by MLM Consulting Engineers Ltd;

These demonstrate that as the site is located adjacent to the north western edge of Trimley St Martin it will form a natural extension to the settlement with the proposals for structural landscaping enhancing the countryside edge of Trimley St Martin. Overall, the site lies in a sustainable location which is demonstrably suitable and appropriate to host new housing development.

There are no access or traffic issues identified that would prevent the proposed development coming forward. The application proposals can be accommodated without having an adverse impact on the local highway network in terms of road safety and capacity.

Information provided with the application confirms there are no other adverse impacts arising from development at this site. In fact, the planning application demonstrates that development would bring forward:

* Economic benefits;
* Much needed affordable housing, (41%) in excess of the policy requirement;
* Two large areas of publicly accessible open space, totalling 0.6 hectares, well in excess of the required standard, helping to meet a current deficiency in the area;
* Traffic calming measures in the form of a new pedestrian refuge island that will help to encourage sustainable
movement; and
* Possible improvements to an adjacent area of open space that has been the subject of anti-social behaviour.

The Development as proposed clearly constitutes sustainable development; the site is available, deliverable and developable.

On this basis it is considered that the site should be included as an additional site allocation in Table 2, and as an addition to those sites identified in Policies FPP3 to FPP8. Further justification to support this position is set out below.

Framlingham Appeal

For the purpose of these representations, since the publication of the Proposed Submission Documents, on 25th of April 2016 an Appeal Decision in respect of land at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, Suffolk was issued (APP/J3530/W/15/3011466). This decision related to a residential development of 163 dwellings and was allowed.

Paragraphs 13 to 28 of the decision are considered of particular relevance, in that they established that Core Strategy Policy SP2 is out of date and that, with a housing requirement based on an 0AN of 11,000 dwellings, the district has a housing land supply of less than 3.7 years. This is an important appeal decision and should be afforded significant weight as part of the consideration of these representations. It provides up-to-date evidence that the Proposed Submission Documents are fundamentally flawed and do not seek to allocate sufficient housing sites, to significantly boost the supply of housing over the plan period.

Legally Compliant

Section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, requires that a local planning authority must only submit a document to the Secretary of State for independent examination where:

a) they have complied with any relevant requirements contained in the regulations under this part, and
b) they think the document is ready for independent examination.

Firstly, the Council is required to demonstrate evidence of having effectively cooperated to plan for cross boundary issues with neighbouring authorities under the "duty to cooperate". It is unclear what evidence the Council has to demonstrate that there has been effective co-operation at this stage of the plan making process.

Secondly, for the reasons set out below in this representation, in respect of housing allocations the Proposed Submission Documents rely on Policy SP2 of the Core Strategy. This is considered to be out-of-date and not based on an up-to-date Objectively Assessed Housing Need for the Suffolk Coastal Council district. More detail on this specific point is set out below. We therefore question whether the proposed strategy is sound and whether the documents are ready for independent examination.

Soundness

For a local plan to be found sound at examination by an independent inspector the NPPF at paragraph 182 advises that it should satisfy a series of tests which are considered in turn below:

Positively Prepared

For a local plan to be considered positively prepared it must be based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed housing development requirements, including the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities.

At the strategic level housing numbers and distribution are set out in the Core Strategy. Objective 2 states:

To meet the minimum locally identified housing needs of the district for the period 2010 to 2027, taking into account existing and future economic, environmental and social opportunities and constraints

In respect of this objective there are two important points to note. Firstly, that the Core Strategy seeks to meet the minimum locally identified housing need, and secondly, that it is a locally identified housing need for the plan period.

Currently, Policy SP2 of the Core Strategy states that provision will be made for at least 7,900 new homes, distributed in accordance with the settlement hierarchy set out in policy SP19. The policy then goes on to commit to an early review in order to identify the full objectively assessed housing needs for the District, to ensure this is met in so far as this is consistent with the policies of the NPPF.

The Examining Inspector's report in respect of the Core Strategy Examination (June 2013) made it clear that an early review was essential because at the time:

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).
“On available evidence at this point the 11,000 new dwellings should be taken as the full, objectively assessed housing need OAN for the District between 2010 and 2027.”

At paragraph 46 of the Report the Inspector commented that:

“Even if the theoretical capacity of all the sites included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability assessment (SHLAA), existing commitments, potential brownfield opportunities, allocations carried forward from the previous Local Plan and a windfall allowance were taken into account, the provision would fall some way short of the 11,000 dwellings required.”

At this point, the Inspector concluded that, as none of the adjoining Councils had objected to the scale of housing proposed, having a core strategy in place with an early review would be preferable to the alternative of suspension of the examination and the likely withdrawal of the plan.

While it is noted that the Site Allocations and Area Specific DPD Issues and Options consultation commenced in 2015, it is of significant concern that this occurred ahead of the objectively assessed housing need for the District being reviewed, updated and firmly established. Policy CS2 states:

“An early review of the Core Strategy will be undertaken, commencing with the publication of an Issues and Options Report by 2015 at the latest. The review will identify the full, objectively assessed need for the District and proposals to ensure that this is met in so far as this is consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework.”

This review has not been undertaken and we therefore consider that Policy CS2 is out of date and not a sound basis for the Proposed Submission Documents. In addition to Paragraph 47 of the NPPF, paragraph 158 requires that the Local Plan is “…based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence…”

Table 3.1 of the Core Strategy references the need for an extra 11,000 dwellings as identified in the work commission by Oxford Economics (OE) in 2010. It goes on to suggest that the review should identify land to meet the current acknowledged shortfall between the locally assessed requirement and the OE objectively assessed need (OAN). However, this information remains unavailable and the Council does not appear to have published its understanding of the current OAN.

A more recent SHMA was produced in 2012 for the sub-region. This suggested that the need figure for Suffolk Coastal was greater still at 14,200. As a result, there is clearly some uncertainty about what the OAN is for the District.

These concerns were born out at the recent Framlingham Appeal (APPJ3530/W/15/3011466). In considering the Council’s five-year housing land supply, the Inspector commented that:

“...not to accept that the requirement of 7900 dwellings over the plan period is out of date would be contrary to the clear message in paragraph 47 of the NPPF that local planning authorities should seek to boost significantly the supply of housing.”

“The 7,900 dwelling housing requirement is not based on an assessment of the OAN for the District, contrary to paragraph 47 of the NPPF, and is artificially low….”

The Inspector also noted that there was a persistent undersupply of housing against the core strategy requirement over the first five years of the plan period and it was therefore entirely appropriate to apply a 20% buffer to the housing requirement.

The Inspector also commented that:

“...the future for housing growth in the district is seriously uncertain and is not following the plan approach that is advocated in the first 12 core planning principle set out in the NPPF.”

The examining Inspector’s final conclusion was that:

“...based on an OAN of 11,000 dwellings, as established in the core strategy, or any other realistic prediction of what an OAN for the District is likely to be, housing land supply is less than 3.7 years.”

We therefore consider that the Proposed Submission Document’s reliance on Policy CS2 is unsound as it does not objectively address the development needs of the District, or neighbouring authorities, and as such cannot be considered to be positively prepared.

Justified

For the plan to be justified it should be the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence. As set out above the Proposed Submission Documents are not considered to be based on the most appropriate strategy. The plan also appears to be at odds with paragraph 47 of the NPPF, as it will...
not boost significantly the supply of housing and does not meet the full objectively assessed needs of the district. As such, the publication of the Proposed Submission Documents would appear to be premature in the absence of an agreed assessment.

We consider that it would be appropriate for a focused review of the housing chapter and of the Core Strategy Policy SP2 to set out updated housing numbers and distribution should have occurred, as the Council had committed to at the Core Strategy Examination. This review should be based on a thorough understanding of the OAN, which would then allow sufficient additional, available and deliverable sites; such as our client’s land at High Road, Trimley St Martin, which is available now to make a contribution to the delivery of housing within a five year period to be allocated. We therefore consider that Tables 1 & 2 of the AAP should be updated to show the additional contribution that the site could make to housing supply and that the site should be included as an additional allocation in addition to those sites identified in Policies FPP3 to FPP8.

As the Inspector noted in the Framlingham Appeal, an OAN of 11,000 was established in the Core Strategy and currently there is no other published review of what a realistic OAN for the District is likely to be. We therefore consider that at the very least, the Proposed Submission Documents should as a minimum be seeking to allocate sufficient sites to meet the 11,000 dwellings and not the 8,620 as set out in Table 1.

Effective

To be considered effective the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working and cross boundary strategic priorities. Currently, the plan does not include any allowance for cross boundary housing delivery. The unmet need of Ipswich is already known to be in the region of 3,300 dwellings, the Proposed Submission Documents are silent on how this evidenced short fall can be addressed. A ‘Draft Memorandum of Understanding has been prepared for the Ipswich Housing Market Area and Ipswich Functional Economic Area. However, there does not appear to be any evidence on negotiations and progress towards completion of this agreement which demonstrates compliance with the duty to co-operate.

Whilst the Council has engaged in discussions with neighbouring councils in the Ipswich Housing Market Area these discussions still appear to be at an early stage. The Local Development Scheme 2015 (LDS) indicates that an Aligned or Joint Local Plan Review will commence in October 2016, with adoption in December 2020. The LDS actually indicated that background evidence gathering started in 2014. This LDS strategy is therefore considered to acknowledge that the adoption of the Proposed Submission Documents is not an effective, deliverable strategy for the plan period, as they are to be immediately replaced by Aligned or Joint Local Plan Review which it is anticipated will be adopted in 2019.

Consistent with National Policy

Paragraph 14 sets out that ‘a presumption in favour of sustainable development’ is at the heart of the Framework and describes this as ‘a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision taking.’ It goes on to state that for plan-making this means:

* Local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area;
* Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change...’

There does not appear to be evidence which demonstrates that the Council has sought to positively meet the development needs of the area or to meet its objectively assessed needs.

These requirements are repeated in more detail throughout the Framework. Paragraph 15 requires the presumption in favour of sustainable development to be applied to local plan policies so that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay. We consider that failure to allocate land at High Road, Trimley St Martin, is at odds with this requirement.

The Core Planning Principles set out at paragraph 17 include a set of overarching objectives which should underpin plan making. Of particular relevance to this consultation response are that planning should be:

* Plan-led with up to date plans providing a practical framework for predictable and efficient decisions.
* Not be about scrutiny but be a creative exercise.
* Proactively drive sustainable development to deliver the homes the country needs.

Every effort should be taken to objectively identify and meet the needs of the area. Sufficient land suitable for development, having regard to market signals, should be allocated and we consider that this should include our client’s site.

The reliability on the Core Strategy Policy CS2 and in turn the housing allocations identified in Table 1 and Policy SSP1 does not appear to have full regard to the Core Planning Principles of the Framework.

Paragraph 47 sets out a clear challenge to local planning authorities ‘to boost significantly the supply of housing...’ In order to achieve this they should ensure that their Local Plan meets the full objectively assessed needs for the area and...
they should identify and annually update their five year housing supply.’

For plan making paragraph 159 reminds local planning authorities that they ‘...should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area.’

The Proposed Submission Documents as currently drafted do not appear to meet these national policy requirements. Actually, they restrict the supply of housing land; and by not taking the opportunity to identify further sites, such as our client’s land in Trimley St Martin, risk not fully addressing the District’s current lack of 5 year housing land supply.

For the reasons set out above it is considered that paragraphs 1.12, 1.1, 1.14, 3.01, 3.03, 3.04, 3.05, 3.06 and 3.07, Table 1: Housing Provision 2010 - 2027 for the District & Table 2 Housing Contribution 2010 -2015 & Proposed New Housing Delivery and Policy FPP1: New Housing Delivery 2015 - 2027 of the Proposed Submission Document, as currently drafted, are inconsistent with the NPPF.

It is therefore contended that Tables 1 & 2 of the AAP, should be updated to show the additional contribution that land at High Road, Trimley St Martin (Alternative Option Site 3022a) could make to housing supply and that the site should be included as an allocation in addition to those sites identified in Policies FPP3 to FPP8.

As set out above it is considered that the current strategy set out in the Proposed Submission Documents are unsound. The proposed submission of the document would appear to be premature and we consider that the Council should instead consider focusing its efforts on delivering its new Aligned or Joint Local Plan Review. We consider that the Council's priority should be to progress an up-to-date assessment of the objectively assessed housing needs within the Ipswich Housing Market Area so that the District's OAN, and the requirements to accommodate any unmet need of neighbouring authorities, can be fully quantified.

We consider that if the Proposed Submission Documents are to be progressed, then they should seek to allocate, as a minimum, sufficient sites to meet an OAN of 11,000 dwellings as established in the core strategy. This could be achieved by way of the allocation of further sites, such as our client's land at High Road, Trimley St Martin (Alternative Option Site 3022a), which is clearly available and deliverable as evidenced by the submission of the current planning application DC/16/1919/FUL.

Tables 1 & 2 of the AAP should therefore be updated to show the additional contribution that the site could make to housing supply and that the site should be included as an additional allocation in addition to those sites identified in Policies FPP3 to FPP8.

Summary: This representation has been prepared by Strutt Parker LLP on behalf of Pigeon (Trimley) Ltd in respect of land at High Road, Trimley St Martin, also referred to as Alternative Option Site 3022a and now the subject of a planning application to Suffolk Coastal District Council (ref. DC/16/1919/FUL).

It is considered that the site should be included as an additional site allocation in Table 2, and as an addition to those sites identified in Policies FPP3 to FPP8.
Policy FPP2: Physical Limits Boundaries

Object: Housing

Full Text:

none of the proposed physical limits boundaries of any settlement within the Suffolk Coastal District could possibly have been appropriately reviewed and re-drawn given the Council's failure to provide for full, objectively assessed housing needs over the Plan period.

Summary:

none of the proposed physical limits boundaries of any settlement within the Suffolk Coastal District could possibly have been appropriately reviewed and re-drawn given the Council's failure to provide for full, objectively assessed housing needs over the Plan period.

Respondent: Artisan PPS Ltd (MR LESLIE SHORT) [4202]  
Agent: Artisan PPS Ltd (MR LESLIE SHORT) [4202]  

Soundness Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Duty to Cooperate: No

Legal: No

Sound: No

Appear at exam? No

Attachments:
This letter is in response to the above consultations and provides Gladman Developments’ representation. Gladman specialise in the promotion of strategic land for residential development with associated community infrastructure. From this experience, Gladman understand the need for the planning system to ensure that local communities have access to both decent homes and local employment opportunities.

The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has brought about fundamental changes to the planning process since its inception. One such change relates to the need to significantly boost the supply of housing and how this fundamental requirement of the Framework should be reflected in the plan making process. Gladman, who operate on a national basis, have considerable experience in contributing to the Local Plan preparation process since the Framework came into effect.

What continues to be clear from this experience is that many local authorities are not fully addressing the requirements of the Framework when preparing their Local Plans, this has led to significant concerns being expressed by Inspectors on the soundness of their plans in their current form. The main concerns centre upon the requirement addressed by paragraph 47 of the Framework to ‘use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) for market and affordable housing in the housing market area’.

Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD

Suffolk Coastal's Core Strategy was adopted in July 2013 and sets the overall vision and strategic objectives for the district, including a target to deliver at least 7,900 dwellings between 2010 and 2027. It is intended that the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD (together with the Felixstowe Area Action Plan (FAAP)) defines sites for various types of development (including housing), defines the boundaries of built up areas and identifies local infrastructure requirements. The documents do not cover areas of the district that are advancing Neighbourhood Plans.

Gladman's response to specific policies is set out below.

Policy SSP1: New Housing Delivery 2015-2027

The policy, with reference to the data set out in Table 2, sets out new housing delivery for the period 2015-2027 to meet the minimum requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy. The policy makes allocations in a number settlements.

Table 2 sets out, across the major centres, market towns, key service centres and local service centres, the amount of housing that has already been delivered between 2010 and 2015, extant permissions (including resolutions to grant as of 31/03/15), and new allocations to be delivered between 2015 and 2027. Whilst policy SP2 of the adopted Core Strategy makes provision for ‘at least’ 7,900 dwellings over the plan period, the figures presented in Table 2 are not expressed in the same terms but rather appear to be development ceilings. The Site Allocations Plan needs to make it clear that the figures in Table 2 are minimum figures to ensure consistency with Core Strategy Policy SP2. It is interesting to note that the FAAP document does include recognition that the housing figures it allocates to settlements are minima, and there should be consistency across the two documents.

Objectively Assessed Need

Gladman have fundamental concerns that the Council is progressing with a Site Allocations document based on an out-of-date housing target from the Core Strategy that does not properly reflect the district’s full Objectively Assessed Need (OAN). When the Core Strategy was adopted, the Inspector at the time noted that the Council had to undertake a review of its OAN by 2015. This is acknowledged by the Council at paragraph 1.12 of the consultation document, which states the adopted figure of 7,900 was lower than the full OAN and therefore the Council made a commitment to undertake an early review to address the level of housing provision. The review has yet to be undertaken.

Despite this commitment, paragraph 1.13 goes on to state that the Site Allocations DPD and FAAP are important to completing the current phase of plan making based on the Core Strategy. The Council consider that both documents positively seek to boost the supply of housing with a 'carefully planned' over provision included as a contingency. Table 1 provides an overview of the housing numbers over the plan period and compared to the Core Strategy target of 7,900 allows for a total of 8,620 homes to come forward, a small oversupply of approximately 9%.

Gladman can see no reason as to why a full review of the Core Strategy, including its housing target, cannot be undertaken now. Failure do so means that the Council must accept that the Site Allocations DPD and FAAP will be out of date as soon as they are adopted.

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).
The situation which has arisen in Suffolk Coastal is similar to other positions taken by Councils in Wokingham, Hinckley and Bosworth, Preston and Tunbridge Wells, where Site Allocations documents have proceeded on the back of either pre NPPF Core Strategies or on principal planning documents which do not contain an assessment of full OAN. The Wokingham judgement [([2014] EWHC 2320 (Admin)] confirms such an approach may be lawful, but made clear it did nothing more than allocate sufficient sites for a housing requirement from a previous generation of planning policy. The reasons behind this have recently been upheld by the Court of Appeal in Oxted Residential v Tandridge District Council [[2016] EWCA Civ 414].

It should be noted that the issue of Suffolk Coastal’s OAN was considered at the Fairfield Road, Framlingham appeal [APP/J3530/W/15/3011466] where evidence was presented by the appellants in that case that suggested the OAN could be 11,000 dwellings between 2010 and 2027, a significant increase on the adopted requirement; the Council’s own witness in that appeal conceded that they would have expected the OAN to have increased. This evidence suggests a requirement far in excess of the ‘carefully planned over provision’ allowed through the Site Allocations and FAAP.

Gladman contend that the Council’s document cannot be seen to be positively prepared. Despite the availability of more recent evidence on housing need and an admission that the OAN is likely to have gone up, the Council is still proceeding with producing a Site Allocations Plan based on a lower figure, and only at the next stage will new housing evidence be considered in a review of the whole development plan. The consequences of this approach (assuming that the allocations Plan is otherwise sound) would be to have an adopted Allocations Plan which would have to be reviewed in short order to take account of the emerging and subsequently adopted housing requirement. Moreover, even if sites were allocated in the Allocations Plan, it is highly likely that they would be insufficient to meet the updated OAN, as required by paragraph 47 of the Framework.

We do not therefore see how the delay in properly dealing with the full OAN for the district can be seen as positive planning. The Council have had since July 2013 to address this and in the time elapsed a full plan review could have been completed.

The process of undertaking an objective assessment is clearly set out in the Framework principally in paragraph 14, paragraph 47, paragraph 152 and paragraph 159 and should be undertaken in a systematic and transparent way to ensure that the plan is based on a robust evidence base.

The starting point for this assessment is set out in paragraph 159 which requires local planning authorities to have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. This involves the preparation of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative areas. The Framework goes on to set out the factors that should be included in a SHMA including identifying ‘the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period which:

* Meets household and population projections taking account of migration and demographic change;
* Addresses the need for all types of housing including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and
* Caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand.’

Key points that are worth noting from the above is that the objective assessment should identify the full need for housing before you consider undertaking any process of assessing the ability to deliver this figure. In addition, paragraph 159 specifically relates to catering for both housing need and housing demand within the authority area. It is worth pointing out that any assessment of housing need and demand within a SHMA must also consider the following factors; falling household formation rates, net inward migration, the need to address the under provision of housing from the previous local plan period, the results of the Census 2011, housing vacancy rates including the need to factor in a 3% housing vacancy rate for churn in the housing market, economic factors to ensure that the economic forecasts for an area are supported by sufficient housing to deliver economic growth, off-setting a falling working age population by providing enough housing vacancy rates including the need to factor in a 3% housing vacancy rate for churn in the housing delivering the full need for affordable housing in an area.

It is our understanding that a majority of the SHMAs that were prepared under the current guidance on SHMA preparation are not Framework compliant and do not consider the full range of factors that are outlined in paragraph 159. This is causing significant problems for authorities currently at Examination and therefore, to avoid this issue, SHMAs should be updated to take account of the Framework and ensure plans are based on robust and up-to-date evidence. Indeed, the Government have noted the deficiency in SHMAs and are updating the guidance on SHMA preparation to fully reflect the guidance given in the Framework.

Following the exercise to identify the full, objectively assessed need for housing in an area, the local planning authority should then seek to undertake the assessment outlined in paragraph 152 of the Framework. This states that

Local planning authorities should seek opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, and net gains across all three. Significant adverse impacts on any of these dimensions should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued.
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Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. This statement clearly sets out that local planning authorities should seek to deliver the full, objectively assessed need and that this should be tested through the evidence base. Only where the evidence shows that this is not achievable should they then test other options to see if any significant adverse impacts could be reduced or eliminated by pursuing these options. If this is not possible then they should test if the significant adverse impacts could be mitigated and where this is not possible, where compensatory measures may be appropriate.

The final stage of the process is outlined in paragraph 14 and involves a planning judgement as to whether, following all of the stages of the process outlined above, ‘any adverse impacts of meeting the objectively assessed needs would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole or specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.’ It is also worth noting that the final part of this sentence refers to footnote 9 which sets out the types of policies that the Government consider to be restrictive. These include ‘sites protected under the Birds and Habitat Directive (see paragraph 119) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Heritage Coast or within a National Park (or the Broads Authority); designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion’. Although this list is not exhaustive it is clear that local landscape designations, intrinsic value of the countryside, the character of areas, green gaps etc. are not specifically mentioned as constraints.

Assessment of Housing and Economic Development Needs - Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

As Suffolk Coastal will be aware, the Government issued a guidance note to support local authorities in objectively assessing and evidencing development needs for housing (both market and affordable) and economic development. This document supports and provides further guidance on the process of undertaking such assessments as set out in the Framework. Gladman highlight the following key points from this document:

* Plan makers should not apply constraints to the overall assessment of need, such as limitations imposed by the supply of land for new development, historic under performance, infrastructure or environmental constraints.
* Household projections published by the Department for Communities and Local Government should provide the starting point estimate of overall housing need.
* Household projection based estimates of housing need may need adjusting to reflect factors affecting local demography and household formation rates which are not captured by past trends, for example historic suppression by under supply and worsening affordability of housing. The assessment will need to reflect the consequences of past under delivery and the extent to which household formation rates have been constrained by supply.
* Plan makers need to consider increasing their housing numbers where the supply of working age population is less than projected job growth, to prevent unsustainable commuting patterns and reduced local business resilience.
* If the historic rate of development shows that actual supply falls below planned supply, future supply should be increased to reflect the likelihood of under-delivery of a plan.
* Plan makers should take account of concealed households.
* Housing needs indicated by household projections should be adjusted to reflect appropriate market signals, as well as other market indicators of the balance between the demand for and supply of dwellings. Appropriate comparisons of indicators (land prices, house prices etc.) should be made - with longer term trends in the HMA, similar demographic and economic areas, and nationally. Divergence under any of these circumstances will require upward adjustment to planned housing numbers.
* The more significant the affordability constraints (as reflected in rising prices and rents, and worsening affordability ratio) and the stronger other indicators of high demand (e.g. the differential between land prices), the larger the improvement in affordability needed, and the larger the additional supply response should be.
* Market signals are affected by a number of economic factors. Plan makers should increase planned supply by an amount that, on reasonable assumptions and consistent with principles of sustainable development, could be expected to improve affordability.

The Framework is clear that Local Planning Authorities must consider market signals. It is one of the core planning principles considered in paragraph 17. The Framework states:

...Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities.

Of critical importance is what the Framework goes onto say in paragraph 158 in the section discussing Plan Making. It states here:

Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals.

Market signals are therefore at the very core of what the Framework is trying to achieve in promoting sustainable development and boosting the supply of housing land.
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The formal publication of the PPG in March 2014 gives further explanation to what the Framework means with regard to market signals, and sets out, in a range of paragraphs, the way in which local planning authorities should go about factoring in relevant market signals in arriving at their objectively assessed need. Paragraphs 19 and 20 of the PPG gives guidance on what market signals should be taken into account and how plan makers should respond to these market signals. The below extracts identify some particularly pertinent points.

The housing need number suggested by household projections (the starting point) should be adjusted to reflect appropriate market signals, as well as other market indicators of the balance between the demand for and supply of dwellings. Prices of rents rising faster than the national/local average may well indicate particular market undersupply relative to demand.

The paragraph goes on to indicate that these factors would include, but should not be limited to, land prices, house prices, rents, affordability, rates of development and overcrowding. However, given what the Framework says at paragraph 17, quoted above, it seems clear that particular consideration should be given to affordability.

In order to consider how market signals should be taken forward paragraph 20 identifies some key concepts:

Appropriate comparisons of indicators should be made. This includes comparison with longer term trends (both in absolute levels and rates of change) in the: housing market area; similar demographic and economic areas; and nationally. A worsening trend in any of these indicators will require upward adjustment to planned housing numbers compared to ones based solely on household projections.

It is therefore clear that where market signals are apparent there is an absolute and clear direction that an upward adjustment to housing numbers is required. It is also clear that both the absolute level of change and the rates of change are considerations, and that local planning authorities need to carefully bench mark themselves against other areas. This should not simply be a case of considering neighbouring authorities but should look at, as well as these, local authorities on a national basis, if the demographic and economic indicators are relevant. Gladman are firmly of the view that considering comparisons purely against neighbouring authorities is not sufficiently robust and does not address the underlying issues which both the Framework and PPG are trying to tackle with regard to housing.

What is of further importance when considering these issues is the period of time analysed when considering both relative and absolute change. It has become apparent, in our consideration of a number of plans that many local authorities choose to look at periods of time which are not fully representative of the depth of the housing crisis which we are currently within.

The problems are noted in Fixing the Foundations: Creating a more prosperous nation published by HM Treasury in July 2015. In paragraph 9.7 the report states:

There remains more to do. As the London School of Economics (LSE) Growth Commission found, ‘under supply of housing, especially in high-growth areas of the country has pushed up house prices. The UK has been incapable of building enough homes to keep up with growing demand.’

Gladman are therefore of the view that local planning authorities must take a long term view when considering affordability and consider the relative and absolute change over a long term 15-20 year period, which coincides with the normal time span of a Local Plan. Authorities should assess, as a constituent part of their OAN, how they can improve affordability over the life time of a plan to a point where affordability is more in line with average earnings and affordable mortgage lending rates. They should assess a level of housing over the 15-20 year plan period which would enable this step change and consider its deliverability in the plan. Only through planning for significant housing growth can local authorities realistically tackle market signals in the way advocated by the PPG and tackle the affordability and housing crisis.

Gladman reserve the right to adduce further evidence on OAN at the appropriate time.

Location of New Housing

Gladman would point out that Suffolk Coastal has a number of different and distinct housing market areas. Each of these distinct areas will have their own requirement for housing and this should be reflected in the spatial distribution of housing supply within the Local Plan. This decision should be based on the findings of the evidence base and should not be a politically driven spatial strategy to put a disproportionate amount of housing in areas where people don’t want to (and will not) live. If the spatial distribution does not reflect need/demand as shown by the evidence base, then housing will not be delivered and the Plan will not be implemented.

Gladman would suggest a hybrid approach should be taken, with more sustainable settlements taking a greater proportion of growth than less sustainable locations. We would caution against too prescriptive a development strategy based solely on a development hierarchy that is itself based on too simplistic an understanding of sustainability (i.e. the number of services available). Whilst level of services is obviously an important criterion, the Framework is clear that development should be allowed where it is sustainable, when measured against the Framework as a whole and the three strands of sustainability (economic, social and environmental) in particular. When considering development in rural areas, Paragraph 55 of the Framework states that ‘housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the
vitality of rural communities.’ Furthermore paragraph 17 states that planning should ‘focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable’.

Para 55 of the Framework seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas to maintain and enhance rural vitality and viability. It is essential therefore, that the needs of the sustainable rural settlements across the district are assessed and a meaningful level of growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing vitality and viability. This will help to preserve and enhance rural services and facilities and allow local rural communities to meet their own needs for housing whilst providing much needed affordable housing in the parts of the district that suffer with the greatest affordable housing need.

In allocating sites, the Council should be mindful that to maximize housing supply the widest possible range of sites, by size and market location are required so that house builders of all types and sizes have access to suitable land in order to offer the widest possible range of products. The key to increased housing supply is the number of sales outlets. For any given time period, all else being equal, overall sales and build out rates are faster from 20 sites of 50 units than 10 sites of 100 units or 1 site of 1,000 units. The maximum delivery is achieved not just because there are more sales outlets but because the widest possible range of products and locations are available to meet the widest possible range of demand. In summary, a wider variety of sites in the widest possible range of locations ensures all types of house builder have access to suitable land which in turn increases housing delivery.

New homes should be distributed in a way that enables the full OAN for the district to be met, rather than based too rigidly on percentages allocated to each town and village. This should take into account factors such as market conditions and viability - it is after all the private sector that will be expected to deliver the majority of the district’s housing need and so it is important that the chosen distribution enables this to happen.

Regardless of the approach a sufficient range of sites need to be allocated (taking into account viability and market conditions) to ensure continuity of housing supply; more sites than needed to deliver the OAN should be allocated to account for slippage and delays. Whichever development strategy is adopted it is vital that the new Local Plan addresses this and that housing figures and distribution are aligned fully with economic growth aspirations.

Delivery Rates

The Council will have to ensure that they have applied realistic assumptions around lead-in times and build-out rates for the sites with permissions and especially for the sites with a resolution to grant, as there is a chance that some of these sites may never sign the s 106 agreement and begin to deliver.

Table 1 shows that 600 of the dwellings needed over the plan period will come through a windfall allowance (50dpas). The Council must be satisfied that, in line with Paragraph 48 of the Framework, they have ‘compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply’. It is also important that ‘any allowance should be realistic having regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens’.

Housing Allocations in Areas with Neighbourhood Plans

The plan sets out at paragraph 1.17 that several Neighbourhood Plans in the district have reached an advanced stage and cover a wide range of policy issues and therefore the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies document does not include allocations or additional policies covering these areas. This means that no sites are allocated for housing through the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD in settlements covered by an advanced Neighbourhood Plan. Gladman have some concerns with this approach.

There needs to be a mechanism in place to address situations where these Neighbourhood Plans fail and therefore do allocate the appropriate amount of housing as required by the Core Strategy. Should these Neighbourhood Plans not come forward as anticipated then the Council will be in danger of not having enough allocated housing land and therefore would be unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply. The Inspector for the Torbay Local Plan required Main Modifications that inserted wording that addressed this issue. The modification read 'If Neighbourhood Plans do not identify sufficient sites to provide the growth requirement of the Local Plan, the Council will bring forward sites through site allocations development plan documents. If it appears that a shortfall in five year supply of deliverable sites is likely to arise, the Council will bring forward additional sites’. The Council should consider inserting a similar provision into the Site Allocations Document.

Another danger of this approach is that if other sites elsewhere in the district fail to come forward in a timely fashion or do not deliver the number of units expected, then the Council will not have the flexibility to release land in sustainable locations that are covered by a Neighbourhood Plan to make up the shortfall, regain a robust housing supply and retain control of housing delivery in the district.

Finally, given the likelihood that the full OAN for the district will increase markedly once the review is finally carried out, there needs to be a process to ensure that areas with adopted Neighbourhood Plans do not prevent increased levels of growth coming forward in future. PPG is clear [Paragraph:084 Reference ID:41-084-201605 19] that ‘policies in a neighbourhood plan may become out of date, for example if they conflict with policies in a Local Plan that is adopted after the making of the neighbourhood plan. In such cases, the more recent plan policy takes precedence.’
Policy SSP2: Physical Limits Boundaries

The policy sets boundaries for all settlements listed as Major Centres, Town, Key and Local Service Centres in accordance with Core Strategy policy SP19. The policy allows for development including housing within these limits, subject to proposals being in accordance with other policies, including Neighbourhood Plans. It notes that ‘proposals for new residential development outside physical limits boundaries will be strictly controlled’.

As outlined above, Gladman consider the housing target in the adopted Core Strategy to be out of date as it does not represent the district’s full OAN. Since the settlement boundaries are set to accommodate the out of date level of housing growth contained in the adopted Core Strategy, the boundary policies are also out of date. Many of the settlement boundaries remain from the old Local Plan and are therefore time expired. Furthermore, the Core Strategy policy upon which SSP2 relies (SP19) was found to be out of date in the Fairfield Road, Framlingham appeal as the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land.

Setting strict settlement boundaries does not allow adequate flexibility for development to come forward outside the settlement boundary if this is required (for example due to a shortfall of housing land).

Gladman would object to the use of settlement limits if these would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. The Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead. The use of settlement limits to arbitrarily restrict sustainable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements would not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework.

Gladman would be opposed to the definition of an urban edge if this would preclude appropriately sited and sustainable development coming forward to meet the district’s housing needs, in accordance with the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development. Proposals that are sustainable should go ahead without delay. An overly restrictive approach could result in a plan that is not positively prepared or effective.

Policies SSP3 - SSP19

Gladman have no specific comments to make on the individual allocations within the plan except to note that many of the allocation policies place additional requirements on the delivery of sites, for example by requiring Development Briefs to be agreed or certain infrastructure to be provided before development can come forward. Gladman remind the Council of the guidance set out in Paragraph 173 of the Framework, which states that 'Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened’. This should be tested through a full plan viability assessment. Realistic and cautious delivery trajectories should be applied by the Council to sites requiring such infrastructure provisions.

In light of the judgement in FODC v. SSCLG and Gladman Developments Ltd [[2016] EWHC 421 Admin ], Gladman consider it is necessary for the Site Allocations DPD to carry out an assessment of the potential impact of proposed development on heritage assets, as set out in paragraph 129 of the Framework. The judgement concerns the interaction between paragraph 14 and paragraph 134 of the Framework, and the issues of the balancing exercise to be undertaken to assess the harm of any proposals against the benefits of the identified proposed development in accordance with paragraphs 133, 134 and 135 of the Framework. Gladman consider that the implications of the judgement apply equally to both the decision making process and the plan making process. Paragraph 134 is clear in talking about development proposals; a phrase which can apply equally to planning applications and proposed allocations. Furthermore, footnote 29 of the Framework clearly states that ‘The principles and policies set out in this section apply to the heritage-related consent regimes for which local planning authorities are responsible under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as well as to plan-making and decision-taking’. It is therefore essential that the implications of the above judgment are fully considered in the context of both decision-taking and plan-making.

The table on page 133 of the consultation document sets out the expected completions per year of the sites allocated in these policies. The Council will have to ensure that they have applied realistic assumptions around lead-in times and build-out rates for these sites.

Policy SSP39: Areas to be Protected from Development

Gladman would query whether such a blanket protection policy is compliant with the Framework.

Gladman submit that new development can often be located in countryside gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character. In such circumstances we would question the purpose of a gap designation, particularly if this would prevent the development of otherwise sustainable and deliverable housing sites to meet the borough’s needs. Gladman note that there appears to be no robust evidence supporting the extent of the current countryside gap designations.

Para 55 of the Framework seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas to maintain and enhance rural vitality and viability. It is essential therefore, that the needs of the sustainable rural settlements across the district are assessed and a meaningful level of growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing vitality and viability. This will
help to preserve and enhance rural services and facilities and allow local rural communities to meet their own needs for housing whilst providing much needed affordable housing in the parts of the district that suffer with the greatest affordable housing need.

Gladman would be opposed to the use of Local Gaps if these would only serve to act as an arbitrary tool to prevent sustainable development. In this regard we submit that new development can often be located in local gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character.

Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan

The FAAP is intended to implement the adopted Core Strategy and will serve as a tool that can be used to direct sustainable development and investment in the FAAP area and identify land required to meet the level of growth identified in the Core Strategy. Table 1 summarises that 2,123 homes will come forward in the FAAP area, 1,120 from new allocations.

FPP1: New Housing Allocations

The policy distributes, with reference to Table 2, new housing allocations across the FAAP area. 590 are in Felixstowe itself whilst 430 are in Trimley St Martin and 100 in Trimley St Mary. Gladman are pleased that paragraph 3.22 makes clear that the figures in the policy are to be read as minima but wonder whether the wording of the policy itself should make this clearer. The fact the policy is for a minima allows for the possibility of further sustainable development to come forward.

Paragraph 3.23 states that the Council 'consider it necessary to over-allocate sites across the district to ensure that a five year land supply is maintained' and that this provides a range of sites, sizes and locations for development. We welcome the recognition that it takes into account the likely increase in the district's OAN in future. As Major Centres, areas like Felixstowe are inherently sustainable and its continued growth will make an important contribution to meeting the district's housing needs now and in the future; it is important that sustainable development can continue to take place here and is not arbitrarily constrained.

FPP2: Physical Limits Boundaries

As with policy SSP 2 in the Site Allocations DPD, this policy sets boundaries for all settlements listed as Major Centres, Town, Key and Local Service Centres in accordance with Core Strategy policy SP19. The policy allows for development including housing within these limits, subject to proposals being in accordance with other policies, including Neighbourhood Plans. It notes that 'proposals for new residential development outside physical limits boundaries will be strictly controlled'.

As outlined above Gladman consider the housing target in the adopted Core Strategy to be out of date as it does not represent the district's full OAN. Since the settlement boundaries are set to accommodate the out of date level of housing growth outlined in the adopted Core Strategy, the boundary policies are also out of date. Furthermore, the Core Strategy policy upon which SSP2 relies (SP19) was found out of date in the Fairfield Road, Framlingham appeal as the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land.

Setting strict settlement boundaries does not allow adequate flexibility for development to come forward outside the settlement boundary if this is required (for example due to a shortfall of housing land).

Gladman would object to the use of settlement limits if these would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. The Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead. The use of settlement limits to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements would not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework.

Gladman would be opposed to the definition of an urban edge if this would preclude appropriately sited and sustainable development coming forward to meet the borough's housing needs, in accordance with the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development. Proposals that are sustainable should go ahead without delay. An overly restrictive approach could result in a plan that is not positively prepared or effective.

Policy FPPS: Land North of Conway Close and Swallow Close, Felixstowe

Gladman support the allocation of land for new housing in this area. We welcome the recognition that 'the land to the north of Conway Close and Swallow Close can provide a natural extension to the built form of Felixstowe without causing a detrimental impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or important views of the Deben Estuary'.

Gladman also welcome the recognition that the presence of the Grade II listed Park Farm Cottages to the west of the site does not preclude development in the area provided that it is sympathetic to the heritage asset.

We note that there are potential capacity issues regarding the foul sewerage network that need to be overcome. Gladman submit that it is the responsibility of Anglian Water to provide sufficient capacity to serve the needs of housing.
in the area and that this should not be used as an excuse to prevent or delay development coming forward. Anglian Water are consulted through the plan process and so must be aware of the capacity issue and should be putting funding in place to resolve it.

Gladman recognise that the area may have some archaeological potential. It is our view and experience that full archaeological investigations are not necessary prior to the grant of planning permission and that appropriately-worded pre-commencement conditions attached to planning applications are effective at securing any archaeological remains on site without delaying the granting of planning permission.

Gladman would caution against being too prescriptive regarding the mix of housing, the design and layout, or the route of the footpath through the site, as these will need to be established and refined through a thorough analysis of the constraints and opportunities of the site and through engagement with the public and stakeholders. The Council will no doubt be aware of the requirements set out in paragraph 59 of the Framework, which states:

Local planning authorities should consider using design codes where they could help deliver high quality outcomes. However, design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.

Furthermore, paragraph 60 goes on to add:

Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

Finally, paragraph 65 makes it clear that

Local planning authorities should not refuse planning permission for buildings or infrastructure which promote high levels of sustainability because of concerns about incompatibility with on existing townscape, if those concerns have been mitigated by good design (unless the concern relates to a designated heritage asset and the impact would cause material harm to the asset or its setting which is not outweighed by the proposal's economic, social and environmental benefits).

In general Gladman remind the Council of the guidance set out in Paragraph 173 of the Framework, which states that 'Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened'.

Gladman submit that policies which seek developer contributions should be properly tested for their effects on development viability and supported by an adequate evidence base. The Council should not set onerous policy obligations that could place an undue burden on the ability of developers to deliver sustainable development.

Gladman submit that a site larger than the proposed allocation is suitable, available and deliverable. A larger allocation in this area could contribute to the over-provision of housing across the district and provide a buffer/reserve should other sites within the FAAP or across the district not come forward as anticipated, enabling the district to maintain a robust five year supply of housing land. Given the recognition that the OAN for the district is likely to increase in future, a larger allocation here could make a valuable contribution to an increased housing requirement in an area outside the AONB, reducing pressure for development within the AONB.

Policies FPP1 - FPP8

Gladman have no specific comments to make on the individual allocations within the plan except to note that many of the allocations policies place burdens upon the delivery of sites, for example by requiring Development Briefs to be agreed or certain infrastructure to be provided before development can come forward. Gladman remind the Council of the guidance set out in Paragraph 173 of the Framework, which states that 'Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened'.

In light of the judgement in FODC v. SSCLG and Gladman Developments Ltd [[2016] EWHC 421 Admin], Gladman consider it is necessary for the FAAP to carry out an assessment of the potential impact of proposed development on heritage assets, as set out in paragraph 129 of the Framework. The judgement concerns the interaction between paragraph 14 and paragraph 134 of the Framework, and the issues of the balancing exercise to be undertaken to assess the harm of any proposals against the benefits of the identified proposed development in accordance with paragraphs 133, 134 and 135 of the Framework. Gladman consider that the implications of the judgement apply equally to both the decision making process and the plan making process. Paragraph 134 is clear in talking about 'development proposals', a phrase which can apply equally to planning applications and proposed allocations. Furthermore footnote 29 of the Framework clearly states that "The principles and policies set out in this section apply to the heritage-related consent regimes for which local planning authorities are responsible under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as well as to plan-making and decision-taking." It is therefore essential that the implications of the above judgment are fully considered in the context of both decision-taking and plan-making.
Policy FPP27: Access to the Countryside

The policy requires new residential developments in the Felixstowe Peninsular to make provision of accessible natural green spaces as agreed by the Council in conjunction with Natural England. Gladman would urge the Council to take a flexible and realistic approach to such provision, recognising that it could take a variety of forms. The Council should even consider payment of offsite contributions if this would be more appropriate given the constraints of a site and issues of viability.

Paragraph 173 of the Framework states that 'Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened'.

Policy FPP28: Areas to be Protected from Development

As with our comments on the Site Allocations DPD, Gladman would query whether such a blanket protection policy is compliant with the Framework.

Gladman submit that new development can often be located in countryside gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character. In such circumstances we would question the purpose of a gap designation, particularly if this would prevent the development of otherwise sustainable and deliverable housing sites to meet the borough's needs. Gladman note that there appears to be no robust evidence supporting the extent of the current countryside gap designations.

Para 55 of the Framework seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas to maintain and enhance rural vitality and viability. It is essential therefore, that the needs of the sustainable rural settlements across the district are assessed and a meaningful level of growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing vitality and viability. This will help to preserve and enhance rural services and facilities and allow local rural communities to meet their own needs for housing whilst providing much needed affordable housing in the parts of the district that suffer with the greatest affordable housing need.

Gladman would be opposed to the use of Local Gaps if these would only serve to act as an arbitrary tool to prevent sustainable development. In this regard we submit that new development can often be located in local gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character.

General Comments

In addition to the above comments on the FAAP policies, Gladman have the following general points to make about the FAAP.

Delivery Rates

The table on page 105 of the FAAP consultation document sets out the expected completions per year of the sites allocated in these policies. The Council will have to ensure that they have applied realistic assumptions around lead-in times and build-out rates for these sites.

Location of New Housing

Gladman would point out that Suffolk Coastal has a number of different and distinct housing market areas. Each of these distinct areas will have their own requirement for housing and this should be reflected in the spatial distribution of housing supply within the Local Plan. This decision should be based on the findings of the evidence base and should not be a politically driven spatial strategy to put a disproportionate amount of housing in areas where people don't want to (and will not) live. If the spatial distribution does not reflect need/demand as shown by the evidence base, then housing will not be delivered and the Plan will not be implemented. Following a dispersed spatial distribution pattern across a large number of settlements is also undesirable as this approach is not likely to be sustainable, will not be delivered and cannot generate the level of community benefits that larger sites can to help make settlements more sustainable and fill important gaps in community provision.

Gladman would suggest a hybrid approach should be taken, with more sustainable settlements taking a greater proportion of growth than less sustainable locations. We would caution against too prescriptive a development strategy based solely on a development hierarchy that is itself based on too simplistic an understanding of sustainability (i.e. the number of services available). Whilst level of services is obviously an important criterion, the Framework is clear that development should be allowed where it is sustainable, when measured against the Framework as a whole and the three strands of sustainability (economic, social and environmental) in particular. When considering development in rural areas, Paragraph 55 of the Framework states that 'housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.' Furthermore paragraph 17 states that planning should 'focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable'.
New homes should be distributed in a way that enables the full OAN for the district to be met, rather than based too rigidly on percentages allocated to each town and village. This should take into account factors such as market conditions and viability - it is after all the private sector that will be expected to deliver the majority of the district’s housing need and so it is important that the chosen distribution enables this to happen.

Regardless of the approach a sufficient range of sites need to be allocated (taking into account viability and market conditions) to ensure continuity of housing supply; more sites than needed to deliver the OAN should be allocated to account for slippage and delays. Whichever development strategy is adopted it is vital that the new Local Plan addresses this and that housing figures and distribution are aligned fully with economic growth aspirations.

Other Comments on Site Allocations and FAAP

Gladman have the following comments to make that apply to both the Site Allocations DPD and the FAAP document.

NPPF Changes

It is vital that the Site Allocations and FAAP fully reflect any revisions to the Framework, the recommendations of the Local Plan Expert Group when implemented, and any requirements relating to Starter Homes once these come into effect. Of particular importance will be the need to address possible changes to the Framework around ensuring housing is delivered on land allocated in plans through the introduction of a ‘housing delivery test’. The consultation document on the proposed changes set out that ‘where significant under-delivery is identified over a sustained period, action needs to be taken to address this’ and that one approach ‘could be to identify additional sustainable sites if the existing approach is demonstrably not delivering the housing required’. The Site Allocations DPD and FAAP will need to include a mechanism for dealing with any sustained under-delivery in a timely fashion.

Another area that the LAPP should consider is the widening of the definition of affordable housing ‘so that it encompasses a fuller range of products that can support people to access home ownership’. It is proposed that the wider definition includes Starter Homes and the Housing and Planning Act has introduced provisions to make regulations to require all suitable reasonably-sized housing developments to include a proportion of Starter Homes. The Plans will need to address how this requirement will impact on the amount of more traditional types of affordable housing that could be delivered, which may entail an adjustment of the housing target to ensure the district’s full OAN can be met.

Duty to Cooperate

The development of the Site Allocations DPD and FAAP represents another opportunity to consider and address cross-boundary issues.

Paragraph 178 of the Framework states that ‘public bodies have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries’ and paragraph 179 states that ‘local planning authorities should work collaboratively with other bodies to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual Local Plans’. It goes on to say that ‘joint working should enable local planning authorities to work together to meet development requirements which cannot wholly be met within their own areas - for instance, because of a lack of physical capacity.

Paragraph 181 of the Framework further sets out that ‘cooperation should be a continuous process of engagement from initial thinking through to implementation, resulting in a final position where plans are in place to provide the land and infrastructure necessary to support current and projected future levels of development’.

PPG provides further explanation of how the policies contained within the Framework should be interpreted and applied. In terms of the Duty to Cooperate, PPG sets out that ‘local planning authorities should make every effort to secure the necessary cooperation on strategic cross boundary matters BEFORE they submit their Local Plans for examination*(my emphasis).

Suffolk Coastal clearly needs to consider the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate. It is something that needs to be built into the entire plan-making process from the very beginning and failure to do so is not something that can be rectified retrospectively.

Sustainability Appraisal Interim Report and Sustainability Appraisal of Policies

Gladman have the following comments regarding the Sustainability Appraisal:

In accordance with Section 19 of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, policies set out in Local Plans must be subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Incorporating the requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, SA is a systematic process that should be undertaken at each stage of the Plan's preparation, assessing the effects of the Local Plan's proposals on sustainable development when judged against all reasonable alternatives.

The Council should ensure that the results of the SA process clearly justify its policy choices. In meeting the

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).
development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of the assessment why some policy options have been progressed, and others have been rejected. Undertaking a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, in the same level of detail for both chosen and rejected alternatives, the Council’s decision making and scoring should be robust, justified and transparent.

Gladman remind the Council that there have now been a number of instances where the failure to undertake a satisfactory SA has resulted in Plans failing the test of legal compliance at Examination (South Somerset) or being subjected to later legal challenge (Heard vs Greater Norwich Development Plan)

Conclusions

What is clear from the Framework, and from the Government’s agenda to boost significantly the supply of housing, is that the premise of the whole process is the assessment and delivery of the full OAN for housing in an area unless there are adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. If the process set out in the Framework and PPG is not followed then the Council run the real risk of the plan being found unsound and this will create significant delay and uncertainty in the process.

All of our best interests are served by your authority getting a Local Plan found sound at the earliest possible opportunity, rather than us utilising considerable resources on preparing for and attending EIPs, preparing Judicial Reviews etc. This approach will put the authority back in control of planning in their area and will give the Members comfort and certainty over the level and location of development that will take place over the lifetime of the Plan.

Gladman have raised concerns in relation to the issues and options being considered by the Council which will fundamentally affect the ‘soundness’ of the Local Plan (with reference to tests of soundness outlined in paragraph 182 of the Framework). If the Local Plan is approached in such a way as presented it will not provide a positive policy approach and in a number of cases it is not consistent with national policy.

Gladman hope that you have found this representation constructive. If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact myself or a member of the Gladman team.

Summary:

Since the settlement boundaries are set to accommodate the out of date level of housing growth outlined in the adopted Core Strategy, the boundary policies are also out of date, particularly as the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land.

Setting strict settlement boundaries does not allow adequate flexibility for development to come forward outside the settlement boundary if this is required (for example due to a shortfall of housing land).

Gladman would object to the use of settlement limits if these would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward.

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>i, ii, iii, iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments:
Scanned Representation
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Introduction

This letter is in response to the above consultations and provides Gladman Developments’ representation. Gladman specialise in the promotion of strategic land for residential development with associated community infrastructure. From this experience, Gladman understand the need for the planning system to ensure that local communities have access to both decent homes and local employment opportunities.

The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has brought about fundamental changes to the planning process since its inception. One such change relates to the need to significantly boost the supply of housing and how this fundamental requirement of the Framework should be reflected in the plan making process. Gladman, who operate on a national basis, have considerable experience in contributing to the Local Plan preparation process since the Framework came into effect.

What continues to be clear from this experience is that many local authorities are not fully addressing the requirements of the Framework when preparing their Local Plans, this has led to significant concerns being expressed by Inspectors on the soundness of their plans in their current form. The main concerns centre upon the requirement addressed by paragraph 47 of the Framework to ‘use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) for market and affordable housing in the housing market area’.

Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD

Suffolk Coastal’s Core Strategy was adopted in July 2013 and sets the overall vision and strategic objectives for the district, including a target to deliver at least 7,900 dwellings between 2010 and 2027. It is intended that the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD (together with the Felixstowe Area Action Plan (FAAP)) defines sites for various types of development (including housing), defines the boundaries of built up areas and identifies local infrastructure requirements. The documents do not cover areas of the district that are advancing Neighbourhood Plans.

Gladman’s response to specific policies is set out below.

Policy SSP1: New Housing Delivery 2015-2027

The policy, with reference to the data set out in Table 2, sets out new housing delivery for the period 2015-2027 to meet the minimum requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy. The policy makes allocations in a number settlements.

Table 2 sets out, across the major centres, market towns, key service centres and local service centres, the amount of housing that has already been delivered between 2010 and 2015, extant permissions (including resolutions to grant as of 31/03/15), and new allocations to be delivered between 2015 and 2027. Whilst policy SP2 of the adopted Core Strategy makes provision for ‘at least’ 7,900 dwellings over the plan period, the figures presented in Table 2 are not expressed in the same terms but rather appear to be development ceilings. The Site Allocations Plan needs to make it clear that the figures in Table 2 are minimum figures to ensure consistency with Core Strategy Policy SP2. It is interesting to note that the FAAP document does include recognition that the housing figures it allocates to settlements are minima, and there should be consistency across the two documents.

Objectively Assessed Need

Gladman have fundamental concerns that the Council is progressing with a Site Allocations document based on an out-of-date housing target from the Core Strategy that does not properly reflect the district’s full Objectively Assessed Need (OAN). When the Core Strategy was adopted, the Inspector at the time noted that the Council had to undertake a review of its OAN by 2015. This is acknowledged by the Council at paragraph 1.12 of the consultation document, which states the adopted figure of 7,900 was lower than the full OAN and therefore the Council made a commitment to undertake an early review to address the level of housing provision. The review has yet to be undertaken.

Despite this commitment, paragraph 1.13 goes on to state that the Site Allocations DPD and FAAP are important to completing the current phase of plan making based on the Core Strategy. The Council consider that both documents positively seek to boost the supply of housing with a ‘carefully planned’ over provision included as a contingency. Table 1 provides an overview of the housing numbers over the plan period and compared to the Core Strategy target of 7,900 allows for a total of 8,620 homes to come forward, a small oversupply of approximately 9%.

Gladman can see no reason as to why a full review of the Core Strategy, including its housing target, cannot be undertaken now. Failure do so means that the Council must accept that the Site Allocations DPD and FAAP will be out of date as soon as they are adopted.
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The situation which has arisen in Suffolk Coastal is similar to other positions taken by Councils in Wokingham, Hinckley and Bosworth, Preston and Tunbridge Wells, where Site Allocations documents have proceeded on the back of either pre NPPF Core Strategies or on principal planning documents which do not contain an assessment of full OAN. The Wokingham judgement ([2014] EWHC 2320 (Admin)) confirms such an approach may be lawful, but made clear it did nothing more than allocate sufficient sites for a housing requirement from a previous generation of planning policy. The reasons behind this have recently been upheld by the Court of Appeal in Oxted Residential v Tandridge District Council ([2016] EWCA Civ 414).

It should be noted that the issue of Suffolk Coastal's OAN was considered at the Fairfield Road, Framlingham appeal [APP/J3530/W/15/3011406] where evidence was presented by the appellants in that case that suggested the OAN could be 11,000 dwellings between 2010 and 2027, a significant increase on the adopted requirement; the Council's own witness in that appeal conceded that they would have expected the OAN to have increased. This evidence suggests a requirement far in excess of the 'carefully planned over provision' allowed through the Site Allocations and FAAP.

Gladman contend that the Council's document cannot be seen to be positively prepared. Despite the availability of more recent evidence on housing need and an admission that the OAN is likely to have gone up, the Council is still proceeding with producing a Site Allocations Plan based on a lower figure, and only at the next stage will new housing evidence be considered in a review of the whole development plan. The consequences of this approach (assuming that the Allocations Plan is otherwise sound) would be to have an adopted Allocations Plan which would have to be reviewed in short order to take account of the emerging and subsequently adopted housing requirement. Moreover, even if sites were allocated in the Allocations Plan, it is highly likely that they would be insufficient to meet the updated OAN, as required by paragraph 47 of the Framework.

We do not therefore see how the delay in properly dealing with the full OAN for the district can be seen as positive planning. The Council have had since July 2013 to address this and in the time elapsed a full plan review could have been completed.

The process of undertaking an objective assessment is clearly set out in the Framework principally in paragraph 14, paragraph 47, paragraph 152 and paragraph 159 and should be undertaken in a systematic and transparent way to ensure that the plan is based on a robust evidence base.

The starting point for this assessment is set out in paragraph 159 which requires local planning authorities to have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. This involves the preparation of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative areas. The Framework goes on to set out the factors that should be included in a SHMA including identifying 'the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period which:

* Meets household and population projections taking account of migration and demographic change;
* Addresses the need for all types of housing including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and
* Caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand.'

Key points that are worth noting from the above is that the objective assessment should identify the full need for housing before you consider undertaking any process of assessing the ability to deliver this figure. In addition, paragraph 159 specifically relates to catering for both housing need and housing demand within the authority area. It is worth pointing out that any assessment of housing need and demand within a SHMA must also consider the following factors; falling household formation rates, net inward migration, the need to address the under provision of housing from the previous local plan period, the results of the Census 2011, housing vacancy rates including the need to factor in a 3% housing vacancy rate for churn in the housing market, economic factors to ensure that the economic forecasts for an area are supported by sufficient housing to deliver economic growth, off-setting a falling working age population by providing enough housing vacancy rates including the need to factor in a 3% housing vacancy rate for churn in the housing delivering the full need for affordable housing in an area.

It is our understanding that a majority of the SHMAs that were prepared under the current guidance on SHMA preparation are not Framework compliant and do not consider the full range of factors that are outlined in paragraph 159. This is causing significant problems for authorities currently at Examination and therefore, to avoid this issue, SHMAs should be updated to take account of the Framework and ensure plans are based on robust and up-to-date evidence. Indeed, the Government have noted the deficiency in SHMAs and are updating the guidance on SHMA preparation to fully reflect the guidance given in the Framework.

Following the exercise to identify the full, objectively assessed need for housing in an area, the local planning authority should then seek to undertake the assessment outlined in paragraph 152 of the Framework. This states that

Local planning authorities should seek opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, and net gains across all three. Significant adverse impacts on any of these dimensions should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued.
Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. This statement clearly sets out that local planning authorities should seek to deliver the full, objectively assessed need and that this should be tested through the evidence base. Only where the evidence shows that this is not achievable should they then test other options to see if any significant adverse impacts could be reduced or eliminated by pursuing these options. If this is not possible then they should test if the significant adverse impacts could be mitigated and where this is not possible, where compensatory measures may be appropriate.

The final stage of the process is outlined in paragraph 14 and involves a planning judgement as to whether, following all of the stages of the process outlined above, ‘any adverse impacts of meeting the objectively assessed needs would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole or specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.’ It is also worth noting that the final part of this sentence refers to footnote 9 which sets out the types of policies that the Government consider to be restrictive. These include sites protected under the Birds and Habitat Directive (see paragraph 119) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Heritage Coast or within a National Park (or the Broads Authority); designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion. Although this list is not exhaustive it is clear that local landscape designations, intrinsic value of the countryside, the character of areas, green gaps etc. are not specifically mentioned as constraints.

Assessment of Housing and Economic Development Needs - Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

As Suffolk Coastal will be aware, the Government issued a guidance note to support local authorities in objectively assessing and evidencing development needs for housing (both market and affordable) and economic development. This document supports and provides further guidance on the process of undertaking such assessments as set out in the Framework. Gladman highlight the following key points from this document:

* Plan makers should not apply constraints to the overall assessment of need, such as limitations imposed by the supply of land for new development, historic under performance, infrastructure or environmental constraints.
* Household projections published by the Department for Communities and Local Government should provide the starting point estimate of overall housing need.
* Household projection based estimates of housing need may need adjusting to reflect factors affecting local demography and household formation rates which are not captured by past trends, for example historic suppression by under supply and worsening affordability of housing. The assessment will need to reflect the consequences of past under delivery and the extent to which household formation rates have been constrained by supply.
* Plan makers need to consider increasing their housing numbers where the supply of working age population is less than projected job growth, to prevent unsustainable commuting patterns and reduced local business resilience.
* If the historic rate of development shows that actual supply falls below planned supply, future supply should be increased to reflect the likelihood of under-delivery of a plan.
* Plan makers should take account of concealed households.
* Housing needs indicated by household projections should be adjusted to reflect appropriate market signals, as well as other market indicators of the balance between the demand for and supply of dwellings. Appropriate comparisons of indicators (land prices, house prices etc.) should be made - with longer term trends in the HMA, similar demographic and economic areas, and nationally. Divergence under any of these circumstances will require upward adjustment to planned housing numbers.
* The more significant the affordability constraints (as reflected in rising prices and rents, and worsening affordability ratio) and the stronger other indicators of high demand (e.g. the differential between land prices), the larger the improvement in affordability needed, and the larger the additional supply response should be.
* Market signals are affected by a number of economic factors. Plan makers should increase planned supply by an amount that, on reasonable assumptions and consistent with principles of sustainable development, could be expected to improve affordability.

The Framework is clear that Local Planning Authorities must consider market signals. It is one of the core planning principles considered in paragraph 17. The Framework states:

...Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities.

Of critical importance is what the Framework goes onto say in paragraph 158 in the section discussing Plan Making. It states here:

Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals.

Market signals are therefore at the very core of what the Framework is trying to achieve in promoting sustainable development and boosting the supply of housing land.
The formal publication of the PPG in March 2014 gives further explanation to what the Framework means with regard to market signals, and sets out, in a range of paragraphs, the way in which local planning authorities should go about factoring in relevant market signals in arriving at their objectively assessed need. Paragraphs 19 and 20 of the PPG gives guidance on what market signals should be taken into account and how plan makers should respond to these market signals. The below extracts identify some particularly pertinent points.

The housing need number suggested by household projections (the starting point) should be adjusted to reflect appropriate market signals, as well as other market indicators of the balance between the demand for and supply of dwellings. Prices of rents rising faster than the national/local average may well indicate particular market undersupply relative to demand.

The paragraph goes on to indicate that these factors would include, but should not be limited to, land prices, house prices, rents, affordability, rates of development and overcrowding. However, given what the Framework says at paragraph 17, quoted above, it seems clear that particular consideration should be given to affordability.

In order to consider how market signals should be taken forward paragraph 20 identifies some key concepts:

Appropriate comparisons of indicators should be made. This includes comparison with longer term trends (both in absolute levels and rates of change) in the: housing market area; similar demographic and economic areas; and nationally. A worsening trend in any of these indicators will require upward adjustment to planned housing numbers compared to ones based solely on household projections.

It is therefore clear that where market signals are apparent there is an absolute and clear direction that an upward adjustment to housing numbers is required. It is also clear that both the absolute level of change and the rates of change are considerations, and that local planning authorities need to carefully benchmark mark themselves against other areas. This should not simply be a case of considering neighbouring authorities but should look at, as well as these, local authorities on a national basis, if the demographic and economic indicators are relevant. Gladman are firmly of the view that considering comparisons purely against neighbouring authorities is not sufficiently robust and does not address the underlying issues which both the Framework and PPG are trying to tackle with regard to housing.

What is of further importance when considering these issues is the period of time analysed when considering both relative and absolute change. It has become apparent, in our consideration of a number of plans that many local authorities choose to look at periods of time which are not fully representative of the depth of the housing crisis which we are currently within.

The problems are noted in Fixing the Foundations: Creating a more prosperous nation published by HM Treasury in July 2015. In paragraph 9.7 the report states:

There remains more to do. As the London School of Economics (LSE) Growth Commission found, ‘under supply of housing, especially in high-growth areas of the country has pushed up house prices. The UK has been incapable of building enough homes to keep up with growing demand.’

Gladman are therefore of the view that local planning authorities must take a long term view when considering affordability and consider the relative and absolute change over a long term 15-20 year period, which coincides with the normal time span of a Local Plan. Authorities should assess, as a constituent part of their OAN, how they can improve affordability over the life time of a plan to a point where affordability is more in line with average earnings and affordable mortgage lending rates. They should assess a level of housing over the 15-20 year plan period which would enable this step change and consider its deliverability in the plan. Only through planning for significant housing growth can local authorities realistically tackle market signals in the way advocated by the PPG and tackle the affordability and housing crisis.

Gladman reserve the right to adduce further evidence on OAN at the appropriate time.

Location of New Housing

Gladman would point out that Suffolk Coastal has a number of different and distinct housing market areas. Each of these distinct areas will have their own requirement for housing and this should be reflected in the spatial distribution of housing supply within the Local Plan. This decision should be based on the findings of the evidence base and should not be a politically driven spatial strategy to put a disproportionate amount of housing in areas where people don’t want to [and will not] live. If the spatial distribution does not reflect need/demand as shown by the evidence base, then housing will not be delivered and the Plan will not be implemented.

Gladman would suggest a hybrid approach should be taken, with more sustainable settlements taking a greater proportion of growth than less sustainable locations. We would caution against too prescriptive a development strategy based solely on a development hierarchy that is itself based on too simplistic an understanding of sustainability (i.e. the number of services available). Whilst level of services is obviously an important criterion, the Framework is clear that development should be allowed where it is sustainable, when measured against the Framework as a whole and the three strands of sustainability (economic, social and environmental) in particular. When considering development in rural areas, Paragraph 55 of the Framework states that ‘housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the
vitality of rural communities.’ Furthermore paragraph 17 states that planning should ‘focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.

Para 55 of the Framework seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas to maintain and enhance rural vitality and viability. It is essential therefore, that the needs of the sustainable rural settlements across the district are assessed and a meaningful level of growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing vitality and viability. This will help to preserve and enhance rural services and facilities and allow local rural communities to meet their own needs for housing whilst providing much needed affordable housing in the parts of the district that suffer with the greatest affordable housing need.

In allocating sites, the Council should be mindful that to maximize housing supply the widest possible range of sites, by size and market location are required so that house builders of all types and sizes have access to suitable land in order to offer the widest possible range of products. The key to increased housing supply is the number of sales outlets. For any given time period, all else being equal, overall sales and build out rates are faster from 20 sites of 50 units than 10 sites of 100 units or 1 site of 1,000 units. The maximum delivery is achieved not just because there are more sales outlets but because the widest possible range of products and locations are available to meet the widest possible range of demand. In summary, a wider variety of sites in the widest possible range of locations ensures all types of house builder have access to suitable land which in turn increases housing delivery.

New homes should be distributed in a way that enables the full OAN for the district to be met, rather than based too rigidly on percentages allocated to each town and village. This should take into account factors such as market conditions and viability - it is after all the private sector that will be expected to deliver the majority of the district’s housing need and so it is important that the chosen distribution enables this to happen.

Regardless of the approach a sufficient range of sites need to be allocated (taking into account viability and market conditions) to ensure continuity of housing supply; more sites than needed to deliver the OAN should be allocated to account for slippage and delays. Whichever development strategy is adopted it is vital that the new Local Plan addresses this and that housing figures and distribution are aligned fully with economic growth aspirations.

Delivery Rates

The Council will have to ensure that they have applied realistic assumptions around lead-in times and build-out rates for the sites with permissions and especially for the sites with a resolution to grant, as there is a chance that some of these sites may never sign the s 106 agreement and begin to deliver.

Table 1 shows that 600 of the dwellings needed over the plan period will come through a windfall allowance (50dpa). The Council must be satisfied that, in line with Paragraph 48 of the Framework, they have ‘compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply’. It is also important that ‘any allowance should be realistic having regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens’.

Housing Allocations in Areas with Neighbourhood Plans

The plan sets out at paragraph 1.17 that several Neighbourhood Plans in the district have reached an advanced stage and cover a wide range of policy issues and therefore the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies document does not include allocations or additional policies covering these areas. This means that no sites are allocated for housing through the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD in settlements covered by an advanced Neighbourhood Plan. Gladman have some concerns with this approach.

There needs to be a mechanism in place to address situations where these Neighbourhood Plans fail and therefore do allocate the appropriate amount of housing as required by the Core Strategy. Should these Neighbourhood Plans not come forward as anticipated then the Council will be in danger of not having enough allocated housing land and therefore would be unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply. The Inspector for the Torbay Local Plan required Main Modifications that inserted wording that addressed this issue. The modification read ‘If Neighbourhood Plans do not identify sufficient sites to provide the growth requirement of the Local Plan, the Council will bring forward sites through site allocations development plan documents. If it appears that a shortfall in five year supply of deliverable sites is likely to arise, the Council will bring forward additional sites’. The Council should consider inserting a similar provision into the Site Allocations Document.

Another danger of this approach is that if other sites elsewhere in the district fail to come forward in a timely fashion or do not deliver the number of units expected, then the Council will not have the flexibility to release land in sustainable locations that are covered by a Neighbourhood Plan to make up the shortfall, regain a robust housing supply and retain control of housing delivery in the district.

Finally, given the likelihood that the full OAN for the district will increase markedly once the review is finally carried out, there needs to be a process to ensure that areas with adopted Neighbourhood Plans do not prevent increased levels of growth coming forward in future. PPG is clear [Paragraph:084 Reference ID:41-084-201605 19] that ‘policies in a neighbourhood plan may become out of date, for exam pie if they conflict with policies in a Local Plan that is adopted after the making of the neighbourhood plan. In such cases, the more recent plan policy takes precedence.’

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).
Policy SSP2: Physical Limits Boundaries

The policy sets boundaries for all settlements listed as Major Centres, Town, Key and Local Service Centres in accordance with Core Strategy policy SP19. The policy allows for development including housing within these limits, subject to proposals being in accordance with other policies, including Neighbourhood Plans. It notes that 'proposals for new residential development outside physical limits boundaries will be strictly controlled'.

As outlined above, Gladman consider the housing target in the adopted Core Strategy to be out of date as it does not represent the district's full OAN. Since the settlement boundaries are set to accommodate the out of date level of housing growth contained in the adopted Core Strategy, the boundary policies are also out of date. Many of the settlement boundaries remain from the old Local Plan and are therefore time-expired. Furthermore, the Core Strategy policy upon which SSP2 relies (SP19) was found to be out of date in the Fairfield Road, Framlingham appeal as the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land.

Setting strict settlement boundaries does not allow adequate flexibility for development to come forward outside the settlement boundary if this is required (for example due to a shortfall of housing land).

Gladman would object to the use of settlement limits if these would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. The Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead. The use of settlement limits to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements would not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework.

Gladman would be opposed to the definition of an urban edge if this would preclude appropriately sited and sustainable development coming forward to meet the district's housing needs, in accordance with the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development. Proposals that are sustainable should go ahead without delay. An overly restrictive approach could result in a plan that is not positively prepared or effective.

Policies SSP3 - SSP19

Gladman have no specific comments to make on the individual allocations within the plan except to note that many of the allocation policies place additional requirements on the delivery of sites, for example by requiring Development Briefs to be agreed or certain infrastructure to be provided before development can come forward. Gladman remind the Council of the guidance set out in Paragraph 173 of the Framework, which states that 'Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened'. This should be tested through a full plan viability assessment. Realistic and cautious delivery trajectories should be applied by the Council to sites requiring such infrastructure provisions.

In light of the judgement in FODC v. SSCLG and Gladman Developments Ltd [2016] EWHC 421 Admin ], Gladman consider it is necessary for the Site Allocations DPD to carry out an assessment of the potential impact of proposed development on heritage assets, as set out in paragraph 129 of the Framework. The judgement concerns the interaction between paragraph 14 and paragraph 134 of the Framework, and the issues of the balancing exercise to be undertaken to assess the harm of any proposals against the benefits of the identified proposed development in accordance with paragraphs 133, 134 and 135 of the Framework. Gladman consider that the implications of the judgement apply equally to both the decision making process and the plan making process. Paragraph 134 is clear in talking about ‘development proposals’, a phrase which can apply equally to planning applications and proposed allocations. Furthermore, footnote 29 of the Framework clearly states that ‘The principles and policies set out in this section apply to the heritage-related consent regimes for which local planning authorities are responsible under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as well as to plan-making and decision-taking”. It is therefore essential that the implications of the above judgment are fully considered in the context of both decision-taking and plan-making.

The table on page 133 of the consultation document sets out the expected completions per year of the sites allocated in these policies. The Council will have to ensure that they have applied realistic assumptions around lead-in times and build-out rates for these sites.

Policy SSP39: Areas to be Protected from Development

Gladman would query whether such a blanket protection policy is compliant with the Framework.

Gladman submit that new development can often be located in countryside gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character. In such circumstances we would question the purpose of a gap designation, particularly if this would prevent the development of otherwise sustainable and deliverable housing sites to meet the borough's needs. Gladman note that there appears to be no robust evidence supporting the extent of the current countryside gap designations.

Para 55 of the Framework seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas to maintain and enhance rural vitality and viability. It is essential therefore, that the needs of the sustainable rural settlements across the district are assessed and a meaningful level of growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing vitality and viability. This will
help to preserve and enhance rural services and facilities and allow local rural communities to meet their own needs for housing whilst providing much needed affordable housing in the parts of the district that suffer with the greatest affordable housing need.

Gladman would be opposed to the use of Local Gaps if these would only serve to act as an arbitrary tool to prevent sustainable development. In this regard we submit that new development can often be located in local gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character.

Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan

The FAAP is intended to implement the adopted Core Strategy and will serve as a tool that can be used to direct sustainable development and investment in the FAAP area and identify land required to meet the level of growth identified in the Core Strategy. Table 1 summarises that 2,123 homes will come forward in the FAAP area, 1,120 from new allocations.

FPP1: New Housing Allocations

The policy distributes, with reference to Table 2, new housing allocations across the FAAP area. 590 are in Felixstowe itself whilst 430 are in Trimley St Martin and 100 in Trimley St Mary. Gladman are pleased that paragraph 3.22 makes clear that the figures in the policy are to be read as minima but wonder whether the wording of the policy itself should make this clearer. The fact the policy is for a minima allows for the possibility of further sustainable development to come forward.

Paragraph 3.23 states that the Council 'consider it necessary to over-allocate sites across the district to ensure that a five year land supply is maintained' and that this provides a range of sites, sizes and locations for development. We welcome the recognition that it takes into account the likely increase in the district's OAN in future. As Major Centres, areas like Felixstowe are inherently sustainable and its continued growth will make an important contribution to meeting the district's housing needs now and in the future; it is important that sustainable development can continue to take place here and is not arbitrarily constrained.

FPP2: Physical Limits Boundaries

As with policy SSP 2 in the Site Allocations DPD, this policy sets boundaries for all settlements listed as Major Centres, Town, Key and Local Service Centres in accordance with Core Strategy policy SP19. The policy allows for development including housing within these limits, subject to proposals being in accordance with other policies, including Neighbourhood Plans. It notes that 'proposals for new residential development outside physical limits boundaries will be strictly controlled'.

As outlined above Gladman consider the housing target in the adopted Core Strategy to be out of date as it does not represent the district's full OAN. Since the settlement boundaries are set to accommodate the out of date level of housing growth outlined in the adopted Core Strategy, the boundary policies are also out of date. Furthermore, the Core Strategy policy upon which SSP2 relies (SP19) was found out of date in the Fairfield Road, Framlingham appeal as the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land.

Setting strict settlement boundaries does not allow adequate flexibility for development to come forward outside the settlement boundary if this is required (for example due to a shortfall of housing land).

Gladman would object to the use of settlement limits if these would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. The Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead. The use of settlement limits to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements would not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework.

Gladman would be opposed to the definition of an urban edge if this would preclude appropriately sited and sustainable development coming forward to meet the borough's housing needs, in accordance with the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development. Proposals that are sustainable should go ahead without delay. An overly restrictive approach could result in a plan that is not positively prepared or effective.

Policy FPPS: Land North of Conway Close and Swallow Close, Felixstowe

Gladman support the allocation of land for new housing in this area. We welcome the recognition that 'the land to the north of Conway Close and Swallow Close can provide a natural extension to the built form of Felixstowe without causing a detrimental impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or important views of the Deben Estuary'.

Gladman also welcome the recognition that the presence of the Grade II listed Park Farm Cottages to the west of the site does not preclude development in the area provided that it is sympathetic to the heritage asset.

We note that there are potential capacity issues regarding the foul sewerage network that need to be overcome. Gladman submit that it is the responsibility of Anglian Water to provide sufficient capacity to serve the needs of housing.
in the area and that this should not be used as an excuse to prevent or delay development coming forward. Anglian Water are consulted through the plan process and so must be aware of the capacity issue and should be putting funding in place to resolve it.

Gladman recognise that the area may have some archaeological potential. It is our view and experience that full archaeological investigations are not necessary prior to the grant of planning permission and that appropriately-worded pre-commencement conditions attached to planning applications are effective at securing any archaeological remains on site without delaying the granting of planning permission.

Gladman would caution against being too prescriptive regarding the mix of housing, the design and layout, or the route of the footpath through the site, as these will need to be established and refined through a thorough analysis of the constraints and opportunities of the site and through engagement with the public and stakeholders. The Council will no doubt be aware of the requirements set out in paragraph 59 of the Framework, which states:

Local planning authorities should consider using design codes where they could help deliver high quality outcomes. However, design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.

Furthermore, paragraph 60 goes on to add:

Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

Finally, paragraph 65 makes it clear that

Local planning authorities should not refuse planning permission for buildings or infrastructure which promote high levels of sustainability because of concerns about incompatibility with on existing townscape, if those concerns have been mitigated by good design (unless the concern relates to a designated heritage asset and the impact would cause material harm to the asset or its setting which is not outweighed by the proposal's economic, social and environmental benefits).

In general Gladman remind the Council of the guidance set out in Paragraph 173 of the Framework, which states that 'Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened'.

Gladman submit that policies which seek developer contributions should be properly tested for their effects on development viability and supported by an adequate evidence base. The Council should not set onerous policy obligations that could place an undue burden on the ability of developers to deliver sustainable development.

Gladman submit that a site larger than the proposed allocation is suitable, available and deliverable. A larger allocation in this area could contribute to the over-provision of housing across the district and provide a buffer/reserve should other sites within the FAAP or across the district not come forward as anticipated, enabling the district to maintain a robust five year supply of housing land. Given the recognition that the OAN for the district is likely to increase in future, a larger allocation here could make a valuable contribution to an increased housing requirement in an area outside the AONB, reducing pressure for development within the AONB.

Policies FPP1 - FPP8

Gladman have no specific comments to make on the individual allocations within the plan except to note that many of the allocations policies place burdens upon the delivery of sites, for example by requiring Development Briefs to be agreed or certain infrastructure to be provided before development can come forward. Gladman remind the Council of the guidance set out in Paragraph 173 of the Framework, which states that 'Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened'.

In light of the judgement in FODC v. SSCLG and Gladman Developments Ltd [(2016) EWHC 421 Admin], Gladman consider it is necessary for the FAAP to carry out an assessment of the potential impact of proposed development on heritage assets, as set out in paragraph 129 of the Framework. The judgement concerns the interaction between paragraph 14 and paragraph 134 of the Framework, and the issues of the balancing exercise to be undertaken to assess the harm of any proposals against the benefits of the identified proposed development in accordance with paragraphs 133, 134 and 135 of the Framework. Gladman consider that the implications of the judgement apply equally to both the decision making process and the plan making process. Paragraph 134 is clear in talking about 'development proposals', a phrase which can apply equally to planning applications and proposed allocations. Furthermore footnote 29 of the Framework clearly states that "The principles and policies set out in this section apply to the heritage-related consent regimes for which local planning authorities are responsible under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as well as to plan-making and decision-taking." It is therefore essential that the implications of the above judgment are fully considered in the context of both decision-taking and plan-making.
Policy FPP27: Access to the Countryside

The policy requires new residential developments in the Felixstowe Peninsular to make provision of accessible natural green spaces as agreed by the Council in conjunction with Natural England. Gladman would urge the Council to take a flexible and realistic approach to such provision, recognising that it could take a variety of forms. The Council should even consider payment of offsite contributions if this would be more appropriate given the constraints of a site and issues of viability.

Paragraph 173 of the Framework states that 'Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened'.

Policy FPP28: Areas to be Protected from Development

As with our comments on the Site Allocations DPD, Gladman would query whether such a blanket protection policy is compliant with the Framework.

Gladman submit that new development can often be located in countryside gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character. In such circumstances we would question the purpose of a gap designation, particularly if this would prevent the development of otherwise sustainable and deliverable housing sites to meet the borough's needs. Gladman note that there appears to be no robust evidence supporting the extent of the current countryside gap designations.

Para 55 of the Framework seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas to maintain and enhance rural vitality and viability. It is essential therefore, that the needs of the sustainable rural settlements across the district are assessed and a meaningful level of growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing vitality and viability. This will help to preserve and enhance rural services and facilities and allow local rural communities to meet their own needs for housing whilst providing much needed affordable housing in the parts of the district that suffer with the greatest affordable housing need.

Gladman would be opposed to the use of Local Gaps if these would only serve to act as an arbitrary tool to prevent sustainable development. In this regard we submit that new development can often be located in local gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character.

General Comments

In addition to the above comments on the FAAP policies, Gladman have the following general points to make about the FAAP.

Delivery Rates

The table on page 105 of the FAAP consultation document sets out the expected completions per year of the sites allocated in these policies. The Council will have to ensure that they have applied realistic assumptions around lead-in times and build-out rates for these sites.

Location of New Housing

Gladman would point out that Suffolk Coastal has a number of different and distinct housing market areas. Each of these distinct areas will have their own requirement for housing and this should be reflected in the spatial distribution of housing supply within the Local Plan. This decision should be based on the findings of the evidence base and should not be a politically driven spatial strategy to put a disproportionate amount of housing in areas where people don’t want to (and will not) live. If the spatial distribution does not reflect need/demand as shown by the evidence base, then housing will not be delivered and the Plan will not be implemented. Following a dispersed spatial distribution pattern across a large number of settlements is also undesirable as this approach is not likely to be sustainable, will not be delivered and cannot generate the level of community benefits that larger sites can to help make settlements more sustainable and fill important gaps in community provision.

Gladman would suggest a hybrid approach should be taken, with more sustainable settlements taking a greater proportion of growth than less sustainable locations. We would caution against too prescriptive a development strategy based solely on a development hierarchy that is itself based on too simplistic an understanding of sustainability (i.e. the number of services available). Whilst level of services is obviously an important criterion, the Framework is clear that development should be allowed where it is sustainable, when measured against the Framework as a whole and the three strands of sustainability (economic, social and environmental) in particular. When considering development in rural areas, Paragraph 55 of the Framework states that 'housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.' Furthermore paragraph 17 states that planning should 'focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable'.

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).
New homes should be distributed in a way that enables the full OAN for the district to be met, rather than based too rigidly on percentages allocated to each town and village. This should take into account factors such as market conditions and viability - it is after all the private sector that will be expected to deliver the majority of the district’s housing need and so it is important that the chosen distribution enables this to happen.

Regardless of the approach a sufficient range of sites need to be allocated (taking into account viability and market conditions) to ensure continuity of housing supply; more sites than needed to deliver the OAN should be allocated to account for slippage and delays. Whichever development strategy is adopted it is vital that the new Local Plan addresses this and that housing figures and distribution are aligned fully with economic growth aspirations.

Other Comments on Site Allocations and FAAP

Gladman have the following comments to make that apply to both the Site Allocations DPD and the FAAP document.

NPPF Changes

It is vital that the Site Allocations and FAAP fully reflect any revisions to the Framework, the recommendations of the Local Plan Expert Group when implemented, and any requirements relating to Starter Homes once these come into effect. Of particular importance will be the need to address possible changes to the Framework around ensuring housing is delivered on land allocated in plans through the introduction of a ‘housing delivery test’. The consultation document on the proposed changes set out that ‘where significant under-delivery is identified over a sustained period, action needs to be taken to address this’ and that one approach ‘could be to identify additional sustainable sites if the existing approach is demonstrably not delivering the housing required’. The Site Allocations DPD and FAAP will need to include a mechanism for dealing with any sustained under-delivery in a timely fashion.

Another area that the LAPP should consider is the widening of the definition of affordable housing ‘so that it encompasses a fuller range of products that can support people to access home ownership’. It is proposed that the wider definition includes Starter Homes and the Housing and Planning Act has introduced provisions to make regulations to require all suitable reasonably-sized housing developments to include a proportion of Starter Homes. The Plans will need to address how this requirement will impact on the amount of more traditional types of affordable housing that could be delivered, which may entail an adjustment of the housing target to ensure the district’s full OAN can be met.

Duty to Cooperate

The development of the Site Allocations DPD and FAAP represents another opportunity to consider and address cross-boundary issues.

Paragraph 178 of the Framework states that ‘public bodies have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries’ and paragraph 179 states that ‘local planning authorities should work collaboratively with other bodies to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual Local Plans’. It goes on to say that ‘joint working should enable local planning authorities to work together to meet development requirements which cannot wholly be met within their own areas - for instance, because of a lack of physical capacity.

Paragraph 181 of the Framework further sets out that ‘cooperation should be a continuous process of engagement from initial thinking through to implementation, resulting in a final position where plans are in place to provide the land and infrastructure necessary to support current and projected future levels of development’.

PPG provides further explanation of how the policies contained within the Framework should be interpreted and applied. In terms of the Duty to Cooperate, PPG sets out that ‘local planning authorities should make every effort to secure the necessary cooperation on strategic cross boundary matters BEFORE they submit their Local Plans for examination’*(my emphasis).

Suffolk Coastal clearly needs to consider the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate. It is something that needs to be built into the entire plan-making process from the very beginning and failure to do so is not something that can be rectified retrospectively.

Sustainability Appraisal Interim Report and Sustainability Appraisal of Policies

Gladman have the following comments regarding the Sustainability Appraisal:

In accordance with Section 19 of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, policies set out in Local Plans must be subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Incorporating the requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, SA is a systematic process that should be undertaken at each stage of the Plan’s preparation, assessing the effects of the Local Plan’s proposals on sustainable development when judged against all reasonable alternatives.

The Council should ensure that the results of the SA process clearly justify its policy choices. In meeting the
development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of the assessment why some policy options have been progressed, and others have been rejected. Undertaking a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, in the same level of detail for both chosen and rejected alternatives, the Council’s decision making and scoring should be robust, justified and transparent.

Gladman remind the Council that there have now been a number of instances where the failure to undertake a satisfactory SA has resulted in Plans failing the test of legal compliance at Examination (South Somerset) or being subjected to later legal challenge (Heard vs Greater Norwich Development Plan).

Conclusions

What is clear from the Framework, and from the Government’s agenda to boost significantly the supply of housing, is that the premise of the whole process is the assessment and delivery of the full OAN for housing in an area unless there are adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. If the process set out in the Framework and PPG is not followed then the Council run the real risk of the plan being found unsound and this will create significant delay and uncertainty in the process.

All of our best interests are served by your authority getting a Local Plan found sound at the earliest possible opportunity, rather than us utilising considerable resources on preparing for and attending EIPs, preparing Judicial Reviews etc. This approach will put the authority back in control of planning in their area and will give the Members comfort and certainty over the level and location of development that will take place over the lifetime of the Plan.

Gladman have raised concerns in relation to the issues and options being considered by the Council which will fundamentally affect the ‘soundness’ of the Local Plan (with reference to tests of soundness outlined in paragraph 182 of the Framework). If the Local Plan is approached in such a way as presented it will not provide a positive policy approach and in a number of cases it is not consistent with national policy.

Gladman hope that you have found this representation constructive. If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact myself or a member of the Gladman team.

Summary:

Gladman have no specific comments to make on the individual allocations within the plan except to note that many of the allocations policies place burdens upon the delivery of sites, for example by requiring Development Briefs to be agreed or certain infrastructure to be provided before development can come forward. The scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened.

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>i, ii, iii, iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments:
Scanned Representation
It is acknowledged that the core strategy has to provide the framework for the Suffolk Coastal district up to 2027, to include a range of strategic objectives which consider issues such as housing, employment, transport, economy, environment and green infrastructure. With a particular focus on the Felixstowe Peninsula, as per Policy SP21.

In particular looking at further development of the Bucklesham, Felixstowe, Kirton, Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary areas and the A12/A14 interchange at Seven Hills. A key highway junction serving the Felixstowe Peninsula and the rest of Suffolk Coastal.

It is noted that this core strategy needs to identify a minimum of 7,900 new homes to be provided across the district between 2010 - 2027.

An example of a good design is one which incorporates good architectural design with consideration for the principles of Secured by Design. It is recognised that there will always need to be compromise but too often in the past designers have created areas which are susceptible to crime and the fear of crime, where once established it is difficult or impossible to rectify.

In particular it is desirable from a crime reduction perspective to incorporate designs that allow natural surveillance from ground floor active rooms, i.e. gable windows looking onto the public domain and parking areas.

Rear parking courts should also be secured to prevent these becoming gathering areas for youths and areas for Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB).

The demarcation of public space and private grounds is important. Approved Document Q (ADQ) requires under Building Regulations dwellings are built to "Prevent Unauthorised Access". This applies to any "dwelling and any part of a building from which access can be gained to a flat within the building". Performance requirements apply to easily accessible doors and windows that provide access in any of the following circumstances:

a. Into a dwelling from outside
b. Into parts of a building containing flats from outside
c. Into a flat from the common parts of the building

As 01 June 2016 the police lead Secure By Design (SBD) New Home 2016 will be introduced, replacing the previous Secure By Design (SBD) 2014 New Homes guide. This guide aptly meets the requirements of Approved Document Q for new builds and renovation work to a more preferred security specification, through using certified fabricators that meet these Secure By Design principals, for external doors, windows and roof lights to the following standards http://www.securedbydesign.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Secured_by_Design_Homes_2016_V1.pdf

How can we improve design through planning policy
Suffolk is one of the safest counties in England, but we must continue to be aware of the ability to create designs that can help to reduce crime. Local policy can ensure that designers must comply with evidence based recommendations when designing new residential and commercial developments. Secured by Design (SBD) is the Police preferred specification for new developments and the advice and recommendations contained in Secure By Design (SBD) Homes 2016.

Sound evidence and research shows that too often the security element of a design is omitted and needs to be redressed. Police Designing Out Crime Officers (DOCO) are employed in all areas of Suffolk and are experts in designing out crime. Their role is to work with designers at the earliest stages to ensure that all aspects of Secured by design are incorporated. To enhance the security of a development and reduce the permeability that allows easy intrusion by potential offenders and can make controlling crime very difficult. The balance between permeability and accessibility is always a delicate one. We (policing) want less permeability as it creates entry and escape routes for those who may want to commit a crime. For planners it is about the green agenda, being able to get people from A to B, preferably not in their cars. We cannot demand reductions in permeability without having evidence that this is the only option. What we can do is look at the design of walkways, lighting, surveillance and the security of surrounding properties to ensure that any permeability is as safe as it can be and that the offender will stand out in a well-designed community. There is no blanket approach, site specifics apply, based on the crime rate and local context.

A cul-de-sac design offers the best features in respect to the principles of Designing out Crime as residents are more inclined to take ownership of the area in which they live, and visitors to that area are subsequently more conspicuous. Local policy should state clearly that all new developments of 10 properties or more should seek at least a Bronze Secured by Design. One of the three awards available within the New Homes 2016 guide. Incorporating Gold, Silver or Bronze standards.

The local plan should have specific recommendations for Designing out Crime at the earliest stages of design. These recommendations are often inexpensive and can result in less management input for landlords and less problems for owner occupiers.

Building for Life12 should be used as a tool to improve the design quality of a new development. In fact the first paragraph within BFL12 states:

How can we improve design through planning policy
Suffolk is one of the safest counties in England, but we must continue to be aware of the ability to create designs that can help to reduce crime. Local policy can ensure that designers must comply with evidence based recommendations when designing new residential and commercial developments. Secured by Design (SBD) is the Police preferred specification for new developments and the advice and recommendations contained in Secure By Design (SBD) Homes 2016.

Sound evidence and research shows that too often the security element of a design is omitted and needs to be redressed. Police Designing Out Crime Officers (DOCO) are employed in all areas of Suffolk and are experts in designing out crime. Their role is to work with designers at the earliest stages to ensure that all aspects of Secured by design are incorporated. To enhance the security of a development and reduce the permeability that allows easy intrusion by potential offenders and can make controlling crime very difficult. The balance between permeability and accessibility is always a delicate one. We (policing) want less permeability as it creates entry and escape routes for those who may want to commit a crime. For planners it is about the green agenda, being able to get people from A to B, preferably not in their cars. We cannot demand reductions in permeability without having evidence that this is the only option. What we can do is look at the design of walkways, lighting, surveillance and the security of surrounding properties to ensure that any permeability is as safe as it can be and that the offender will stand out in a well-designed community. There is no blanket approach, site specifics apply, based on the crime rate and local context.

A cul-de-sac design offers the best features in respect to the principles of Designing out Crime as residents are more inclined to take ownership of the area in which they live, and visitors to that area are subsequently more conspicuous. Local policy should state clearly that all new developments of 10 properties or more should seek at least a Bronze Secured by Design. One of the three awards available within the New Homes 2016 guide. Incorporating Gold, Silver or Bronze standards.

The local plan should have specific recommendations for Designing out Crime at the earliest stages of design. These recommendations are often inexpensive and can result in less management input for landlords and less problems for owner occupiers.

Building for Life12 should be used as a tool to improve the design quality of a new development. In fact the first paragraph within BFL12 states:
“The Building for Life campaign is about guiding the better planning of new development through urban design that is safe and provides everything that should be expected of a new community.”

The earlier a Design Out Crime Officer and local Developers can work together the better, in order to achieve aims and objectives acceptable to both parties. Incorporating a development where clients are happy to live and work, in order to assist the environment and economic success of that area.

It is commendable that land usage within the Felixstowe Action Plan prioritises the use of Brownfield sites, including those at Felixstowe, Walton and also the Trimley villages. It is acknowledged that such sites can more easily integrate into the existing physical environment and social networks of the area.

Secured by Design aims to achieve a good overall standard of Security for buildings and the immediate environment. It attempts to deter criminal and anti-social behaviour within developments by introducing appropriate design features that enable Natural Surveillance and create a sense of ownership and responsibility for every part of the development.

These features include secure vehicle parking, adequate lighting of common areas, control of access to individual and common areas, defensible space and a landscaping and lighting scheme which when combined, enhances Natural Surveillance and safety.

Experience shows that incorporating security measures during a New Build or Refurbishment reduces crime, fear of crime and disorder. The aim of the Police Service is to assist in the Design process to achieve a safe and secure environment for Residents and Visitors without creating a ‘Fortress environment’

Where developers will incorporate Play Areas, all play equipment and the spacing there of, should meet BS EN 1176 standards. I would recommend that the particular area has suitable floor matting tested to BS EN1177 standards. There is a recommended guideline that static equipment should be at a minimum 2.50 metres distance from each object.

Conclusion

I would be pleased to work with any agent and/or a developer to ensure any future proposed development incorporates the required security elements. This is the most efficient way to proceed with residential and commercial developments and is a useful partnership approach to reduce the opportunity for crime and the fear of crime.

Summary:

It is commendable that land usage within the Felixstowe Action Plan prioritises the use of Brownfield sites, including those at Felixstowe, Walton and also the Trimley villages. It is acknowledged that such sites can more easily integrate into the existing physical environment and social networks of the area.
Client: Trinity College, Cambridge

I write in response to the Proposed Submission Consultation, submitting representations on behalf of my client, Trinity College, Cambridge, in respect of site 3003 - Land at Great Street Farm, High Road, Trimley St. Mary.

Site 3003: Land at Great Street Farm, High Road, Trimley St. Mary

On behalf of the site’s owner, Trinity College, we are disappointed that the above site has not been supported as a Proposed Submission Allocation for residential development following the representations made to the AAP ‘Preferred Options’ consultation, and in accordance with the requirements of Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework) my client does not consider the omission of this site as policy to be “sound”.

Extending to approximately 1.01 hectares, and consisting of a range of farm buildings of little architectural merit, the site could provide approximately 35 dwellings subject to suitable masterplanning to preserve the setting of the heritage asset at 185 High Road and views of St. Mary’s Church.

The allocation of the site would make a meaningful contribution towards the pressing need for new housing across the Peninsula, allied with the Council's commitment to deliver a minimum of 1,760 new dwellings in Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimley villages during the plan period (2010 to 2027) of the adopted Core Strategy.

The Core Strategy states that Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimley villages is by far the largest town within the District and includes the Port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, of both regional and national significance. Pertinently, it also acknowledges that the growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one. This had led to an unsustainable increase in commuting from other towns on a daily basis. In addition, the population in the area is increasing at the same time as average household sizes are falling.

As such, current housing need is higher than the levels of growth currently being planned for, and more sites are likely to be required to come forward on the peninsula in the medium term, over and above those proposed for allocation via the AAP. It is, therefore, critical to make the best use of land for housing and prioritise the delivery of residential development.

The necessity to urgently have an adopted AAP in place to encourage the delivery of housing is heightened by the current deficit in the five-year supply of deliverable housing sites in Suffolk Coastal District as required by Paragraph 49 of the NPPF. As such, the presumption in favour of sustainable development is applicable to residential applications made within the District. This position has recently (25 April 2016) been confirmed by an appeal decision for a site at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, where an Inspector assessed the Council’s housing land supply at 3.7 years at best, commenting:

"The future for housing growth in the District is seriously uncertain and is not following the plan-led approach that is advocated in the first of twelve core planning principles set out in the NPPF. In these circumstances, it is necessary to maintain the principle established in the PPG, that undersupply should be addressed in the first five years of the remaining plan period, the Sedgefield method, rather than over the remaining years of the plan period, the Council's preferred Liverpool method" (para.25).

In concluding on the land supply issue, the Inspector concluded:
The relevant five-year period for an assessment of housing delivery is April 2015 to March 2020 and during that period the BT Adastral Park site will contribute only 200 dwellings towards housing supply. It is appropriate to apply a 20% buffer and it is necessary to require the shortfall in previous housing delivery to be delivered over the first five years, and not over the remainder, of the plan period. Based on these three main factors, and setting aside the debate about housing delivery being based on the OAN for the District rather than the CS figure of 7,900 dwellings, it is estimated that the Council has a housing land supply of only about 3.7 years. Even if only one of the three main factors is correct the Council does not have a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years’ worth of housing. Furthermore, if the housing requirement is based on an OAN of 11,000 dwellings, as established in the CS, or on any realistic prediction of what an OAN for the District is likely to be, housing land supply is less than 3.7 years.

The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land and paragraph 49 of the NPPF is therefore engaged* (paras 27 and 28, appeal decision APP/J3530/W/15/3011466). This appeal decision corroborates the findings of two earlier appeals for sites at North Entrance, Saxmundham (PINS Ref. APP/J3530/A/14/2221769) and Woods Lane, Melton (APP/J3530/A/14/2225141) issued in July and September 2015 respectively, where it was concluded that the District did not have a five-year housing land supply.

Given the five-year housing supply deficit and the Council’s commitment to deliver at least 1,760 new dwellings in Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimleys between 2010 and 2027, this sustainable site continues to represent a key opportunity to deliver much needed housing, address the five-year housing supply deficit and realise the objectives of the adopted Core Strategy.

**Sustainability Appraisal**

Section 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), requires that Local Planning Authorities carry out an appraisal of the sustainability of the proposals (Sustainability Appraisal, SA) in each local development document, and prepare a report of these findings. Furthermore, this report should identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan, and the ‘reasonable alternatives’ taking into account the objectives and geographical scope of the plan (Section 12, The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulation 2004).

In essence, the SA should be applied as an iterative process informing the development of the Local Plan document.

In relation to the host site, the Proposed Submission version of the Sustainability Appraisal Report, April 2016 reads:

"The site scores well in terms of major positive social effects due to its proximity to key services and the potential to reuse a vacant site. Relatively good provision of public transport and proximity to key services allow the site to potentially reduce the effects of traffic on the environment and to encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth. The site has one major negative environmental effect due to the loss of Grade 2 agricultural soils. However, scope exists to mitigate this effect. Development would see a site previously discounted due to poor access being combined with a new site providing access for both" (p.223 "overall assessment' Appendix 5).

The SA considers 23 objectives with the site (3003) scoring as follows:

* ++ Major positive significant effect: 4
* + Minor positive significant effect: 5
* 0 Neutral: 11
* - Minor negative significant effect: 1
* -- Major negative significant effect: 1
* ? Uncertain: 1

The total scores as outlined above, confirm that the site scores very well and is one of the most appropriate/sustainable sites when considered against all alternative options.

Within the ‘Conclusion’ section of the SA, only one major negative significant effect (soil resources) is listed, although all of the greenfield sites proposed for allocation are subject to this classification. As such, whilst the site is of Grade 2 agricultural soil status, it should be recognised that the majority of the greenfield land across the Peninsula is either Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land and, therefore, agricultural land will need to be released for residential development. Such a position has been adopted by the Council in its consideration of a number of recent planning applications, and is being accepted in the allocation of a range of sites via the AAP.

Pertinently, the SA also scores a 'Major positive significant effect' in four of the SA objectives (numbers 1, 8, 14 and 22). This correctly recognises the sites access to Felixstowe Community Hospital and Walton Surgery, and the sites walking distance proximity to Trimley St. Mary Primary School (objective 1). It also recognises the significant opportunity that the site offers to reuse a vacant site for housing (objective 8), and the sites proximity to the Town/District Centre and Strategic Employment Opportunities (Port of Felixstowe) (objective 22), and proximity to Trimley train station and a number of bus routes (objective 14).
On this basis, and in accordance with Paragraph 182 of the Framework, the AAP does not meet the ‘Justified’ test and is unsound given that the plan is not the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence. Furthermore, it also fails the ‘Consistent with national policy’ test as it does not enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

To make the Plan sound, the Council should allocate site 3003 for residential development.

Access

It is noted that the SA’s reasons for rejection of the site reads “Site put forward as alternative options within Preferred Options Document. Highways advice: Access from High Road adjacent to farm buildings not adopted” (p.18). However, the site was submitted for Council consideration at the Issues and Options Consultation stage (letter of 27 February 2015). Furthermore, notwithstanding the highway reasons outlined, my client has control over the land directly abutting the public highway that would allow an adoptable access to be provided to satisfactorily service the site. This stretch of High Road is subject to a 30mph speed limit and recent Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) survey data commissioned by my client has indicated that the 85th percentile speeds are 35mph in both directions with less than 5% Heavy Vehicles. As such, my client’s Transport Consultant has indicated that a scheme of this size could be delivered via the principles of Manual for Streets, that requires 2m x 60m visibility splays, which can be satisfactorily accommodated.

Conclusion

Given the representations that were made during the Preferred Options Consultation on the AAP to this effect, my client is disappointed to see that the Council has maintained its position of not choosing to shortlist this sustainable site that would assist in meeting the Council’s pressing housing requirements. Whilst the Local Planning Authority has undertaken a SA, it is unclear whether ‘reasonable alternatives’ have been adequately considered in accordance with the Regulations.

The Great Street Farm site is shown to score well with significant positive effects far outscoring significant negative effects. As such, the site could provide much needed housing to meet the District’s pressing needs.

In accordance with Paragraph 182 of the Framework, in order to be considered ‘sound’ policies in Local Plans must be consistent with national policy, justified based on proportionate evidence, and based on a strategy that seeks to meet objectively assessed housing needs.

In the absence of the sites allocation (despite its sustainable nature), and the tests contained within Paragraph 182 of the Framework, the AAP is not considered to be Justified or Consistent with National Policy. Whilst disappointing that the various representations made to the Preferred Options AAP consultation appear not to have been given due consideration prior to the Proposed Submission consultation, we trust that they will be given full and meaningful consideration prior to or during the examination in public sessions.

Summary:

Given representations made to the preferred options consultation, my client is disappointed that the Council has maintained its position of not choosing to shortlist this sustainable site that would assist in meeting the Council’s pressing housing requirements. The Great Street Farm site is shown to show in the Council’s supporting sustainability appraisal to score well with significant positive effects far outscoring significant negative effects. As such, the site could provide much needed housing to meet the District’s pressing needs.

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ii, iii, iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments:

Great Street Farm High Road Trimley St Mary site plan
Scanned Representation
It is acknowledged that the core strategy has to provide the framework for the Suffolk Coastal district up to 2027, to include a range of strategic objectives which consider issues such as housing, employment, transport, economy, environment and green infrastructure. With a particular focus on the Felixstowe Peninsula, as per Policy SP21.

In particular looking at further development of the Bucklesham, Felixstowe, Kirton, Trimley St Martin and Trimley St Mary areas and the A12/A14 interchange at Seven Hills. A key highway junction serving the Felixstowe Peninsula and the rest of Suffolk Coastal.

It is noted that this core strategy needs to identify a minimum of 7,900 new homes to be provided across the district between 2010 - 2027.

An example of a good design is one which incorporates good architectural design with consideration for the principles of Secured by Design. It is recognised that there will always need to be compromise but too often in the past designers have created areas which are susceptible to crime and the fear of crime, where once established it is difficult or impossible to rectify.

In particular it is desirable from a crime reduction perspective to incorporate designs that allow natural surveillance from ground floor active rooms, i.e. gable windows looking onto the public domain and parking areas.

Rear parking courts should also be secured to prevent these becoming gathering areas for youths and areas for Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB).

The demarcation of public space and private grounds is important. Approved Document Q (ADQ) requires under Building Regulations dwellings are built to "Prevent Unauthorised Access". This applies to any "dwelling and any part of a building from which access can be gained to a flat within the building". Performance requirements apply to easily accessible doors and windows that provide access in any of the following circumstances:

a. Into a dwelling from outside
b. Into parts of a building containing flats from outside
c. Into a flat from the common parts of the building

As 01 June 2016 the police lead Secure By Design (SBD) New Home 2016 will be introduced, replacing the previous Secure By Design (SBD) 2014 New Homes guide. This guide aptly meets the requirements of Approved Document Q for new builds and renovation work to a more preferred security specification, through using certified fabricators that meet these Secure By Design principals, for external doors, windows and roof lights to the following standards http://www.securedbydesign.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Secured_by_Design_Homes_2016_V1.pdf

How can we improve design through planning policy
Suffolk is one of the safest counties in England, but we must continue to be aware of the ability to create designs that can help to reduce crime. Local policy can ensure that designers must comply with evidence based recommendations when designing new residential and commercial developments. Secured by Design (SBD) is the Police preferred specification for new developments and the advice and recommendations contained in Secure By Design (SBD) Homes 2016.

Sound evidence and research shows that too often the security element of a design is omitted and needs to be redressed.

Police Designing Out Crime Officers (DOCO) are employed in all areas of Suffolk and are experts in designing out crime. Their role is to work with designers at the earliest stages to ensure that all aspects of Secured by design are incorporated. To enhance the security of a development and reduce the permeability that allows easy intrusion by potential offenders and can make controlling crime very difficult. The balance between permeability and accessibility is always a delicate one. We (policing) want less permeability as it creates entry and escape routes for those who may want to commit a crime. For planners it is about the green agenda, being able to get people from A to B, preferably not in their cars. We cannot demand reductions in permeability without having evidence that this is the only option. What we can do is look at the design of walkways, lighting, surveillance and the security of surrounding properties to ensure that any permeability is as safe as it can be and that the offender will stand out in a well-designed community. There is no blanket approach, site specifics apply, based on the crime rate and local context.

A cul-de-sac design offers the best features in respect to the principles of Designing out Crime as residents are more inclined to take ownership of the area in which they live, and visitors to that area are subsequently more conspicuous. Local policy should state clearly that all new developments of 10 properties or more should seek at least a Bronze Secured by Design. One of the three awards available within the New Homes 2016 guide. Incorporating Gold, Silver or Bronze standards.

The local plan should have specific recommendations for Designing out Crime at the earliest stages of design. These recommendations are often inexpensive and can result in less management input for landlords and less problems for owner occupiers.

Building for Life12 should be used as a tool to improve the design quality of a new development. In fact the first paragraph within BfL12 states:

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).
"The Building for Life campaign is about guiding the better planning of new development through urban design that is safe and provides everything that should be expected of a new community."

The earlier a Design Out Crime Officer and local Developers can work together the better, in order to achieve aims and objectives acceptable to both parties. Incorporating a development where clients are happy to live and work, in order to assist the environment and economic success of that area.

It is commendable that land usage within the Felixstowe Action Plan prioritises the use of Brownfield sites, including those at Felixstowe, Walton and also the Trimley villages. It is acknowledged that such sites can more easily integrate into the existing physical environment and social networks of the area.

Secured by Design aims to achieve a good overall standard of Security for buildings and the immediate environment. It attempts to deter criminal and anti-social behaviour within developments by introducing appropriate design features that enable Natural Surveillance and create a sense of ownership and responsibility for every part of the development.

These features include secure vehicle parking, adequate lighting of common areas, control of access to individual and common areas, defensible space and a landscaping and lighting scheme which when combined, enhances Natural Surveillance and safety.

Experience shows that incorporating security measures during a New Build or Refurbishment reduces crime, fear of crime and disorder. The aim of the Police Service is to assist in the Design process to achieve a safe and secure environment for Residents and Visitors without creating a 'Fortress environment'.

Where developers will incorporate Play Areas, all play equipment and the spacing there of, should meet BS EN 1176 standards. I would recommend that the particular area has suitable floor matting tested to BS EN1177 standards. There is a recommended guideline that static equipment should be at a minimum 2.50 metres distance from each object.

Conclusion

I would be pleased to work with any agent and/or a developer to ensure any future proposed development incorporates the required security elements. This is the most efficient way to proceed with residential and commercial developments and is a useful partnership approach to reduce the opportunity for crime and the fear of crime.

Summary:

An example of a good design is one which incorporates good architectural design with consideration for the principles of Secured by Design. The local plan should have specific recommendations for Designing out Crime at the earliest stages of design. Building for Life12 should be used as a tool to improve the design quality of a new development.

Change to Plan

N/A

---|---|---|---|---
Not Specified | Yes | Yes | Yes | 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).
Note - no papers available at Felixstowe library.
(i) Following the recent decision made by planning inspector John Braithwaite that (a) Housing growth uncertain, not to national guidelines, (b) not having a five year supply of housing, should FPAAP continue at all?? When the position is clear it would be right to re-consult the community of FP. Not withstanding present position, some comments on AAP.
(ii) Fails to promote strengthening communities and highlighting lack of infrastructure particularly highways, following reduction of secondary schools is one at eastern side of Walton.
(iii) Failed to deliver the 1/3 affordable dwellings (added to local plan 2004/5?).
(iv) Fails to relate or encourage applicants to relate to SCDC "Housing needs survey".(v) No meaningful policy or guidance for end of life dwellings, whether partners or single. With community support and financially sound, thereby making existing family homes available and make best use of existing housing (see dwelling occupancy).
(vii) No policy on over provision of holiday and second homes (New build - South seafront Felixstowe, public land only 10% affordable) re St Ives, Cornwall.

Please enter above comments and inform me whether the process will be rerun (ref Braithwaite).

**Summary:**
Fails to promote strengthening communities and highlighting lack of infrastructure particularly highways, following reduction of secondary schools is one at eastern side of Walton.

**Change to Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>i, ii, iii, iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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).
Thank you for consulting Suffolk County Council on submission version for development in Felixstowe.

Suffolk County Council responded previously to the preferred options stage in November 2015. This response does not rehearse all the issues as Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) has responded well to the points that the county council made at the time.

The following response relates to the ways in which the development of these sites affects county council responsibilities, and how our authorities will need to work together to bring these sites forward in a successful way.

This letter does not take into account the impact of sites which may come forward as windfall development, which may have significant impacts on local infrastructure.

Archaeology

Additional text has been systematically added in general information about archaeology, using the county council's previous comments. It introduces archaeology throughout the document and gives the plan a sound approach to archaeology.

Suffolk County Council Archaeology has reviewed the document and the only minor outstanding matters relate to suggested amendments and the terminology used in the following paragraphs:

Para. 3.74 (FPP4) - the site will require archaeological excavation rather than assessment, as it has already been assessed. Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service can provide a brief for the works and also discuss options for preservation in situ.

Paras. 3.82 (FPP5), 3.94 (FPP6), 3.101 (FPP7), 3.109 (FPP8) - Change the reference to archaeological assessment “prior to the development of the site” to “at an appropriate design stage prior to the granting of outline, technical details or full planning permission.” This will allow for preservation in situ, where appropriate, of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed, for which conditions may or may not be sufficient.

With regard to FFP12 (Land at Haven Exchange), which is an enabling policy, archaeological investigation will be required, particularly for larger schemes.

Education

Early Education

The document reflects advice provided by the county council on the need for at least one additional facility for early years education (excluding the Candlet Road site subject to an appeal). The detail provided is paragraphs 3.39 to 3.41 is welcomed. During the previous stage, the county council highlighted ways in which policy FPP15 could be more supportive of early education in retail centres, as part of a balanced policy which also protects the vitality and viability of retail centres. The county raised the point that policy FPP16 (previously FPP17) would support early years provision, which SCDC has considered. Therefore, our councils agree that early years facilities can be considered as “other local services” within FPP16.

Primary Education

The challenge presented by the distribution of housing proposed for ensuring sufficient additional primary school places has been recognised in the submission version. Land needs to be identified for a new primary school in order to ensure that there can be confidence of a long term solution for primary school provision. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in identifying options for sites based on the pattern of development coming forward and the need to find a location that promotes sustainable travel choices. The two locations identified and other alternatives as stated in para. 3.44 provide a clear indication of how a site could be identified. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in keeping the expected size of school and the area of land required under review.

Transport

A report by AECOM, on behalf of Highways England and Suffolk County Council (SCC), to assess the cumulative impact of development proposed in the Area Action Plan on the local and strategic road networks is attached to this response. In addition to the sites identified, this report implicitly includes background growth port-related traffic and the growth throughout the district.

The Suffolk County Council supports the creation of a link road between Candlet Road and High Street Walton. The intention of this link is that it is designed to serve local journeys so that the impacts from rerouting are localised.

I hope that these comments are helpful. Please contact me via the details at the top of this letter, if we or any of our colleagues can be of assistance.
Summary: The challenge presented by the distribution of housing proposed for ensuring sufficient additional primary school places has been recognised in the submission version. Land needs to be identified for a new primary school in order to ensure that there can be confidence of a long term solution for primary school provision. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in identifying options for sites based on the pattern of development coming forward and the need to find a location that promotes sustainable travel choices. The two locations identified and other alternatives as stated in para. 3.44 provide a clear indication of how a site could be identified. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in keeping the expected size of school and the area of land required under review.

Change to Plan: N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed submission version of the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Whilst in principal we have no objections to raise we would request some modifications:

Policy FPP3; Land at Sea Road, Felixstowe,
Policy FPP5: Land north of Conway Close and Swallow Close, Felixstowe
Policy FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin
Policy FPP10 : Land at Bridge Road, Felixstowe
Policy FPP11: Land at Carr Road/Langer Road, Felixstowe
Policy FFP12: Land at Haven Exchange, Felixstowe
. Confirmation of adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or action to upgrade to create the required capacity.

3.81. The capacity of the foul sewerage network is a constraint that needs to be overcome to the satisfaction of Anglian Water. Suffolk County Council have statutory responsibility for Surface Water Management. (Note: The subject of foul and surface water issues need to be separated)

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you wish to discuss the above comments,

Summary:
Whilst in principal we have no objections to raise we would request some modifications:
Policy FPP3; Land at Sea Road, Felixstowe,
. Confirmation of adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or action to upgrade to create the required capacity. 
We support the inclusion of bullet point 4 in policy FFP3 which states residential accommodation will not be permitted on the ground floor and that there must be a means of internal escape to higher levels within the building.
Funding If relocation/building costs prove too high, The Club's existence could be endangered. Accessibility, the new site is not on a bus route - access for disabled and visually impaired club members will require some creative thinking and support if they are to continue using this club. Independent access to the club via public transport, & being able to develop a new skill, has given one member the confidence to go back into employment. His access to the proposed new site could be difficult, without thought being given as to how he can get there and back.
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the possible impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II* Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We considered that development here would urbanise the setting of this important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance. It was expressed that harm would also be caused to the Grade II lodge and we strongly advised that an alternative site was found for development, though it was thought that there may be scope for some limited development at the eastern end of this site.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfilling the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words 'and their setting' in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

FFP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe (502e)
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

FFP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be
protected.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed. At Preferred Options stage, we considered 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 note that the policy still does not include this requirement (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.88.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

FPFP7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin (451c and 451d)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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 references in paragraph 3.104 and Policy FFP7 bullet point 7 to the setting of the churches and high quality developments, sympathetic to the character of the area and Listed Buildings.

FPFP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary (383f and 451f)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

Town Centre
FPFP13: Felixstowe Town Centre and FFP14: Retail Frontages
As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FFP13 and FFP14.

District Centres
FPFP16: District Centres
As above in previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.

Tourism and Sea Front Activities

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).
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word 'on' with 'to'.

FPFP18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FPFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point, FPFP20: Cobbolds Point to Spa, FPFP21: Spa to Martello Park and FPFP22 Martello Park to Landguard

We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FPFP23: Car Parking

At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the 'high quality of design' requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FPFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment

At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe's archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council’s approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area

We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report 'Felixstowe South Conservation Area' commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to

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).
identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment. The conservation area survey identified the loss of architectural detail as a significant problem, and consideration might therefore be given to applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a Townscape Heritage programme for the area, or a smaller partnership scheme with Historic England to reinstate lost architectural details on key buildings etc.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden
We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Other Issues
Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding
At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary:
We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words "and their setting" in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.

Change to Plan
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Sound? Not Specified
Duty to Cooperate? Not Specified
Soundness Tests N/A
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Housing 3.75
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Although I fully agree with SCDC’s support for the Rifle Club in its Policy Statement FPP4 12.82 I would like to see the requirement (ref 3.65) for “appropriate funding and finances to be in place” to be included in the Policy statement 12.82. As the level of funding required may be unachievable, due to the high projected costing. If this is the case I would suggest the Rifle Club remains where it is and acts as a buffer between the A14 Dock Spur and any proposed housing. Noise issues are addressable.
We understand the need for extra housing in the Felixstowe area. But it must be done in keeping with the community feel and spirit.

Certain sites are totally unsuitable and will cause untold problems. Instead of solving issues it will cause more. We feel that having 2 main sites with a reduced footprint would spread the stress on Felixstowe's infrastructure; the opposite side of the A14 have a school, possibly a good site to build new homes.

High Street Walton. This site has always been identified as a potential site but the size and location are of serious worry. A large housing estate without proper access will turn the High Road into a car park. Any access from Candlet Road will always have knock on issues to the main dock spur roundabout. As above you could reduce the amount of housing, creating a better atmosphere within the estate and help the high road.

Conway Close. Although in old Felixstowe the access to Colneis Road/Candlet Road/A14 is excellent A limited well thought out estate would provide one of the most sort after area as to live in on the Peninsular.

Howlett Road. We worry about its effect on the local sewer network. This area is already under stress, adding 360 more houses on such a vast scale as proposed would put a huge strain on schools, doctors, drainage, roads etc. This will add another 600 vehicles to the road system and the access is poor. Already we have had many accidents down this road this will only add to more near misses and accidents. We will lose a Village and it will become a Town concreting over the country will change the nature and character of Trimley.

Leisure activities, like horse riding, dog walking, cycling would all be affected by Trimleys green fields shrinking.

Hand In Hand - That part of the high road is bad at the best of times. The road thins dangerously and the addition of further housing would make this unsuitable. Unless you could widen the road OR make it one way we would be totally against this build.

I would reiterate our initial point. A spread of new housing over Walton / and Conway would provide a boost to Felixstowe but remove major issues it would cause to the infrastructure.

High Street Walton. This site has always been identified as a potential site but the size and location are of serious worry. A large housing estate without proper access will turn the High Road into a car park. Any access from Candlet Road will always have knock on issues to the main dock spur roundabout. As above you could reduce the amount of housing, creating a better atmosphere within the estate and help the high road.
Thank you for your letter dated 14th April 2016 regarding the above consultation. We have had the opportunity to assess the letter and consultation documents and can offer the following advice. Please note we have provided comments on the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies within a separate letter to you dated the same. This follows two previous consultations and our comments dated 25th February 2015 and 24th November 2015.

In terms of our general comments:

Recent Guidance from Historic England

We have recently published guidance on The Historic Environment in Local Plans and the Historic Environment and Site Allocations. Where we have not made comment below some additional guidance on ensuring a positive strategy for the historic environment is secured within the Felixstowe Area Action Plan can be seen by following these links <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa1-historic-environment-local-plans/> and <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/>.

In terms of our site specific comments:

FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe (451g)

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the possible impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II* Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We highlighted that the principal elevation of Walton Hall faces north and overlooks site 451g. It was considered that development here would urbanise the setting of this important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance. It was expressed that harm would also be caused to the Grade II lodge and we strongly advised that an alternative site was found for development, though it was thought that there may be scope for some limited development at the eastern end of this site.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfil the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words 'and their setting' in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

FPP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe (502e)

At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be
Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed. At Preferred Options stage, we considered 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 note that the policy still does not include this requirement (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.88. 

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

FPP7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin (451c and 451d)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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 references in paragraph 3.104 and Policy FPP7 bullet point 7 to the setting of the churches and high quality developments, sympathetic to the character of the area and Listed Buildings.

FPP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary (383f and 451f)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

Town Centre
FPP13: Felixstowe Town Centre and FFP14: Retail Frontages
As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FPP13 and FPP14.

District Centres
FPP16: District Centres
As above in previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.

Tourism and Sea Front Activities
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word 'on' with 'to'.

FFP18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point, FPP20: Cobbolds Point to Spa, FFP21: Spa to Martello Park and FFP22 Martello Park to Landguard
We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FFP23: Car Parking
At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the 'high quality of design' requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe's archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council’s approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area
We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report 'Felixstowe South Conservation Area' commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to...
identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment. The conservation area survey identified the loss of architectural detail as a significant problem, and consideration might therefore be given to applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a Townscape Heritage programme for the area, or a smaller partnership scheme with Historic England to reinstate lost architectural details on key buildings etc.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: “local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment”. The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the “positive strategy” required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden
We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Other Issues
Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding
At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary:
We advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfil the Public Open Space requirement. However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. Paragraph 157 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Plans to provide detail with site allocations where appropriate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Policy FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7805</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appear at exam?**
- Not Specified

**Legal?**
- Not Specified

**Sound?**
- No

**Duty to Cooperate?**
- Not Specified

**Soundness Tests**
- iii, iv

**Attachments:**
- Scanned Representation

---

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).
The Sustainability Appraisal of policy FPP4 identifies that the policy will have a minor negative impact on SA objective 17 (To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity). The implementation of adopted plan policies should not negatively affect biodiversity and the policy should therefore be revised to ensure that this is the case.

Site allocations and plan policies should ensure that impacts on biodiversity are properly assessed. Any identified adverse impacts must then be either avoided; mitigated or compensated in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy (as per the requirements of chapter 11 of the NPPF). Local Plans should also seek to enhance developments for biodiversity. This policy should therefore be revised to ensure that it does not result in an adverse biodiversity impact, to ensure that the plan is "Sound". If this cannot be achieved the policy should not be adopted.

Summary: SA objective 17 scores 'minor negative', policy should be revised to ensure that implementation does not result in an adverse impact on biodiversity. If this cannot be achieved the policy should not be adopted.

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ii, iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments:
I write in response to the above consultation to submit representations on behalf of my client, Trinity College Cambridge, in respect of the draft allocation of Preferred Policy FPP4 - land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe.

Trinity College Cambridge owns this site and supports its proposed allocation for residential development.

The allocation of the site will make an important contribution towards the pressing need for new housing and the Council's commitment to the delivery of at least 1,760 new dwellings in Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimleys between 2010 and 2027, as set out in the adopted Core Strategy.

The Core Strategy acknowledges that the growth of jobs in the area, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one. This had led to an unsustainable increase of in-commuting from other towns on a daily basis. In addition, the population in the area is increasing at the same time as average house-hold sizes are falling, further increasing the need for housing. The number and type of new homes provided in recent years has not matched this increase in demand. Addressing these issues must be a priority for the Council through the AAP and Trinity College will be supportive in helping it to do so.

The importance of boosting housing supply in Felixstowe is reaffirmed by the Council's commitment to pursuing an early review of the Core Strategy's strategic policies to address objectively assessed housing needs, which are higher than the levels of growth currently being planned for. More sites are likely to be required to come forward on the peninsula over and above those proposed for allocation in the AAP to meet those needs. It is therefore critical to prioritise the delivery of housing.

The urgency to get the AAP in place to encourage the delivery of housing is heightened by the current deficit in the five-year supply of deliverable housing sites in Suffolk Coastal District as required by Paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). As such, the presumption in favour of sustainable development is applicable to residential applications coming forward within the District. This is confirmed by an appeal decision for a site at Fairfield Road, Framlingham published on 25 April 2016, where an Inspector assessed the Council's housing land supply at 3.7 years at best, concluding:

"The relevant five-year period for an assessment of housing delivery is April 2015 to March 2020 and during that period the BT Adastral Park site will contribute only 200 dwellings towards housing supply. It is appropriate to apply a 20% buffer and it is necessary to require the shortfall in previous housing delivery to be delivered over the first five years, and not over the remainder, of the plan period. Based on these three main factors, and setting aside the debate about housing delivery being based on the OAN for the District rather than the CS figure of 7,900 dwellings, it is estimated that the Council has a housing land supply of only about 3.7 years. Even if only one of the three main factors is correct the Council does not have a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing. Furthermore, if the housing requirement is based on an OAN of 11,000 dwellings, as established in the CS, or on any realistic prediction of what an OAN for the District is likely to be, housing land supply is less than 3.7 years.

The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land and paragraph 49 of the NPPF is therefore engaged" (paras 27 and 28, appeal decision APP/J3530/W/15/3011466). This decision corroborates the outcomes of two earlier appeals for sites at North Entrance, Saxmundham (PINS ref: APP/J3530/A/14/2221769) and Woods Lane, Melton (APP/J3530/A/14/2225141), published in July and September 2015 respectively, where it was concluded that the District did not have a five-year housing land supply. This site represents a key opportunity to deliver much needed housing, address the District's housing supply deficit and to realise the objectives of the adopted Core Strategy.

This site is one of a number identified by the Council as being suitable for development in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA, 2014). My client supports the SHLAA's conclusion that the site is deliverable, being suitable, available and achievable for development within five years. The suitability of the site for housing is reaffirmed by its sustainability. The Sustainability Appraisal supporting the Proposed Submission AAP consultation identifies that it is one of the most sustainable on the peninsula, scoring particularly well in terms of social effects by providing access to a wide range of key services including employment, health and education. This is no surprise, for the following reasons:

* The site is located opposite Felixstowe Academy and within walking distance of a number of primary and pre-school facilities and the wide range of shops and services and facilities available on Walton High Street.

* It is adjacent to the main bus route (Walton High Street) connecting Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimleys with neighbouring centres and within walking distance of both Felixstowe and Trimley railway stations.

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).
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* Of those available for development, the site is one of the closest to the Port of Felixstowe and its other employment areas, making it ideally placed to help the Council to reverse unsustainable patterns of in-commuting to Felixstowe

* The site is entirely contained by Candlet Road to the north, Walton High Street to the south, the A14 (Port of Felixstowe Road) to the west, and existing residential development to the east, limiting the potential for development to encroach into the wider countryside or have harmful landscape impacts. The site is largely enclosed by existing established hedgerows, which can be supplemented to provide further landscape containment.

The site is ideally suited for residential development. Its allocation in the AAP is entirely consistent with the Core Strategy’s objectives to deliver organic and evolutionary growth on sites immediately abutting existing built up areas and it is likely to be the only site on the peninsula that can address the Council's aspirations to provide a link road between Walton High Street and Candlet Road.

Scale of residential development required

We welcome amendments to the wording of Policy FPP4 since the Preferred Options stage to provide some flexibility in the number of houses to be delivered, changing to an expectation that “approximately 400” dwellings will be delivered on the site rather than “at least 400”. 400 units is well above the SHLAA’s estimate of maximum capacity of 360 dwellings.

My client is bringing forward a planning application supported by a masterplan that will seek to deliver 385 dwellings. We consider this to be compliant with the Proposed Submission draft policy and, after extensive analysis of constraints, the maximum capacity of the site.

It is of paramount importance to ensure the delivery of high quality living environments and, ultimately, sustainable communities. It has been necessary to take other constraints into account, such as the need to respect the settings of nearby listed buildings, the requirement to provide sufficient on-site ecological mitigation, recreational provision, play and open space and the lack of market demand for flatted accommodation in this location. These factors have impinged the quantum of development that can be achieved. We welcome the Council’s amendments which will ensure that density can be informed by the constraints of the site, whilst making every effort to make best use of the land available.

Felixstowe Rifle Club

Relocation

The site currently accommodates a rifle range facility, the use of which is leased to Felixstowe Rifle Club by Trinity College Cambridge. The College is a long term supporter of the Rifle Club, having leased the existing site and facilities on very favourable terms for many years, and acknowledges the importance of providing an alternative facility that can be used by the Club to allow for development.

The College has been actively working with Felixstowe Rifle Club to progress proposals for an alternative facility on land that it owns to the north of the railway line off Nicholas Road, Trimley St Mary. Outline planning permission with all matters reserved except access was granted for a new rifle range off Nicholas Road on 13 March 2014 (Planning Ref: C/13/0967). The College is continuing to work with the Club’s committee members to prepare a reserved matters application which is due to be submitted for approval shortly. 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.

Whilst there are no objections to the need for an alternative range to be provided, or for it to be equivalent in quantity and quality to the existing facility, the College objects to the requirement for the alternative site to be equally as accessible as the existing site for a number of reasons.

First and foremost, the requirement is inconsistent with national planning policy contained in the NPPF and adopted local policy set out in the Core Strategy and is therefore unsound. In summary:

■ Where existing sporting facilities are to be displaced, paragraph 74 of the NPPF requires that an alternative facility needs to be of an "equivalent or better quantity or quality and in a suitable location". Whilst requiring a "suitable" location, it does not stipulate that it should be of equal accessibility to existing facility.

■ In the same circumstances, policy DM32 of the adopted Core Strategy requires that "an equivalent facility must be provided in a location agreed with the District Council". Again, whilst the location needs to be agreed with the Council, it is not stipulated that it should be of equal accessibility.

The location of the alternative facility off Nicholas Road and its means of access were agreed and approved by the Council as part of the outline planning permission. The following extracts are taken from the Officer’s Report to Committee confirm why the new location was deemed to be suitable. The Officer Report is attached to these representations for review:

"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."

Despite this clearly expressed agreement on the suitability of the location of the alternative venue and the extant planning permission that has subsequently been granted, the new site may not be considered as accessible as the existing facility or to comply with the draft AAP policy in its current form. This is largely because the existing venue is in an exceptionally accessible location, adjacent to Walton High Street and the main bus route linking Walton, Felixstowe and the Trimenleys to the wider area. As such, it is unlikely that any site could be found to satisfy the policy as drafted, regardless of our concerns over soundness. The following factors are relevant:

- The noise impacts of the Club’s activities mean that it needs to be located away from residential properties to avoid causing unacceptable disturbance. This inevitably means that it must be located in a relatively remote location which is less likely to be served by regular public transport. This was acknowledged by the Council when planning permission was granted for the Nicholas Road site.
- The rifle range is only in such an accessible location now because it has occupied the site for around 100 years, during which the surrounding area has gradually developed for residential use and wider public transport services provided.
- The need to locate the Club’s activities away from housing means that it cannot be retained on site. Doing so would limit the amount of housing that could be provided and make the objective of delivering approximately 400 dwellings in this location impossible to achieve, meaning that the requirements of policy FPP4 as a whole were undeliverable. Indeed, the accessibility and sustainability of the site is a key factor in its selection as a location for strategic housing growth. This must be balanced with the acknowledged needs to the Club. In any case, the location of the new site and the facilities to be provided were agreed with Felixstowe Rifle Club prior to submitting the outline planning application. Indeed, the outline application was submitted jointly with the Club. Trinity College Cambridge has since invested significantly in progressing the proposals through the outline approval process and towards a reserved matters planning application. The College remains convinced that the relocation of the range to the Nicholas Road site, which is close to the existing venue, Trimley railway station and the bus services serving the wider area, is the optimum solution for Felixstowe Rifle Club.

To make the draft policy consistent with national policy and sound, the Council should remove the requirement for the replacement venue to be ‘of equivalent (or greater) accessibility as the existing facility’ and simply require than the alternative venue is ‘suitable’.

Timing of re-provision

As drafted, policy FPP4 requires the new facility to be provided “ahead of the site being redeveloped”. Due to the size of the wider site, it is likely that it will take several years to develop in several phases. The activities of the Club could continue for some time whilst housing is constructed and occupied in other parts of the site. It is therefore unnecessary, unjustified and unsound to require that no development takes place prior to re-provision of the range.

To ensure that the Club’s activities can continue without undue interruption, the College objects to this part of the policy as drafted and requests that it is amended to require the alternative venue to be secured and provided “ahead of the removal and demolition of the existing facility”.

Funding

Whilst the College has been and will continue to be a strong supporter of Felixstowe Rifle Club, all parties must acknowledge that providing a new facility for the Club is not a viable commercial venture in isolation and is entirely unrelated to the core education and research objectives that the College exists to promote. As the need to provide a replacement facility is a consequence of planning policy and the objective to deliver approximately 400 new dwellings on this site, the cost of doing so will need to be taken into account in any discussions on viability and negotiations regarding other planning obligations. The College will be taking forward discussions on this subject with Planning Officers shortly as part of the planning application process.

Other site requirements

We have acute concerns about the range of other aspirations for the site contained in draft policy FPP4 and its supporting text. The AAP suggests that proposals should have regard to the need for a new link road between Candlet Road and High Street, new business units, on-site open space and play equipment and delivery of an alternative facility
for Felixstowe Rifle Club alongside the delivery of approximately 400 new homes.

Whilst my client is willing to co-operate with the Council wherever possible, the local planning authority must be realistic about what the site can deliver and prioritise the most important objectives for Felixstowe. We strongly contend that making the best use of the site to deliver housing and its supporting infrastructure should take primacy as a consequence of the need to support the Port, the Core Strategy's commitment to deliver a minimum of 1,760 dwellings in Felixstowe before 2027, the Council's five-year housing supply deficit and the likelihood of an increased requirement within the same timescale arising from the forthcoming early review. Seeking to impose a range of other requirements that are of less importance will only harm viability and, as a minimum, the amount of affordable housing that can be supported alongside CIL and other development costs.

The Council must consider that most of Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimleys is in an area assessed as being of "low" land value in the viability evidence prepared to support its CIL examination. This makes sites particularly sensitive to excessive policy burdens. Paragraph 173 of the NPPF makes clear that pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan making and decision making, stating that:

"sites identified in the Plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions and other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing landowner and willing developer to enable development to be deliverable."

The Council must be satisfied that the policy burdens it is seeking to impose on the site, in addition to the CIL charge that will apply, will not threaten its viability or the willingness of my client to release it for development. We have not seen any evidence to suggest that this has been fully taken into account and will need to ensure that it is addressed as proposals become more advanced towards an application submission.

We have specific concerns in respect of the following matters:

Requirement for Business Units

My client objects to the requirement for the site to deliver business units due to the potential impact on viability and the absence of evidence demonstrating a need as outlined under Policy FPP4 and at paragraph 4.30 of the AAP. As a consequence, the draft policy is unjustified in this respect. Representations were made during the Preferred Options Consultation on the AAP to this effect and my client is disappointed to see that the Council has maintained the requirement whilst providing no further justification or evidence to support it.

In accordance with Paragraph 160 of the NPPF, the Council should have a clear understanding of the business needs within its area, working with neighbouring authorities to prepare and maintain a robust evidence base. The evidence base on employment needs is out of date, with the most recent economic assessments dating from 2011 (Suffolk’s Local Economic Assessment) and 2010 (Oxford Economics Suffolk Coastal Profile and Outlook). In any case, neither of these studies identifies a need for more non-port related employment space on this site or in Felixstowe, or provides any support for the Council's contention that a lack of available non-port related facilities is preventing business growth in the area. Indeed, their main recommendations focus on the need to support the Port of Felixstowe, which the Core Strategy seeks to achieve by providing more housing for employees in closer proximity.

The aspiration to deliver business units on this site appears to have originated from the 'Local Strategy for Felixstowe' prepared by David Lock Associates in 2005 and published in 2006. This document was prepared to set out a 'vision' to guide regeneration in the future but was not in itself based on robust evidence of employment needs and is in any case now ten years old and out of date. The notes from the AAP Member Working Group Meeting held on 3 August 2015 confirm that the requirement to provide non-port related employment space is an 'aspiration' and the AAP should not cite the David Lock report as justification for pursuing it due to the time that has elapsed since it was prepared. As a consequence, the AAP does not refer to any evidence to support its request for business units to come forward.

Previous planning consents (1998) on Trinity College commercial expansion land at Clickett Hill Road had included B1 restrictions introduced to try and stimulate demand for B1 diversification on approximately 7 acres, which despite extensive marketing for well over a decade failed to achieve the policy requirement. Haven Gateway Partnership commissioned a Feasibility Study (Felixstowe Enterprise Village) from DTZ in 2004 which examined the potential for B1 business and incubator space on the Clickett Hill site. This study is submitted alongside these representations for reference. It concluded the market for non-port related B1 incubator space to be non-viable without gap funding, a position which we consider has not changed to the present day. Although a B1 HQ building has now finally been constructed some 15 years later on part of the site, this is for a one in twenty-year Port related HQ occupier; the remainder of the B1 allocation area (4.25 acres) has recently been granted planning consent for B8 Port related use.

In addition, the Council have not provided any evidence or justification as to why there is a need for business units to be located in the north western corner of the site to provide a noise attenuation buffer adjacent to the Port of Felixstowe Road and Candlet Road, as required by the draft policy and paragraph 3.62. A planning application submitted for mixed use development of the site in 2013 (ref: C/13/0058) proposed residential development adjacent to these boundaries, with noise mitigated by an acoustic landscaped bund and fence. The Council's Environmental Health Officers confirmed...
that these proposals were acceptable and impacts of noise were not cited as reasons for refusing the application. A similar approach is intended for the planning application currently being prepared. Noise testing has been undertaken in support of the proposals using SoundPlan noise modelling and is submitted to accompany these representations. The noise assessment results, which are submitted alongside these representations for reference, demonstrate that noise levels can be maintained below 55 dBA eq at the properties closest to the boundary of the site with the A14 and Candlet Road in accordance with World Health Organisation's Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) guidelines BS 8233:2014. There is no need for business units to be located in this area to provide a further buffer. This policy requirement is therefore unjustified and unsound when considered against Paragraph 182 of the NPPF where policies must be “based upon proportionate evidence”.

Taking account of the lack of any evidence demonstrating a need for business units on this site, the impacts of their provision on the availability of land for housing (for which there is clearly a pressing need), the potential impacts on viability of the scheme as a whole and my client’s evidence demonstrating that that traffic noise impacts can be suitably mitigated without them, the need for business units must be removed from the draft policy.

Requirement for Open and Play Space

In bringing forward proposals for the development of the site, my client is aware of the need to provide substantial amounts of green open space on the High Street frontage to protect the setting of the nearby listed buildings. This will limit the amount of open space that can be provided elsewhere within the site whilst delivering the scale of residential development the Council is seeking.

My client is happy to bring forward a development that addresses with the Council’s adopted play and open space standards, as set out in the Core Strategy under policies SP16 and SP17, the Outdoor Playing Space SPG, the Council’s Leisure Strategy 2014 - 2024 and Objective 12 and 13 of the AAP which requires that the AAP improves access to green space and minimises the potential impacts of development on the Orwell and Deben estuaries by providing appropriate mitigation measures. As part of the masterplanning exercise undertaken for the site, a significant amount of open space is proposed, including a green linear park running north to south centrally within the scheme acting as a Gateway to Felixstowe and by also providing an enclosed dog walking recreational area to minimise effects on protected wildlife sites in the wider area.

My client objects to the inclusion of these requirements within the draft Policy FPP4 as it is considered unnecessary due to policy requirements regarding open and play space already secured by national planning policy, the Core Strategy and the SPG. There is no need for the Council to repeat these policy requirements within the AAP.

Requirements for a transport assessment, air quality assessment and archaeological assessment.

These requirements can be secured by way of national planning policy, the adopted Core Strategy and a validation checklist for the submission of a planning application. My client has commissioned this work to be undertaken as part of the proposed development at Walton North and this evidence will be submitted as part of a planning application. Their inclusion as draft policies within the AAP unnecessary. As such, my client considers that these three bullet points should be removed from the draft policy FPP4.

Requirement for affordable housing provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2 and a range of housing types and tenures in keeping with surrounding area band in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6.

These policy requirements are already secured through the Core Strategy so repeating them within the draft AAP as policies is unnecessary. As such, my client considers that these two bullet points should be removed from the draft policy FPP4.

Requirement for improving the capacity of the foul sewerage network

In bringing forward proposals for the development of the site, my client has been in consultation with Anglian Water and has been advised of an indicative fee for the upgrade of the foul sewerage network. This can be secured by planning obligation or other legal agreement.

Requirements for development to be sympathetic to Walton Hall and 362 High Street and their setting.

In bringing forward proposals for the development of the site, my client has appointed a project team to undertake a detailed, in-depth masterplanning exercise in order to produce an outline masterplan that is sensitive and considerate to the listed buildings and their setting. This includes setting aside land opposite Walton Hall and around 362 High Street as open space to respect the buildings’ settings.

362 High Street is owned by my client and the proposals for the development of the site will seek to enhance its setting by enlarging its curtilage, providing additional tree planting around the north, east and west boundary edges, providing a green buffer to reinforce its existing landscaped enclosure and enhance its landmark appearance in views up and down the High Street.

Consideration of heritage constraints has been a key component feature throughout the masterplanning process and detailed pre-application discussions have been undertaken with Planning and Conservation Officers at the Council to...
shape the indicative layout. My client has also sought to engage with Historic England prior to an application being submitted to demonstrate how the setting of Walton Hall and 362 High Street have been respected and enhanced as part of the Masterplan proposals. An outline Masterplan has been produced that provides a well-designed residential led development whilst being sympathetic to and enhancing the setting of both Walton Hall and 362 High Street.

Conclusion

In summary, my client is supportive of the proposed allocation of the site to provide a significant amount of new housing to help meet the minimum targets adopted in the Core Strategy, support the needs of the workforce of the Port of Felixstowe, help reverse unsustainable patterns of in-commuting and assist the Council in meeting its five-year housing supply requirements.

However, my client has real concerns about the range of other aspirations that proposals for the site are expected to have regard to, including the draft policy requirements to:

■ Secure a replacement venue for Felixstowe Rifle Club that is equally accessible as the current rifle range, which is inconsistent with national policy, the adopted Core Strategy and the planning permission granted by the Council for a new venue off Nicholas Road in Trimley St Mary.

■ Secure a replacement venue for Felixstowe Rifle Club prior to the redevelopment of the site. Relocation can be secured alongside the phased development of the site and does not need to delay the delivery of housing.

■ Provide business units, for which there is no evidence of market need or demand or necessity in respect of noise attenuation. A requirement to provide business units will inevitably restrict the capacity of the site to deliver housing and potentially diminish the viability of the scheme as a whole.

In accordance with Paragraph 182 of the NPPF, in order to be considered ‘sound’ policies in Local Plans must be consistent with national policy, founded in proportionate evidence and based on a strategy that seeks to meet objectively assessed development needs. Whilst we welcome the allocation of the site for housing, for the reasons set out within these representations we do not consider some of the policy requirements of FPP4 to be sound. We would urge the Council to focus on the priority, which is to make the best use of land to deliver housing whilst protecting sites elsewhere. It is disappointing that representations made on various matters at the Preferred Options AAP consultation appear not to have been addressed prior to the Proposed Submission consultation and trust that they will be taken into account prior to or during the examination in public.

Summary:

I write in response to the above consultation to submit representations on behalf of my client, Trinity College Cambridge, in respect of the draft allocation of Preferred Policy FPP4 - land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe. Trinity College Cambridge owns this site and supports its proposed allocation for residential development. The allocation of the site will make an important contribution towards the pressing need for new housing and the Council’s commitment to the delivery of at least 1,760 new dwellings in Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimleys between 2010 and 2027, as set out in the adopted Core Strategy.

Change to Plan

N/A

No Yes Yes Yes N/A

Attachments:
Feasibility Study for the Felixstowe Enterprise Village
Noise Assessment
Outline Permission C_13_0967 Officer Report
Thank you for consulting Suffolk County Council on submission version for development in Felixstowe.

Suffolk County Council responded previously to the preferred options stage in November 2015. This response does not rehearse all the issues as Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) has responded well to the points that the county council made at the time.

The following response relates to the ways in which the development of these sites affects county council responsibilities, and how our authorities will need to work together to bring these sites forward in a successful way.

This letter does not take into account the impact of sites which may come forward as windfall development, which may have significant impacts on local infrastructure.

Archaeology

Additional text has been systematically added in general information about archaeology, using the county council’s previous comments. It introduces archaeology throughout the document and gives the plan a sound approach to archaeology.

Suffolk County Council Archaeology has reviewed the document and the only minor outstanding matters relate to suggested amendments and the terminology used in the following paragraphs:

Para. 3.74 (FPP4) - the site will require archaeological excavation rather than assessment, as it has already been assessed. Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service can provide a brief for the works and also discuss options for preservation in situ.

Paras. 3.82 (FPP5), 3.101 (FPP7), 3.109 (FPP8) - Change the reference to archaeological assessment “prior to the development of the site” to “at an appropriate design stage prior to the granting of outline, technical details or full planning permission.” This will allow for preservation in situ, where appropriate, of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed, for which conditions may or may not be sufficient.

With regard to FFP12 (Land at Haven Exchange), which is an enabling policy, archaeological investigation will be required, particularly for larger schemes.

Education

Early Education

The document reflects advice provided by the county council on the need for at least one additional facility for early years education (excluding the Candlet Road site subject to an appeal). The detail provided is paragraphs 3.39 to 3.41 is welcomed. During the previous stage, the county council highlighted ways in which policy FPP15 could be more supportive of early education in retail centres, as part of a balanced policy which also protects the vitality and viability of retail centres. The county raised the point that policy FPP16 (previously FPP17) would support early years provision, which SCDC has considered. Therefore, our councils agree that early years facilities can be considered as “other local services” within FPP16.

Primary Education

The challenge presented by the distribution of housing proposed for ensuring sufficient additional primary school places has been recognised in the submission version. Land needs to be identified for a new primary school in order to ensure that there can be confidence of a long term solution for primary school provision. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in identifying options for sites based on the pattern of development coming forward and the need to find a location that promotes sustainable travel choices. The two locations identified and other alternatives as stated in para. 3.44 provide a clear indication of how a site could be identified. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in keeping the expected size of school and the area of land required under review.

Transport

A report by AECOM, on behalf of Highways England and Suffolk County Council (SCC), to assess the cumulative impact of development proposed in the Area Action Plan on the local and strategic road networks is attached to this response. In addition to the sites identified, this report implicitly includes background growth port-related traffic and the growth throughout the district.

The Suffolk County Council supports the creation of a link road between Candlet Road and High Street Walton. The intention of this link is that it is designed to serve local journeys so that the impacts from rerouting are localised.

I hope that these comments are helpful. Please contact me via the details at the top of this letter, if we or any of our colleagues can be of assistance.
Summary: Para. 3.74 (FPP4) - the site will require archaeological excavation rather than assessment, as it has already been assessed. Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service can provide a brief for the works and also discuss options for preservation in situ.
Thank you for consulting Suffolk County Council on submission version for development in Felixstowe.

Suffolk County Council responded previously to the preferred options stage in November 2015. This response does not rehearse all the issues as Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) has responded well to the points that the county council made at the time.

The following response relates to the ways in which the development of these sites affects county council responsibilities, and how our authorities will need to work together to bring these sites forward in a successful way.

This letter does not take into account the impact of sites which may come forward as windfall development, which may have significant impacts on local infrastructure.

Archaeology

Additional text has been systematically added in general information about archaeology, using the county council’s previous comments. It introduces archaeology throughout the document and gives the plan a sound approach to archaeology.

Suffolk County Council Archaeology has reviewed the document and the only minor outstanding matters relate to suggested amendments and the terminology used in the following paragraphs:

Para. 3.74 (FPP4) - the site will require archaeological excavation rather than assessment, as it has already been assessed. Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service can provide a brief for the works and also discuss options for preservation in situ.

Paras. 3.82 (FPP5), 3.94 (FPP6), 3.101 (FPP7), 3.109 (FPP8) - Change the reference to archaeological assessment “prior to the development of the site” to “at an appropriate design stage prior to the granting of outline, technical details or full planning permission.” This will allow for preservation in situ, where appropriate, of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed, for which conditions may or may not be sufficient.

With regard to FFP12 (Land at Haven Exchange), which is an enabling policy, archaeological investigation will be required, particularly for larger schemes.

Education

Early Education

The document reflects advice provided by the county council on the need for at least one additional facility for early years education (excluding the Candlet Road site subject to an appeal). The detail provided is paragraphs 3.39 to 3.41 is welcomed. During the previous stage, the county council highlighted ways in which policy FPP15 could be more supportive of early education in retail centres, as part of a balanced policy which also protects the vitality and viability of retail centres. The county raised the point that policy FPP16 (previously FPP17) would support early years provision, which SCDC has considered. Therefore, our councils agree that early years facilities can be considered as “other local services” within FPP16.

Primary Education

The challenge presented by the distribution of housing proposed for ensuring sufficient additional primary school places has been recognised in the submission version. Land needs to be identified for a new primary school in order to ensure that there can be confidence of a long term solution for primary school provision. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in identifying options for sites based on the pattern of development coming forward and the need to find a location that promotes sustainable travel choices. The two locations identified and other alternatives as stated in para. 3.44 provide a clear indication of how a site could be identified. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in keeping the expected size of school and the area of land required under review.

Transport

A report by AECOM, on behalf of Highways England and Suffolk County Council (SCC), to assess the cumulative impact of development proposed in the Area Action Plan on the local and strategic road networks is attached to this response. In addition to the sites identified, this report implicitly includes background growth port-related traffic and the growth throughout the district.

The Suffolk County Council supports the creation of a link road between Candlet Road and High Street Walton. The intention of this link is that it is designed to serve local journeys so that the impacts from rerouting are localised.

I hope that these comments are helpful. Please contact me via the details at the top of this letter, if we or any of our colleagues can be of assistance.
Summary: The Suffolk County Council supports the creation of a link road between Candlet Road and High Street Walton. The intention of this link is that it is designed to serve local journeys so that the impacts from rerouting are localised.
I write in response to the above consultation to submit representations on behalf of my client, Trinity College Cambridge, in respect of the draft allocation of Preferred Policy FPP4 - land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe.

Preferred Policy FPP4 - Land North of High Street, Walton, Felixstowe

Trinity College Cambridge owns this site and supports its proposed allocation for residential development.

The allocation of the site will make an important contribution towards the pressing need for new housing and the Council's commitment to the delivery of at least 1,760 new dwellings in Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimleys between 2010 and 2027, as set out in the adopted Core Strategy.

The Core Strategy acknowledges that the growth of jobs in the area, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one. This had led to an unsustainable increase of in-commuting from other towns on a daily basis. In addition, the population in the area is increasing at the same time as average house-hold sizes are falling, further increasing the need for housing. The number and type of new homes provided in recent years has not matched this increase in demand. Addressing these issues must be a priority for the Council through the AAP and Trinity College will be supportive in helping it to do so.

The importance of boosting housing supply in Felixstowe is reaffirmed by the Council's commitment to pursuing an early review of the Core Strategy's strategic policies to address objectively assessed housing needs, which are higher than the levels of growth currently being planned for. More sites are likely to be required to come forward on the peninsula over and above those proposed for allocation in the AAP to meet those needs. It is therefore critical to prioritise the delivery of housing.

The urgency to get the AAP in place to encourage the delivery of housing is heightened by the current deficit in the five-year supply of deliverable housing sites in Suffolk Coastal District as required by Paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). As such, the presumption in favour of sustainable development is applicable to residential applications coming forward within the District. This is confirmed by an appeal decision for a site at Fairfield Road, Framlingham published on 25 April 2016, where an Inspector assessed the Council's housing land supply at 3.7 years at best, concluding:

"The relevant five-year period for an assessment of housing delivery is April 2015 to March 2020 and during that period the BT Adastral Park site will contribute only 200 dwellings towards housing supply. It is appropriate to apply a 20% buffer and it is necessary to require the shortfall in previous housing delivery to be delivered over the first five years, and not over the remainder, of the plan period. Based on these three main factors, and setting aside the debate about housing delivery being based on the OAN for the District rather than the CS figure of 7,900 dwellings, it is estimated that the Council has a housing land supply of only about 3.7 years. Even if only one of the three main factors is correct the Council does not have a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing. Furthermore, if the housing requirement is based on an OAN of 11,000 dwellings, as established in the CS, or on any realistic prediction of what an OAN for the District is likely to be, housing land supply is less than 3.7 years.

The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land and paragraph 49 of the NPPF is therefore engaged" (paras 27 and 28, appeal decision APP/J3530/W/15/3011466).

This decision corroborates the outcomes of two earlier appeals for sites at North Entrance, Saxmundham (PINS ref: APP/J3530/A/14/2221769) and Woods Lane, Melton (APP/J3530/A/14/2225141), published in July and September 2015 respectively, where it was concluded that the District did not have a five-year housing land supply. This site represents a key opportunity to deliver much needed housing, address the District's housing supply deficit and to realise the objectives of the adopted Core Strategy.

This site is one of a number identified by the Council as being suitable for development in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA, 2014). My client supports the SHLAA's conclusion that the site is deliverable, being suitable, available and achievable for development within five years. The suitability of the site for housing is reaffirmed by its sustainability. The Sustainability Appraisal supporting the Proposed Submission AAP consultation identifies that it is one of the most sustainable on the peninsula, scoring particularly well in terms of social effects by providing access to a wide range of key services including employment, health and education. This is no surprise, for the following reasons:
The site is located opposite Felixstowe Academy and within walking distance of a number of primary and pre-school facilities and the wide range of shops and services and facilities available on Walton High Street.

* The site is adjacent to the main bus route (Walton High Street) connecting Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimleys with neighbouring centres and within walking distance of both Felixstowe and Trimley railway stations.

* Of those available for development, the site is one of the closest to the Port of Felixstowe and its other employment areas, making it ideally placed to help the Council to reverse unsustainable patterns of in-commuting to Felixstowe.

* The site is entirely contained by Candlet Road to the north, Walton High Street to the south, the A14 (Port of Felixstowe Road) to the west, and existing residential development to the east, limiting the potential for development to encroach into the wider countryside or have harmful landscape impacts. The site is largely enclosed by existing established hedgerows, which can be supplemented to provide further landscape containment.

The site is ideally suited for residential development. Its allocation in the AAP is entirely consistent with the Core Strategy’s objectives to deliver organic and evolutionary growth on sites immediately abutting existing built up areas and it is likely to be the only site on the peninsula that can address the Council’s aspirations to provide a link road between Walton High Street and Candlet Road.

Scale of residential development required

We welcome amendments to the wording of Policy FPP4 since the Preferred Options stage to provide some flexibility in the number of houses to be delivered, changing to an expectation that “approximately 400” dwellings will be delivered on the site rather than “at least 400”. 400 units is well above the SHLAA’s estimate of maximum capacity of 360 dwellings.

My client is bringing forward a planning application supported by a masterplan that will seek to deliver 385 dwellings. We consider this to be compliant with the Proposed Submission draft policy and, after extensive analysis of constraints, the maximum capacity of the site.

It is of paramount importance to ensure the delivery of high quality living environments and, ultimately, sustainable communities. It has been necessary to take other constraints into account, such as the need to respect the settings of nearby listed buildings, the requirement to provide sufficient on-site ecological mitigation, recreational provision, play and open space and the lack of market demand for flatted accommodation in this location. These factors have impinged the quantum of development that can be achieved. We welcome the Council’s amendments which will ensure that density can be informed by the constraints of the site, whilst making every effort to make best use of the land available.

Felixstowe Rifle Club

Relocation

The site currently accommodates a rifle range facility, the use of which is leased to Felixstowe Rifle Club by Trinity College Cambridge. The College is a long term supporter of the Rifle Club, having leased the existing site and facilities on very favourable terms for many years, and acknowledges the importance of providing an alternative facility that can be used by the Club to allow for development.

The College has been actively working with Felixstowe Rifle Club to progress proposals for an alternative facility on land that it owns to the north of the railway line off Nicholas Road, Trimley St Mary. Outline planning permission with all matters reserved except access was granted for a new rifle range off Nicholas Road on 13 March 2014 (Planning Ref: C/13/00967). The College is continuing to work with the Club’s committee members to prepare a reserved matters application which is due to be submitted for approval shortly. 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.

Whilst there are no objections to the need for an alternative range to be provided, or for it to be equivalent in quantity and quality to the existing facility, the College objects to the requirement for the alternative site to be equally accessible as the existing site for a number of reasons.

First and foremost, the requirement is inconsistent with national planning policy contained in the NPPF and adopted local policy set out in the Core Strategy and is therefore unsound. In summary:

- Where existing sporting facilities are to be displaced, paragraph 74 of the NPPF requires that an alternative facility needs to be of an “equivalent or better quantity or quality and in a suitable location”. Whilst requiring a “suitable” location, it does not stipulate that it should be of equal accessibility to existing facility.

- In the same circumstances, policy DM32 of the adopted Core Strategy requires that “an equivalent facility must be provided in a location agreed with the District Council”. Again, whilst the location needs to be agreed with the Council, it is not stipulated that it should be of equal accessibility.

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).
The location of the alternative facility off Nicholas Road and its means of access were agreed and approved by the Council as part of the outline planning permission. The following extracts are taken from the Officer's Report to Committee confirm why the new location was deemed to be suitable. The Officer Report is attached to these representations for review:

"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."

Despite this clearly expressed agreement on the suitability of the location of the alternative venue and the extant planning permission that has subsequently been granted, the new site may not be considered as accessible as the existing facility or to comply with the draft AAP policy in its current form. This is largely because the existing venue is in an exceptionally accessible location, adjacent to Walton High Street and the main bus route linking Walton, Felixstowe and the Trimleys to the wider area. As such, it is unlikely that any site could be found to satisfy the policy as drafted, regardless of our concerns over soundness. The following factors are relevant:

- The noise impacts of the Club’s activities mean that it needs to be located away from residential properties to avoid causing unacceptable disturbance. This inevitably means that it must be located in a relatively remote location which is less likely to be served by regular public transport. This was acknowledged by the Council when planning permission was granted for the Nicholas Road site.

- The rifle range is only in such an accessible location now because it has occupied the site for around 100 years, during which the surrounding area has gradually been developed for residential use and wider public transport services provided.

- The need to locate the Club’s activities away from housing means that is cannot be retained on site. Doing so would limit the amount of housing that could be provided and make the objective of delivering approximately 400 dwellings in this location impossible to achieve, meaning that the requirements of policy FPP4 as a whole were undeliverable.

In any case, the location of the new site and the facilities to be provided were agreed with Felixstowe Rifle Club prior to submitting the outline planning application. Indeed, the outline application was submitted jointly with the Club. Trinity College Cambridge has since invested significantly in progressing the proposals through the outline approval process and towards a reserved matters planning application. The College remains convinced that the relocation of the rifle range to the Nicholas Road site, which is close to the existing venue, Trimley railway station and the bus services serving the wider area, is the optimum solution for Felixstowe Rifle Club.

To make the draft policy consistent with national policy and sound, the Council should remove the requirement for the replacement venue to be ‘of equivalent (or greater) accessibility as the existing facility’ and simply require than the alternative venue is ‘suitable’.

Timing of re-provision

As drafted, policy FPP4 requires the new facility to be provided “ahead of the site being redeveloped”. Due to the size of the wider site, it is likely that it will take several years to develop in several phases. The activities of the Club could continue for some time whilst housing is constructed and occupied in other parts of the site. It is therefore unnecessary, unjustified and unsound to require that no development takes place prior to re-provision of the rifle range.

To ensure that the Club’s activities can continue without undue interruption, the College objects to this part of the policy as drafted and requests that it is amended to require the alternative venue to be secured and provided “ahead of the removal and demolition of the existing facility”.

Funding

Whilst the College has been and will continue to be a strong supporter of Felixstowe Rifle Club, all parties must acknowledge that providing a new facility for the Club is not a viable commercial venture in isolation and is entirely unrelated to the core education and research objectives that the College exists to promote. As the need to provide a replacement facility is a consequence of planning policy and the objective to deliver approximately 400 new dwellings on this site, the cost of doing so will need to be taken into account in any discussions on viability and negotiations.
We have specific concerns in respect of the following matters:

Requirement for Business Units

My client objects to the requirement for the site to deliver business units due to the potential impact on viability and the absence of evidence demonstrating a need as outlined under Policy FPP4 and at paragraph 4.30 of the AAP. As a consequence, the draft policy is unjustified in this respect. Representations were made during the Preferred Options Consultation on the AAP to this effect and my client is disappointed to see that the Council has maintained the requirement whilst providing no further justification or evidence to support it.

In accordance with Paragraph 160 of the NPPF, the Council should have a clear understanding of the business needs within its area, working with neighbouring authorities to prepare and maintain a robust evidence base. The evidence base on employment needs is out of date, with the most recent economic assessments dating from 2011 (Suffolk’s Local Economic Assessment) and 2010 (Oxford Economics Suffolk Coastal Profile and Outlook). In any case, neither of these studies identifies a need for more non-port related employment space on this site or in Felixstowe, or provides support alongside CIL and other development costs.

The Council must consider that most of Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimleys is in an area assessed as being of "low" land value in the viability evidence prepared to support its CIL examination. This makes sites particularly sensitive to excessive policy burdens. Paragraph 173 of the NPPF makes clear that pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan making and decision making, stating that:

"sites identified in the Plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions and other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing landowner and willing developer to enable development to be deliverable."

The Council must be satisfied that the policy burdens it is seeking to impose on the site, in addition to the CIL charge that will apply, will not threaten its viability or the willingness of my client to release it for development. We have not seen any evidence to suggest that this has been fully taken into account and will need to ensure that it is addressed as proposals become more advanced towards an application submission.

We have specific concerns in respect of the following matters:

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).
In bringing forward proposals for the development of the site, my client has appointed a project team to undertake a
verification of the suitability of the foul sewerage network. This can be secured by planning
proposals for the development of the site with no need for a further buffer. This
mitigated without them, the need for business units must be removed from the draft policy.

Requirement for Open and Play Space

In bringing forward proposals for the development of the site, my client is aware of the need to provide substantial
amounts of green open space on the High Street frontage to protect the setting of the nearby listed buildings. This will
limit the amount of open space that can be provided elsewhere within the site whilst delivering the scale of residential
development the Council is seeking.

My client is happy to bring forward a development that addresses with the Council's adopted play and open space
standards, as set out in the Core Strategy under policies SP16 and SP17, the Outdoor Playing Space SPG, the
Candlet Road in accordance with World Health Organisation's Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL)
guidelines BS 8233:2014. There is no need for business units to be located in this area to provide a further buffer. This
policy requirement is therefore unjustified and unsound when considered against Paragraph 182 of the NPPF where
policies must be "based upon proportionate evidence".

Taking account of the lack of any evidence demonstrating a need for business units on this site, the impacts of their
provision on the availability of land for housing (for which there is clearly a pressing need), the potential impacts on
viability of the scheme as a whole and my client's evidence demonstrating that that traffic noise impacts can be suitably
mitigated without them, the need for business units must be removed from the draft policy.

Requirements for a transport assessment, air quality assessment and archaeological assessment.

These requirements can be secured by way of national planning policy, the adopted Core Strategy and a validation
checklist for the submission of a planning application. My client has commissioned this work to be undertaken as part of
the proposed development at Walton North and this evidence will be submitted as part of a planning application. Their
inclusion as draft policies within the AAP unnecessary. As such, my client considers that these three bullet points
should be removed from the draft policy FPP4.

Requirement for affordable housing provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2 and a range of housing types
and tenures in keeping with surrounding area band in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6.

These policy requirements are already secured through the Core Strategy so repeating them within the draft AAP as
policies is unnecessary. As such, my client considers that these two bullet points should be removed from the draft
policy FPP4.

Requirement for improving the capacity of the foul sewerage network

In bringing forward proposals for the development of the site, my client has been in consultation with Anglian Water and
has been advised of an indicative fee for the upgrade of the foul sewerage network. This can be secured by planning
obligation or other legal agreement.

Requirements for development to be sympathetic to Walton Hall and 362 High Street and their setting.

In bringing forward proposals for the development of the site, my client has appointed a project team to undertake a

Note: The composite reference number in the box at the top of the page is made up of the following information: Object/Support -
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Object

Housing Policy FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe

detailed, in depth masterplanning exercise in order to produce an outline masterplan that is sensitive and considerate to the listed buildings and their setting. This includes setting aside land opposite Walton Hall and around 362 High Street as open space to respect the buildings’ settings.

362 High Street is owned by my client and the proposals for the development of the site will seek to enhance its setting by enlarging its curtilage, providing additional tree planting around the north, east and west boundary edges, providing a green buffer to reinforce its existing landscaped enclosure and enhance its landmark appearance in views up and down the High Street.

Consideration of heritage constraints has been a key component feature throughout the masterplanning process and detailed pre-application discussions have been undertaken with Planning and Conservation Officers at the Council to shape the indicative layout. My client has also sought to engage with Historic England prior to an application being submitted to demonstrate how the setting of Walton Hall and 362 High Street have been respected and enhanced as part of the Masterplan proposals. An outline Masterplan has been produced that provides a well-designed residential led development whilst being sympathetic to and enhancing the setting of both Walton Hall and 362 High Street.

Conclusion

In summary, my client is supportive of the proposed allocation of the site to provide a significant amount of new housing to help meet the minimum targets adopted in the Core Strategy, support the needs of the workforce of the Port of Felixstowe, help reverse unsustainable patterns of in-commuting and assist the Council in meeting its five-year housing supply requirements.

However, my client has real concerns about the range of other aspirations that proposals for the site are expected to have regard to, including the policy requirements to:

■ Secure a replacement venue for Felixstowe Rifle Club that is equally accessible as the current rifle range, which is inconsistent with national policy, the adopted Core Strategy and the planning permission granted by the Council for a new venue off Nicholas Road in Trimley St Mary.
■ Secure a replacement venue for Felixstowe Rifle Club prior to the redevelopment of the site. Relocation can be secured alongside the phased development of the site and does not need to delay the delivery of housing.
■ Provide business units, for which there is no evidence of market need or demand or necessity in respect of noise attenuation. A requirement to provide business units will inevitably restrict the capacity of the site to deliver housing and potentially diminish the viability of the scheme as a whole.

In accordance with Paragraph 182 of the NPPF, in order to be considered ‘sound’ policies in Local Plans must be consistent with national policy, founded in proportionate evidence and based on a strategy that seeks to meet objectively assessed development needs. Whilst we welcome the allocation of the site for housing, for the reasons set out within these representations we do not consider some of the policy requirements of FPP4 to be sound. We would urge the Council to focus on the priority, which is to make the best use of land to deliver housing whilst protecting sites elsewhere. It is disappointing that representations made on various matters at the Preferred Options AAP consultation appear not to have been addressed prior to the Proposed Submission consultation and trust that they will be taken into account prior to or during the examination in public.

Summary: My client has real concerns about the range of other aspirations that proposals for the site are expected to have regard to:
Secure a replacement venue for Felixstowe Rifle Club that is equally accessible as the current rifle range, which is inconsistent with national policy, the adopted Core Strategy and the planning permission granted by the Council for a new venue off Nicholas Road in Trimley St Mary.
Secure a replacement venue for Felixstowe Rifle Club prior to the redevelopment of the site. Relocation can be secured alongside the phased development of the site and does not need to delay the delivery of housing; Provision of business units, for which there is no evidence of market need or demand or necessity in respect of noise attenuation. A requirement to provide business units will inevitably restrict the capacity of the site to deliver housing and potentially diminish the viability of the scheme as a whole.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Christchurch Land and Estates (Felixstowe) Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Christchurch") are the promoters of the land at Candlet Road Felixstowe (hereinafter referred to as "the site") edged red on the plan attached as Annexure 1. A planning application reference DC/15/1128/OUT was refused by the Council on 12th June 2015 and is now the subject of an appeal.

1.2 It is confirmed in paragraph 4.28 of the adopted Local Plan (July 2013) with our emphasis added that "4.28 Felixstowe with Walton is by far the largest town within the District and includes the port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, being of both regional and national significance....."

It is considered that the site is a potential urban extension to Felixstowe ("the largest town within the District").

1.3 The site is in a highly sustainable location for the growth of Felixstowe (to address housing need), and should therefore, in our opinion, be allocated as part of the preferred strategy in accordance with the principles of sustainability set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

1.4 Christchurch consider that the Council is failing to address the full objective assessment of housing need (FOAN) for the District, which contention is supported by the land at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, Suffolk appeal decision letter, appeal reference 3011466, paragraphs 14 to 28 (attached as Annexure 3).

1.5 Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework considers that for a plan to be considered "sound" it should be "positively prepared", and that it should meet objectively assessed development needs. In failing to address the objectively assessed need, the Area Action Plan is not "positively prepared".

1.6 The approach to distributing the growth of Felixstowe (one of dispersal), as the strategy in the Area Action Plan document, is not considered the appropriate strategy for the future development needs in the Peninsular. The Council has failed to advance any proper or sufficient analysis to support its proposed approach as opposed to allocation of a significant (and sustainable) urban extension such as the Candlet Road growth area (abutting the Felixstowe settlement boundary).

1.7 Accordingly, and by reference to paragraph 182 of the Framework, it cannot be concluded that the Area Action Plan is;

"justified",
"the most appropriate strategy",
"consistent with national policy" (paragraph 52).

1.8 The submissions made by Christchurch earlier this year relating to the site also contained a detailed response to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (31st March 2014) and the corresponding consideration of site suitability in the emerging Plan.

1.9 The Candlet Road site has not been allocated in the Area Action Plan, therefore in terms of the emerging Plan, the site is an "omission site".

It is submitted that the Council has failed to properly assess appropriate alternative sites in their Sustainability Appraisal Report Proposed Submission Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Development Plan Document (April 2016) to ensure that the most sustainable sites come forward.

1.10 Thereby compounding our concern that the Area Action Plan is not "justified".

2. FULL OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED HOUSING NEED

2.1 The requirement of 7,900 dwellings as set out in Policy SP2 of the adopted Core Strategy is now considered to be out of date as the process of review stipulated within the policy (to review the Core Strategy by 2015 at the latest) has not been commenced. Given that the requirement of 7,900 is both out of date, and fails to reflect the full objectively assessed need for housing (FOAN), the emerging plan should be proceeding on the basis of an up to date review of housing need (as recognised by the Core Strategy itself). That the figure of 7,900 is out of date has been recognised by the Inspector in the Framlingham appeal decision. It is considered that the current FOAN for the District is between 15,000 (750 per annum) and 22,360 dwellings (1,118 per annum) for the period 2011 to 2031.

2.2 Sustainably located sites need to be identified to ensure that the FOAN is met.
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2.3 The proposed approach in the Area Action Plan is neither justified nor positively prepared. The development needs of the District will not be met.

3. THE GROWTH STRATEGY IN THE AREA ACTION PLAN

3.1 The growth of Felixstowe, as proposed in the Area Action Plan, is not considered the most appropriate strategy for the future development needs in the Peninsular, and there is no proper or sufficient analysis to support the dispersed approach adopted by the Plan.

3.2 The site at Candlet Road, together with other land holdings, should be considered the most sustainable growth option for the town.

3.3 The adopted Local Plan (July 2013) confirms at paragraph 4.28;

"4.28 Felixstowe with Walton is by far the largest town within the District and includes the port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, being of both regional and national significance....."

3.4 Paragraph 4.31 of the adopted Local Plan confirms;

"4.31 The growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one...."

3.5 The site at Candlet Road Felixstowe (as part of a sustainable urban extension) is in a position to "redress" this imbalance identified at paragraph 4.31 of the adopted Local Plan.

3.6 It is, further acknowledged, at paragraph 4.35 of the adopted Local Plan that;

"4.35 Longer term, it is likely that additional housing will need to be provided......"

3.7 Strategic Policy SP21 of the adopted Local Plan confirms (with our emphasis added);

"The strategy for Felixstowe will be to reverse the recent trends towards a population in balance, threats to local services and a decline in the fortunes of the town in order to enable it to fulfil its role as a major centre......."

"Additional housing will be created. In the short to medium term, this will represent organic and evolutionary growth in the Felixstowe and Trimleys area over a mixture of sites immediately abutting existing built up areas......"

3.8 Whilst adopted Local Plan policy SP21 refers to a "strategy for a dispersed pattern of future development" it is submitted that such an approach is not sustainable and also does not accord with the thrust of strategic policy SP21 by recommending development "immediately abutting existing built up areas....".

3.9 Policies SP1 and SP1A of the adopted Local Plan seek the achievement of sustainable development.

3.10 With regard to Felixstowe, the 2013 Local Plan confirms:

"4.28 Felixstowe with Walton is by far the largest town within the district and includes the Port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, being of both regional and national significance....." (with emphasis added).

"4.29 Felixstowe has more people of retirement age and fewer people of working age than the norm, either in the rest of Suffolk or across the UK......" (with emphasis added).

"Younger generations already have to look outside Felixstowe for careers and housing" (with emphasis added).

"4.30 The population of Felixstowe is increasing slowly although household size is falling. Despite slow population growth there are, therefore, even more people looking for homes, and Felixstowe has more small households - single people or couples - particularly those that are key workers or first time buyers. The number and type of new homes provided in the town over recent years has not matched this increase in demand".

"4.31 The growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one......" (with emphasis added).

3.11 On the 27th February 2015, Christchurch made submissions to the then emerging Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies and the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan, relating to the site.
3.12 The February submissions referred to a Council report to the Local Development Framework Task Group on the 4th August 2008 (LPTG11/08). The Council's consideration of the ("option 4") land north of Candlet Road Felixstowe stated:

"on the whole option 4 has significant merit. It represents a good sustainable option that benefits from existing formal and informal recreational areas to the east as well as access to the town centre. It is also the closest area to the town centre and development might also ensure a stronger and more viable town centre given the increased usage of facilities there...the landscape, particularly the western part, is the least sensitive of all of the option and the existing wildlife corridor in the east can be built upon as part of a strategy of enhancing green infrastructure".

3.13 The 2008 Council Report confirms Christchurch's contention that the site (combined with other land holdings) is a highly sustainable location for growth, being immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary and close to a range of services and facilities within walking and cycling distance, therefore should be an allocated site.

3.14 The site (combined with other land holdings) is not a preferred allocation for residential development despite Core Strategy Policy SP21 confirming that (with our emphasis added)

"additional housing will be created"

"over a mixture of sites immediately abutting existing built up areas" and to

"create a more sustainable balance between housing and employment thereby providing an opportunity to reduce commuting"

3.15 Paragraph 4.31 of the adopted 2013 Local Plan confirms:

"4.31 The growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one.

The 2001 Census revealed that there was a daily net inflow to Felixstowe of 2,719 workers. This comprised an outflow of 3,600 Felixstowe residents to jobs in Ipswich and elsewhere and an inflow of 6,319 who work in Felixstowe but live elsewhere".

3.16 The site (combined with other land holdings) abuts the urban area of Felixstowe, complies with the aims and objectives of adopted Local Plan and creates additional housing to address the "imbalance" set out in paragraph 4.31 (above), constituting "organic and evolutionary growth".

3.17 Whilst adopted Policy SP21 confirms;

"a strategy for a dispersed pattern of future development"

which is continued in the Area Action Plan (the site is not identified as a preferred allocation) it is considered that a "dispersed pattern" is not the most sustainable growth option for Felixstowe.

4. RESPONSE TO THE STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT ("SHLAA") (SITE SUITABILITY)

4.1 The site (potentially part of a larger land assembly) has previously been considered by the Local Planning Authority and with particular regard to the 'Core Strategy - Proposed location of strategic housing growth in Felixstowe and the Trimley villages'.

4.2 As noted above, a Report on this matter was presented to the Local Development Framework Task Group on 4th August 2008 (LPTG 11/08). A copy of the Report is attached as Annexure 2 to these Submissions.

4.3 The site formed one part of a number of recommendations as to which sites should be the preference to the Council for the location of housing growth, indicating a preference toward larger developments, with related infrastructure incorporated into those schemes.

4.4 Appendix 1 to LPTG 11/08 provided some background in reaching that conclusion. Within this Appendix, it is stated that the landscape

"is not particularly attractive. It is, however, visible from a number of locations. Most are close distance and with the introduction of mitigation planting are not significant. The exception will be from the east where the close proximity viewpoints are in elevated locations and the topography would still allow views in to the area'.

4.5 The Appendix also states that

"the landscape in the part of the area to the east of Gulpher Road is more sensitive and shows a lower capacity to
4.6 Whilst only referenced in the Executive Summary to the Appendix, the report states that the site is
'separated from Felixstowe by the single carriageways of Candlet Road, but has Gulpher Road passing beneath it and
the ability for crossings to be created. Development would be close to the town centre. Road access to the Port is easy
although sustainable means of travel by cycle or on foot could need to be created'.

4.7 The Council's summary acknowledged that;
'on the whole option 4 has significant merit. It represents a good sustainable option that benefits from existing formal
and informal recreational areas to the east as well as access to the town centre. It is also the closest area to the town
centre and development might also ensure a stronger and more viable town centre given the increased usage of
facilities there...the landscape, particularly the western part, is the least sensitive of all of the option and the existing
wildlife corridor in the east can be built upon as part of a strategy of enhancing green infrastructure'.

4.8 The conclusion of the SHLAA and the (site suitability) emerging Plan and the Sustainability Report is clearly at odds
with the Council's previous assessment of the site's merits.

5. THE SUSTAINABILITY OF THE CANDLET ROAD SITE/AREA AND THE COUNCIL'S SUSTAINABILITY
APPRAISAL

5.1 Christchurch commissioned Turley to carry out a detailed Sustainability Appraisal of the land north of Candlet Road
(February 2015).

5.2 The Sustainability Appraisal confirms that this location is a highly sustainable location for residential development,
abutting the main area of Felixstowe, the largest town in the District.

5.3 The Turley Sustainability Appraisal also references the recommendations contained in the 2008 Report where the
current Head of Planning Services at the Council confirmed that the land north of Candlet Road Felixstowe presented
the most appropriate and sustainable option for the growth of the town.

5.4 It is particularly noted, that officers did not favour the "dispersed pattern of development" as advocated by both the
Local Plan (July 2013) and the emerging Plan.

5.5 The Council have prepared a Sustainability Appraisal Report. The Sustainability Appraisal is not adequate,
particularly with regard to the way that the Sustainability Appraisal appraises the strategic alternatives. The reasons for
selection of the Preferred Options (as opposed to alternatives) are not clear.

5.6 It cannot be concluded that the Council have properly taken into account reasonable alternatives, thereby
undermining the soundness of the Plan.

6. ALTERNATIVE SITES (PREFERRED OPTIONS)

6.1 The focusing of housing growth adjacent to Felixstowe represents the most sustainable growth option.

6.2 The most sustainable strategy for accommodation of housing growth at Felixstowe is for new development to be
accommodated within the existing limits of the urban area, and then sustainable urban extensions.

6.3 We have raised concerns with regard to the adequacy of the preferred options site selection procedure.

6.4 In addition, there is a concern that certain allocations may, in reality, be undelivered due to heritage constraints.

Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") obliges the decision
maker, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its
setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special
architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

6.5 In R (on the application of Forge Field Society) v Sevenoaks District Council [2014] EWHC 1896 (Admin), Lindblom
J referred to this duty - and the parallel duty under Section 72(1) of the 1990 Act in relation to development within a
conservation area - in the following terms with our emphasis added:

"... it is to recognise, as the Court of Appeal emphasised in [East Northamptonshire District Council v Secretary of

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).
State for Communities and Local Government [2014] EWCA Civ 137, that a finding of harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area gives rise to a strong presumption against planning permission being granted. The presumption is a statutory one. It is not irrebuttable. It can be outweighed by material considerations powerful enough to do so.

But an authority can only properly strike the balance between harm to a heritage asset on the one hand and planning benefits on the other if it is conscious of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation and if it demonstrably applies that presumption to the proposal it is considering”.

6.6 Furthermore, paragraph 169 of the Framework requires the Local Planning Authority to have

“up to date evidence about the historic environment in their area and use it to assess the significance of heritage assets and the contribution they make to the environment…..”

6.7 The following allocations suffer from serious constraints associated with designated heritage assets. We have seen no clear evidence which shows that those constraints can be overcome in respect of the following sites;

(a) Policy FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street Felixstowe

"development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street and their setting”

(b) Policy FPP5 Land north of Conway Close and Swallow Close Felixstowe

(c) Policy FPP7 Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin

7. CONCLUSIONS

7.1 It is considered, for the reasons outlined in this submission, that the land at Candlet Road should be allocated in the Area Action Plan.

7.2 By omitting the site, the Plan would fail to significantly boost housing supply and fail to meet the objectively assessed housing needs of the District (paragraphs 14 and 47 of the Framework).

7.3 It is submitted that the AAP document would be sound - in securing the necessary delivery for infrastructure, and an appropriate delivery of new housing - if land at Candlet Road is allocated for housing as part of an urban extension for Felixstowe.

7.4 The proposed release of land at Candlet Road represents the most sustainable, viable and ultimately deliverable option to achieve the required housing and infrastructure needs for Felixstowe and the surrounding area.

7.5 It is submitted, therefore, that the Candlet Road site should be a preferred location for housing, being an appropriate urban extension to Felixstowe where the other competing sites do not relate as well in terms of connections and accessibility to the town, that against this criteria the Candlet Road site is the most sustainable and appropriate option for the extension (growth) of Felixstowe.

Richard Brown MSc
27th May 2016

Annexures

1. Site plan

2. Local Development Framework Task Group Report on 04/08/08 (LPTG 11/08), together with Appendix 8

3. Land at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, Suffolk IP13 9LH, appeal reference 3011466

Summary: The following allocations suffer from serious constraints associated with designated heritage assets. We have seen no clear evidence which shows that those constraints can be overcome in respect of the following sites;
Object

Housing

Policy FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe

(a) Policy FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street Felixstowe

"development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street and their setting"

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>i, ii, iii, iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments:
- Representation Form
- Site Plan
- Scanned Representation
- Apx8 Appraisal of each option
- Appeal decision
- Recommended Preferred Options Report Aug2008
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 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

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Ref. Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4ZX Route 400kV two circuit route from Sizewell substation in Suffolk Coastal to Bramford substation in Mid Suffolk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4ZW Route 400kV two circuit route from Sizewell substation in Suffolk Coastal to Bramford substation in Mid Suffolk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pipe Pressure Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HP 1680 Wissett Lodge - Saxmundham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP 2752 Martlesham - Harleston Pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP 1682 Bredfield - Bramford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP 1691 great Bealings - Trimley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP 1437z Kesgrave 7 Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP 1690 Great Bealings - Playford Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP 9770b Playford Road Prs To Rushmere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP 1692 Martlesham - Trimley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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).
Uk Power Networks owns and operates the local electricity distribution network in Suffolk Coastal District Council. 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.
* IGE/SR/18 - Safe working practices to ensure the integrity of gas pipelines and associated installations.

http://www2.nationalgrid.com/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=33968

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).
* 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 Spencer Jefferies
Development Liaison Officer, National Grid
n.grid@amecfw.com
box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com

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

Summary: 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. Site FPP4 'Land north of Walton High Street' is identified as being crossed by or within close proximity to IP / HP apparatus.

Change to Plan: N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments:
Scanned Representation
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed submission version of the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Whilst in principal we have no objections to raise we would request some modifications:

Policy FPP3: Land at Sea Road, Felixstowe,
Policy FPP5: Land north of Conway Close and Swallow Close , Felixstowe
Policy FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin
Policy FPP10 : Land at Bridge Road, Felixstowe
Policy FFP11: Land at Carr Road/Langer Road, Felixstowe
Policy FFP12: Land at Haven Exchange Felixstowe

Confirmation of adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or action to upgrade to create the required capacity.

3.81 ..The capacity of the foul sewerage network is a constraint that needs to be overcome to the satisfaction of Anglian Water. Suffolk County Council have statutory responsibility for Surface Water Management. (Note: The subject of foul and surface water issues need to be separated)

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you wish to discuss the above comments,

Whilst in principal we have no objections to raise we would request some modifications:

Summary:

3.81 ..The capacity of the foul sewerage network is a constraint that needs to be overcome to the satisfaction of Anglian Water. Suffolk County Council who have statutory responsibility for Surface Water Management. (Note: The subject of foul and surface water issues need to be separated)

Change to Plan

Not Specified  Not Specified  Not Specified  Not Specified  None

Attachments:
Scanned Representation
We understand the need for extra housing in the Felixstowe area. But it must be done in keeping with the community feel and spirit.

Certain sites are totally unsuitable and will cause untold problems. Instead of solving issues it will cause more. We feel that having 2 main sites with a reduced footprint would spread the stress on Felixstowe's infrastructure; the opposite side of the A14 have a school, possibly a good site to build new homes.

High Street Walton. This site has always been identified as a potential site but the size and location are of serious worry. A large housing estate without proper access will turn the High Road into a car park. Any access from Candlet Road will always have knock on issues to the main dock spur roundabout. As above you could reduce the amount of housing, creating a better atmosphere within the estate and help the high road. Conway Close. Although in old Felixstowe the access to Colneis Road /Candlet Road/A14 is excellent A limited well thought out estate would provide one of the most sort after area as to live in on the Peninsular.

Howlett Road. We worry about its effect on the local sewer network. This area is already under stress, adding 360 more houses on such a vast scale as proposed would put a huge strain on schools, doctors, drainage, roads etc. This will add another 600 vehicles to the road system and the access is poor. Already we have had many accidents down this road this will only add to more near misses and accidents. We will lose a Village and it will become a Town concreting over the country will change the nature and character of Trimley.

Leisure activities, like horse riding, dog walking, cycling would all be affected by Trimleys green fields shrinking.

Hand In Hand - That part of the high road is bad at the best of times. The road thins dangerously and the addition of further housing would make this unsuitable. Unless you could widen the road OR make it one way we would be totally against this build.

I would reiterate our initial point. A spread of new housing over Walton / and Conway would provide a boost to Felixstowe but remove major issues it would cause to the infrastructure.

Summary: Conway Close. Although in old Felixstowe the access to Colneis Road /Candlet Road/A14 is excellent A limited well thought out estate would provide one of the most sort after area as to live in on the Peninsular.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed submission version of the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Whilst in principal we have no objections to raise we would request some modifications:

Policy FPP5: Land north of Conway Close and Swallow Close, Felixstowe

3.81..The capacity of the foul sewerage network is a constraint that needs to be overcome to the satisfaction of Anglian Water.

Suffolk County Council have statutory responsibility for Surface Water Management. (Note :The subject of foul and surface water issues need to be separated)

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you wish to discuss the above comments,

Summary:

Whilst in principal we have no objections to raise we would request some modifications:

Policy FPP5: Land north of Conway Close and Swallow Close , Felixstowe

... Confirmation of adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or action to upgrade to create the required capacity.

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).
Thank you for your letter dated 14th April 2016 regarding the above consultation. We have had the opportunity to assess the letter and consultation documents and can offer the following advice. Please note we have provided comments on the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies within a separate letter to you dated the same. This follows two previous consultations and our comments dated 25th February 2015 and 24th November 2015.

In terms of our general comments:
Recent Guidance from Historic England

We have recently published guidance on The Historic Environment in Local Plans and the Historic Environment and Site Allocations. Where we have not made comment below some additional guidance on ensuring a positive strategy for the historic environment is secured within the Felixstowe Area Action Plan can be seen by following these links: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa1-historic-environment-local-plans/> and <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/>.

In terms of our site specific comments:

**Housing Sites**

**FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe (451g)**

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the possible impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II* Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We highlighted that the principal elevation of Walton Hall faces north and overlooks site 451g. It was considered that development here would urbanise the setting of this important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance. It was expressed that harm would also be caused to the Grade II lodge and we strongly advised that an alternative site was found for development, though it was thought that there may be scope for some limited development at the eastern end of this site.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfill the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words 'and their setting' in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

**FPP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe (502e)**

At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

**FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)**

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be protected.
Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed. At Preferred Options stage, we considered 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 note that the policy still does not include this requirement (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.88.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

FPFP7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin (451c and 451d)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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 references in paragraph 3.104 and Policy FPP7 bullet point 7 to the setting of the churches and high quality developments, sympathetic to the character of the area and Listed Buildings.

FPFP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary (383f and 451f)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

Town Centre
FPFP13: Felixstowe Town Centre and FFP14: Retail Frontages
As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FFP13 and FFP14.

District Centres
FPFP16: District Centres
As above in previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word ‘on’ with ‘to’.

FFP18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point, FPP20: Cobbolds Point to Spa, FFP21: Spa to Martello Park and FFP22 Martello Park to Landguard
We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FFP23: Car Parking
At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the ‘high quality of design’ requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe’s archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment”. The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the “positive strategy” required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council’s approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area
We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report ‘Felixstowe South Conservation Area’ commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to...
identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment. The conservation area survey identified the loss of architectural detail as a significant problem, and consideration might therefore be given to applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a Townscape Heritage programme for the area, or a smaller partnership scheme with Historic England to reinstate lost architectural details on key buildings etc.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden
We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Other Issues
Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding
At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary: At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.
### Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Policy FPP5: Land north of Conway Close and Swallow Close, Felixstowe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Housing

Policy FPP5: Land north of Conway Close and Swallow Close, Felixstowe

Respondent: Optima Land & Property Limited [4192]  
Agent: JCN Design (Mr Michael Smith) [455]

Full Text:

FELIXSTOWE PENINSULA AREA ACTION PLAN
LAND NORTH OF CONWAY CLOSE AND SWALLOW CLOSE, FELIXSTOWE

On behalf of Optima Land and Property, I am writing to respond to the current consultation exercise with regard to the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan Proposed Submission Document (April 2016), as part of the preparation of the documents to assist in the delivery of the Suffolk Coastal Core Strategy. My client has an interest in land to the north of Conway Close and Swallow Close, Felixstowe, that is identified as an allocation for residential development through Policy FPP5 and, as such, Optima Land and Property wishes to express their support for the creation of new homes on the site and can confirm that the policy can be considered to be “sound”.

With a site area of 3.38 hectares and an indicative capacity of 150 new homes, the land to the north of Conway Close has already been promoted through the call for sites process as Site 502e and the Felixstowe AAP Preferred Options Document as Preferred Policy FPP5. Representations were submitted at earlier stages to confirm that the site should be considered to be deliverable in the short term insofar that it meets the tests set out in the footnote to Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework: it is (a) available now, (b) offers a suitable location for development now, (c) is achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and (d) development of the site is viable.

At this stage in the plan-making process, representations should be restricted to matters that relate to whether the documents will be found to be sound, therefore in accordance with paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework I can confirm that the matters with regard to Policy FPP5 are considered to be:

* Positively prepared - as noted above, the site is deliverable in the short term and will help the district council to meet their objectively assessed housing need, as well as addressing the provision of new infrastructure to support the creation of up to 150 new homes.

* Justified - the site is adjacent to the northern edge of the existing built-up area of Felixstowe and will form a natural extension to the town without harming views of the Deben estuary or creating any negative impacts on the nearby Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Furthermore, there is no opportunity for the development of the site to begin a process of expansion into countryside to the north of Felixstowe because the site is enclosed by Gulpher Road to the north and the buildings of Park Farm to the west.

* Effective - the site is deliverable in the short term and is not subject to phasing constraints or reliant on enabling development elsewhere.

* Consistent with national policy - the creation of new homes will be sustainable development (as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework), playing an economic role, a social role and an environmental role at the same time as achieving positive improvements in the quality of the built environment, the natural environment and people’s quality of life.

The site is already controlled by a developer and initial assessments have taken place with a view to submitting an application for planning permission in the near future. Draft schemes for the site have been prepared and detailed options for the development of the site are currently being considered. On behalf of my client, I can confirm that it is anticipated that the emerging scheme will be designed in accordance with the requirements of the bullet points listed in Policy FPP5, including the provision of affordable housing, a range of house types for sale on the open market and on-site open space, play facilities and an upgrade to the public right of way.

Once again, Optima Land and Property wishes to express its support for the proposed growth to the north of Felixstowe and, in particular, the identification of the land to the north of Conway Close and Swallow Close, Felixstowe as a location for residential development through Policy FPP5.

I trust that you will find this representation to be clear and straightforward, but if you have any queries or should you wish to discuss the potential development of the site to the north of Conway Close and Swallow Close, Felixstowe, in greater detail, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above address.

Summary:

Representations were submitted at earlier stages to confirm that the site should be considered to be deliverable in the short term insofar that it meets the tests set out in the footnote to Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework: it is (a) available now, (b) offers a suitable location for development now, (c) is achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and (d) development of the site is viable.

Change to Plan  
N/A

Appeal at exam?  
Not Specified

Legal?  
Not Specified

Sound?  
Yes

Duty to Cooperate?  
Not Specified

Soundness Tests  
N/A

Attachments:

Scanned Representation
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Policy FPP5: Land north of Conway Close and Swallow Close, Felixstowe

Respondent: Mr Keith Mahoney [3204]  Agent: N/A

Full Text:
FPP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe.
The Plan was not based on objectively assessed developments and infrastructure requirements because:
(1) SCDC agreed in 2008 to dispersed development across the Felixstowe Peninsula.
(16) Referring to FPP5. The inclusion of sites 1666 and 502e will mean that 2 development sites have been allocated in one small area which contravenes the nation of dispersed development.
(2) Referring to FPP5. SCDC have ignored the guidelines as stated by the Locke Report (2006).
(3) The inclusion of this site (FPP5) is not justified as the most appropriate strategy.
(3) Whilst subject to assessment from Suffolk Highways and Byways (in relation to FPP5), local residents have made local authorities and councillors aware that currently the road infrastructure is unable to cope with excess traffic. This is predominantly due to visitors to Kingsfleet Primary School, Colneis Primary School, church in Church Lane and a community centre in Church Lane. A further proposed 350 dwellings in this area will inevitably cause traffic uses detrimental to local residents, pedestrians and the environment.
(4) Referring to FPP5. So far it is not evident that SCDC have adhered to the AONB legislation as defined in the Countryside Rights of Way Act (2000).
(95) referring to FPP5. The National Framework requires sustainability in several areas including transport and proximity to employment opportunities. This site relies totally on personal transport and is over 4 miles from the main town employer (Felixstowe Port). Furthermore, no public transport exists near site 1666 and 502e.
(6) referring to FPP5. The plan is not effective due to the persisting drainage issues as reported in Ferry Road (Felixstowe). This issue, after many years, is not resolved and continues.

Summary:
The allocation of both sites 1666 and 502e in one small area is contrary to the dispersed development strategy across the Felixstowe Peninsula. Highways, drainage and public transport infrastructure in insufficient. Guidelines in the 2006 Locke Report are ignored.

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>i, ii, iii, iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).
Thank you for consulting Suffolk County Council on submission version for development in Felixstowe.

Suffolk County Council responded previously to the preferred options stage in November 2015. This response does not rehearse all the issues as Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) has responded well to the points that the county council made at the time.

The following response relates to the ways in which the development of these sites affects county council responsibilities, and how our authorities will need to work together to bring these sites forward in a successful way.

This letter does not take into account the impact of sites which may come forward as windfall development, which may have significant impacts on local infrastructure.

Archaeology

Additional text has been systematically added in general information about archaeology, using the county council's previous comments. It introduces archaeology throughout the document and gives the plan a sound approach to archaeology.

Suffolk County Council Archaeology has reviewed the document and the only minor outstanding matters relate to suggested amendments and the terminology used in the following paragraphs:

Para. 3.74 (FPP4) - the site will require archaeological excavation rather than assessment, as it has already been assessed. Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service can provide a brief for the works and also discuss options for preservation in situ.

Paras. 3.82 (FPP5), 3.94 (FPP6), 3.101 (FPP7), 3.109 (FPP8) - Change the reference to archaeological assessment "prior to the development of the site" to "at an appropriate design stage prior to the granting of outline, technical details or full planning permission." This will allow for preservation in situ, where appropriate, of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed, for which conditions may or may not be sufficient.

With regard to FPP12 (Land at Haven Exchange), which is an enabling policy, archaeological investigation will be required, particularly for larger schemes.

Early Education

The document reflects advice provided by the county council on the need for at least one additional facility for early years education (excluding the Candlet Road site subject to an appeal). The detail provided is paragraphs 3.39 to 3.41 is welcomed. During the previous stage, the county council highlighted ways in which policy FPP15 could be more supportive of early education in retail centres, as part of a balanced policy which also protects the vitality and viability of retail centres. The county raised the point that policy FPP16 (previously FPP17) would support early years provision, which SCDC has considered. Therefore, our councils agree that early years facilities can be considered as "other local services" within FPP16.

Primary Education

The challenge presented by the distribution of housing proposed for ensuring sufficient additional primary school places has been recognised in the submission version. Land needs to be identified for a new primary school in order to ensure that there can be confidence of a long term solution for primary school provision. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in identifying options for sites based on the pattern of development coming forward and the need to find a location that promotes sustainable travel choices. The two locations identified and other alternatives as stated in para. 3.44 provide a clear indication of how a site could be identified. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in keeping the expected size of school and the area of land required under review.

Transport

A report by AECOM, on behalf of Highways England and Suffolk County Council (SCC), to assess the cumulative impact of development proposed in the Area Action Plan on the local and strategic road networks is attached to this response. In addition to the sites identified, this report implicitly includes background growth port-related traffic and the growth throughout the district.

The Suffolk County Council supports the creation of a link road between Candlet Road and High Street Walton. The intention of this link is that it is designed to serve local journeys so that the impacts from rerouting are localised.

I hope that these comments are helpful. Please contact me via the details at the top of this letter, if we or any of our colleagues can be of assistance.
### Summary:
Paras. 3.82 (FPP5), 3.94 (FPP6), 3.101 (FPP7), 3.109 (FPP8) - Change the reference to archaeological assessment "prior to the development of the site" to "at an appropriate design stage prior to the granting of outline, technical details or full planning permission." This will allow for preservation in situ, where appropriate, of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed, for which conditions may or may not be sufficient.

### Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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).
Full Text: RE: Suffolk Coastal Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD and Felixstowe Area Action Plan Proposed Submission Consultations

(Representation submitted via email to suffolkcoastallocalplan@eastsuffolk.gov.uk)

Introduction

This letter is in response to the above consultations and provides Gladman Developments’ representation. Gladman specialise in the promotion of strategic land for residential development with associated community infrastructure. From this experience, Gladman understand the need for the planning system to ensure that local communities have access to both decent homes and local employment opportunities.

The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has brought about fundamental changes to the planning process since its inception. One such change relates to the need to significantly boost the supply of housing and how this fundamental requirement of the Framework should be reflected in the plan making process. Gladman, who operate on a national basis, have considerable experience in contributing to the Local Plan preparation process since the Framework came into effect.

What continues to be clear from this experience is that many local authorities are not fully addressing the requirements of the Framework when preparing their Local Plans, this has led to significant concerns being expressed by Inspectors on the soundness of their plans in their current form. The main concerns centre upon the requirement addressed by paragraph 47 of the Framework to ‘use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) for market and affordable housing in the housing market area’.

Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD

Suffolk Coastal's Core Strategy was adopted in July 2013 and sets the overall vision and strategic objectives for the district, including a target to deliver at least 7,900 dwellings between 2010 and 2027. It is intended that the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD (together with the Felixstowe Area Action Plan (FAAP)) defines sites for various types of development (including housing), defines the boundaries of built up areas and identifies local infrastructure requirements. The documents do not cover areas of the district that are advancing Neighbourhood Plans.

Gladman’s response to specific policies is set out below.

Policy SSP1: New Housing Delivery 2015-2027

The policy, with reference to the data set out in Table 2, sets out new housing delivery for the period 2015-2027 to meet the minimum requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy. The policy makes allocations in a number of settlements.

Table 2 sets out, across the major centres, market towns, key service centres and local service centres, the amount of housing that has already been delivered between 2010 and 2015, extant permissions (including resolutions to grant as of 31/03/15), and new allocations to be delivered between 2015 and 2027. Whilst policy SP2 of the adopted Core Strategy makes provision for ‘at least’ 7,900 dwellings over the plan period, the figures presented in Table 2 are not expressed in the same terms but rather appear to be development ceilings. The Site Allocations Plan needs to make it clear that the figures in Table 2 are minimum figures to ensure consistency with Core Strategy Policy SP2. It is interesting to note that the FAAP document does include recognition that the housing figures it allocates to settlements are minima, and there should be consistency across the two documents.

Objectively Assessed Need

Gladman have fundamental concerns that the Council is progressing with a Site Allocations document based on an out-of-date housing target from the Core Strategy that does not properly reflect the district’s full Objectively Assessed Need (OAN). When the Core Strategy was adopted, the Inspector at the time noted that the Council had to undertake a review of its OAN by 2015. This is acknowledged by the Council at paragraph 1.12 of the consultation document, which states the adopted figure of 7,900 was lower than the full OAN and therefore the Council made a commitment to undertake an early review to address the level of housing provision. The review has yet to be undertaken.

Despite this commitment, paragraph 1.13 goes on to state that the Site Allocations DPD and FAAP are important to completing the current phase of plan making based on the Core Strategy. The Council consider that both documents positively seek to boost the supply of housing with a ‘carefully planned’ over provision included as a contingency. Table 1 provides an overview of the housing numbers over the plan period and compared to the Core Strategy target of 7,900 allows for a total of 8,620 homes to come forward, a small oversupply of approximately 9%.

Gladman can see no reason as to why a full review of the Core Strategy, including its housing target, cannot be undertaken now. Failure do so means that the Council must accept that the Site Allocations DPD and FAAP will be out of date as soon as they are adopted.
The situation which has arisen in Suffolk Coastal is similar to other positions taken by Councils in Wokingham, Hinckley and Bosworth, Preston and Tunbridge Wells, where Site Allocations documents have proceeded on the back of either pre NPPF Core Strategies or on principal planning documents which do not contain an assessment of full OAN. The Wokingham judgement ([2014] EWHC 2320 (Admin]) confirms such an approach may be lawful, but made clear it did nothing more than allocate sufficient sites for a housing requirement from a previous generation of planning policy. The reasons behind this have recently been upheld by the Court of Appeal in Oxed Residential v Tandridge District Council ([2016] EWCA Civ 414).

It should be noted that the issue of Suffolk Coastal's OAN was considered at the Fairfield Road, Framlingham appeal [APP/J5330/W/15/3011466] where evidence was presented by the appellants in that case that suggested the OAN could be 11,000 dwellings between 2010 and 2027, a significant increase on the adopted requirement; the Council's own witness in that appeal conceded that they would have expected the OAN to have increased. This evidence suggests a requirement far in excess of the 'carefully planned over provision' allowed through the Site Allocations and FAAP.

Gladman contend that the Council's document cannot be seen to be positively prepared. Despite the availability of more recent evidence on housing need and an admission that the OAN is likely to have gone up, the Council is still proceeding with producing a Site Allocations Plan based on a lower figure, and only at the next stage will new housing evidence be considered in a review of the whole development plan. The consequences of this approach (assuming that the Allocations Plan is otherwise sound) would be to have an adopted Allocations Plan which would have to be reviewed in short order to take account of the emerging and subsequently adopted housing requirement. Moreover, even if sites were allocated in the Allocations Plan, it is highly likely that they would be insufficient to meet the updated OAN, as required by paragraph 47 of the Framework.

We do not therefore see how the delay in properly dealing with the full OAN for the district can be seen as positive planning. The Council have had since July 2013 to address this and in the time elapsed a full plan review could have been completed.

The process of undertaking an objective assessment is clearly set out in the Framework principally in paragraph 14, paragraph 47, paragraph 152 and paragraph 159 and should be undertaken in a systematic and transparent way to ensure that the plan is based on a robust evidence base.

The starting point for this assessment is set out in paragraph 159 which requires local planning authorities to have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. This involves the preparation of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative areas. The Framework goes on to set out the factors that should be included in a SHMA including identifying 'the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period which:

* Meets household and population projections taking account of migration and demographic change;
* Addresses the need for all types of housing including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and
* Caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand.'

Key points that are worth noting from the above is that the objective assessment should identify the full need for housing before you consider undertaking any process of assessing the ability to deliver this figure. In addition, paragraph 159 specifically relates to catering for both housing need and housing demand within the authority area. It is worth pointing out that any assessment of housing need and demand within a SHMA must also consider the following factors; falling household formation rates, net inward migration, the need to address the under provision of housing from the previous local plan period, the results of the Census 2011, housing vacancy rates including the need to factor in a 3% housing vacancy rate for churn in the housing market, economic factors to ensure that the economic forecasts for an area are supported by sufficient housing to deliver economic growth, off-setting a falling working age population by providing enough housing vacancy rates including the need to factor in a 3% housing vacancy rate for churn in the housing delivering the full need for affordable housing in an area.

It is our understanding that a majority of the SHMAs that were prepared under the current guidance on SHMA preparation are not Framework compliant and do not consider the full range of factors that are outlined in paragraph 159. This is causing significant problems for authorities currently at Examination and therefore, to avoid this issue, SHMAs should be updated to take account of the Framework and ensure plans are based on robust and up-to-date evidence. Indeed, the Government have noted the deficiency in SHMAs and are updating the guidance on SHMA preparation to fully reflect the guidance given in the Framework.

Following the exercise to identify the full, objectively assessed need for housing in an area, the local planning authority should then seek to undertake the assessment outlined in paragraph 152 of the Framework. This states that

Local planning authorities should seek opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, and net gains across all three. Significant adverse impacts on any of these dimensions should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued.

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).
Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. This statement clearly sets out that local planning authorities should seek to deliver the full, objectively assessed need and that this should be tested through the evidence base. Only where the evidence shows that this is not achievable should they then test other options to see if any significant adverse impacts could be reduced or eliminated by pursuing these options. If this is not possible then they should test if the significant adverse impacts could be mitigated and where this is not possible, where compensatory measures may be appropriate.

The final stage of the process is outlined in paragraph 14 and involves a planning judgement as to whether, following all of the stages of the process outlined above, 'any adverse impacts of meeting the objectively assessed needs would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole or specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.' It is also worth noting that the final part of this sentence refers to footnote 9 which sets out the types of policies that the Government consider to be restrictive. These include 'sites protected under the Birds and Habitat Directive (see paragraph 119) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Heritage Coast or within a National Park (or the Broads Authority): designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion'. Although this list is not exhaustive it is clear that local landscape designations, intrinsic value of the countryside, the character of areas, green gaps etc. are not specifically mentioned as constraints.

Assessment of Housing and Economic Development Needs - Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

As Suffolk Coastal will be aware, the Government issued a guidance note to support local authorities in objectively assessing and evidencing development needs for housing (both market and affordable) and economic development. This document supports and provides further guidance on the process of undertaking such assessments as set out in the Framework. Gladman highlight the following key points from this document:

* Plan makers should not apply constraints to the overall assessment of need, such as limitations imposed by the supply of land for new development, historic under performance, infrastructure or environmental constraints.
* Household projections published by the Department for Communities and Local Government should provide the starting point estimate of overall housing need.
* Household projection based estimates of housing need may need adjusting to reflect factors affecting local demography and household formation rates which are not captured by past trends, for example historic suppression by under supply and worsening affordability of housing. The assessment will need to reflect the consequences of past under delivery and the extent to which household formation rates have been constrained by supply.
* Plan makers need to consider increasing their housing numbers where the supply of working age population is less than projected job growth, to prevent unsustainable commuting patterns and reduced local business resilience.
* If the historic rate of development shows that actual supply falls below planned supply, future supply should be increased to reflect the likelihood of under-delivery of a plan.
* Plan makers should take account of concealed households.
* Housing needs indicated by household projections should be adjusted to reflect appropriate market signals, as well as other market indicators of the balance between the demand for and supply of dwellings. Appropriate comparisons of indicators (land prices, house prices etc.) should be made - with longer term trends in the HMA, similar demographic and economic areas, and nationally. Divergence under any of these circumstances will require upward adjustment to planned housing numbers.
* The more significant the affordability constraints (as reflected in rising prices and rents, and worsening affordability ratio) and the stronger other indicators of high demand (e.g. the differential between land prices), the larger the improvement in affordability needed, and the larger the additional supply response should be.
* Market signals are affected by a number of economic factors. Plan makers should increase planned supply by an amount that, on reasonable assumptions and consistent with principles of sustainable development, could be expected to improve affordability.

The Framework is clear that Local Planning Authorities must consider market signals. It is one of the core planning principles considered in paragraph 17. The Framework states:

...Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities.

Of critical importance is what the Framework goes onto say in paragraph 158 in the section discussing Plan Making. It states here:

Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals.

Market signals are therefore at the very core of what the Framework is trying to achieve in promoting sustainable development and boosting the supply of housing land.

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).
The formal publication of the PPG in March 2014 gives further explanation to what the Framework means with regard to market signals, and sets out, in a range of paragraphs, the way in which local planning authorities should go about factoring in relevant market signals in arriving at their objectively assessed need. Paragraphs 19 and 20 of the PPG gives guidance on what market signals should be taken into account and how plan makers should respond to these market signals. The below extracts identify some particularly pertinent points.

The housing need number suggested by household projections (the starting point) should be adjusted to reflect appropriate market signals, as well as other market indicators of the balance between the demand for and supply of dwellings. Prices of rents rising faster than the national/local average may well indicate particular market undersupply relative to demand.

The paragraph goes on to indicate that these factors would include, but should not be limited to, land prices, house prices, rents, affordability, rates of development and overcrowding. However, given what the Framework says at paragraph 17, quoted above, it seems clear that particular consideration should be given to affordability.

In order to consider how market signals should be taken forward paragraph 20 identifies some key concepts:

Appropriate comparisons of indicators should be made. This includes comparison with longer term trends (both in absolute levels and rates of change) in the: housing market area; similar demographic and economic areas; and nationally. A worsening trend in any of these indicators will require upward adjustment to planned housing numbers compared to ones based solely on household projections.

It is therefore clear that where market signals are apparent there is an absolute and clear direction that an upward adjustment to housing numbers is required. It is also clear that both the absolute level of change and the rates of change are considerations, and that local planning authorities need to carefully bench mark themselves against other areas. This should not simply be a case of considering neighbouring authorities but should look at, as well as these, local authorities on a national basis, if the demographic and economic indicators are relevant. Gladman are firmly of the view that considering comparisons purely against neighbouring authorities is not sufficiently robust and does not address the underlying issues which both the Framework and PPG are trying to tackle with regard to housing.

What is of further importance when considering these issues is the period of time analysed when considering both relative and absolute change. It has become apparent, in our consideration of a number of plans that many local authorities choose to look at periods of time which are not fully representative of the depth of the housing crisis which we are currently within.

The problems are noted in Fixing the Foundations: Creating a more prosperous nation published by HM Treasury in July 2015. In paragraph 9.7 the report states:

There remains more to do. As the London School of Economics (LSE) Growth Commission found, ‘under supply of housing, especially in high-growth areas of the country has pushed up house prices. The UK has been incapable of building enough homes to keep up with growing demand.’

Gladman are therefore of the view that local planning authorities must take a long term view when considering affordability and consider the relative and absolute change over a long term 15-20 year period, which coincides with the normal time span of a Local Plan. Authorities should assess, as a constituent part of their OAN, how they can improve affordability over the life time of a plan to a point where affordability is more in line with average earnings and affordable mortgage lending rates. They should assess a level of housing over the 15-20 year plan period which would enable this step change and consider its deliverability in the plan. Only through planning for significant housing growth can local authorities realistically tackle market signals in the way advocated by the PPG and tackle the affordability and housing crisis.

Gladman reserve the right to adduce further evidence on OAN at the appropriate time.

Location of New Housing

Gladman would point out that Suffolk Coastal has a number of different and distinct housing market areas. Each of these distinct areas will have their own requirement for housing and this should be reflected in the spatial distribution of housing supply within the Local Plan. This decision should be based on the findings of the evidence base and should not be a politically driven spatial strategy to put a disproportionate amount of housing in areas where people don’t want to (and will not) live. If the spatial distribution does not reflect need/demand as shown by the evidence base, then housing will not be delivered and the Plan will not be implemented.

Gladman would suggest a hybrid approach should be taken, with more sustainable settlements taking a greater proportion of growth than less sustainable locations. We would caution against too prescriptive a development strategy based solely on a development hierarchy that is itself based on too simplistic an understanding of sustainability (i.e. the number of services available). Whilst level of services is obviously an important criterion, the Framework is clear that development should be allowed where it is sustainable, when measured against the Framework as a whole and the three strands of sustainability (economic, social and environmental) in particular. When considering development in rural areas, Paragraph 55 of the Framework states that ‘housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the three strands of sustainability (economic, social and environmental) in particular’.

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).
Object: Housing

Policy FPP5: Land north of Conway Close and Swallow Close, Felixstowe

vitality of rural communities.' Furthermore paragraph 17 states that planning should 'focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable'.

Para 55 of the Framework seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas to maintain and enhance rural vitality and viability. It is essential therefore, that the needs of the sustainable rural settlements across the district are assessed and a meaningful level of growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing vitality and viability. This will help to preserve and enhance rural services and facilities and allow local rural communities to meet their own needs for housing whilst providing much needed affordable housing in the parts of the district that suffer with the greatest affordable housing need.

In allocating sites, the Council should be mindful that to maximize housing supply the widest possible range of sites, by size and market location are required so that house builders of all types and sizes have access to suitable land in order to offer the widest possible range of products. The key to increased housing supply is the number of sales outlets. For any given time period, all else being equal, overall sales and build out rates are faster from 20 sites of 50 units than 10 sites of 100 units or 1 site of 1,000 units. The maximum delivery is achieved not just because there are more sales outlets but because the widest possible range of products and locations are available to meet the widest possible range of demand. In summary, a wider variety of sites in the widest possible range of locations ensures all types of house builder have access to suitable land which in turn increases housing delivery.

New homes should be distributed in a way that enables the full OAN for the district to be met, rather than based too rigidly on percentages allocated to each town and village. This should take into account factors such as market conditions and viability - it is after all the private sector that will be expected to deliver the majority of the district’s housing need and so it is important that the chosen distribution enables this to happen.

Regardless of the approach a sufficient range of sites need to be allocated (taking into account viability and market conditions) to ensure continuity of housing supply; more sites than needed to deliver the OAN should be allocated to account for slippage and delays. Whichever development strategy is adopted it is vital that the new Local Plan addresses this and that housing figures and distribution are aligned fully with economic growth aspirations.

Delivery Rates

The Council will have to ensure that they have applied realistic assumptions around lead-in times and build-out rates for the sites with permissions and especially for the sites with a resolution to grant, as there is a chance that some of these sites may never sign the s 106 agreement and begin to deliver.

Table 1 shows that 600 of the dwellings needed over the plan period will come through a windfall allowance (50dpa). The Council must be satisfied that, in line with Paragraph 48 of the Framework, they have ‘compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply’. It is also important that ‘any allowance should be realistic having regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens’.

Housing Allocations in Areas with Neighbourhood Plans

The plan sets out at paragraph 1.17 that several Neighbourhood Plans in the district have reached an advanced stage and cover a wide range of policy issues and therefore the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies document does not include allocations or additional policies covering these areas. This means that no sites are allocated for housing through the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD in settlements covered by an advanced Neighbourhood Plan. Gladman have some concerns with this approach.

There needs to be a mechanism in place to address situations where these Neighbourhood Plans fail and therefore do allocate the appropriate amount of housing as required by the Core Strategy. Should these Neighbourhood Plans not come forward as anticipated then the Council will be in danger of not having enough allocated housing land and therefore would be unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply. The Inspector for the Torbay Local Plan required Main Modifications that inserted wording that addressed this issue. The modification read ‘If Neighbourhood Plans do not identify sufficient sites to provide the growth requirement of the Local Plan, the Council will bring forward sites through site allocations development plan documents. If it appears that a shortfall in five year supply of deliverable sites is likely to arise, the Council will bring forward additional sites’. The Council should consider inserting a similar provision into the Site Allocations Document.

Another danger of this approach is that if other sites elsewhere in the district fail to come forward in a timely fashion or do not deliver the number of units expected, then the Council will not have the flexibility to release land in sustainable locations that are covered by a Neighbourhood Plan to make up the shortfall, regain a robust housing supply and retain control of housing delivery in the district.

Finally, given the likelihood that the full OAN for the district will increase markedly once the review is finally carried out, there needs to be a process to ensure that areas with adopted Neighbourhood Plans do not prevent increased levels of growth coming forward in future. PPG is clear [Paragraph:084 Reference ID:41-084-201605 19] that ‘policies in a neighbourhood plan may become out of date, for example if they conflict with policies in a Local Plan that is adopted after the making of the neighbourhood plan. In such cases, the more recent plan policy takes precedence.’
Policy SSP2: Physical Limits Boundaries

The policy sets boundaries for all settlements listed as Major Centres, Town, Key and Local Service Centres in accordance with Core Strategy policy SP19. The policy allows for development including housing within these limits, subject to proposals being in accordance with other policies, including Neighbourhood Plans. It notes that proposals for new residential development outside physical limits boundaries will be strictly controlled.

As outlined above, Gladman consider the housing target in the adopted Core Strategy to be out of date as it does not represent the district's full OAN. Since the settlement boundaries are set to accommodate the out of date level of housing growth contained in the adopted Core Strategy, the boundary policies are also out of date. Many of the settlement boundaries remain from the old Local Plan and are therefore time-expired. Furthermore, the Core Strategy policy upon which SSP2 relies (SP19) was found to be out of date in the Fairfield Road, Framlingham appeal as the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land.

Setting strict settlement boundaries does not allow adequate flexibility for development to come forward outside the settlement boundary if this is required (for example due to a shortfall of housing land).

Gladman would object to the use of settlement limits if these would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. The Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead. The use of settlement limits to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements would not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework.

Gladman would be opposed to the definition of an urban edge if this would preclude appropriately sited and sustainable development coming forward to meet the district's housing needs, in accordance with the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development. Proposals that are sustainable should go ahead without delay. An overly restrictive approach could result in a plan that is not positively prepared or effective.

Policies SSP3 - SSP19

Gladman have no specific comments to make on the individual allocations within the plan except to note that many of the allocation policies place additional requirements on the delivery of sites, for example by requiring Development Briefs to be agreed or certain infrastructure to be provided before development can come forward. Gladman remind the Council of the guidance set out in Paragraph 173 of the Framework, which states that 'Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened'. This should be tested through a full plan viability assessment. Realistic and cautious delivery trajectories should be applied by the Council to sites requiring such infrastructure provisions.

In light of the judgement in FODC v. SSCLG and Gladman Developments Ltd [[2016] EWHC 421 Admin ], Gladman consider it is necessary for the Site Allocations DPD to carry out an assessment of the potential impact of proposed development on heritage assets, as set out in paragraph 129 of the Framework. The judgement concerns the interaction between paragraph 14 and paragraph 134 of the Framework, and the issues of the balancing exercise to be undertaken to assess the harm of any proposals against the benefits of the identified proposed development in accordance with paragraphs 133, 134 and 135 of the Framework. Gladman consider that the implications of the judgement apply equally to both the decision making process and the plan making process. Paragraph 134 is clear in talking about 'development proposals', a phrase which can apply equally to planning applications and proposed allocations. Furthermore, footnote 29 of the Framework clearly states that 'the principles and policies set out in this section apply to the heritage-related consent regimes for which local planning authorities are responsible under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as well as to plan-making and decision-taking". It is therefore essential that the implications of the above judgment are fully considered in the context of both decision-taking and plan-making.

The table on page 133 of the consultation document sets out the expected completions per year of the sites allocated in these policies. The Council will have to ensure that they have applied realistic assumptions around lead-in times and build-out rates for these sites.

Policy SSP39: Areas to be Protected from Development

Gladman would query whether such a blanket protection policy is compliant with the Framework.

Gladman submit that new development can often be located in countryside gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character. In such circumstances we would question the purpose of a gap designation, particularly if this would prevent the development of otherwise sustainable and deliverable housing sites to meet the borough's needs. Gladman note that there appears to be no robust evidence supporting the extent of the current countryside gap designations.

Para 55 of the Framework seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas to maintain and enhance rural vitality and viability. It is essential therefore, that the needs of the sustainable rural settlements across the district are assessed and a meaningful level of growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing vitality and viability. This will
help to preserve and enhance rural services and facilities and allow local rural communities to meet their own needs for housing whilst providing much needed affordable housing in the parts of the district that suffer with the greatest affordable housing need.

Gladman would be opposed to the use of Local Gaps if these would only serve to act as an arbitrary tool to prevent sustainable development. In this regard we submit that new development can often be located in local gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character.

Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan

The FAAP is intended to implement the adopted Core Strategy and will serve as a tool that can be used to direct sustainable development and investment in the FAAP area and identify land required to meet the level of growth identified in the Core Strategy. Table 1 summarises that 2,123 homes will come forward in the FAAP area, 1,120 from new allocations.

FPP1: New Housing Allocations

The policy distributes, with reference to Table 2, new housing allocations across the FAAP area. 590 are in Felixstowe itself whilst 430 are in Trimley St Martin and 100 in Trimley St Mary. Gladman are pleased that paragraph 3.22 makes clear that the figures in the policy are to be read as minima but wonder whether the wording of the policy itself should make this clearer. The fact the policy is for a minima allows for the possibility of further sustainable development to come forward.

Paragraph 3.23 states that the Council 'consider it necessary to over-allocate sites across the district to ensure that a five year land supply is maintained' and that this provides a range of sites, sizes and locations for development. We welcome the recognition that it takes into account the likely increase in the district's OAN in future. As Major Centres, areas like Felixstowe are inherently sustainable and its continued growth will make an important contribution to meeting the district's housing needs now and in the future; it is important that sustainable development can continue to take place here and is not arbitrarily constrained.

FPP2: Physical Limits Boundaries

As with policy SSP 2 in the Site Allocations DPD, this policy sets boundaries for all settlements listed as Major Centres, Town, Key and Local Service Centres in accordance with Core Strategy policy SP19. The policy allows for development including housing within these limits, subject to proposals being in accordance with other policies, including Neighbourhood Plans. It notes that 'proposals for new residential development outside physical limits boundaries will be strictly controlled'.

As outlined above Gladman consider the housing target in the adopted Core Strategy to be out of date as it does not represent the district's full OAN. Since the settlement boundaries are set to accommodate the out of date level of housing growth outlined in the adopted Core Strategy, the boundary policies are also out of date. Furthermore, the Core Strategy policy upon which SSP2 relies (SP19) was found out of date in the Fairfield Road, Framlingham appeal as the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land.

Setting strict settlement boundaries does not allow adequate flexibility for development to come forward outside the settlement boundary if this is required (for example due to a shortfall of housing land).

Gladman would object to the use of settlement limits if these would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. The Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead. The use of settlement limits to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements would not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework.

Gladman would be opposed to the definition of an urban edge if this would preclude appropriately sited and sustainable development coming forward to meet the borough's housing needs, in accordance with the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development. Proposals that are sustainable should go ahead without delay. An overly restrictive approach could result in a plan that is not positively prepared or effective.

Policy FPP5: Land North of Conway Close and Swallow Close, Felixstowe

Gladman support the allocation of land for new housing in this area. We welcome the recognition that 'the land to the north of Conway Close and Swallow Close can provide a natural extension to the built form of Felixstowe without causing a detrimental impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or important views of the Deben Estuary'.

Gladman also welcome the recognition that the presence of the Grade II listed Park Farm Cottages to the west of the site does not preclude development in the area provided that it is sympathetic to the heritage asset.

We note that there are potential capacity issues regarding the foul sewerage network that need to be overcome. Gladman submit that it is the responsibility of Anglian Water to provide sufficient capacity to serve the needs of housing.
in the area and that this should not be used as an excuse to prevent or delay development coming forward. Anglian Water are consulted through the plan process and so must be aware of the capacity issue and should be putting funding in place to resolve it.

Gladman recognise that the area may have some archaeological potential. It is our view and experience that full archaeological investigations are not necessary prior to the grant of planning permission and that appropriately-worded pre-commencement conditions attached to planning applications are effective at securing any archaeological remains on site without delaying the granting of planning permission.

Gladman would caution against being too prescriptive regarding the mix of housing, the design and layout, or the route of the footpath through the site, as these will need to be established and refined through a thorough analysis of the constraints and opportunities of the site and through engagement with the public and stakeholders. The Council will no doubt be aware of the requirements set out in paragraph 59 of the Framework, which states:

Local planning authorities should consider using design codes where they could help deliver high quality outcomes. However, design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.

Furthermore, paragraph 60 goes on to add:

Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

Finally, paragraph 65 makes it clear that

Local planning authorities should not refuse planning permission for buildings or infrastructure which promote high levels of sustainability because of concerns about incompatibility with on existing townscape, if those concerns have been mitigated by good design (unless the concern relates to a designated heritage asset and the impact would cause material harm to the asset or its setting which is not outweighed by the proposal's economic, social and environmental benefits).

In general Gladman remind the Council of the guidance set out in Paragraph 173 of the Framework, which states that 'Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened'.

Gladman submit that policies which seek developer contributions should be properly tested for their effects on development viability and supported by an adequate evidence base. The Council should not set onerous policy obligations that could place an undue burden on the ability of developers to deliver sustainable development.

Gladman submit that a site larger than the proposed allocation is suitable, available and deliverable. A larger allocation in this area could contribute to the over-provision of housing across the district and provide a buffer/reserve should other sites within the FAAP or across the district not come forward as anticipated, enabling the district to maintain a robust five year supply of housing land. Given the recognition that the OAN for the district is likely to increase in future, a larger allocation here could make a valuable contribution to an increased housing requirement in an area outside the AONB, reducing pressure for development within the AONB.

Policies FPP1 - FPP8

Gladman have no specific comments to make on the individual allocations within the plan except to note that many of the allocations policies place burdens upon the delivery of sites, for example by requiring Development Briefs to be agreed or certain infrastructure to be provided before development can come forward. Gladman remind the Council of the guidance set out in Paragraph 173 of the Framework, which states that ‘Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened’.

In light of the judgement in FODC v. SSCLG and Gladman Developments Ltd [[2016] EWHC 421 Admin], Gladman consider it is necessary for the FAAP to carry out an assessment of the potential impact of proposed development on heritage assets, as set out in paragraph 129 of the Framework. The judgement concerns the interaction between paragraph 14 and paragraph 134 of the Framework, and the issues of the balancing exercise to be undertaken to assess the harm of any proposals against the benefits of the identified proposed development in accordance with paragraphs 133, 134 and 135 of the Framework. Gladman consider that the implications of the judgement apply equally to both the decision making process and the plan making process. Paragraph 134 is clear in talking about ‘development proposals’, a phrase which can apply equally to planning applications and proposed allocations. Furthermore footnote 29 of the Framework clearly states that “The principles and policies set out in this section apply to the heritage-related consent regimes for which local planning authorities are responsible under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as well as to plan-making and decision-taking.” It is therefore essential that the implications of the above judgment are fully considered in the context of both decision-taking and plan-making.

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).
Policy FPP27: Access to the Countryside

The policy requires new residential developments in the Felixstowe Peninsular to make provision of accessible natural green spaces as agreed by the Council in conjunction with Natural England. Gladman would urge the Council to take a flexible and realistic approach to such provision, recognising that it could take a variety of forms. The Council should even consider payment of offsite contributions if this would be more appropriate given the constraints of a site and issues of viability.

Paragraph 173 of the Framework states that 'Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened'.

Policy FPP28: Areas to be Protected from Development

As with our comments on the Site Allocations DPD, Gladman would query whether such a blanket protection policy is compliant with the Framework.

Gladman submit that new development can often be located in countryside gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character. In such circumstances we would question the purpose of a gap designation, particularly if this would prevent the development of otherwise sustainable and deliverable housing sites to meet the borough's needs. Gladman note that there appears to be no robust evidence supporting the extent of the current countryside gap designations.

Para 55 of the Framework seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas to maintain and enhance rural vitality and viability. It is essential therefore, that the needs of the sustainable rural settlements across the district are assessed and a meaningful level of growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing vitality and viability. This will help to preserve and enhance rural services and facilities and allow local rural communities to meet their own needs for housing whilst providing much needed affordable housing in the parts of the district that suffer with the greatest affordable housing need.

Gladman would be opposed to the use of Local Gaps if these would only serve to act as an arbitrary tool to prevent sustainable development. In this regard we submit that new development can often be located in local gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character.

General Comments

In addition to the above comments on the FAAP policies, Gladman have the following general points to make about the FAAP.

Delivery Rates

The table on page 105 of the FAAP consultation document sets out the expected completions per year of the sites allocated in these policies. The Council will have to ensure that they have applied realistic assumptions around lead-in times and build-out rates for these sites.

Location of New Housing

Gladman would point out that Suffolk Coastal has a number of different and distinct housing market areas. Each of these distinct areas will have their own requirement for housing and this should be reflected in the spatial distribution of housing supply within the Local Plan. This decision should be based on the findings of the evidence base and should not be a politically driven spatial strategy to put a disproportionate amount of housing in areas where people don’t want to (and will not) live. If the spatial distribution does not reflect need/demand as shown by the evidence base, then housing will not be delivered and the Plan will not be implemented. Following a dispersed spatial distribution pattern across a large number of settlements is also undesirable as this approach is not likely to be sustainable, will not be delivered and cannot generate the level of community benefits that larger sites can to help make settlements more sustainable and fill important gaps in community provision.

Gladman would suggest a hybrid approach should be taken, with more sustainable settlements taking a greater proportion of growth than less sustainable locations. We would caution against too prescriptive a development strategy based solely on a development hierarchy that is itself based on too simplistic an understanding of sustainability (i.e. the number of services available). Whilst level of services is obviously an important criterion, the Framework is clear that development should be allowed where it is sustainable, when measured against the Framework as a whole and the three strands of sustainability (economic, social and environmental) in particular. When considering development in rural areas, Paragraph 55 of the Framework states that ‘housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.’ Furthermore paragraph 17 states that planning should ‘focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable’.

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).
New homes should be distributed in a way that enables the full OAN for the district to be met, rather than based too rigidly on percentages allocated to each town and village. This should take into account factors such as market conditions and viability - it is after all the private sector that will be expected to deliver the majority of the district's housing need and so it is important that the chosen distribution enables this to happen.

Regardless of the approach a sufficient range of sites need to be allocated (taking into account viability and market conditions) to ensure continuity of housing supply; more sites than needed to deliver the OAN should be allocated to account for slippage and delays. Whichever development strategy is adopted it is vital that the new Local Plan addresses this and that housing figures and distribution are aligned fully with economic growth aspirations.

Other Comments on Site Allocations and FAAP

Gladman have the following comments to make that apply to both the Site Allocations DPD and the FAAP document.

NPPF Changes

It is vital that the Site Allocations and FAAP fully reflect any revisions to the Framework, the recommendations of the Local Plan Expert Group when implemented, and any requirements relating to Starter Homes once these come into effect. Of particular importance will be the need to address possible changes to the Framework around ensuring housing is delivered on land allocated in plans through the introduction of a 'housing delivery test'. The consultation document on the proposed changes set out that ‘where significant under-delivery is identified over a sustained period, action needs to be taken to address this’ and that one approach ‘could be to identify additional sustainable sites if the existing approach is demonstrably not delivering the housing required’. The Site Allocations DPD and FAAP will need to include a mechanism for dealing with any sustained under-delivery in a timely fashion.

Another area that the LAPP should consider is the widening of the definition of affordable housing ‘so that it encompasses a fuller range of products that can support people to access home ownership’. It is proposed that the wider definition includes Starter Homes and the Housing and Planning Act has introduced provisions to make regulations to require all suitable reasonably-sized housing developments to include a proportion of Starter Homes. The Plans will need to address how this requirement will impact on the amount of more traditional types of affordable housing that could be delivered, which may entail an adjustment of the housing target to ensure the district’s full OAN can be met.

Duty to Cooperate

The development of the Site Allocations DPD and FAAP represents another opportunity to consider and address cross-boundary issues.

Paragraph 178 of the Framework states that ‘public bodies have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries’ and paragraph 179 states that ‘local planning authorities should work collaboratively with other bodies to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual Local Plans’. It goes on to say that ‘joint working should enable local planning authorities to work together to meet development requirements which cannot wholly be met within their own areas - for instance, because of a lack of physical capacity.

Paragraph 181 of the Framework further sets out that ‘cooperation should be a continuous process of engagement from initial thinking through to implementation, resulting in a final position where plans are in place to provide the land and infrastructure necessary to support current and projected future levels of development’.

PPG provides further explanation of how the policies contained within the Framework should be interpreted and applied. In terms of the Duty to Cooperate, PPG sets out that ‘local planning authorities should make every effort to secure the necessary cooperation on strategic cross boundary matters BEFORE they submit their Local Plans for examination’ (my emphasis).

Suffolk Coastal clearly needs to consider the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate. It is something that needs to be built into the entire plan-making process from the very beginning and failure to do so is not something that can be rectified retrospectively.

Sustainability Appraisal Interim Report and Sustainability Appraisal of Policies

Gladman have the following comments regarding the Sustainability Appraisal:

In accordance with Section 19 of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, policies set out in Local Plans must be subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Incorporating the requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, SA is a systematic process that should be undertaken at each stage of the Plan’s preparation, assessing the effects of the Local Plan’s proposals on sustainable development when judged against all reasonable alternatives.

The Council should ensure that the results of the SA process clearly justify its policy choices. In meeting the...
development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of the assessment why some policy options have been progressed, and others have been rejected. Undertaking a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, in the same level of detail for both chosen and rejected alternatives, the Council’s decision making and scoring should be robust, justified and transparent.

Gladman remind the Council that there have now been a number of instances where the failure to undertake a satisfactory SA has resulted in Plans failing the test of legal compliance at Examination (South Somerset) or being subjected to later legal challenge (Heard vs Greater Norwich Development Plan).

Conclusions

What is clear from the Framework, and from the Government's agenda to boost significantly the supply of housing, is that the premise of the whole process is the assessment and delivery of the full OAN for housing in an area unless there are adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. If the process set out in the Framework and PPG is not followed then the Council run the real risk of the plan being found unsound and this will create significant delay and uncertainty in the process.

All of our best interests are served by your authority getting a Local Plan found sound at the earliest possible opportunity, rather than us utilising considerable resources on preparing for and attending EIPs, preparing Judicial Reviews etc. This approach will put the authority back in control of planning in their area and will give the Members comfort and certainty over the level and location of development that will take place over the lifetime of the Plan.

Gladman have raised concerns in relation to the issues and options being considered by the Council which will fundamentally affect the 'soundness' of the Local Plan (with reference to tests of soundness outlined in paragraph 182 of the Framework). If the Local Plan is approached in such a way as presented it will not provide a positive policy approach and in a number of cases it is not consistent with national policy.

Gladman hope that you have found this representation constructive. If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact myself or a member of the Gladman team.

Summary: Gladman submit that policies which seek developer contributions should be properly tested for their effects on development viability and supported by an adequate evidence base. The Council should not set onerous policy obligations that could place an undue burden on the ability of developers to deliver sustainable development. Gladman submit that a site larger than the proposed allocation is suitable, available and deliverable. A larger allocation in this area could contribute to the over-provision of housing across the district and provide a buffer/reserve should other sites within the FAAP or across the district not come forward as anticipated, enabling the district to maintain a robust five year supply of housing land. Given the recognition that the OAN for the district is likely to increase in future, a larger allocation here could make a valuable contribution to an increased housing requirement in an area outside the AONB, reducing pressure for development within the AONB.

Change to Plan

<table>
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<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
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Attachments: Scanned Representation

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. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Christchurch Land and Estates (Felixstowe) Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Christchurch") are the promoters of the land at Candlet Road Felixstowe (hereinafter referred to as "the site") edged red on the plan attached as Annexure 1. A planning application reference DC/15/1128/OUT was refused by the Council on 12th June 2015 and is now the subject of an appeal.

1.2 It is confirmed in paragraph 4.28 of the adopted Local Plan (July 2013) with our emphasis added that "4.28 Felixstowe with Walton is by far the largest town within the District and includes the port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, being of both regional and national significance....."

It is considered that the site is a potential urban extension to Felixstowe ("the largest town within the District").

1.3 The site is in a highly sustainable location for the growth of Felixstowe (to address housing need), and should therefore, in our opinion, be allocated as part of the preferred strategy in accordance with the principles of sustainability set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

1.4 Christchurch consider that the Council is failing to address the full objective assessment of housing need (FOAN) for the District, which contention is supported by the land at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, Suffolk appeal decision letter, appeal reference 3011466, paragraphs 14 to 28 (attached as Annexure 3).

1.5 Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework considers that for a plan to be considered "sound" it should be "positively prepared", and that it should meet objectively assessed development needs. In failing to address the objectively assessed need, the Area Action Plan is not "positively prepared".

1.6 The approach to distributing the growth of Felixstowe (one of dispersal), as the strategy in the Area Action Plan document, is not considered the appropriate strategy for the future development needs in the Peninsular. The Council has failed to advance any proper or sufficient analysis to support its proposed approach as opposed to allocation of a significant (and sustainable) urban extension such as the Candlet Road growth area (abutting the Felixstowe settlement boundary).

1.7 Accordingly, and by reference to paragraph 182 of the Framework, it cannot be concluded that the Area Action Plan is;

"justified",
"the most appropriate strategy",
"consistent with national policy" (paragraph 52).

1.8 The submissions made by Christchurch earlier this year relating to the site also contained a detailed response to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (31st March 2014) and the corresponding consideration of site suitability in the emerging Plan.

1.9 The Candlet Road site has not been allocated in the Area Action Plan, therefore in terms of the emerging Plan, the site is an "omission site".

It is submitted that the Council has failed to properly assess appropriate alternative sites in their Sustainability Appraisal Report Proposed Submission Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Development Plan Document (April 2016) to ensure that the most sustainable sites come forward.

1.10 Thereby compounding our concern that the Area Action Plan is not "justified".

2. FULL OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED HOUSING NEED

2.1 The requirement of 7,900 dwellings as set out in Policy SP2 of the adopted Core Strategy is now considered to be out of date as the process of review stipulated within the policy (to review the Core Strategy by 2015 at the latest) has not been commenced. Given that the requirement of 7,900 is both out of date, and fails to reflect the full objectively assessed need for housing (FOAN), the emerging plan should be proceeding on the basis of an up to date review of housing need (as recognised by the Core Strategy itself). That the figure of 7,900 is out of date has been recognised by the Inspector in the Framlingham appeal decision. It is considered that the current FOAN for the District is between 15,000 (750 per annum) and 22,360 dwellings (1,118 per annum) for the period 2011 to 2031.

2.2 Sustainably located sites need to be identified to ensure that the FOAN is met.

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).
2.3 The proposed approach in the Area Action Plan is neither justified nor positively prepared. The development needs of the District will not be met.

3. THE GROWTH STRATEGY IN THE AREA ACTION PLAN

3.1 The growth of Felixstowe, as proposed in the Area Action Plan, is not considered the most appropriate strategy for the future development needs in the Peninsular, and there is no proper or sufficient analysis to support the dispersed approach adopted by the Plan.

3.2 The site at Candlet Road, together with other land holdings, should be considered the most sustainable growth option for the town.

3.3 The adopted Local Plan (July 2013) confirms at paragraph 4.28;

"4.28 Felixstowe with Walton is by far the largest town within the District and includes the port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, being of both regional and national significance....."

3.4 Paragraph 4.31 of the adopted Local Plan confirms;

"4.31 The growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one...."

3.5 The site at Candlet Road Felixstowe (as part of a sustainable urban extension) is in a position to "redress" this imbalance identified at paragraph 4.31 of the adopted Local Plan.

3.6 It is, further acknowledged, at paragraph 4.35 of the adopted Local Plan that;

"4.35 Longer term, it is likely that additional housing will need to be provided......"

3.7 Strategic Policy SP21 of the adopted Local Plan confirms (with our emphasis added);

"The strategy for Felixstowe will be to reverse the recent trends towards a population in balance, threats to local services and a decline in the fortunes of the town in order to enable it to fulfil its role as a major centre......."

"Additional housing will be created. In the short to medium term, this will represent organic and evolutionary growth in the Felixstowe and Trimleys area over a mixture of sites immediately abutting existing built up areas......."

3.8 Whilst adopted Local Plan policy SP21 refers to a "strategy for a dispersed pattern of future development" it is submitted that such an approach is not sustainable and also does not accord with the thrust of strategic policy SP21 by recommending development "immediately abutting existing built up areas.....".

3.9 Policies SP1 and SP1A of the adopted Local Plan seek the achievement of sustainable development.

3.10 With regard to Felixstowe, the 2013 Local Plan confirms:

"4.28 Felixstowe with Walton is by far the largest town within the district and includes the Port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, being of both regional and national significance....." (with emphasis added).

"4.29 Felixstowe has more people of retirement age and fewer people of working age than the norm, either in the rest of Suffolk or across the UK......"

"Younger generations already have to look outside Felixstowe for careers and housing" (with emphasis added).

"4.30 The population of Felixstowe is increasing slowly although household size is falling. Despite slow population growth there are, therefore, even more people looking for homes, and Felixstowe has more small households - single people or couples - particularly those that are key workers or first time buyers. The number and type of new homes provided in the town over recent years has not matched this increase in demand".

"4.31 The growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one......" (with emphasis added).

3.11 On the 27th February 2015, Christchurch made submissions to the then emerging Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies and the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan, relating to the site.
3.12 The February submissions referred to a Council report to the Local Development Framework Task Group on the 4th August 2008 (LPTG11/08). The Council's consideration of the ("option 4") land north of Candlet Road Felixstowe stated:

"on the whole option 4 has significant merit. It represents a good sustainable option that benefits from existing formal and informal recreational areas to the east as well as access to the town centre. It is also the closest area to the town centre and development might also ensure a stronger and more viable town centre given the increased usage of facilities there...the landscape, particularly the western part, is the least sensitive of all of the option and the existing wildlife corridor in the east can be built upon as part of a strategy of enhancing green infrastructure".

3.13 The 2008 Council Report confirms Christchurch's contention that the site (combined with other land holdings) is a highly sustainable location for growth, being immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary and close to a range of services and facilities within walking and cycling distance, therefore should be an allocated site.

3.14 The site (combined with other land holdings) is not a preferred allocation for residential development despite Core Strategy Policy SP21 confirming that (with our emphasis added)

"additional housing will be created"

"over a mixture of sites immediately abutting existing built up areas" and to

"create a more sustainable balance between housing and employment thereby providing an opportunity to reduce commuting"

3.15 Paragraph 4.31 of the adopted 2013 Local Plan confirms:

"4.31 The growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one.

The 2001 Census revealed that there was a daily net inflow to Felixstowe of 2,719 workers. This comprised an outflow of 3,600 Felixstowe residents to jobs in Ipswich and elsewhere and an inflow of 6,319 who work in Felixstowe but live elsewhere".

3.16 The site (combined with other land holdings) abuts the urban area of Felixstowe, complies with the aims and objectives of adopted Local Plan and creates additional housing to address the "imbalance" set out in paragraph 4.31 (above), constituting "organic and evolutionary growth".

3.17 Whilst adopted Policy SP21 confirms;

"a strategy for a dispersed pattern of future development"

which is continued in the Area Action Plan (the site is not identified as a preferred allocation) it is considered that a "dispersed pattern" is not the most sustainable growth option for Felixstowe.

4. RESPONSE TO THE STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT ("SHLAA") (SITE SUITABILITY)

4.1 The site (potentially part of a larger land assembly) has previously been considered by the Local Planning Authority and with particular regard to the 'Core Strategy - Proposed location of strategic housing growth in Felixstowe and the Trimley villages'.

4.2 As noted above, a Report on this matter was presented to the Local Development Framework Task Group on 4th August 2008 (LPTG 11/08). A copy of the Report is attached as Annexure 2 to these Submissions.

4.3 The site formed one part of a number of recommendations as to which sites should be the preference to the Council for the location of housing growth, indicating a preference toward larger developments, with related infrastructure incorporated into those schemes.

4.4 Appendix 1 to LPTG 11/08 provided some background in reaching that conclusion. Within this Appendix, it is stated that the landscape

'is not particularly attractive. It is, however, visible from a number of locations. Most are close distance and with the introduction of mitigation planting are not significant. The exception will be from the east where the close proximity viewpoints are in elevated locations and the topography would still allow views in to the area'.

4.5 The Appendix also states that

'the landscape in the part of the area to the east of Gulpher Road is more sensitive and shows a lower capacity to
absorb development than the west. It also already has some recreational/green infrastructure value. In an area of current and predicted deficiencies of accessible natural greenspace, this part of area 4 may provide opportunities to address this’.

4.6 Whilst only referenced in the Executive Summary to the Appendix, the report states that the site is ‘separated from Felixstowe by the single carriageways of Candlet Road, but has Gulpher Road passing beneath it and the ability for crossings to be created. Development would be close to the town centre. Road access to the Port is easy although sustainable means of travel by cycle or on foot could need to be created’.

4.7 The Council’s summary acknowledged that;

‘on the whole option 4 has significant merit. It represents a good sustainable option that benefits from existing formal and informal recreational areas to the east as well as access to the town centre. It is also the closest area to the town centre and development might also ensure a stronger and more viable town centre given the increased usage of facilities there…the landscape, particularly the western part, is the least sensitive of all of the option and the existing wildlife corridor in the east can be built upon as part of a strategy of enhancing green infrastructure’.

4.8 The conclusion of the SHLAA and the (site suitability) emerging Plan and the Sustainability Report is clearly at odds with the Council’s previous assessment of the site’s merits.

5. THE SUSTAINABILITY OF THE CANDLET ROAD SITE/AREA AND THE COUNCIL’S SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

5.1 Christchurch commissioned Turley to carry out a detailed Sustainability Appraisal of the land north of Candlet Road (February 2015).

5.2 The Sustainability Appraisal confirms that this location is a highly sustainable location for residential development, abutting the main area of Felixstowe, the largest town in the District.

5.3 The Turley Sustainability Appraisal also references the recommendations contained in the 2008 Report where the current Head of Planning Services at the Council confirmed that the land north of Candlet Road Felixstowe presented the most appropriate and sustainable option for the growth of the town.

5.4 It is particularly noted, that officers did not favour the "dispersed pattern of development" as advocated by both the Local Plan (July 2013) and the emerging Plan.

5.5 The Council have prepared a Sustainability Appraisal Report. The Sustainability Appraisal is not adequate, particularly with regard to the way that the Sustainability Appraisal appraises the strategic alternatives. The reasons for selection of the Preferred Options (as opposed to alternatives) are not clear.

5.6 It cannot be concluded that the Council have properly taken into account reasonable alternatives, thereby undermining the soundness of the Plan.

6. ALTERNATIVE SITES (PREFERRED OPTIONS)

6.1 The focusing of housing growth adjacent to Felixstowe represents the most sustainable growth option.

6.2 The most sustainable strategy for accommodation of housing growth at Felixstowe is for new development to be accommodated within the existing limits of the urban area, and then sustainable urban extensions.

6.3 We have raised concerns with regard to the adequacy of the preferred options site selection procedure.

6.4 In addition, there is a concern that certain allocations may, in reality, be undelivered due to heritage constraints.

Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") obliges the decision maker, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

6.5 In R (on the application of Forge Field Society) v Sebenoaks District Council [2014] EWHC 1896 (Admin), Lindblom J referred to this duty - and the parallel duty under Section 72(1) of the 1990 Act in relation to development within a conservation area - in the following terms with our emphasis added:

“…. it is to recognise, as the Court of Appeal emphasised in [East Northamptonshire District Council v Secretary of
State for Communities and Local Government [2014] EWCA Civ 137, that a finding of harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area gives rise to a strong presumption against planning permission being granted. The presumption is a statutory one. It is not irrebuttable. It can be outweighed by material considerations powerful enough to do so.

But an authority can only properly strike the balance between harm to a heritage asset on the one hand and planning benefits on the other if it is conscious of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation and if it demonstrably applies that presumption to the proposal it is considering”.

6.6 Furthermore, paragraph 169 of the Framework requires the Local Planning Authority to have

“up to date evidence about the historic environment in their area and use it to assess the significance of heritage assets and the contribution they make to the environment…..”

6.7 The following allocations suffer from serious constraints associated with designated heritage assets. We have seen no clear evidence which shows that those constraints can be overcome in respect of the following sites;

(a) Policy FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street Felixstowe

"development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street and their setting"

(b) Policy FPP5 Land north of Conway Close and Swallow Close Felixstowe

(c) Policy FPP7 Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin

7. CONCLUSIONS

7.1 It is considered, for the reasons outlined in this submission, that the land at Candlet Road should be allocated in the Area Action Plan.

7.2 By omitting the site, the Plan would fail to significantly boost housing supply and fail to meet the objectively assessed housing needs of the District (paragraphs 14 and 47 of the Framework).

7.3 It is submitted that the AAP document would be sound - in securing the necessary delivery for infrastructure, and an appropriate delivery of new housing - if land at Candlet Road is allocated for housing as part of an urban extension for Felixstowe.

7.4 The proposed release of land at Candlet Road represents the most sustainable, viable and ultimately deliverable option to achieve the required housing and infrastructure needs for Felixstowe and the surrounding area.

7.5 It is submitted, therefore, that the Candlet Road site should be a preferred location for housing, being an appropriate urban extension to Felixstowe where the other competing sites do not relate as well in terms of connections and accessibility to the town, that against this criteria the Candlet Road site is the most sustainable and appropriate option for the extension (growth) of Felixstowe.

Richard Brown MSc
27th May 2016

Annexures

1. Site plan

2. Local Development Framework Task Group Report on 04/08/08 (LPTG 11/08), together with Appendix 8

3. Land at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, Suffolk IP13 9LH, appeal reference 3011466

Summary: The following allocations suffer from serious constraints associated with designated heritage assets. We have seen no clear evidence which shows that those constraints can be overcome in respect of the following sites;
8008  Object  Housing  Policy FPP5: Land north of Conway Close and Swallow Close, Felixstowe

(b) Policy FPP5 Land north of Conway Close and Swallow Close Felixstowe

Change to Plan
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- Apx8 Appraisal of each option
- Scanned Representation
- Representation Form
- Appeal decision
- Recommended Preferred Options Report Aug2008
- Site Plan
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We understand the need for extra housing in the Felixstowe area. But it must be done in keeping with the community feel and spirit.

Certain sites are totally unsuitable and will cause untold problems. Instead of solving issues it will cause more. We feel that having 2 main sites with a reduced footprint would spread the stress on Felixstowe's infrastructure, the opposite side of the A14 have a school, possibly a good site to build new homes.

High Street Walton. This site has always been identified as a potential site but the size and location are of serious worry. A large housing estate without proper access will turn the High Road into a car park. Any access from Candlet Road will always have knock on issues to the main dock spur roundabout. As above you could reduce the amount of housing, creating a better atmosphere within the estate and help the high road.

Conway Close. Although in old Felixstowe the access to Colneis Road/Candlet Road/A14 is excellent A limited well thought out estate would provide one of the most sort after area as to live in on the Peninsular.

Howlett Road. We worry about its effect on the local sewer network. This area is already under stress, adding 360 more houses on such a vast scale as proposed would put a huge strain on schools, doctors, drainage, roads etc. This will add another 600 vehicles to the road system and the access is poor. Already we have had many accidents down this road this will only add to more near misses and accidents. We will lose a Village and it will become a Town concreting over the country will change the nature and character of Trimley.

Leisure activities, like horse riding, dog walking, cycling would all be affected by Trimleys green fields shrinking.

Hand In Hand - That part of the high road is bad at the best of times. The road thins dangerously and the addition of further housing would make this unsuitable. Unless you could widen the road OR make it one way we would be totally against this build.

I would reiterate our initial point. A spread of new housing over Walton / and Conway would provide a boost to Felixstowe but remove major issues it would cause to the infrastructure.

Summary:

Hand In Hand - That part of the high road is bad at the best of times. The road thins dangerously and the addition of further housing would make this unsuitable. Unless you could widen the road OR make it one way we would be totally against this build.

Change to Plan

Not Specified Not Specified Not Specified Not Specified None

Attachments:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed submission version of the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Whilst in principle we have no objections to raise we would request some modifications:

- Policy FPP3: Land at Sea Road, Felixstowe
- Policy FPP5: Land north of Conway Close and Swallow Close, Felixstowe
- Policy FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin
- Policy FPP10: Land at Bridge Road, Felixstowe
- Policy FPP11: Land at Carr Road/Langer Road, Felixstowe
- Policy FPP12: Land at Haven Exchange, Felixstowe

. Confirmation of adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or action to upgrade to create the required capacity.

3.81 . The capacity of the foul sewerage network is a constraint that needs to be overcome to the satisfaction of Anglian Water.
Suffolk County Council have statutory responsibility for Surface Water Management. (Note: The subject of foul and surface water issues need to be separated)

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you wish to discuss the above comments,

Summary:
Whilst in principle we have no objections to raise we would request some modifications:

- Policy FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin

. Confirmation of adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or action to upgrade to create the required capacity.
We would like to submit comments on the above document.

Trimley St Martin Parish Council previously requested the addition/changes be included in the Proposed Submission Document shown below; however it is with great disappointment we note that, on reading the Proposed Submission Document, although some of the council's comments have been included, the items highlighted in yellow have been disregarded when preparing the final text.

a) Policy FPP6 - Land opposite the Hand in Hand Public House, High Road - residential development

Whilst in principle the Council would prefer to see this site undeveloped, if development is to occur the Council would like the following changes and additions to policy FPP6:­

- Applicants should have regard to the following:
  a) Primary vehicular access onto High Road
  b) Village green to be created fronting onto High Road to reduce impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand Public House
  c) Existing Public Right of Way to be retained and integrated into the site layout
  d) 70 dwellings expected on the site as a minimum with affordable housing provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2
  e) Future residential properties should not extend beyond the residential curtilage of 21 Grimston Lane
  f) A range of housing types and tenures in keeping with the surrounding area and in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6
  g) Maximum build height of 2 storeys
  h) High percentage of bungalow/low rise units to reflect character of the surrounding area
  i) Air Quality assessment required

TSM Proposed Wording

- The ONLY vehicular access is to be onto High Road
- Village green to be created fronting onto High Road to reduce impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand Public House
- Existing Public Right of Way to be retained and integrated into the site layout
- 70 dwellings expected on the site AS A MAXIMUM with affordable housing provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2
- FUTURE DEVELOPMENT (RESIDENTIAL OR COMMERCIAL) should not extend beyond the residential curtilage of 21 Grimston Lane
- A range of housing types and tenures in keeping with the surrounding area and in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6. The range to be determined by a Local Housing Needs Survey conducted by an independent organization and paid for by the developer.
- Maximum build height of 2 storeys
- High percentage of bungalow/low rise units to reflect character of the surrounding area
- Air Quality assessment required

Road widening of High Road to provide layby parking on its south side (the north boundary of this development Junction control (mini-roundabout or traffic lights) for access road opposite Mill Lane
Pedestrian crossing in High Road to enable residents from new development to access services

b) Policy FPP7 - Land off Howlett Way - residential development

Whilst in principle the Council would prefer to see this site undeveloped, if development is to occur the Council would like the following changes and additions to policy FPP7:­

- Applicants should have regard to the following:
  a) Primary vehicular access onto Howlett Way
  b) No vehicular access onto Church Lane
  c) Links to existing Public Rights of Way Network
  d) 360 dwellings expected on the site as a minimum with affordable housing provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2
  e) A range of housing types and tenures in keeping with the surrounding area and in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6
  f) Development to be sympathetic to the setting of the Old Rectory

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).
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- g) Site design and layout to take into account the water mains crossing the site
- h) On-site open space and play facilities to meet needs identified in the SCDC Leisure Strategy
- i) Air Quality Assessment needed

TMS Proposed Wording

- a] The ONLY vehicular access to be onto Howlett Way
- b] No vehicular access onto Church Lane
- c] Links to existing Public Rights of Way Network
- d] 360 dwellings expected on the site AS A MAXIMUM with affordable housing provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2
- e] A range of housing types and tenures in keeping with the surrounding area and in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6. The range to be determined by a Local Housing Needs Survey conducted by an independent organization and paid for by the developer.
- f] Development to be sympathetic to the setting of the Old Rectory
- g] Site design and layout to take into account the water mains crossing the site
- h] On-site open space and play facilities to meet needs identified in the SCDC Leisure Strategy
- i) Air Quality Assessment needed
  - Maximum build height of 2 storeys

Members of this council feel the disregard of these important additions/changes represent important omissions from the final document and request the situation be reviewed and rectified.

Summary:

TMS Proposed Wording

The ONLY vehicular access is to be onto High Road

70 dwellings expected on the site MAXIMUM with affordable housing provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT (RESIDENTIAL OR COMMERCIAL) should not extend beyond the residential curtilage of 21 Grimston Lane

A range of housing types and tenures in keeping with the surrounding area and in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6. THE RANGE TO BE DETERMINED BY A LOCAL HOUSING NEEDS SURVEY CONDUCTED BY AN INDEPENDENT ORGANIZATION AND PAID FOR BY THE DEVELOPER.

Junction control (mini-roundabout or traffic lights) for access road opposite Mill Lane

Pedestrian crossing in High Road to enable residents from new development to access services

Change to Plan

- Soundness Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments:
Scanned Representation

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).
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II* Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We highlighted that the principal elevation of Walton Hall faces north and overlooks site 451g. It was considered that development here would urbanise the setting of this important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance. It was expressed that harm would also be caused to the Grade II lodge and we strongly advised that an alternative site was found for development, though it was thought that there may be scope for some limited development at the eastern end of this site.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfilling the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words ‘and their setting’ in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. Paragraph 157 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Plans to provide detailed 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 an indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan. In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be
protected.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed. At Preferred Options stage, we considered 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 note that the policy still does not include this requirement (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.88.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

FPP7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin (451c and 451d)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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 references in paragraph 3.104 and Policy FPP7 bullet point 7 to the setting of the churches and high quality developments, sympathetic to the character of the area and Listed Buildings.

FPP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary (383f and 451f)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

Town Centre
FFP13: Felixstowe Town Centre and FFP14: Retail Frontages
As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FFP13 and FFP14.

District Centres
FFP16: District Centres
As above in previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.

Tourism and Sea Front Activities

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).
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word 'on' with 'to'.

FFP18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to CobBolds Point, FPP20: CobBolds Point to Spa, FFP21: Spa to Martello Park and FFP22 Martello Park to Landguard

We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FFP23: Car Parking

At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the 'high quality of design' requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment

At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe's archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council's approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area

We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report 'Felixstowe South Conservation Area' commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to...
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identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment. The conservation area survey identified the loss of architectural detail as a significant problem, and consideration might therefore be given to applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a Townscape Heritage programme for the area, or a smaller partnership scheme with Historic England to reinstate lost architectural details on key buildings etc.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden

We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Other Issues

Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding

At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary:

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. Paragraph 157 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Plans to provide detail with site allocations where appropriate.

Change to Plan

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).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7808</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>iii, iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachments:**
Scanned Representation

*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).*
Thank you for consulting Suffolk County Council on submission version for development in Felixstowe.

Suffolk County Council responded previously to the preferred options stage in November 2015. This response does not rehearse all the issues as Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) has responded well to the points that the county council made at the time.

The following response relates to the ways in which the development of these sites affects county council responsibilities, and how our authorities will need to work together to bring these sites forward in a successful way.

This letter does not take into account the impact of sites which may come forward as windfall development, which may have significant impacts on local infrastructure.

Archaeology

Additional text has been systematically added in general information about archaeology, using the county council's previous comments. It introduces archaeology throughout the document and gives the plan a sound approach to archaeology.

Suffolk County Council Archaeology has reviewed the document and the only minor outstanding matters relate to suggested amendments and the terminology used in the following paragraphs:

Para. 3.74 (FPP4) - the site will require archaeological excavation rather than assessment, as it has already been assessed. Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service can provide a brief for the works and also discuss options for preservation in situ.

Paras. 3.82 (FPP5), 3.94 (FPP6), 3.101 (FPP7), 3.109 (FPP8) - Change the reference to archaeological assessment "prior to the development of the site" to "at an appropriate design stage prior to the granting of outline, technical details or full planning permission." This will allow for preservation in situ, where appropriate, of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed, for which conditions may or may not be sufficient.

With regard to FFP12 (Land at Haven Exchange), which is an enabling policy, archaeological investigation will be required, particularly for larger schemes.

Education

Early Education

The document reflects advice provided by the county council on the need for at least one additional facility for early years education (excluding the Candlet Road site subject to an appeal). The detail provided is paragraphs 3.39 to 3.41 is welcomed. During the previous stage, the county council highlighted ways in which policy FPP15 could be more supportive of early education in retail centres, as part of a balanced policy which also protects the vitality and viability of retail centres. The county raised the point that policy FPP16 (previously FPP17) would support early years provision, which SCDC has considered. Therefore, our councils agree that early years facilities can be considered as "other local services" within FPP16.

Primary Education

The challenge presented by the distribution of housing proposed for ensuring sufficient additional primary school places has been recognised in the submission version. Land needs to be identified for a new primary school in order to ensure that there can be confidence of a long term solution for primary school provision. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in identifying options for sites based on the pattern of development coming forward and the need to find a location that promotes sustainable travel choices. The two locations identified and other alternatives as stated in para. 3.44 provide a clear indication of how a site could be identified. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in keeping the expected size of school and the area of land required under review.

Transport

A report by AECOM, on behalf of Highways England and Suffolk County Council (SCC), to assess the cumulative impact of development proposed in the Area Action Plan on the local and strategic road networks is attached to this response. In addition to the sites identified, this report implicitly includes background growth port-related traffic and the growth throughout the district.

The Suffolk County Council supports the creation of a link road between Candlet Road and High Street Walton. The intention of this link is that it is designed to serve local journeys so that the impacts from rerouting are localised.

I hope that these comments are helpful. Please contact me via the details at the top of this letter, if we or any of our colleagues can be of assistance.
Summary: Paras. 3.82 (FPP5), 3.94 (FPP6), 3.101 (FPP7), 3.109 (FPP8) - Change the reference to archaeological assessment "prior to the development of the site" to "at an appropriate design stage prior to the granting of outline, technical details or full planning permission." This will allow for preservation in situ, where appropriate, of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed, for which conditions may or may not be sufficient.

Change to Plan
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</tr>
</tbody>
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Attachments:
I write in response to the Proposed Submission consultation, submitting representations on behalf of my client, Trinity College, Cambridge, in respect of the draft allocation of Proposed Submission Policy FPP6 - Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin.

As owner, Trinity College supports the proposed allocation of the above site for residential development, subject to the matters outlined below and the requirements of Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework).

The allocation of the site will make a meaningful contribution towards the pressing need for new housing across the Peninsula, allied with the Council's commitment to deliver a minimum of 1,760 new dwellings in Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimley villages during the plan period (2010 to 2027) of the adopted Core Strategy.

The Core Strategy states that Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimley villages is by far the largest town within the District and includes the Port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, of both regional and national significance. Pertinently, it also acknowledges that the growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one. This had led to an unsustainable increase in commuting from other towns on a daily basis. In addition, the population in the area is increasing at the same time as average household sizes are falling, further increasing the need for housing. The number and type of new homes provided in recent years has not matched this increase in demand.

The importance of boosting housing supply in Felixstowe is demonstrated by the Council's commitment (as required by the Inspector who examined the Core Strategy) to pursue an early review of the Core Strategy's strategic policies (amongst them a minimum housing requirement of 7,900 dwellings) by 2015 to address objectively assessed housing needs (Policy SP2 - Housing Numbers and Distribution). As part of the evidence base to inform the Core Strategy, Oxford Economics were commissioned (2010) to determine housing need for the District, which was established to be 11,000 dwellings at that time. It is understood that evidence gathering during 2015 indicates that the current full, objectively assessed district wide housing need could be higher still.

As such, current housing need is higher than the levels of growth currently being planned for, and more sites are likely to be required to come forward on the peninsular in the medium term, over and above those proposed for allocation via the AAP. It is, therefore, critical to make the best use of land for housing and prioritise the delivery of residential development.

The necessity to urgently have an adopted AAP in place to encourage the delivery of housing is heightened by the current deficit in the five-year supply of deliverable housing sites in Suffolk Coastal District as required by Paragraph 49 of the NPPF. As such, the presumption in favour of sustainable development is applicable to residential applications made within the District. This position has recently (25 April 2016) been confirmed by an appeal decision for a site at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, where an Inspector assessed the Council's housing land supply at 3.7 years at best, commenting:

"The future for housing growth in the District is seriously uncertain and is not following the plan-led approach that is advocated in the first of twelve core planning principles set out in the NPPF. In these circumstances, it is necessary to maintain the principle established in the PPG; that undersupply should be addressed in the first five years of the remaining plan period, the Sedgefield method, rather than over the remaining years of the plan period, the Council's preferred Liverpool method" (para.25).

In concluding on the land supply issue, the Inspector concluded:

"The relevant five-year period for an assessment of housing delivery is April 2015 to March 2020 and during that period the BT Adastral Park site will contribute only 200 dwellings towards housing supply. It is appropriate to apply a 20% buffer and it is necessary to require the shortfall in previous housing delivery to be delivered over the first five years, and not over the remainder, of the plan period. Based on these three main factors, and setting aside the debate about housing delivery being based on the OAN for the District rather than the CS figure of 7,900 dwellings, it is estimated that the Council has a housing land supply of only about 3.7 years. Even if only one of the three main factors is correct the Council does not have a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing. Furthermore, if the housing requirement is based on an OAN of 11,000 dwellings, as established in the CS, or on any realistic prediction of what an OAN for the District is likely to be, housing land supply is less than 3.7 years.

The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land and paragraph 49 of the NPPF is therefore engaged" (paras 27 and 28, appeal decision APP/J3530W/15/3011466).

This appeal decision corroborates the findings of two earlier appeals for sites at North Entrance, Saxmundham (PINS
Ref. APP/J3530/A/14/2221769) and Woods Lane, Melton (APP/J3530/A/14/225141) issued in July and September 2015 respectively, where it was concluded that the District did not have a five-year housing land supply.

Given the five-year housing supply deficit and the Council's commitment to deliver at least 1,760 new dwellings in Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimleys between 2010 and 2027, this sustainable site represents a key opportunity to deliver much needed housing, address the five-year housing supply deficit and realise the objectives of the adopted Core Strategy.

The host site is one of a number identified by the Council as being suitable for residential development in its Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA, 2014). My client supports the SHLAA's conclusion that the site is deliverable, being suitable, available and achievable for development within 5 years.

The suitability of the site for housing is reaffirmed by its sustainability. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) supporting the Proposed Submission AAP consultation identifies that it scores well when considered against its social, environmental and economic effects. In particular, the SA acknowledges that the site scores well in terms of major positive social effects due to the provision of potential community benefits:

For example:

* The site is located close to a range of local services, including the Trimley Sports and Social Club, Memorial Hall, Hand in Hand Public House, and Trimley Methodist Church.

* It is adjacent to bus routes (High Road) connecting the village with Felixstowe and Ipswich.

* The site will assist in the Core Strategy's aim to reduce and reverse the unsustainable patterns of in-commuting to Felixstowe (the Port and its other employment areas).

* On site open space to provide a village green to the High Street frontage to provide a new open space for the village (community benefits), and reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand Public House.

In essence, the site is ideally suited for residential development and its allocation in the AAP is entirely consistent with the Core Strategy's short to medium term objectives to deliver organic and evolutionary growth over a mixture of sites immediately abutting existing built up areas.

Scale of Residential Development Required

We acknowledge and welcome that the wording of Policy FPP6 has been amended since the Preferred Options document, to provide some flexibility in the number of houses to be delivered, changing to an expectation that "approximately 70" dwellings will be delivered on the site rather than "70 dwellings expected on the site as a minimum". This is considered to better reflect the previous SHLAA's estimate of its maximum capacity of 54 dwellings (SHLAA, March 3151 2014) and indicative capacity of 70 homes (SHLAA, November 2010). My client acknowledges this "approximately 70 dwellings" target and has brought forward a masterplan as part of an outline planning application that will seek to deliver up to 70 dwellings, whilst recognising the necessity to take other constraints into account, such as the need to respect the setting of the Listed Public House and the desire to provide a suitably sized village green to act as a focus for Trimley St Martin.

Requirement for a Range of Housing Types (Including Bungalows)

My client has no objection to bringing forward proposals which provide for a good mix of housing, including dwellings suitable for the elderly, but does object to the prescriptive policy requirement that reads 'including bungalows ......in keeping with surrounding area'.

Following representations made to the Preferred Options Consultation it remains unclear what evidence of need this requirement is based on because little justification is provided in the AAP. For example, it should be noted that the High Street frontage adjacent the site actually consists predominantly of Victorian and more recent two storey houses.

More importantly, the site does not have capacity (relatively limited site area) to support the development of land hungry bungalow dwellings when providing a meaningful Village Green alongside approximately 70 new dwellings. The indicative layout plan, as submitted with the recent outline planning application for up to 70 dwellings, indicates how a housing-led scheme can be sensitively accommodated upon the site, whilst respecting Listed Buildings in the vicinity of the site, and providing a significant Village Green.

Any requirement to provide bungalows is unlikely to be deliverable and, therefore, unsound. In respect of the Core Strategy Policy SP3 (New Homes) whilst Table 3.6 outlines the target proportions of house sizes that have emerged via the Local Housing Assessment evidence base, there is no prescriptive reference made to bungalow type accommodation.

As a consequence, the draft policy is unjustified in this respect, and the policy wording should be amended to remove any reference towards the provision of bungalows and should instead focus on the delivery of a high quality residential development.

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).
Object

Housing

Policy FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin

Rather than prescriptive, and unachievable building forms given other competing requirements, there are other measures open to ensure that homes are accessible and inclusive. Originally the concept of 'Lifetime Homes Standard', its legacy has now been taken forward through Building Regulations in the form of a national standard for accessible, adaptable dwellings set out in Part M(4), Category 2, the regulatory standard having been in place since 1 October 2015.

Representations were made during the Preferred Options Consultation on the AAP to this effect and my client is disappointed to see that the Council has maintained this requirement whilst providing no further justification or evidence to support it.

The new Category 2 Building Regulations standard make dwellings usable for a wide range of households, from families with young children to older less agile people and anyone living with a mobility impairment, whether temporarily or on a longer term basis. As such, to make the draft policy consistent with national policy and sound, the Council should remove the explicit requirement for bungalows within Policy FPP6, given that flexible and adaptable accommodation can be accommodated via Building Regulations.

Requirements for an Air Quality Assessment and Archaeological Assessment

These requirements can be secured by way of national planning policy, the adopted Core Strategy and a validation checklist for the submission of a planning application (as the Council has already produced). My client has commissioned this work to be undertaken as part of the proposed development and this evidence has been submitted as part of the recent planning application. As such, their inclusion within the Policy is considered unnecessary, and my client considers that the two bullet points should be removed from draft policy FPP6.

Requirement for Affordable Housing Provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2, and a range of housing types and tenures in keeping with surrounding area and in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6

These policy requirements are already secured through the Core Strategy so repeating them within the draft AAP as policies is unnecessary. As such, my client considers that these two bullet points should be removed from draft policy FPP6.

Conclusion

In summary, subject to the concerns outlined, my client is supportive of the proposed allocation of the site to provide new housing to assist in meeting the minimum Core Strategy housing requirements, help reverse unsustainable patterns of in-commuting to the Port of Felixstowe and other employment areas, and assist the Council in meeting its five-year housing supply requirements.

Notwithstanding this, my client continues to have concerns as outlined above. In accordance with the requirements of Paragraph 182 of the Framework, in order to be considered ‘sound’ policies in Local Plans must be consistent with national policy, justified based on proportionate evidence, and based on a strategy that seeks to meet objectively assessed development needs. Whilst welcoming the allocation of the site for residential development, for the reasons set out within these representations, we do not consider some of the policy requirements of FPP6 to be sound. In light of the Council's current land supply position, we would respectfully suggest that the focus should be on making the most appropriate use of land to deliver housing whilst protecting less appropriate sites elsewhere.

Summary:

Subject to the concerns outlined, my client is supportive of the proposed allocation of the site to provide new housing to assist in meeting the minimum Core Strategy housing requirements, help reverse unsustainable patterns of in-commuting to the Port of Felixstowe and other employment areas, and assist the Council in meeting its five-year housing supply requirements.

In order to be considered ‘sound’ policies in Local Plans must be consistent with national policy, justified based on proportionate evidence, and based on a strategy that seeks to meet objectively assessed development needs. Whilst welcoming the allocation of the site for residential development, for the reasons set out within these representations, we do not consider some of the policy requirements of FPP6 to be sound. In light of the Council's current land supply position, we would respectfully suggest that the focus should be on making the most appropriate use of land to deliver housing whilst protecting less appropriate sites elsewhere.

Change to Plan

Yes Yes No Yes ii, iii, iv

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).
I write in response to the Proposed Submission consultation, submitting representations on behalf of my client, Trinity College, Cambridge, in respect of the draft allocation of Proposed Submission Policy FPP6 - Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin.

Proposed Submission Policy FPP6: Land Opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St. Martin

As owner, Trinity College supports the proposed allocation of the above site for residential development, subject to the matters outlined below and the requirements of Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework).

The allocation of the site will make a meaningful contribution towards the pressing need for new housing across the Peninsula, allied with the Council's commitment to deliver a minimum of 1,760 new dwellings in Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimley villages during the plan period (2010 to 2027) of the adopted Core Strategy.

The Core Strategy states that Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimley villages is by far the largest town within the District and includes the Port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, of both regional and national significance. Pertinently, it also acknowledges that the growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one. This had led to an unsustainable increase in commuting from other towns on a daily basis. In addition, the population in the area is increasing at the same time as average household sizes are falling, further increasing the need for housing. The number and type of new homes provided in recent years has not matched this increase in demand.

The importance of boosting housing supply in Felixstowe is demonstrated by the Council's commitment (as required by the Inspector who examined the Core Strategy) to pursue an early review of the Core Strategy's strategic policies (amongst them a minimum housing requirement of 7,900 dwellings) by 2015 to address objectively assessed housing needs (Policy SP2 - Housing Numbers and Distribution). As part of the evidence base to inform the Core Strategy, Oxford Economics were commissioned (2010) to determine housing need for the District, which was established to be 11,000 dwellings at that time. It is understood that evidence gathering during 2015 indicates that the current full, objectively assessed district wide housing need could be higher still.

As such, current housing need is higher than the levels of growth currently being planned for, and more sites are likely to be required to come forward on the peninsula in the medium term, over and above those proposed for allocation via the AAP. It is, therefore, critical to make the best use of land for housing and prioritise the delivery of residential development.

The necessity to urgently have an adopted AAP in place to encourage the delivery of housing is heightened by the current deficit in the five-year supply of deliverable housing sites in Suffolk Coastal District as required by Paragraph 49 of the NPPF. As such, the presumption in favour of sustainable development is applicable to residential applications made within the District. This position has recently (25 April 2016) been confirmed by an appeal decision for a site at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, where an Inspector assessed the Council's housing land supply at 3.7 years at best, commenting:

"The future for housing growth in the District is seriously uncertain and is not following the plan-led approach that is advocated in the first of twelve core planning principles set out in the NPPF. In these circumstances, it is necessary to maintain the principle established in the PPG: that undersupply should be addressed in the first five years of the remaining plan period, the Sedgefield method, rather than over the remaining years of the plan period, the Council's preferred Liverpool method" (para.25).

In concluding on the land supply issue, the Inspector concluded:

"The relevant five-year period for an assessment of housing delivery is April 2015 to March 2020 and during that period the BT Adastral Park site will contribute only 200 dwellings towards housing supply. It is appropriate to apply a 20% buffer and it is necessary to require the shortfall in previous housing delivery to be delivered over the first five years, and not over the remainder, of the plan period. Based on these three main factors, and setting aside the debate about housing delivery being based on the OAN for the District rather than the CS figure of 7,900 dwellings, it is estimated that the Council has a housing land supply of only about 3.7 years. Even if only one of the three main factors is correct the Council does not have a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing. Furthermore, if the housing requirement is based on an OAN of 11,000 dwellings, as established in the CS, or on any realistic prediction of what an OAN for the District is likely to be, housing land supply is less than 3.7 years.

The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land and paragraph 49 of the NPPF is therefore engaged" (paras 27 and 28, appeal decision APP/J3530/W/15/3011466).

This appeal decision corroborates the findings of two earlier appeals for sites at North Entrance, Saxmundham (PINS 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).
Ref. APP/J3530/A/14/2221769) and Woods Lane, Melton (APP/J3530/A/14/2225141) issued in July and September 2015 respectively, where it was concluded that the District did not have a five-year housing land supply.

Given the five-year housing supply deficit and the Council's commitment to deliver at least 1,760 new dwellings in Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimleys between 2010 and 2027, this sustainable site represents a key opportunity to deliver much needed housing, address the five-year housing supply deficit and realise the objectives of the adopted Core Strategy.

The host site is one of a number identified by the Council as being suitable for residential development in its Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA, 2014). My client supports the SHLAA's conclusion that the site is deliverable, being suitable, available and achievable for development within 5 years.

The suitability of the site for housing is reaffirmed by its sustainability. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) supporting the Proposed Submission AAP consultation identifies that it scores well when considered against its social, environmental and economic effects. In particular, the SA acknowledges that the site scores well in terms of major positive social effects due to the provision of potential community benefits:

For example:

* The site is located close to a range of local services, including the Trimley Sports and Social Club, Memorial Hall, Hand in Hand Public House, and Trimley Methodist Church.

* It is adjacent to bus routes (High Road) connecting the village with Felixstowe and Ipswich.

* The site will assist in the Core Strategy's aim to reduce and reverse the unsustainable patterns of in-commuting to Felixstowe (the Port and its other employment areas).

* On site open space to provide a village green to the High Street frontage to provide a new open space for the village (community benefits), and reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand Public House.

In essence, the site is ideally suited for residential development and its allocation in the AAP is entirely consistent with the Core Strategy's short to medium term objectives to deliver organic and evolutionary growth over a mixture of sites immediately abutting existing built up areas.

Scale of Residential Development Required

We acknowledge and welcome that the wording of Policy FPP6 has been amended since the Preferred Options document, to provide some flexibility in the number of houses to be delivered, changing to an expectation that "approximately 70" dwellings will be delivered on the site rather than "70 dwellings expected on the site as a minimum". This is considered to better reflect the previous SHLAA's estimate of its maximum capacity of 54 dwellings (SHLAA, March 3151 2014) and indicative capacity of 70 homes (SHLAA, November 2010). My client acknowledges this "approximately 70 dwellings" target and has brought forward a masterplan as part of an outline planning application that will seek to deliver up to 70 dwellings, whilst recognising the necessity to take other constraints into account, such as the need to respect the setting of the Listed Public House and the desire to provide a suitably sized village green to act as a focus for Trimley St. Martin.

Requirement for a Range of Housing Types (Including Bungalows)

My client has no objection to bringing forward proposals which provide for a good mix of housing, including dwellings suitable for the elderly, but does object to the prescriptive policy requirement that reads 'including bungalows .......in keeping with surrounding area'.

Following representations made to the Preferred Options Consultation it remains unclear what evidence of need this requirement is based on because little justification is provided in the AAP. For example, it should be noted that the High Street frontage adjacent the site actually consists predominantly of Victorian and more recent two storey houses.

More importantly, the site does not have capacity (relatively limited site area) to support the development of land hungry bungalow dwellings when providing a meaningful Village Green alongside approximately 70 new dwellings. The indicative layout plan, as submitted with the recent outline planning application for up to 70 dwellings, indicates how a housing-led scheme can be sensitively accommodated upon the site, whilst respecting Listed Buildings in the vicinity of the site, and providing a significant Village Green.

Any requirement to provide bungalows is unlikely to be deliverable and, therefore, unsound. In respect of the Core Strategy Policy SP3 (New Homes) whilst Table 3.6 outlines the target proportions of house sizes that have emerged via the Local Housing Assessment evidence base, there is no prescriptive reference made to bungalow type accommodation.

As a consequence, the draft policy is unjustified in this respect, and the policy wording should be amended to remove any reference towards the provision of bungalows and should instead focus on the delivery of a high quality residential development.
Rather than prescriptive, and unconstrained building forms given other competing requirements, there are other measures open to ensure that homes are accessible and inclusive. Originally the concept of 'Lifetime Homes Standard', its legacy has now been taken forward through Building Regulations in the form of a national standard for accessible, adaptable dwellings set out in Part M(4), Category 2, the regulatory standard having been in place since 1 October 2015.

Representations were made during the Preferred Options Consultation on the AAP to this effect and my client is disappointed to see that the Council has maintained this requirement whilst providing no further justification or evidence to support it.

The new Category 2 Building Regulations standard make dwellings usable for a wide range of householders, from families with young children to older less agile people and anyone living with a mobility impairment, whether temporarily or on a longer term basis. As such, to make the draft policy consistent with national policy and sound, the Council should remove the explicit requirement for bungalows within Policy FPP6, given that flexible and adaptable accommodation can be accommodated via Building Regulations.

Requirements for an Air Quality Assessment and Archaeological Assessment These requirements can be secured by way of national planning policy, the adopted Core Strategy and a validation checklist for the submission of a planning application (as the Council has already produced). My client has commissioned this work to be undertaken as part of the proposed development and this evidence has been submitted as part of the recent planning application. As such, their inclusion within the Policy is considered unnecessary, and my client considers that the two bullet points should be removed from draft policy FPP6.

Requirement for Affordable Housing Provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2, and a range of housing types and tenures in keeping with surrounding area and in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6

These policy requirements are already secured through the Core Strategy so repeating them within the draft AAP as policies is unnecessary. As such, my client considers that these two bullet points should be removed from draft policy FPP6.

Conclusion
In summary, subject to the concerns outlined, my client is supportive of the proposed allocation of the site to provide new housing to assist in meeting the minimum Core Strategy housing requirements, help reverse unsustainable patterns of in-commuting to the Port of Felixstowe and other employment areas, and assist the Council in meeting its five-year housing supply requirements.

Notwithstanding this, my client continues to have concerns as outlined above. In accordance with the requirements of Paragraph 182 of the Framework, in order to be considered 'sound' policies in Local Plans must be consistent with national policy, justified based on proportionate evidence, and based on a strategy that seeks to meet objectively assessed development needs. Whilst welcoming the allocation of the site for residential development, for the reasons set out within these representations, we do not consider some of the policy requirements of FPP6 to be sound. In light of the Council's current land supply position, we would respectfully suggest that the focus should be on making the most appropriate use of land to deliver housing whilst protecting less appropriate sites elsewhere. Following the representations made on various matters at the Preferred Options AAP consultation stage and these representations, we trust that they will be duly considered prior to or during the examination in public sessions.

Summary:
Requirements for an Air Quality Assessment and Archaeological Assessment

These requirements can be secured by way of national planning policy, the adopted Core Strategy and a validation checklist for the submission of a planning application (as the Council has already produced). My client has commissioned this work to be undertaken as part of the proposed development and this evidence has been submitted as part of the recent planning application. As such, their inclusion within the Policy is considered unnecessary, and my client considers that the two bullet points should be removed from draft policy FPP6.

Requirement for Affordable Housing Provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2, and a range of housing types and tenures in keeping with surrounding area and in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6

These policy requirements are already secured through the Core Strategy so repeating them within the draft AAP as policies is unnecessary. As such, my client considers that these two bullet points should be removed from draft policy FPP6.
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**Respondent:** Mr Gerry Bremner [3599]  

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:**
We live directly in front of this land at 240a High Road. There is a development of 60 houses already under construction near the Old Mushroom Farm, a further proposal of 60 more houses opp Goslings Farm. A further development of some 60 plus housed off of the Josselyns currently under construction and this proposed 360 plus development. This in total within just a small area of the Trimley Villages is approximately totalling potentially 540 new homes on top of existing large scale developments at Trimley St Martin and Trimleyt St Mary. If you assume an average of two cars per household that means an additional 1200 vehicles attempting to use the High Road through the Trimleys and Walton into Felixstowe Town Centre. Plus the additional delivery vehicles and visitors vehicles that will result. This will massively impact on the character of the area in terms of noise and air pollution as well as totally disrupting the lifestyle of the existing residents during the construction process. The High Road cannot sustain such an increase in traffic when you add to that the other proposed developments at Walton and other parts of the peninsula. Felixstowe Town Centre cannot accommodate such vast increases in traffic without major new road construction and I have seen nothing mentioned of such in any proposals. The Trimley's have already provided significant estate housing and further development of a such a vast scale is not in line with your stated comments about small scale development that will not unduly change the character of the area. In your last local plan you stated in writing that SCDC believed that large scale development of the peninsula would damage the character of the region. Therefore these plans to concentrate such a huge amount of development on a peninsula with just one major road in and out is in direct contradiction to that comment and indicates that SCDC are now prepared to damage the character of the area deliberately to satisfy central government requirements. These developments are not in any way sound in terms of road traffic, air pollution, sound pollution, loss of light and loss of amenity to the existing inhabitants. Getting in and out of Felixstowe at the weekend with the additional influx of visiting traffic plus these proposed vast additional numbers of vehicles from new homes will make it a complete grid lock situation at times for people living in the area. It is totally unacceptable and you have never paid anything other than lip service to the local inhabitants expressions of concerns and valid comments. This whole development process is about profit and greed driven by large landowners such as Trinity College and developers who have no concern or thought for destroying the area and the character of the area that has brought existing residents here. It is quite frankly unacceptable.

**Summary:**
The proposals are unsound. They totally change and destroy the character of the region as SCDC have already stated in writing in their last Local Plan. The level of additional traffic will create air pollution, sound pollution, traffic congestion that will have a detrimental effect on all who live on this peninsula. The whole volume of new housing proposed needs to be scaled back to protect the character of the region. Spread the volumes further afield where there is better road and transport links.

**Change to Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachments:**
We understand the need for extra housing in the Felixstowe area. But it must be done in keeping with the community feel and spirit.

Certain sites are totally unsuitable and will cause untold problems. Instead of solving issues it will cause more. We feel that having 2 main sites with a reduced footprint would spread the stress on Felixstowe's infrastructure; the opposite side of the A14 have a school, possibly a good site to build new homes.

High Street Walton. This site has always been identified as a potential site but the size and location are of serious worry. A large housing estate without proper access will turn the High Road into a car park. Any access from Candlet Road will always have knock on issues to the main dock spur roundabout. As above you could reduce the amount of housing, creating a better atmosphere within the estate and help the high road.

Conway Close. Although in old Felixstowe the access to Colneis Road /Candlet Road/A14 is excellent A limited well thought out estate would provide one of the most sort after area as to live in on the Peninsular.

Howlett Road. We worry about its effect on the local sewer network. This area is already under stress, adding 360 more houses on such a vast scale as proposed would put a huge strain on schools, doctors, drainage, roads etc. This will add another 600 vehicles to the road system and the access is poor. Already we have had many accidents down this road this will only add to more near misses and accidents. We will lose a Village and it will become a Town concreting over the country will change the nature and character of Trimley.

Leisure activities, like horse riding, dog walking, cycling would all be affected by Trimleys green fields shrinking.

Hand In Hand - That part of the high road is bad at the best of times. The road thins dangerously and the addition of further housing would make this unsuitable. Unless you could widen the road OR make it one way we would be totally against this build.

I would reiterate our initial point. A spread of new housing over Walton / and Conway would provide a boost to Felixstowe but remove major issues it would cause to the infrastructure.

Howlett Road. We worry about its effect on the local sewer network. This area is already under stress, adding 360 more houses on such a vast scale as proposed would put a huge strain on schools, doctors, drainage, roads etc. This will add another 600 vehicles to the road system and the access is poor. Already we have had many accidents down this road this will only add to more near misses and accidents. We will lose a Village and it will become a Town concreting over the country will change the nature and character of Trimley.
Dear Mr Edgerley,

We met at the Town Hall on November 12th 2015. You graciously received my long letter with numerous wildlife photos.

(Attached a few more, taken in the last two weeks)!

I am not a good form-filler-in! I am not good at Council Speak. It's quite possible I will tick a box without realising the implications.

Ergo this follow-up letter.

I appreciate that my comments regarding the land off Howlett way were noted and agreed. This was encouraging.

It is, however, still distressing to consider hundreds of houses being erected on this area. The field is the only buffer from the noise of the A14, which thankfully is usually eclipsed by the chorus of blackbirds and robins that live here. All the trees around our house are at present home to many many nests. The birds will leave with intensive building. So will our hedgehogs who are on the verge of extinction, certainly in the next decade.

The village will lose its identity....no one seems to even know the proposed design on the houses...or the builder...or the architect.

I plead again for us and the surrounding houses.

The destruction of highly fertile ground will be mourned by humans and animals. Already our High Road traffic has increased noticeably...when Cavendish Grove is finished it will become even worse.

I would very much like to be present if there are any more meetings the public can attend before it is taken out of our hands and sold to the highest bidder.

Our little lane is always busy with dog walkers and hikers and horse riders, it is lovely to stop and have a chat with them. I doubt that they will come down here anymore when this fertile farming land is ripped apart.

My previous letter dealt with all the history that hovers over this patch of land, I hope you still have that on file. It is pointless to repeat. Will this letter count?

Have geological surveys been done regarding the water table...is there a risk this field could flood?

There are so many unanswered questions...how many "little Me's" are raising their heads above the parapet ? Or are our defensive projectiles of Concern and Guardians of Nature to be obliterated?

I look forward to hearing from you.

Summary:

The field is the only buffer from the noise of the A14, which thankfully is usually eclipsed by the chorus of blackbirds and robins that live here. All the trees around our house are at present home to many many nests. The birds will leave with intensive building. So will our hedgehogs who are on the verge of extinction, certainly in the next decade.

The village will lose its identity....no one seems to even know the proposed design on the houses...or the builder...or the architect.

I plead again for us and the surrounding houses.
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Object:

Housing

Policy FPP7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin

Respondent: Trimley St Martin Parish Council (Mrs Katrina Coutts) [4119]

Agent: N/A

Full Text:

Re: Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan (Development Plan Document)- Proposed Submission Document; Section 3, policies FPP6 and FPP7

We would like to submit comments on the above document.

Trimley St Martin Parish Council previously requested the addition/changes be included in the Proposed Submission Document shown below; however it is with great disappointment we note that, on reading the Proposed Submission Document, although some of the council's comments have been included, the items highlighted in yellow have been disregarded when preparing the final text.

a) Policy FPP6 - Land opposite the Hand in Hand Public House, High Road - residential development

Whilst in principle the Council would prefer to see this site undeveloped, if development is to occur the Council would like the following changes and additions to policy FPP6:-

Applicants should have regard to the following:-

SCDC Policy Wording

a) Primary vehicular access onto High Road
b) Village green to be created fronting onto High Road to reduce impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand Public House
c) Existing Public Right of Way to be retained and integrated into the site layout
d) 70 dwellings expected on the site as a minimum with affordable housing provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2
e) Future residential properties should not extend beyond the residential curtilage of 21 Grimston Lane
f) A range of housing types and tenures in keeping with the surrounding area and in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6
g) Maximum build height of 2 storeys
h) High percentage of bungalow/low rise units to reflect character of the surrounding area
i) Air Quality assessment required

TSM Proposed Wording

a] The ONLY vehicular access is to be onto High Road
b] Village green to be created fronting onto High Road to reduce impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand Public House
c] Existing Public Right of Way to be retained and integrated into the site layout
d] 70 dwellings expected on the site AS A MAXIMUM with affordable housing provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2
e] FUTURE DEVELOPMENT (RESIDENTIAL OR COMMERCIAL) should not extend beyond the residential curtilage of 21 Grimston Lane
f] A range of housing types and tenures in keeping with the surrounding area and in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6. The range to be determined by a Local Housing Needs Survey conducted by an independent organization and paid for by the developer.
g] Maximum build height of 2 storeys
h] High percentage of bungalow/low rise units to reflect character of the surrounding area
i] Air Quality assessment required

Road widening of High Road to provide layby parking on its south side (the north boundary of this development Junction control (mini-roundabout or traffic lights) for access road opposite Mill Lane
Pedestrian crossing in High Road to enable residents from new development to access services

b) Policy FPP7 - Land off Howlett Way - residential development

Whilst in principle the Council would prefer to see this site undeveloped, if development is to occur the Council would like the following changes and additions to policy FPP7:-

Applicants should have regard to the following:-

SCDC Policy Wording

a) Primary vehicular access onto Howlett Way
b) No vehicular access onto Church Lane
c) Links to existing Public Rights of Way Network
d) 360 dwellings expected on the site as a minimum with affordable housing provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2
e) A range of housing types and tenures in keeping with the surrounding area and in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6
f) Development to be sympathetic to the setting of the Old Rectory

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).
Object

Housing

Policy FPP7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin

g) Site design and layout to take into account the water mains crossing the site
h) On-site open space and play facilities to meet needs identified in the SCDC Leisure Strategy
i) Air Quality Assessment needed

TMS Proposed Wording

a] The ONLY vehicular access to be onto Howlett Way
b] No vehicular access onto Church Lane
c] Links to existing Public Rights of Way Network
d] 360 dwellings expected on the site AS A MAXIMUM with affordable housing provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2
e] A range of housing types and tenures in keeping with the surrounding area and in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6. The range to be determined by a Local Housing Needs Survey conducted by an independent organization and paid for by the developer.
f] Development to be sympathetic to the setting of the Old Rectory
g] Site design and layout to take into account the water mains crossing the site
h] On-site open space and play facilities to meet needs identified in the SCDC Leisure Strategy
i] Air Quality Assessment needed

Maximum build height of 2 storeys

Members of this council feel the disregard of these important additions/changes represent important omissions from the final document and request the situation be reviewed and rectified.

Summary:

TMS Proposed Wording

The ONLY vehicular access to be onto Howlett Way
360 dwellings expected on the site AS A MAXIMUM with affordable housing provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2
A range of housing types and tenures in keeping with the surrounding area and in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6. THE RANGE TO BE DETERMINED BY A LOCAL HOUSING NEEDS SURVEY CONDUCTED BY AN INDEPENDENT ORGANIZATION AND PAID FOR BY THE DEVELOPER.
Maximum build height of 2 storeys

Change to Plan

Not Specified Not Specified Not Specified Not Specified None

Attachments:
Scanned Representation

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).
Thank you for your letter dated 14th April 2016 regarding the above consultation. We have had the opportunity to assess the letter and consultation documents and can offer the following advice. Please note we have provided comments on the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies within a separate letter to you dated the same. This follows two previous consultations and our comments dated 25th February 2015 and 24th November 2015.

In terms of our general comments:
Recent Guidance from Historic England

We have recently published guidance on The Historic Environment in Local Plans and the Historic Environment and Site Allocations. Where we have not made comment below some additional guidance on ensuring a positive strategy for the historic environment is secured within the Felixstowe Area Action Plan can be seen by following these links
<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa1-historic-environment-local-plans/> and

In terms of our site specific comments:

Housing Sites

FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe (451g)

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the possible impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II* Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We highlighted that the principal elevation of Walton Hall faces north and overlooks site 451g. It was considered that development here would urbanise the setting of this important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance. It was expressed that harm would also be caused to the Grade II lodge and we strongly advised that an alternative site was found for development, though it was thought that there may be scope for some limited development at the eastern end of this site.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfil the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words 'and their setting' in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

FPP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe (502e)

At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be...
Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed. At Preferred Options stage, we considered 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 note that the policy still does not include this requirement (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.88.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

**FPP7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin (451c and 451d)**

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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 references in paragraph 3.104 and Policy FPP7 bullet point 7 to the setting of the churches and high quality developments, sympathetic to the character of the area and Listed Buildings.

**FPP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary (383f and 451f)**

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

**Town Centre**

FPP13: Felixstowe Town Centre and FFP14: Retail Frontages

As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FPP13 and FFP14.

**District Centres**

FPP16: District Centres

As above in previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.

**Tourism and Sea Front Activities**

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).
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word 'on' with 'to'.

FFP18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point, FPP20: Cobbolds Point to Spa, FPP21: Spa to Martello Park and FFP22 Martello Park to Landguard

We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FFP23: Car Parking

At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the 'high quality of design' requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment

At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe’s archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: “local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment”. The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the “positive strategy” required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiterating of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council’s approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area

We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report ‘Felixstowe South Conservation Area’ commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to...
identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment. The conservation area survey identified the loss of architectural detail as a significant problem, and consideration might therefore be given to applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a Townscape Heritage programme for the area, or a smaller partnership scheme with Historic England to reinstate lost architectural details on key buildings etc.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden
We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Other Issues
Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding
At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary:
Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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 references in paragraph 3.104 and Policy FPP7 bullet point 7 to the setting of the churches and high quality developments, sympathetic to the character of the area and Listed Buildings.

Change to Plan N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachments:**
Scanned Representation

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).
Thank you for consulting Suffolk County Council on submission version for development in Felixstowe.

Suffolk County Council responded previously to the preferred options stage in November 2015. This response does not rehearse all the issues as Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) has responded well to the points that the county council made at the time.

The following response relates to the ways in which the development of these sites affects county council responsibilities, and how our authorities will need to work together to bring these sites forward in a successful way.

This letter does not take into account the impact of sites which may come forward as windfall development, which may have significant impacts on local infrastructure.

Archaeology

Additional text has been systematically added in general information about archaeology, using the county council's previous comments. It introduces archaeology throughout the document and gives the plan a sound approach to archaeology.

Suffolk County Council Archaeology has reviewed the document and the only minor outstanding matters relate to suggested amendments and the terminology used in the following paragraphs:

Para. 3.74 (FPP4) - the site will require archaeological excavation rather than assessment, as it has already been assessed. Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service can provide a brief for the works and also discuss options for preservation in situ.

Paras. 3.82 (FPP5), 3.94 (FPP6), 3.101 (FPP7), 3.109 (FPP8) - Change the reference to archaeological assessment “prior to the development of the site” to “at an appropriate design stage prior to the granting of outline, technical details or full planning permission.” This will allow for preservation in situ, where appropriate, of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed, for which conditions may or may not be sufficient.

With regard to FFP12 (Land at Haven Exchange), which is an enabling policy, archaeological investigation will be required, particularly for larger schemes.

Education

Early Education

The document reflects advice provided by the county council on the need for at least one additional facility for early years education (excluding the Candlet Road site subject to an appeal). The detail provided is paragraphs 3.39 to 3.41 is welcomed. During the previous stage, the county council highlighted ways in which policy FPP15 could be more supportive of early education in retail centres, as part of a balanced policy which also protects the vitality and viability of retail centres. The county raised the point that policy FPP16 (previously FPP17) would support early years provision, which SCDC has considered. Therefore, our councils agree that early years facilities can be considered as “other local services” within FPP16.

Primary Education

The challenge presented by the distribution of housing proposed for ensuring sufficient additional primary school places has been recognised in the submission version. Land needs to be identified for a new primary school in order to ensure that there can be confidence of a long term solution for primary school provision. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in identifying options for sites based on the pattern of development coming forward and the need to find a location that promotes sustainable travel choices. The two locations identified and other alternatives as stated in para. 3.44 provide a clear indication of how a site could be identified. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in keeping the expected size of school and the area of land required under review.

Transport

A report by AECOM, on behalf of Highways England and Suffolk County Council (SCC), to assess the cumulative impact of development proposed in the Area Action Plan on the local and strategic road networks is attached to this response. In addition to the sites identified, this report implicitly includes background growth port-related traffic and the growth throughout the district.

The Suffolk County Council supports the creation of a link road between Candlet Road and High Street Walton. The intention of this link is that it is designed to serve local journeys so that the impacts from rerouting are localised.

I hope that these comments are helpful. Please contact me via the details at the top of this letter, if we or any of our colleagues can be of assistance.
Summary: Paras. 3.82 (FPP5), 3.94 (FPP6), 3.101 (FPP7), 3.109 (FPP8) - Change the reference to archaeological assessment "prior to the development of the site" to "at an appropriate design stage prior to the granting of outline, technical details or full planning permission." This will allow for preservation in situ, where appropriate, of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed, for which conditions may or may not be sufficient.

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments:
I write in response to the Preferred Options consultation, submitting representations on behalf of my client, Trinity
College, Cambridge, in respect of the draft allocation of Proposed Submission Policy FPP7 - Land off Howlett Way,
Trimley St. Martin.

Proposed Submission Policy FPP7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St. Martin

As owner, Trinity College supports the proposed allocation of the above site for residential development, subject to the
matters outlined below and the requirements of Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter
referred to as the Framework).

The allocation of the site will make a meaningful contribution towards the pressing need for new housing across the
Peninsula, allied with the Council's commitment to deliver a minimum of 1,760 new dwellings in Felixstowe, Walton and
the Trimley villages during the plan period (2010 to 2027) of the adopted Core Strategy.

The Core Strategy states that Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimley villages is by far the largest town within the District
and includes the Port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, of both regional and national significance. Pertinently,
it also acknowledges that the growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is
now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who
are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one. This had led to an unsustainable increase in
commuting from other towns on a daily basis. In addition, the population in the area is increasing at the same time as
average house-hold sizes are falling, further increasing the need for housing. The number and type of new homes
provided in recent years has not matched this increase in demand.

The importance of boosting housing supply in Felixstowe is demonstrated by the Council’s commitment (as required by
the Inspector who examined the Core Strategy) to pursue an early review of the Core Strategy's strategic policies
(amongst them a minimum housing requirement of 7,900 dwellings) by 2015 to address objectively assessed housing
needs (Policy SP2 - Housing Numbers and Distribution). As part of the evidence base to inform the Core Strategy,
Oxford Economics were commissioned (2010) to determine

Bidwells is trading name of Bidwells LLP, a limited liability partnership, registered in England and Wales with number
OC344553.
Registered office: Bidwell House Trumpington Road Cambridge CB2 9LD. A list of members is available for inspection
at the above address.

housing need for the District, which was established to be 11,000 dwellings at that time. It is understood that
evidence gathering during 2015 indicates that the current full, objectively assessed district wide housing need could be
higher still.

As such, current housing need is higher than the levels of growth currently being planned for, and more sites are likely
to be required to come forward on the peninsula in the medium term, over and above those proposed for allocation via
the AAP. It is, therefore, critical to make the best use of land for housing and prioritise the delivery of residential
development.

The necessity to urgently have an adopted AAP in place to encourage the delivery of housing is heightened by the

current deficit in the five-year supply of deliverable housing sites in Suffolk Coastal District as required by Paragraph 49
of the NPPF. As such, the presumption in favour of sustainable development is applicable to residential applications
made within the District. This position has recently (25 April 2016) been confirmed by an appeal decision for a site at
Fairfield Road, Framlingham, where an Inspector assessed the Council's housing land supply at 3.7 years at best, commenting:

"The future for housing growth in the District is seriously uncertain and is not following the plan-led approach that is
advocated in the first of twelve core planning principles set out in the NPPF. In these circumstances, it is necessary to
maintain the principle established in the PPG; that undersupply should be addressed in the first five years of the
remaining plan period, the Sedgefield method, rather than over the remaining years of the plan period, the Council's
preferred Liverpool method" (para.25).

In concluding on the land supply issue, the Inspector concluded:

"The relevant five-year period for an assessment of housing delivery is April 2015 to March 2020 and during that period
the BT Adastral Park site will contribute only 200 dwellings towards housing supply. It is appropriate to apply a 20% buffer
and it is necessary to require the shortfall in previous housing delivery to be delivered over the first five years, and
not over the remainder, of the plan period. Based on these three main factors, and setting aside the debate about
housing delivery being based on the OAN for the District rather than the CS figure of 7,900 dwellings, it is estimated that
the Council has a housing land supply of only about 3.7 years. Even if only one of the three main factors is correct the
Council does not have a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years’ worth of housing.

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).
Furthermore, if the housing requirement is based on an OAN of 11,000 dwellings, as established in the CS, or on any realistic prediction of what an OAN for the District is likely to be, housing land supply is less than 3.7 years.

The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land and paragraph 49 of the NPPF is therefore engaged (paras 27 and 28, appeal decision APP/J3530/W/15/3011466).

This appeal decision corroborates the findings of two earlier appeals for sites at North Entrance, Saxmundham (PINS Ref. APP/J3530/A/14/2221769) and Woods Lane, Melton (APP/J3530/A/14/2225141) issued in July and September 2015 respectively, where it was concluded that the District did not have a five-year housing land supply.

Given the five-year housing supply deficit and Council's commitment to deliver at least 1,760 new dwellings in Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimleys between 2010 and 2027, this sustainable site represents a key opportunity to deliver much needed housing, address the five-year housing supply deficit and realise the objectives of the adopted Core Strategy.

The host site is one of a number identified by the Council as being suitable for residential development in its Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (Ref. 451c and 451d, SHLAA, 2014). My client supports the within 5 years.

The suitability of the site for housing is reaffirmed by its sustainability. The Interim Sustainability Appraisal supporting the AAP consultation identifies that it scores well when considered against its social, environmental and economic effects. For example:

- The site is centrally located to the villages of Trimley St. Martin and Trimley St. Mary and provides an opportunity for organic and evolutionary growth as outlined by Core Strategy Policy SP21.
- The site is located close to a range of local services, including the Trimley Sports and Social Club, Memorial Hall, Hand in Hand Public House, and Trimley Methodist Church.
- It is adjacent to bus routes (High Road and Howlett Way) connecting the village with Felixstowe and Ipswich.
- The site will assist in the Core Strategy's aim to reduce and reverse the unsustainable patterns of in-commuting to Felixstowe (the Port and its other employment areas).
- The site offers the opportunity to link to the existing Public Right of Way Network, and Bridleways Network.

In essence, the collective site (incorporating SHLAA sites 451c and 451d) is ideally suited for residential development and its allocation in the AAP is entirely consistent with the Core Strategy's short to medium term objectives to deliver organic and evolutionary growth over a mixture of sites immediately abutting existing built up areas.

Requirements for an Air Quality Assessment and Archaeological Assessment

These requirements can be secured by way of national planning policy, the adopted Core Strategy and a validation checklist for the submission of a planning application (as the Council has already produced). My client has commissioned this work to be undertaken as part of the proposed development and this evidence has been submitted as part of the recent planning application. As such, their inclusion within the Policy is considered unnecessary, and my client considers that the two bullet points should be removed from draft Policy FPP7.

Requirement for Affordable Housing Provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2, and a range of housing types and tenures in keeping with surrounding area and in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6

These policy requirements are already secured through the Core Strategy so repeating them within the draft AAP as policies is unnecessary. As such, my client considers that these two bullet points should be removed from draft Policy FPP7.

Conclusion

In summary, subject to the concerns outlined, my client is supportive of the proposed allocation of the site to provide new housing to assist in meeting the minimum Core Strategy housing requirements, help reverse unsustainable patterns of in-commuting to the Port of Felixstowe and other employment areas, and assist the Council in meeting its five-year housing supply requirements.

Notwithstanding this, my client continues to have concerns as outlined above. In accordance with the requirements of Paragraph 182 of the Framework in order to be considered 'sound' policies in Local Plans must be consistent with national policy, justified based on proportionate evidence, and based on a strategy that seeks to meet objectively assessed development needs. Whilst welcoming the allocation of the site for residential development, for the reasons set out within these representations, we do not consider some of the policy requirements of FPP7 to be sound. In light of the Council's current land supply position, we would respectfully suggest that the focus should be on making the most appropriate use of land to deliver housing whilst protecting less
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Welcome the allocation of the site but do not consider some of the policy requirements of FFP7 to be sound, specifically requirements in addition to national and adopted core strategy policy for an air quality and archaeological assessment and affordable housing provision.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Christchurch Land and Estates (Felixstowe) Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Christchurch") are the promoters of the land at Candlet Road Felixstowe (hereinafter referred to as "the site") edged red on the plan attached as Annexure 1. A planning application reference DC/15/1128/OUT was refused by the Council on 12th June 2015 and is now the subject of an appeal.

1.2 It is confirmed in paragraph 4.28 of the adopted Local Plan (July 2013) with our emphasis added that

"4.28 Felixstowe with Walton is by far the largest town within the District and includes the port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, being of both regional and national significance....."

It is considered that the site is a potential urban extension to Felixstowe ("the largest town within the District").

1.3 The site is in a highly sustainable location for the growth of Felixstowe (to address housing need), and should therefore, in our opinion, be allocated as part of the preferred strategy in accordance with the principles of sustainability set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

1.4 Christchurch consider that the Council is failing to address the full objective assessment of housing need (FOAN) for the District, which contention is supported by the land at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, Suffolk appeal decision letter, appeal reference 3011466, paragraphs 14 to 28 (attached as Annexure 3).

1.5 Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework considers that for a plan to be considered "sound" it should be "positively prepared", and that it should meet objectively assessed development needs. In failing to address the objectively assessed need, the Area Action Plan is not "positively prepared".

1.6 The approach to distributing the growth of Felixstowe (one of dispersal), as the strategy in the Area Action Plan document, is not considered the appropriate strategy for the future development needs in the Peninsular. The Council has failed to advance any proper or sufficient analysis to support its proposed approach as opposed to allocation of a significant (and sustainable) urban extension such as the Candlet Road growth area (abutting the Felixstowe settlement boundary).

1.7 Accordingly, and by reference to paragraph 182 of the Framework, it cannot be concluded that the Area Action Plan is;

"justified",
"the most appropriate strategy",
"consistent with national policy" (paragraph 52).

1.8 The submissions made by Christchurch earlier this year relating to the site also contained a detailed response to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (31st March 2014) and the corresponding consideration of site suitability in the emerging Plan.

1.9 The Candlet Road site has not been allocated in the Area Action Plan, therefore in terms of the emerging Plan, the site is an "omission site".

It is submitted that the Council has failed to properly assess appropriate alternative sites in their Sustainability Appraisal Report Proposed Submission Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Development Plan Document (April 2016) to ensure that the most sustainable sites come forward.

1.10 Thereby compounding our concern that the Area Action Plan is not "justified".

2. FULL OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED HOUSING NEED

2.1 The requirement of 7,900 dwellings as set out in Policy SP2 of the adopted Core Strategy is now considered to be out of date as the process of review stipulated within the policy (to review the Core Strategy by 2015 at the latest) has not been commenced. Given that the requirement of 7,900 is both out of date, and fails to reflect the full objectively assessed need for housing (FOAN), the emerging plan should be proceeding on the basis of an up to date review of housing need (as recognised by the Core Strategy itself). That the figure of 7,900 is out of date has been recognised by the Inspector in the Framlingham appeal decision. It is considered that the current FOAN for the District is between 15,000 (750 per annum) and 22,360 dwellings (1,118 per annum) for the period 2011 to 2031.

2.2 Sustainably located sites need to be identified to ensure that the FOAN is met.
2.3 The proposed approach in the Area Action Plan is neither justified nor positively prepared. The development needs of the District will not be met.

3. THE GROWTH STRATEGY IN THE AREA ACTION PLAN

3.1 The growth of Felixstowe, as proposed in the Area Action Plan, is not considered the most appropriate strategy for the future development needs in the Peninsular, and there is no proper or sufficient analysis to support the dispersed approach adopted by the Plan.

3.2 The site at Candlet Road, together with other land holdings, should be considered the most sustainable growth option for the town.

3.3 The adopted Local Plan (July 2013) confirms at paragraph 4.28;

"4.28 Felixstowe with Walton is by far the largest town within the District and includes the port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, being of both regional and national significance....."

3.4 Paragraph 4.31 of the adopted Local Plan confirms;

"4.31 The growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one...."

3.5 The site at Candlet Road Felixstowe (as part of a sustainable urban extension) is in a position to "redress" this imbalance identified at paragraph 4.31 of the adopted Local Plan.

3.6 It is, further acknowledged, at paragraph 4.35 of the adopted Local Plan that;

"4.35 Longer term, it is likely that additional housing will need to be provided......"

3.7 Strategic Policy SP21 of the adopted Local Plan confirms (with our emphasis added);

"The strategy for Felixstowe will be to reverse the recent trends towards a population in balance, threats to local services and a decline in the fortunes of the town in order to enable it to fulfil its role as a major centre......."

"Additional housing will be created. In the short to medium term, this will represent organic and evolutionary growth in the Felixstowe and Trimleys area over a mixture of sites immediately abutting existing built up areas......"

3.8 Whilst adoption adopted Local Plan policy SP21 refers to a "strategy for a dispersed pattern of future development" it is submitted that such an approach is not sustainable and also does not accord with the thrust of strategic policy SP21 by recommending development "immediately abutting existing built up areas.....".

3.9 Policies SP1 and SP1A of the adopted Local Plan seek the achievement of sustainable development.

3.10 With regard to Felixstowe, the 2013 Local Plan confirms:

"4.28 Felixstowe with Walton is by far the largest town within the district and includes the Port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, being of both regional and national significance....." (with emphasis added).

"4.29 Felixstowe has more people of retirement age and fewer people of working age than the norm, either in the rest of Suffolk or across the UK......"

"Younger generations already have to look outside Felixstowe for careers and housing" (with emphasis added).

"4.30 The population of Felixstowe is increasing slowly although household size is falling. Despite slow population growth there are, therefore, even more people looking for homes, and Felixstowe has more small households - single people or couples - particularly those that are key workers or first time buyers. The number and type of new homes provided in the town over recent years has not matched this increase in demand".

"4.31 The growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one......" (with emphasis added).

3.11 On the 27th February 2015, Christchurch made submissions to the then emerging Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies and the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan, relating to the site.
3.12 The February submissions referred to a Council report to the Local Development Framework Task Group on the 4th August 2008 (LPTG11/08). The Council's consideration of the ("option 4") land north of Candlet Road Felixstowe stated:

"on the whole option 4 has significant merit. It represents a good sustainable option that benefits from existing formal and informal recreational areas to the east as well as access to the town centre. It is also the closest area to the town centre and development might also ensure a stronger and more viable town centre given the increased usage of facilities there...the landscape, particularly the western part, is the least sensitive of all of the option and the existing wildlife corridor in the east can be built upon as part of a strategy of enhancing green infrastructure".

3.13 The 2008 Council Report confirms Christchurch's contention that the site (combined with other land holdings) is a highly sustainable location for growth, being immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary and close to a range of services and facilities within walking and cycling distance, therefore should be an allocated site.

3.14 The site (combined with other land holdings) is not a preferred allocation for residential development despite Core Strategy Policy SP21 confirming that (with our emphasis added)

"additional housing will be created"

"over a mixture of sites immediately abutting existing built up areas" and to

"create a more sustainable balance between housing and employment thereby providing an opportunity to reduce commuting"

3.15 Paragraph 4.31 of the adopted 2013 Local Plan confirms:

"4.31 The growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one.

The 2001 Census revealed that there was a daily net inflow to Felixstowe of 2,719 workers. This comprised an outflow of 3,600 Felixstowe residents to jobs in Ipswich and elsewhere and an inflow of 6,319 who work in Felixstowe but live elsewhere".

3.16 The site (combined with other land holdings) abuts the urban area of Felixstowe, complies with the aims and objectives of adopted Local Plan and creates additional housing to address the "imbalance" set out in paragraph 4.31 (above), constituting "organic and evolutionary growth".

3.17 Whilst adopted Policy SP21 confirms;

"a strategy for a dispersed pattern of future development"

which is continued in the Area Action Plan (the site is not identified as a preferred allocation) it is considered that a "dispersed pattern" is not the most sustainable growth option for Felixstowe.

4. RESPONSE TO THE STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT ("SHLAA") (SITE SUITABILITY)

4.1 The site (potentially part of a larger land assembly) has previously been considered by the Local Planning Authority and with particular regard to the 'Core Strategy - Proposed location of strategic housing growth in Felixstowe and the Trimley villages'.

4.2 As noted above, a Report on this matter was presented to the Local Development Framework Task Group on 4th August 2008 (LPTG 11/08). A copy of the Report is attached as Annexure 2 to these Submissions.

4.3 The site formed one part of a number of recommendations as to which sites should be the preference to the Council for the location of housing growth, indicating a preference toward larger developments, with related infrastructure incorporated into those schemes.

4.4 Appendix 1 to LPTG 11/08 provided some background in reaching that conclusion. Within this Appendix, it is stated that the landscape

'is not particularly attractive. It is, however, visible from a number of locations. Most are close distance and with the introduction of mitigation planting are not significant. The exception will be from the east where the close proximity viewpoints are in elevated locations and the topography would still allow views in to the area'.

4.5 The Appendix also states that

'the landscape in the part of the area to the east of Gulpher Road is more sensitive and shows a lower capacity to
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absorb development than the west. It also already has some recreational/green infrastructure value. In an area of current and predicted deficiencies of accessible natural greenspace, this part of area 4 may provide opportunities to address this.

4.6 Whilst only referenced in the Executive Summary to the Appendix, the report states that the site is ‘separated from Felixstowe by the single carriageways of Candlet Road, but has Gulpher Road passing beneath it and the ability for crossings to be created. Development would be close to the town centre. Road access to the Port is easy although sustainable means of travel by cycle or on foot could need to be created’.

4.7 The Council’s summary acknowledged that;

‘on the whole option 4 has significant merit. It represents a good sustainable option that benefits from existing formal and informal recreational areas to the east as well as access to the town centre. It is also the closest area to the town centre and development might also ensure a stronger and more viable town centre given the increased usage of facilities there...the landscape, particularly the western part, is the least sensitive of all of the option and the existing wildlife corridor in the east can be built upon as part of a strategy of enhancing green infrastructure’.

4.8 The conclusion of the SHLAA and the (site suitability) emerging Plan and the Sustainability Report is clearly at odds with the Council’s previous assessment of the site’s merits.

5. THE SUSTAINABILITY OF THE CANDLET ROAD SITE/AREA AND THE COUNCIL’S SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

5.1 Christchurch commissioned Turley to carry out a detailed Sustainability Appraisal of the land north of Candlet Road (February 2015).

5.2 The Sustainability Appraisal confirms that this location is a highly sustainable location for residential development, abutting the main area of Felixstowe, the largest town in the District.

5.3 The Turley Sustainability Appraisal also references the recommendations contained in the 2008 Report where the current Head of Planning Services at the Council confirmed that the land north of Candlet Road Felixstowe presented the most appropriate and sustainable option for the growth of the town.

5.4 It is particularly noted, that officers did not favour the "dispersed pattern of development" as advocated by both the Local Plan (July 2013) and the emerging Plan.

5.5 The Council have prepared a Sustainability Appraisal Report. The Sustainability Appraisal is not adequate, particularly with regard to the way that the Sustainability Appraisal appraises the strategic alternatives. The reasons for selection of the Preferred Options (as opposed to alternatives) are not clear.

5.6 It cannot be concluded that the Council have properly taken into account reasonable alternatives, thereby undermining the soundness of the Plan.

6. ALTERNATIVE SITES (PREFERRED OPTIONS)

6.1 The focusing of housing growth adjacent to Felixstowe represents the most sustainable growth option.

6.2 The most sustainable strategy for accommodation of housing growth at Felixstowe is for new development to be accommodated within the existing limits of the urban area, and then sustainable urban extensions.

6.3 We have raised concerns with regard to the adequacy of the preferred options site selection procedure.

6.4 In addition, there is a concern that certain allocations may, in reality, be undelivered due to heritage constraints.

Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") obliges the decision maker, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

6.5 In R (on the application of Forge Field Society) v Sevenoaks District Council [2014] EWHC 1896 (Admin), Lindblom J referred to this duty - and the parallel duty under Section 72(1) of the 1990 Act in relation to development within a conservation area - in the following terms with our emphasis added:

"... it is to recognise, as the Court of Appeal emphasised in [East Northamptonshire District Council v Secretary of..."
State for Communities and Local Government [2014] EWCA Civ 137], that a finding of harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area gives rise to a strong presumption against planning permission being granted. The presumption is a statutory one. It is not irrebuttable. It can be outweighed by material considerations powerful enough to do so.

But an authority can only properly strike the balance between harm to a heritage asset on the one hand and planning benefits on the other if it is conscious of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation and if it demonstrably applies that presumption to the proposal it is considering”.

6.6 Furthermore, paragraph 169 of the Framework requires the Local Planning Authority to have
”up to date evidence about the historic environment in their area and use it to assess the significance of heritage assets and the contribution they make to the environment....”

6.7 The following allocations suffer from serious constraints associated with designated heritage assets. We have seen no clear evidence which shows that those constraints can be overcome in respect of the following sites;

(a) Policy FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street Felixstowe
"development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street and their setting"

(b) Policy FPP5 Land north of Conway Close and Swallow Close Felixstowe

(c) Policy FPP7 Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin

7. CONCLUSIONS

7.1 It is considered, for the reasons outlined in this submission, that the land at Candlet Road should be allocated in the Area Action Plan.

7.2 By omitting the site, the Plan would fail to significantly boost housing supply and fail to meet the objectively assessed housing needs of the District (paragraphs 14 and 47 of the Framework).

7.3 It is submitted that the AAP document would be sound - in securing the necessary delivery for infrastructure, and an appropriate delivery of new housing - if land at Candlet Road is allocated for housing as part of an urban extension for Felixstowe.

7.4 The proposed release of land at Candlet Road represents the most sustainable, viable and ultimately deliverable option to achieve the required housing and infrastructure needs for Felixstowe and the surrounding area.

7.5 It is submitted, therefore, that the Candlet Road site should be a preferred location for housing, being an appropriate urban extension to Felixstowe where the other competing sites do not relate as well in terms of connections and accessibility to the town, that against this criteria the Candlet Road site is the most sustainable and appropriate option for the extension (growth) of Felixstowe.

Richard Brown MSc
27th May 2016

Annexures

1. Site plan

2. Local Development Framework Task Group Report on 04/08/08 (LPTG 11/08), together with Appendix 8

3. Land at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, Suffolk IP13 9LH, appeal reference 3011466
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Support

I write in response to the Preferred Options consultation, submitting representations on behalf of my client, Trinity College, Cambridge, in respect of the draft allocation of Proposed Submission Policy FPP7 - Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St. Martin.

As owner, Trinity College supports the proposed allocation of the above site for residential development, subject to the matters outlined below and the requirements of Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework).

The allocation of the site will make a meaningful contribution towards the pressing need for new housing across the Peninsula, allied with the Council's commitment to deliver a minimum of 1,760 new dwellings in Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimley villages during the plan period (2010 to 2027) of the adopted Core Strategy.

The Core Strategy states that Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimley villages is by far the largest town within the District and includes the Port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, of both regional and national significance. Pertinently, it also acknowledges that the growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one. This had led to an unsustainable increase in commuting from other towns on a daily basis. In addition, the population in the area is increasing at the same time as average house-hold sizes are falling, further increasing the need for housing. The number and type of new homes provided in recent years has not matched this increase in demand.

The importance of boosting housing supply in Felixstowe is demonstrated by the Council's commitment (as required by the Inspector who examined the Core Strategy) to pursue an early review of the Core Strategy's strategic policies (amongst them a minimum housing requirement of 7,900 dwellings) by 2015 to address objectively assessed housing needs (Policy SP2 - Housing Numbers and Distribution). As part of the evidence base to inform the Core Strategy, Oxford Economics were commissioned (2010) to determine housing need for the District, which was established to be 11,000 dwellings at that time. It is understood that evidence gathering during 2015 indicates that the current full, objectively assessed district wide housing need could be higher still.

As such, current housing need is higher than the levels of growth currently being planned for, and more sites are likely to be required to come forward on the peninsula in the medium term, over and above those proposed for allocation via the AAP. It is, therefore, critical to make the best use of land for housing and prioritise the delivery of residential development.

The necessity to urgently have an adopted AAP in place to encourage the delivery of housing is heightened by the current deficit in the five-year supply of deliverable housing sites in Suffolk Coastal District as required by Paragraph 49 of the NPPF. As such, the presumption in favour of sustainable development is applicable to residential applications made within the District. This position has recently (25 April 2016) been confirmed by an appeal decision for a site at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, where an Inspector assessed the Council's housing land supply at 3.7 years at best, commenting:

"The future for housing growth in the District is seriously uncertain and is not following the plan-led approach that is advocated in the first of twelve core planning principles set out in the NPPF. In these circumstances, it is necessary to maintain the principle established in the PPG; that undersupply should be addressed in the first five years of the remaining plan period, the Sedgefield method, rather than over the remaining years of the plan period, the Council's preferred Liverpool method” (para.25).

In concluding on the land supply issue, the Inspector concluded:

"The relevant five-year period for an assessment of housing delivery is April 2015 to March 2020 and during that period the BT Adastral Park site will contribute only 200 dwellings towards housing supply. It is appropriate to apply a 20% buffer and it is necessary to require the shortfall in previous housing delivery to be delivered over the first five years, and not over the remainder, of the plan period. Based on these three main factors, and setting aside the debate about housing delivery being based on the OAN for the District rather than the CS figure of 7,900 dwellings, it is estimated that the Council has a housing land supply of only about 3.7 years. Even if only one of the three main factors is correct the Council does not have a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing.”

Bidwells is trading name of Bidwells LLP, a limited liability partnership, registered in England and Wales with number OC344553. Registered office: Bidwell House Trumpington Road Cambridge CB2 9LD. A list of members is available for inspection at the above address.
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Furthermore, if the housing requirement is based on an OAN of 11,000 dwellings, as established in the CS, or on any realistic prediction of what an OAN for the District is likely to be, housing land supply is less than 3.7 years.

The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land and paragraph 49 of the NPPF is therefore engaged* (paras 27 and 28, appeal decision APP/J3530/W/15/3011466).

This appeal decision corroborates the findings of two earlier appeals for sites at North Entrance, Saxmundham (PINS Ref. APP/J3530/A/14/2221769) and Woods Lane, Melton (APP/J3530/A/14/2225141) issued in July and September 2015 respectively, where it was concluded that the District did not have a five-year housing land supply.

Given the five-year housing supply deficit and Council's commitment to deliver at least 1,760 new dwellings in Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimleys between 2010 and 2027, this sustainable site represents a key opportunity to deliver much needed housing, address the five-year housing supply deficit and realise the objectives of the adopted Core Strategy.

The host site is one of a number identified by the Council as being suitable for residential development in its Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (Ref. 451c and 451d, SHLAA, 2014). My client supports the within 5 years.

The suitability of the site for housing is reaffirmed by its sustainability. The Interim Sustainability Appraisal supporting the AAP consultation identifies that it scores well when considered against its social, environmental and economic effects. For example:

- The site is centrally located to the villages of Trimley St. Martin and Trimley St. Mary and provides an opportunity for organic and evolutionary growth as outlined by Core Strategy Policy SP21.
- The site is located close to a range of local services, including the Trimley Sports and Social Club, Memorial Hall, Hand in Hand Public House, and Trimley Methodist Church.
- It is adjacent to bus routes (High Road and Howlett Way) connecting the village with Felixstowe and Ipswich.
- The site will assist in the Core Strategy's aim to reduce and reverse the unsustainable patterns of in-commuting to Felixstowe (the Port and its other employment areas).
- The site offers the opportunity to link to the existing Public Right of Way Network, and Bridleways Network.

In essence, the collective site (incorporating SHLAA sites 451c and 451d) is ideally suited for residential development and its allocation in the AAP is entirely consistent with the Core Strategy's short to medium term objectives to deliver organic and evolutionary growth over a mixture of sites immediately abutting existing built up areas.

Requirements for an Air Quality Assessment and Archaeological Assessment

These requirements can be secured by way of national planning policy, the adopted Core Strategy and a validation checklist for the submission of a planning application (as the Council has already produced). My client has commissioned this work to be undertaken as part of the proposed development and this evidence has been submitted as part of the recent planning application. As such, their inclusion within the Policy is considered unnecessary, and my client considers that the two bullet points should be removed from draft Policy FPP7.

Requirement for Affordable Housing Provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2, and a range of housing types and tenures in keeping with surrounding area and in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6

These policy requirements are already secured through the Core Strategy so repeating them within the draft AAP as policies is unnecessary. As such, my client considers that these two bullet points should be removed from draft Policy FPP7.

Conclusion

In summary, subject to the concerns outlined, my client is supportive of the proposed allocation of the site to provide new housing to assist in meeting the minimum Core Strategy housing requirements, help reverse unsustainable patterns of in-commuting to the Port of Felixstowe and other employment areas, and assist the Council in meeting its five-year housing supply requirements.

Notwithstanding this, my client continues to have concerns as outlined above. In accordance with the requirements of Paragraph 182 of the Framework in order to be considered ‘sound’ policies in Local Plans must be consistent with national policy, justified based on proportionate evidence, and based on a strategy that seeks to meet objectively assessed development needs. Whilst welcoming the allocation of the site for residential development, for the reasons set out within these representations, we do not consider some of the policy requirements of FPP7 to be sound. In light of the Council's current land supply position, we would respectfully suggest that the focus should be on making the most appropriate use of land to deliver housing whilst protecting less...
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appropriate sites elsewhere. Following the representations made on various matters at the Preferred Options AAP consultation stage, and these representations, we trust that they will be duly considered prior to or during the examination in public sessions.

**Summary:** As owner, Trinity College supports the proposed allocation of the above site for residential development, subject to the matters outlined below and the requirements of Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework).

The allocation of the site will make a meaningful contribution towards the pressing need for new housing across the Peninsula, allied with the Council's commitment to deliver a minimum of 1,760 new dwellings in Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimley villages during the plan period (2010 to 2027) of the adopted Core Strategy.

**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:**

---

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).
Having lived in Thomas Avenue for the last 30+ years, I and other residents have enjoyed a peaceful and quiet community with the low volumes of traffic being one of the reasons for living here. The development of land to the South of Thurmans Lane will destroy the quietness & safety of both the roads into the Josselyns & Thomas Avenue and Faulkeners Way, all of which are not capable of taking the additional volume of traffic and definitely will not be able to accommodate the ingress/egress of large construction/delivery vehicles due to the restricted widths of the roads. With most of the current housing having at least 2 cars to each household, cars parking adjacent to each other do not leave adequate space for anything as large as the Council Waste Collection vehicles and will be a major hazard to emergency vehicles having to enter the two roads.

As usual, not a lot of thought has gone into the proposal which anyone with an ounce of common sense can see will cause dramatic disruption and additional noise/pollution effects that will be imposed on the current residential population of these two roads together with Faulkeners way and the traffic congestion that will occur along the High Road leading into/out of Faulkeners Way for the foreseeable future and beyond. It is and has been a badly thought out plan with no thought given to the detrimental impact on the lives of the residents in both the Josselyns and Thomas Avenue and Faulkeners way and should be rejected as such.

Summary:
Current road access/exit infrastructure unable to accommodate proposed Traffic volumes (both construction & residential). Major impact on health and well being of current residents. Any development should be in harmony with existing conditions, not destructive as this plan seeks to do. It must also be what the Parish residents want, not what the government feels it has a right to impose. I reject the proposals for the number of dwellings and the access/exit use of the Josselyns & Thomas Avenue.
As a Trimley St. Mary resident of 30+ years, I have seen the ever increasing volumes of traffic on the High Road and the increasing levels of dangerous driving especially when drivers are negotiating the mini roundabouts. There have been serious injuries and very close calls all along the High Road, but especially at these junctions and the pinch point between the Mariners public house and Reeve Lodge Care home. Not only would any major increase in traffic volume cause an upward move in hazard / danger levels, but the whole infrastructure of the High Road through the Trimleys is insufficient and will need a major reconfiguration to bring it up to a suitable standard to cope with any proposed development of land South of Thurmans Lane or anywhere else in both Trimley villages. These are villages, not small towns, therefore they MUST retain their unique character as separate villages.

Any increase in traffic volumes will increase hazard / danger levels without complete re-configuration of the entire High Road, especially the pinch point between the Mariners public house and Reeve Ledge care home. Minor adjustments at mini roundabouts will exacerbate the problems, not solve them. As usual, the developments are given the go ahead without the necessary infrastructure being put in place to cope with the additional needs, coming as an after thought when the mistake is glaringly obvious to all. 'I told you so' is an all too common saying when it is too late.

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).
In relation to pressure on Faulkeners Way and Trimley High Rd, reference is made to consideration of the need to redesign the mini-roundabout on Faulkeners Way and High Rd. This is on the assumption of a possibility of approximately 100 residential units being constructed on land south of Thurmans Lane. We do not consider that this possible re-design goes far enough in proposing adequate traffic control measures to cope with the anticipated additional volume of traffic which this potential development will create, a volume which would increase substantially if the additional proposed development, bringing the total number of residential units to around 150, were to be permitted. No reference has been made to the necessity of installing pedestrian crossings at the above location, and other locations along High Rd, together with traffic calming measures in order to secure an acceptable level of safety for pedestrians, and particularly persons with reduced mobility.

Summary:
Not enough traffic control measures to cope with potential development.
Any development needs to be proportional to the size of the villages, not how many dwellings can be squeezed onto a section of land. Just because the Faulkeners way development is an estate does not give you the right to impose further development of estate type housing and numbers on limited land resources. Creating a situation of overcrowding is unacceptable (Mice in a cage syndrome - put too many in the cage and you will get unrest/conflict). Accompanying health issues will be exacerbated causing further strain on an already over stretched Social and Health service that is unable to cope now.

Summary:
Any development needs to be proportional to the size of the villages, not how many dwellings can be squeezed onto a section of land. Just because the Faulkeners way development is an estate does not give you the right to impose further development of estate type housing and numbers on limited land resources. Creating a situation of overcrowding is unacceptable (Mice in a cage syndrome - put too many in the cage and you will get unrest/conflict). Accompanying health issues will be exacerbated causing further strain on an already over stretched Social and Health service that is unable to cope now.
Policy FPP8: Land south of Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary

Full Text:
No Primary vehicular access from the Josselyns / Thomas Avenue is acceptable due to the extreme detrimental effect on the current residential population of the two roads with insufficient road width to accommodate any level of construction vehicles or additional vehicle volumes. The number of dwellings is far in excess of what is proportional to the needs of the village, and is a figure that is being used to justify compliance with the Government assertion of a massive increase in housing development. The current village infrastructure is inadequate and incapable of handling the predicted increase in volumes of vehicles and residents needs, yet alone the current levels and needs to be seriously considered before any agreement to further residential/business development in either village.

Any development needs to meet the agreement of the residents, not the imposition of Policy by Government bureaucrats.

Summary:
Any development needs to meet the agreement of the residents, not the imposition of Policy by Government bureaucrats.

Attentions:
Thank you for your letter dated 14th April 2016 regarding the above consultation. We have had the opportunity to assess the letter and consultation documents and can offer the following advice. Please note we have provided comments on the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies within a separate letter to you dated the same. This follows two previous consultations and our comments dated 25th February 2015 and 24th November 2015.

In terms of our general comments:

Recent Guidance from Historic England

We have recently published guidance on The Historic Environment in Local Plans and the Historic Environment and Site Allocations. Where we have not made comment below some additional guidance on ensuring a positive strategy for the historic environment is secured within the Felixstowe Area Action Plan can be seen by following these links: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa1-historic-environment-local-plans/> and <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/>.

In terms of our specific comments:

Housing Sites

FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe (451g)

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the possible impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II* Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We highlighted that the principal elevation of Walton Hall faces north and overlooks site 451g. It was considered that development here would urbanise the setting of this important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance. It was expressed that harm would also be caused to the Grade II lodge and we strongly advised that an alternative site was found for development, though it was thought that there may be scope for some limited development at the eastern end of this site.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfil the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words ‘and their setting’ in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

FPP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe (502e)

At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be...
Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed. At Preferred Options stage, we considered 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 note that the policy still does not include this requirement (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.88.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

FPF7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin (451c and 451d)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

FPF8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary (383f and 451f)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

FPF13: Felixstowe Town Centre and FFP14: Retail Frontages
As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FPF13 and FFP14.

As above in previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word 'on' with 'to'.

FFP18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point, FPP20: Cobbolds Point to Spa, FFP21: Spa to Martello Park and FFP22 Martello Park to Landguard
We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FFP23: Car Parking
At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the 'high quality of design' requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe's archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council's approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area
We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report 'Felixstowe South Conservation Area' commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to...
Object

Housing

At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden

We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Other Issues

Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding

At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary:

At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. Paragraph 157 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Plans to provide detail with site allocations where appropriate.

Change to Plan

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).
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Housing Policy FPP8: Land south of Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>iii, iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments:

Scanned Representation

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).
We are writing this to show our concern to the proposed new development on the 2 fields on land south of Thurmans lane Trimley St Mary and that we strongly object to the plans to build here. We have lived at 43 The Josselyns for 24 years and are next to the field at the end by the proposed road into new estate the whole development and site access will be adjacent to the frontage of our home. If this goes ahead our front door is 3 meters away from building site entrance this is totally unacceptable, our front door opens directly onto path so my new carpets would be ruined with the construction mess. We like the vast majority of our neighbours have lived in this road a long time for the quality of life we would lose this if this area was developed. And this will bring huge problems to our road, our main concern is the access route into the new estate and building site which is past my front window, as this would be through the narrow residential road of the Josselyns, which already has more than enough parking problems for the existing homes here now. My parking space would join the road and I would find it difficult to access this and I do not believe this road or Faulkeners way, the mini roundabout & High road could cope with more traffic. There are other possible routes into this new development with access directly to the high road with less disruption to the Josselyns and Faulkeners way and existing housing estate.

We feel that the route will cause years of disruption to the homes and lives of the residents as well as my own. My objections are:

* Building Site entrance 3 meters away from my front door! this is totally unacceptable
* Parking during construction with building vehicle’s parked outside my front window waiting to get on to building site
* Parking caused but new residents
* Safety of contamination from the development (we have pets & husband has respiratory problems)
* Volume of heavy goods/construction traffic
* Potential 200/400 new traffic movements per day
* New traffic calming measures
* Disruption to my sleep pattern while on shift work
* I do not agree with the building of houses on farming fields
* The noise and mess the building would create
* The loss of the wildlife
* The damage to our road which was not designed for heavy goods this road is already cracked
* The trimley high road is already congested at school entry times.

Summary:

Objections are:

* Building Site entrance 3 meters away from my front door! this is totally unacceptable
* Parking during construction with building vehicle’s parked outside my front window waiting to get on to building site
* Parking caused but new residents
* Safety of contamination from the development (we have pets & husband has respiratory problems)
* Volume of heavy goods/construction traffic
* Potential 200/400 new traffic movements per day
* New traffic calming measures
* Disruption to my sleep pattern while on shift work
* I do not agree with the building of houses on farming fields
* The noise and mess the building would create
* The loss of the wildlife
* The damage to our road which was not designed for heavy goods this road is already cracked
* The trimley high road is already congested at school entry times.
Thank you for consulting Suffolk County Council on submission version for development in Felixstowe.

Suffolk County Council responded previously to the preferred options stage in November 2015. This response does not rehearse all the issues as Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) has responded well to the points that the county council made at the time.

The following response relates to the ways in which the development of these sites affects county council responsibilities, and how our authorities will need to work together to bring these sites forward in a successful way.

This letter does not take into account the impact of sites which may come forward as windfall development, which may have significant impacts on local infrastructure.

Archaeology

Additional text has been systematically added in general information about archaeology, using the county council’s previous comments. It introduces archaeology throughout the document and gives the plan a sound approach to archaeology.

Suffolk County Council Archaeology has reviewed the document and the only minor outstanding matters relate to suggested amendments and the terminology used in the following paragraphs:

Para. 3.74 (FPP4) - the site will require archaeological excavation rather than assessment, as it has already been assessed. Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service can provide a brief for the works and also discuss options for preservation in situ.

Paras. 3.82 (FPP5), 3.94 (FPP6), 3.101 (FPP7), 3.109 (FPP8) - Change the reference to archaeological assessment “prior to the development of the site” to “at an appropriate design stage prior to the granting of outline, technical details or full planning permission.” This will allow for preservation in situ, where appropriate, of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed, for which conditions may or may not be sufficient.

With regard to FFP12 (Land at Haven Exchange), which is an enabling policy, archaeological investigation will be required, particularly for larger schemes.

Education

Early Education

The document reflects advice provided by the county council on the need for at least one additional facility for early years education (excluding the Candlet Road site subject to an appeal). The detail provided is paragraphs 3.39 to 3.41 is welcomed. During the previous stage, the county council highlighted ways in which policy FPP15 could be more supportive of early education in retail centres, as part of a balanced policy which also protects the vitality and viability of retail centres. The county raised the point that policy FPP16 (previously FPP17) would support early years provision, which SCDC has considered. Therefore, our councils agree that early years facilities can be considered as “other local services” within FPP16.

Primary Education

The challenge presented by the distribution of housing proposed for ensuring sufficient additional primary school places has been recognised in the submission version. Land needs to be identified for a new primary school in order to ensure that there can be confidence of a long term solution for primary school provision. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in identifying options for sites based on the pattern of development coming forward and the need to find a location that promotes sustainable travel choices. The two locations identified and other alternatives as stated in para. 3.44 provide a clear indication of how a site could be identified. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in keeping the expected size of school and the area of land required under review.

Transport

A report by AECOM, on behalf of Highways England and Suffolk County Council (SCC), to assess the cumulative impact of development proposed in the Area Action Plan on the local and strategic road networks is attached to this response. In addition to the sites identified, this report implicitly includes background growth port-related traffic and the growth throughout the district.

The Suffolk County Council supports the creation of a link road between Candlet Road and High Street Walton. The intention of this link is that it is designed to serve local journeys so that the impacts from rerouting are localised.

I hope that these comments are helpful. Please contact me via the details at the top of this letter, if we or any of our colleagues can be of assistance.
7918 Object

Housing

Policy FPP8: Land south of Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary

Summary:

Paras. 3.82 (FPP5), 3.94 (FPP6), 3.101 (FPP7), 3.109 (FPP8) - Change the reference to archaeological assessment "prior to the development of the site" to "at an appropriate design stage prior to the granting of outline, technical details or full planning permission." This will allow for preservation in situ, where appropriate, of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed, for which conditions may or may not be sufficient.

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments:
I write in response to the Proposed Submission Consultation, submitting representations on behalf of my client, Trinity College, Cambridge, in respect of the draft allocation of Proposed Submission Policy FPP8 - Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St. Mary.

Proposed Submission Policy FPP8: Land south of Thurmans Lane, Trimley St. Mary

As owner, Trinity College supports the proposed allocation of the above site for residential development, subject to the matters outlined below and the requirements of Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework).

The allocation of the site will make a meaningful contribution towards the pressing need for new housing across the Peninsula, allied with the Council's commitment to deliver a minimum of 1,760 new dwellings in Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimley villages during the plan period (2010 to 2027) of the adopted Core Strategy.

The Core Strategy states that Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimley villages is by far the largest town within the District and includes the Port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, of both regional and national significance. Pertinently, it also acknowledges that the growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one. This had led to an unsustainable increase in commuting from other towns on a daily basis. In addition, the population in the area is increasing at the same time as average household sizes are falling, further increasing the need for housing. The number and type of new homes provided in recent years has not matched this increase in demand.

The importance of boosting housing supply in Felixstowe is demonstrated by the Council's commitment (as required by the Inspector who examined the Core Strategy) to pursue an early review of the Core Strategy's strategic policies (amongst them a minimum housing requirement of 7,900 dwellings) by 2015 to address objectively assessed housing needs (Policy SP2 - Housing Numbers and Distribution). As part of the evidence base to inform the Core Strategy, Oxford Economics were commissioned (2010) to determine housing need for the District, which was established to be 11,000 dwellings at that time. It is understood that evidence gathering during 2015 indicates that the current full, objectively assessed district wide housing need could be higher still.

As such, current housing need is higher than the levels of growth currently being planned for, and more sites are likely to be required to come forward on the peninsular in the medium term, over and above those proposed for allocation via the AAP. It is, therefore, critical to make the best use of land for housing and prioritise the delivery of residential development.

The necessity to urgently have an adopted AAP in place to encourage the delivery of housing is heightened by the current deficit in the five-year supply of deliverable housing sites in Suffolk Coastal District as required by Paragraph 49 of the NPPF. As such, the presumption in favour of sustainable development is applicable to residential applications made within the District. This position has recently (25 April 2016) been confirmed by an appeal decision for a site at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, where an Inspector assessed the Council's housing land supply at 3.7 years at best, commenting:

"The future for housing growth in the District is seriously uncertain and is not following the plan-led approach that is advocated in the first of twelve core planning principles set out in the NPPF. In these circumstances, it is necessary to maintain the principle established in the PPG; that undersupply should be addressed in the first five years of the remaining plan period, the Sedgefield method, rather than over the remaining years of the plan period, the Council's preferred Liverpool method" (para.25).

In concluding on the land supply issue, the Inspector concluded:

"The relevant five-year period for an assessment of housing delivery is April 2015 to March 2020 and during that period the BT Adastral Park site will contribute only 200 dwellings towards housing supply. It is appropriate to apply a 20% buffer and it is necessary to require the shortfall in previous housing delivery to be delivered over the first five years, and not over the remainder, of the plan period. Based on these three main factors, and setting aside the debate about housing delivery being based on the OAN for the District rather than the CS figure of 7,900 dwellings, it is estimated that the Council has a housing land supply of only about 3.7 years. Even if only one of the three main factors is correct the Council does not have a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing. Furthermore, if the housing requirement is based on an OAN of 11,000 dwellings, as established in the CS, or on any realistic prediction of what an OAN for the District is likely to be, housing land supply is less than 3.7 years.

The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land and paragraph 49 of the NPPF is therefore engaged" (paras 27 and 28, appeal decision APP/J3530/W/15/3011466).

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).
In summary, subject to the concerns outlined, my client is supportive of the proposed allocation of the site to provide up to 50 dwellings within the context of a sustainable community and high quality scheme for up to 50 dwellings, public open space and associated infrastructure to, in part, deliver the Core Strategy’s short to medium term objectives to deliver organic and evolutionary growth over a mixture of sites immediately abutting existing built up areas.

The suitability of the site for housing is reaffirmed by its sustainability. The Interim Sustainability Appraisal supporting the AAP consultation identifies that it scores well when considered against its social, environmental and economic effects. For example:

- The site is located relatively close to a range of local services, including the local shops on Faulkeners Way.
- It is adjacent to bus routes (Faulkeners Way, off Thomas Avenue) connecting the village with Felixstowe and Ipswich.
- The site will assist in the Core Strategy’s aim to reduce and reverse the unsustainable patterns of in-commuting to Felixstowe (the Port and its other employment areas).
- The site offers the opportunity to link to the existing Public Rights of Way Network and Village Green.

In essence, the site is ideally suited for residential development and its allocation in the AAP is entirely consistent with the Core Strategy's short to medium term objectives to deliver organic and evolutionary growth over a mixture of sites immediately abutting existing built up areas.

Scale of Residential Development Required

My client has control, as landowner, of SHLAA site 451f, which would be accessed from Thomas Avenue. Collectively, with the adjacent site (SHLAA Ref.383f) the Preferred Option iterations of the AAP "expected" a minimum of 100 dwellings to be delivered on the site. The current Proposed Submission iteration of Policy FPP8 identifies the collective site for approximately 100 residential units.

In the interim, my client has brought forward a masterplan as part of a recently submitted outline planning application that will seek to deliver up to 50 dwellings, public open space and associated infrastructure to, in part, deliver the minimum figure referred to in the Preferred Options consultation iteration. This indicative layout and the associated supporting reports, as submitted to the Council, demonstrates that a sustainable community and high quality scheme for up to 50 dwellings can be accommodated upon the site, that respects the setting of the Grade II Listed Mill Farmhouse adjacent the site.

Furthermore, it is understood that since the Preferred Options iteration of the AAP, a full planning application has also been made on the adjacent land (SHLAA Ref.383f) by Bloor Homes for 98 dwellings, that is currently under consideration. My client's site has considered this application in the Transport Statement that accompanied the planning application (and the other supporting documents as appropriate) and demonstrates that my client's scheme can be satisfactorily accommodated.

In this context, it is requested that the quantum of development outlined within Policy FPP8 is reworded to reflect that in the previous iteration Preferred Options consultation draft of the AAP, with "100 dwellings expected on the site as a minimum" reinstated to replace "identified for approximately 100 residential units".

Requirements for an Air Quality Assessment and Archaeological Assessment

These requirements can be secured by way of national planning policy, the adopted Core Strategy and a validation checklist for the submission of a planning application (as the Council has already produced). My client has commissioned this work to be undertaken as part of the proposed development and this evidence has been submitted as part of the recent planning application. As such, their inclusion within the Policy is considered unnecessary, and my client considers that the two bullet points should be removed from draft policy FPP8.

Requirement for Affordable Housing Provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2, and a range of housing types and tenures in keeping with surrounding area and in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6

These policy requirements are already secured through the Core Strategy so repeating them within the draft AAP as policies is unnecessary. As such, my client considers that these two bullet points should be removed from draft policy FPP8.

Conclusion

In summary, subject to the concerns outlined, my client is supportive of the proposed allocation of the site to provide up to 50 dwellings within the context of a sustainable community and high quality scheme for up to 50 dwellings, public open space and associated infrastructure to, in part, deliver the Core Strategy’s short to medium term objectives to deliver organic and evolutionary growth over a mixture of sites immediately abutting existing built up areas.

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).
new housing to assist in meeting the minimum Core Strategy housing requirements, help reverse unsustainable patterns of in-commuting to the Port of Felixstowe and other employment areas, and assist the Council in meeting its five-year housing supply requirements.

Notwithstanding this, my client continues to have concerns as outlined above. In accordance with the requirements of Paragraph 182 of the Framework, in order to be considered 'sound' policies in Local Plans must be consistent with national policy, justified based on proportionate evidence, and based on a strategy that seeks to meet objectively assessed development needs. Whilst welcoming the allocation of the site for residential development, for the reasons set out within these representations, we do not consider some of the policy requirements of FPP8 to be sound. In light of the Council's current land supply position, we would respectfully suggest that the focus should be on making the most appropriate use of land to deliver housing whilst protecting less appropriate sites elsewhere. Following the representations made on various matters at the Preferred Options AAP consultation stage and these representations, we trust that they will be duly considered prior to or during the examination in public sessions.

Summary:
Supportive of the proposed allocation of the site to provide new housing to assist in meeting the minimum Core Strategy housing requirements, help reverse unsustainable patterns of in-commuting to the Port of Felixstowe and other employment areas, and assist the Council in meeting its five-year housing supply requirements. Notwithstanding this, do not consider some of the policy requirements of FPP8 to be sound, specifically in relation to the scale of residential development required, the requirement for an air quality assessment and archaeological assessment and 2 bullet points being unnecessary repetition of already secured core strategy affordable housing policy.

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change to Plan</th>
<th>Appear at exam?</th>
<th>Legal?</th>
<th>Sound?</th>
<th>Duty to Cooperate?</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ii, iii, iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).
I write in response to the Proposed Submission Consultation, submitting representations on behalf of my client, Trinity College, Cambridge, in respect of the draft allocation of Proposed Submission Policy FPP8 - Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary.

Proposed Submission Policy FPP8: Land south of Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary

As owner, Trinity College supports the proposed allocation of the above site for residential development, subject to the matters outlined below and the requirements of Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework).

The allocation of the site will make a meaningful contribution towards the pressing need for new housing across the Peninsula, allied with the Council's commitment to deliver a minimum of 1,760 new dwellings in Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimley villages during the plan period (2010 to 2027) of the adopted Core Strategy.

The Core Strategy states that Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimley villages is by far the largest town within the District and includes the Port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, of both regional and national significance. Pertinently, it also acknowledges that the growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one. This had led to an unsustainable increase in commuting from other towns on a daily basis. In addition, the population in the area is increasing at the same time as average household sizes are falling, further increasing the need for housing. The number and type of new homes provided in recent years has not matched this increase in demand.

The importance of boosting housing supply in Felixstowe is demonstrated by the Council's commitment (as required by the Inspector who examined the Core Strategy) to pursue an early review of the Core Strategy's strategic policies (amongst them a minimum housing requirement of 7,900 dwellings) by 2015 to address objectively assessed housing needs (Policy SP2 - Housing Numbers and Distribution). As part of the evidence base to inform the Core Strategy, Oxford Economics were commissioned (2010) to determine housing need for the District, which was established to be 11,000 dwellings at that time. It is understood that evidence gathering during 2015 indicates that the current full, objectively assessed district wide housing need could be higher still.

As such, current housing need is higher than the levels of growth currently being planned for, and more sites are likely to be required to come forward on the peninsular in the medium term, over and above those proposed for allocation via the AAP. It is, therefore, critical to make the best use of land for housing and prioritise the delivery of residential development.

The necessity to urgently have an adopted AAP in place to encourage the delivery of housing is heightened by the current deficit in the five-year supply of deliverable housing sites in Suffolk Coastal District as required by Paragraph 49 of the NPPF. As such, the presumption in favour of sustainable development is applicable to residential applications made within the District. This position has recently (25 April 2016) been confirmed by an appeal decision for a site at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, where an Inspector assessed the Council's housing land supply at 3.7 years at best, commenting:

"The future for housing growth in the District is seriously uncertain and is not following the plan-led approach that is advocated in the first of twelve core planning principles set out in the NPPF. In these circumstances, it is necessary to maintain the principle established in the PPG; that undersupply should be addressed in the first five years of the remaining plan period, the Sedgefield method, rather than over the remaining years of the plan period, the Council's preferred Liverpool method" (para.25).

In concluding on the land supply issue, the Inspector concluded:

"The relevant five-year period for an assessment of housing delivery is April 2015 to March 2020 and during that period the BT Adastral Park site will contribute only 200 dwellings towards housing supply. It is appropriate to apply a 20% buffer and it is necessary to require the shortfall in previous housing delivery to be delivered over the first five years, and not over the remainder, of the plan period. Based on these three main factors, and setting aside the debate about housing delivery being based on the OAN for the District rather than the CS figure of 7,900 dwellings, it is estimated that the Council has a housing land supply of only about 3.7 years. Even if only one of the three main factors is correct the Council does not have a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing. Furthermore, if the housing requirement is based on an OAN of 11,000 dwellings, as established in the CS, or on any realistic prediction of what an OAN for the District is likely to be, housing land supply is less than 3.7 years.

The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land and paragraph 49 of the NPPF is therefore engaged" (paras 27 and 28, appeal decision APJ3530/W/15/3011466).

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).
In summary, subject to the concerns outlined, my client is supportive of the proposed allocation of the site to provide 100 dwellings to be delivered on the site. The current Proposed Submission iteration of Policy FPP8 identifies the collective requirement for Affordable Housing Provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2, and a range of housing types and tenures in keeping with surrounding area and in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6.

These requirements can be secured by way of national planning policy, the adopted Core Strategy and a validation supporting reports, as submitted to the Council, demonstrates that a sustainable community and high quality scheme for up to 50 dwellings can be accommodated upon the site, that respects the setting of the Grade II Listed Mill Farmhouse adjacent the site.

Furthermore, it is understood that since the Preferred Options iteration of the AAP, a full planning application has also been made on the adjacent land (SHLAA Ref.383f) by Bloor Homes for 98 dwellings, that is currently under consideration. My client's site has considered this application in the Transport Statement that accompanied the planning application (and the other supporting documents as appropriate) and demonstrates that my client's scheme can be satisfactorily accommodated.

In this context, it is requested that the quantum of development outlined within Policy FPP8 is reworded to reflect that in the previous iteration Preferred Options consultation draft of the AAP, with "100 dwellings expected on the site as a minimum" reinstated to replace "identified for approximately 100 residential units".

Requirements for an Air Quality Assessment and Archaeological Assessment

These requirements can be secured by way of national planning policy, the adopted Core Strategy and a validation checklist for the submission of a planning application (as the Council has already produced). My client has commissioned this work to be undertaken as part of the proposed development and this evidence has been submitted as part of the recent planning application. As such, their inclusion within the Policy is considered unnecessary, and my client considers that the two bullet points should be removed from draft policy FPP8.

Requirement for Affordable Housing Provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2, and a range of housing types and tenures in keeping with surrounding area and in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6.

These policy requirements are already secured through the Core Strategy so repeating them within the draft AAP as policies is unnecessary. As such, my client considers that these two bullet points should be removed from draft policy FPP8.

Conclusion

In summary, subject to the concerns outlined, my client is supportive of the proposed allocation of the site to provide 100 dwellings to be delivered on the site. The current Proposed Submission iteration of Policy FPP8 identifies the collective requirement for Affordable Housing Provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2, and a range of housing types and tenures in keeping with surrounding area and in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6.

In essence, the site is ideally suited for residential development and its allocation in the AAP is entirely consistent with the Core Strategy's short to medium term objectives to deliver organic and evolutionary growth over a mixture of sites immediately abutting existing built up areas.

In the interim, my client has brought forward a masterplan as part of a recently submitted outline planning application that will seek to deliver up to 50 dwellings, public open space and associated infrastructure to, in part, deliver the minimum figure referred to in the Preferred Options consultation iteration. This indicative layout and the associated supporting reports, as submitted to the Council, demonstrates that a sustainable community and high quality scheme for up to 50 dwellings can be accommodated upon the site, that respects the setting of the Grade II Listed Mill Farmhouse adjacent the site.

Furthermore, it is understood that since the Preferred Options iteration of the AAP, a full planning application has also been made on the adjacent land (SHLAA Ref.383f) by Bloor Homes for 98 dwellings, that is currently under consideration. My client's site has considered this application in the Transport Statement that accompanied the planning application (and the other supporting documents as appropriate) and demonstrates that my client's scheme can be satisfactorily accommodated.

In this context, it is requested that the quantum of development outlined within Policy FPP8 is reworded to reflect that in the previous iteration Preferred Options consultation draft of the AAP, with "100 dwellings expected on the site as a minimum" reinstated to replace "identified for approximately 100 residential units".

Requirements for an Air Quality Assessment and Archaeological Assessment

These requirements can be secured by way of national planning policy, the adopted Core Strategy and a validation checklist for the submission of a planning application (as the Council has already produced). My client has commissioned this work to be undertaken as part of the proposed development and this evidence has been submitted as part of the recent planning application. As such, their inclusion within the Policy is considered unnecessary, and my client considers that the two bullet points should be removed from draft policy FPP8.

Requirement for Affordable Housing Provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2, and a range of housing types and tenures in keeping with surrounding area and in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6.

These policy requirements are already secured through the Core Strategy so repeating them within the draft AAP as policies is unnecessary. As such, my client considers that these two bullet points should be removed from draft policy FPP8.

Conclusion

In summary, subject to the concerns outlined, my client is supportive of the proposed allocation of the site to provide 100 dwellings to be delivered on the site. The current Proposed Submission iteration of Policy FPP8 identifies the collective requirement for Affordable Housing Provision to be in line with Core Strategy Policy DM2, and a range of housing types and tenures in keeping with surrounding area and in line with Core Strategy Table 3.6.

In essence, the site is ideally suited for residential development and its allocation in the AAP is entirely consistent with the Core Strategy's short to medium term objectives to deliver organic and evolutionary growth over a mixture of sites immediately abutting existing built up areas.
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Housing Policy FPP8: Land south of Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary

new housing to assist in meeting the minimum Core Strategy housing requirements, help reverse unsustainable patterns of in-commuting to the Port of Felixstowe and other employment areas, and assist the Council in meeting its five-year housing supply requirements.

Notwithstanding this, my client continues to have concerns as outlined above. In accordance with the requirements of Paragraph 182 of the Framework, in order to be considered 'sound' policies in Local Plans must be consistent with national policy, justified based on proportionate evidence, and based on a strategy that seeks to meet objectively assessed development needs. Whilst welcoming the allocation of the site for residential development, for the reasons set out within these representations, we do not consider some of the policy requirements of FPP8 to be sound. In light of the Council's current land supply position, we would respectfully suggest that the focus should be on making the most appropriate use of land to deliver housing whilst protecting less appropriate sites elsewhere. Following the representations made on various matters at the Preferred Options AAP consultation stage and these representations, we trust that they will be duly considered prior to or during the examination in public sessions.

Summary:

I write in response to the Proposed Submission Consultation, submitting representations on behalf of my client, Trinity College, Cambridge, in respect of the draft allocation of Proposed Submission Policy FPP8 - Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St. Mary.

As owner, Trinity College supports the proposed allocation of the above site for residential development, subject to the matters outlined below and the requirements of Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework).

The allocation of the site will make a meaningful contribution towards the pressing need for new housing across the Peninsula, allied with the Council's commitment to deliver a minimum of 1,760 new dwellings in Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimley villages during the plan period (2010 to 2027) of the adopted Core Strategy.

Change to Plan N/A

Legal? Not Specified
Sound? Not Specified
Duty to Cooperate? Not Specified
Soundness Tests 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).
This is an OBJECTION to the BLOORS HOMES planning application ref DC/16/1107/FUL re Land On The South Side Of Thurmans Lane Trimley St Mary Suffolk - Erection of 98 dwellings (including 32 affordable units) together with drainage, garaging, parking, landscaping, public open spaces, new electricity sub-station, new foul water pump-station, pedestrian links to Thurmans Lane, access onto The Josselyns and all ancillary works.

I wish to raise my OBJECTIONS to the above Planning Application and any other FUTURE Planning Applications for this area as follows:

Contrary to the UK democratic rights of the individual citizen, Suffolk Coastal District Council have failed in their duty to allow / provide open Public Consultation and Open Public Meetings in relation to this and other proposed Planning APPLICATIONS for the Trimley Villages. The lack of transparency is a clear indication that the council are pushing through planning applications for major developments without proper procedures being followed to allow the public the FULL opportunity to raise concerns and discuss the issues - preferring to make decisions behind closed doors without Public scrutiny/accountability. They have also failed to follow major recommendations as published in FPP28 (see attached) - in effect, sweeping this document to one side, hoping it would not get noticed.

As the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan Proposed Submission Document is still in it's Consultative phase, how can any Planning Applications for major developments be permitted until such time as this has been completed - safeguards are being ignored and the impact assessments are purely desk and paper based around Google Mapping. The whole process is weighted against the proper public representation of the local people - decisions being made by people & departments that have no physical/domicile relationships to the communities they are destroying - all in the name of progress.

Lack of investment in local Infrastructure and Education / Health facilities means immense additional pressures on existing services which are struggling to meet the demands of the current population, yet alone, any increase on the scale proposed. The local Health service providers are having great difficulty in providing sufficient GP's and support staff for the area communities with many reporting severe shortages and the local Primary / Infant school is FULL with this year's September intake.

To quote a phrase - "You cannot squeeze a QUART into a PINT pot".

It is also becoming Common Knowledge that Ipswich has for the past decade been a major Immigrant dispersal centre.

I am not prepared to have my views ignored - STOP DESTROYING OUR VILLAGES

Summary:
Contrary to the UK democratic rights of the individual citizen, Suffolk Coastal District Council have failed in their duty to allow / provide open Public Consultation and Open Public Meetings in relation to this and other proposed Planning APPLICATIONS for the Trimley Villages. The lack of transparency is a clear indication that the council are pushing through planning applications for major developments without proper procedures being followed to allow the public the FULL opportunity to raise concerns and discuss the issues - preferring to make decisions behind closed doors without Public scrutiny/accountability.

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>i, ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments:
- Previous objection Letter
- Policy FPP28
- Policy AP28

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).
I am writing TO STRONGLY OBJECT to the above planning application for 90+ dwellings accessed via The Josselyns off Faulkeners Way in Trimley St Mary.

My objections are as follows:

1. Although I do not live on The Josselyns, it seems evident to me that this road was dimensioned as an estate "side road" rather than a main access road, therefore not designed to carry the number of traffic movements that 90+ dwellings will bring without a massive impact on those who live on it, and in some cases have front doors opening onto the road. As is generally accepted, most homes own more than one car which leads to inevitable on road parking. Given the huge increase in daily car movements as a result of the development, this road is just too narrow to sensibly and practically cope with parking and free movement of vehicles and it will inevitably complicate free access for emergency vehicles as well as the usual variety of large delivery vehicles on a daily basis. In addition, it will hugely impact on the quality of life of those residents of The Josselyns.

2. Leaving our own property to gain access to Trimley High Road has increasingly become a serious challenge over the years we have lived here particularly when wanting to cross the traffic - no sooner does a break in the traffic occur in one direction than it closes in the other direction. The building of another 90+ homes with its attendant cars and car movements is going to put further strain on an already very busy High Road. I know for a fact that an elderly couple who live on the other side of the High Road to us are in genuine fear of crossing the road to reach the bus stop, as they cannot move quickly, and judging an opportunity to cross has become a real worry for them.

3. Whilst it is obvious from what we learn in the media of the need to build more housing within the UK, it is not obvious to me as to why there is a need to build them on the Felixstowe peninsula. Do we really have the employment opportunities for all the people who we seem to be building for here? I would suggest not, and I would suggest that the long term employment prospects for Felixstowe Docks is not assured, both as a result of inevitable increased automation as well as the obvious competition from a much more modern port at Thames Gateway.

4. With not only this development but others that seem to be planned in the village, what is being done besides traffic management issues to ensure that schools and health and welfare services will be able to cope with the increased numbers?

Summary:

Whilst it is obvious from what we learn in the media of the need to build more housing within the UK, it is not obvious to me as to why there is a need to build them on the Felixstowe peninsula. Do we really have the employment opportunities for all the people who we seem to be building for here? I would suggest not, and I would suggest that the long term employment prospects for Felixstowe Docks is not assured, both as a result of inevitable increased automation as well as the obvious competition from a much more modern port at Thames Gateway.
I STRONGLY OBJECT to the planning application for 98 dwellings on land adjacent to Thurman’s Lane, Trimley St Mary. The grounds for my objection is as follows:

1. This is the wrong scale of development. The SCDC Local Plan identifies Trimley St Mary as a ‘Key Service Centre’. Strategic Policy SP 27 states that Key Service Centres should have allocations in the form of minor extensions to some villages to meet local needs. The Trimleys are identified uniquely as ‘considered capable of accommodating more strategic levels of growth’.

‘Strategic’ does not mean more, strategic means fulfilling an identified need and for a specific purpose. This scale of development exceeds local need and fulfils no local purpose.

2. This development contradicts Strategic Policy SP1 of the local Plan ‘Sustainable Development’. The population of Trimley St Mary is falling. Local people were consulted at a recent meeting and reported that there is no major need for further development. There is already a migration of traffic from Trimley to the west each morning to go to work, and back each evening on the return from work. Expansion at Felixstowe docks is unlikely to produce a large increase in work, as much of the operation is automated. The planned warehouse by Uniserve may produce up to 300 jobs in the first phase, but these are low paid, low skilled jobs, and Uniserve has a reputation for bussing migrant workers from more deprived areas. This development will not provide suitable accommodation for these workers.

The nearby development at Cavendish Grove promotes the locality as ‘ideal for those wishing to commute.’ The proposed houses are likely to be bought by people working in Ipswich, or those travelling to Ipswich Station to commute further afield. A car journey produces 10.9 kg carbon per gallon of fuel used. Just 50 commuters to Ipswich would add more than 500,000 kg - that’s 500 tonnes - of carbon to the atmosphere each year.

3. This development conflicts with the Felixstowe Area Action Plan. The Felixstowe AAP Preferred Policy FPP 8 identifies the combined sites of 383f & 451f as suitable for ‘Approx 100 dwellings’. I have already objected to this scale. However, the proposed development plans to put 98 houses on a little over half the site, which would result in an overall build of some 150 houses. This is excessive development in a small village. Whereas I accept that some development is needed, I would argue for 75 houses on the whole of FPP8, approx 50 on this development and 25 on the adjoining plot.

4. This fails to meet the needs of older people, as identified in para 2.13 of the Local Plan, which states:

an ageing population creates a specific housing need ..... Providing suitable accommodation for older people to remain within their communities or close by, potentially freeing up larger family housing will be important. However, there are no dwellings suitable for older people within the community who may wish to move to a more easily manageable bungalow. For this reason alone, I argue that the developer is putting greed before need.

5. This contradicts Strategic Policy SP21, which requires ‘Improvements to the operation of the strategic (A14 / A12) and local road network .... improved access to the Dock from Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimley villages.’ Traffic on the High road is already excessive. It can be difficult to cross the road, and cars are often parked illegally. There is no alternative route, and so further development will make the High Road even more congested, adding to both pollution and travel problems. However, there is no provision offered to ameliorate this problem.

6. Lack of appropriate investment in infrastructure. In addition to the points I have already raised, it is clear that this development will place an increased burden on infrastructure; The primary school will have the double problem of increased numbers of pupils and increased parking problems in the road; health services will be put under yet further pressure; increased traffic without alternative routes will mean more traffic congestion and more difficulty for emergency services; mains water, which already suffers from low pressure, will need to be improved; the main sewers will need an increased capacity, and all other aspects of the infrastructure will be placed under greater stress. The Prime Minister, at PMQs earlier in the year, stated that we should welcome new developments provided the infrastructure is put in place to support them. Josselyns is a small residential road - and yet the plans propose 98 dwelling to have access through this road. The only provision for the road infrastructure is the remodelling of a mini-roundabout.

Suffolk Coastal District Council have let down the people of Trimley. I understand that SCDC stands accused of not having a 15 year stock of land for housing, however, the answer is not to squeeze more housing into an already overdeveloped village.

Summary: The Felixstowe AAP Preferred Policy FPP 8 identifies the combined sites of 383f & 451f as suitable for ‘Approx 100 dwellings’. I have already objected to this scale. However, the proposed development plans to put 98 houses on a little over half the site, which would result in an overall build of some 150 houses. This is excessive development in a small village. Whereas I accept that some development is needed, I would argue for 75 houses on the whole of FPP8, approx 50 on this development and 25 on the adjoining plot.
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### Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan Proposed Submission Document

**8029 Object**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Policy FPP8: Land south of Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachments:**

---
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Thank you for your recent postal and email correspondence regarding the above. The incorporated changes are very welcome and we feel are to be commended. We are very grateful for all your consideration and appreciation for local opinion on this matter and the revised submission document appears to parallel the views of our village and the encompassed surrounding areas. We appreciate this has been a fractious and challenging period and sympathise with the position exhorted on you externally. Therefore we thank you for the deliberation afforded to this matter.

REF: FELIXSTOWE AREA ACTION PLAN - CONSULTATION DOCUMENT - APRIL 2016

Respondent: Mrs Julie Durrant [3912]  
Agent: N/A

Summary:  
Thank you for your recent postal and email correspondence regarding the above. The incorporated changes are very welcome and we feel are to be commended. We are very grateful for all your consideration and appreciation for local opinion on this matter and the revised submission document appears to parallel the views of our village and the encompassed surrounding areas. We appreciate this has been a fractious and challenging period and sympathise with the position exhorted on you externally. Therefore we thank you for the deliberation afforded to this matter.

REF: FELIXSTOWE AREA ACTION PLAN - CONSULTATION DOCUMENT - APRIL 2016

Change to Plan: N/A

Not Specified Not Specified Not Specified Not Specified N/A

Attachments: 
Scanned Comments
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With reference to the further consultation I totally agree with the decision to remove the above site from the FPAAP Consultation Document.
I confirm that I approve of the decision for the above land to be removed from the FPAAP Consultation Document.
Support

Employment

Policy FPP9: Port of Felixstowe

**Full Text:**

* The ES team welcomes the emphasis placed on safeguarding port-related businesses and on providing conditions to stimulate a wide business base in Felixstowe. We note the associated emphasis placed on the retention of land for appropriate employment purposes.

* We concur with the report's statements on the retail zones (town centre, neighbourhood service areas etc) and support the objective of maintaining and enhancing a strong town centre economy. We recognise the need to safeguard the town centre's distinctiveness and therefore support the aim of retaining features of architectural interest in the retail area. We are currently looking to develop 'pop up' retail opportunities on the seafront during major events and festivals and therefore suggest that the report references the need to be open to encouraging new retail opportunities (Jim, you may wish to liaise with Laura Hack or Catherine Thornber on this point).

* We support the aspiration of maintaining and enhancing the town's tourism economy. We would suggest that as well as facilitating provision of new accommodation in the resort and town centre, we are also open to the possibility of new tourist accommodation in the rural parts of the peninsula. Interestingly, the current trend on the Suffolk Coast is for the growth of 'niche' tourist accommodation in rural areas, often farm cottages or 'themed' accommodation such as static 1950's caravans, static yurts etc.

* We have no comments relating to beach huts but would suggest that you seek comments from Gayle Hart who now manages the council's beach huts and is currently looking at development options.

**Summary:**

The ES team welcomes the emphasis placed on safeguarding port-related businesses and on providing conditions to stimulate a wide business base in Felixstowe. We note the associated emphasis placed on the retention of land for appropriate employment purposes.

**Change to Plan:**

N/A
I write in response to the Proposed Submission consultation, submitting representations on behalf of my client, Trinity College, Cambridge in respect of Employment Land, and in particular land at Christmasyards Wood, Felixstowe and Innocence Farm, Trimley St. Martin. I attach draft plans to indicate the site’s locations.

Both sites have previously been subject to discussions with, and technical representations to Suffolk Coastal District Council, Suffolk County Council, etc. as well as some engagement with the relevant Parish Councils.

Planning Context:

As with earlier iterations, the Felixstowe AAP ‘Proposed Submission’ consultation document acknowledges that the adopted Core Strategy (2013) Policy SP5 (Employment Land) considers employment land across the district and makes the distinction between Strategic Employment Areas and General Employment Areas.

The consultation document also acknowledges that employment opportunities across the Felixstowe Peninsula are dominated by the Port of Felixstowe. The New Anglia Strategic Economic Plan (2014) outlines that "Felixstowe is the UK's largest container port, handling 40% of the national container traffic. The Port employs over 2,700 people directly and a further 10,000 jobs are based in related industries." In recent years, the Port has undergone significant expansion and investment which has seen improvement to the railway connections and further infrastructure investment continues to enable the Port to handle the latest mega-vessels.

The Core Strategy identifies the Port of Felixstowe as a Strategic Employment Area (SEA), given its contribution to the sub-regional, national and international economies, and states that those employed by the Port or Port related businesses represent 45% of the total workforce in the Felixstowe Area. Its significance is felt beyond the operations within the Port itself, with many businesses, and organisations relying upon the activities of the port for their own operations, such as shipping, logistics, distribution and transport companies.

In this context, the strategic importance of the Port of Felixstowe cannot be understated, with Core Strategy Policy SP5 (Employment Land) stating that the Council will make allocations of at least 8.5 hectares of new employment land within the district.

Felixstowe AAP Proposed Submission Policy FPP9: Port of Felixstowe identifies the SEA for the Port of Felixstowe (Policies Map), where land will be promoted and safeguarded for employment, activities and operations which support the retention, expansion and consolidation of the Port of Felixstowe and the jobs associated with the Port. It states that employment proposals which are considered to be of a strategic scale and nature, will be directed to sites within the Strategic Employment Area.

The supporting text to Policy FPP9 acknowledges the locational benefits of proximity to the SEA, and the aim, where possible, to intensify activities within the SEA, it also acknowledges that enduring that there is sufficient infrastructure to support the Port of Felixstowe will be fundamental to the continued success of the Strategic Employment Area.

Current Strategic Pressures:

As explored within the representations made to the previous Preferred Options AAP consultation, the Port and Trinity’s joint hinterland Estate continues to be under considerable pressure, there having been no new greenfield employment land allocations for third party logistics since the 1990’s. In this context, Core Strategy Policy SP21 (Felixstowe with Walton and the Trimley Villages) acknowledges that "land is required for port-related uses such as storage (including laden or un-laden containers) and distribution" (para. 4.38). It also acknowledges that "such land may need to be located away from the Port itself".

The presence of London Gateway, with its extensive distribution park hinterland (560 acres with the potential for 9.25m sq ft of warehousing) remains a potential competitive threat.

The Launch of the ‘Port of Felixstowe Logistics Park’ initiative at the end of 2014 introduced the potential for some 1.45 million sq ft of warehousing over a 68 acre site within the SEA, but this requires the displacement of approximately 20 acres of long established third party haulage and yard based logistics providers, whose leases terminate in 2016, to sites outside the Port estate.

This proposal for the construction of four new B8 distribution buildings, with ancillary office space and gatehouse buildings, provide a total of 83,411 sq.m (GIA) floorspace, and received planning permission (DC/15/2576/FUL) from

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).
Suffolk Coastal District Council on 1 December 2015.

At this point in time, many of the existing site users continue to have unresolved relocation requirements and discussions on behalf of Trinity College have been opened with a view to seeing whether any of these can be accommodated within Trinity's Estate. At the same time, Trinity is also dealing with significant other unresolved accommodation requirements from both existing and new port related occupiers, including strategic requirements for Mediterranean Shipping Company (MSC).

Proposed Employment Sites:

With the approval given for the B2/B8 Distribution Warehouse (Uniserve) at Clickett Hill Road, Trinity College has virtually no void space on its current hinterland distribution park and will be seeking to bring forward, as a matter of urgency, two sites; A minimum 27 acre net useable site at Christmasyards Wood, Felixstowe for single occupancy; and, a minimum 40 acre net useable site at Innocence Farm, Trimley St. Martin for multi occupancy. I attach plans to indicate the locations of these sites. Given the current level of unresolved premises, the number of enquiries received would utilise both of these allocations.

The proposed site is located off Fagbury Road West, Felixstowe and extends to approximately 12.71 hectares.

As part of the previous promotion of this site, a number of preparatory technical studies were prepared in 2008/2009 to seek to demonstrate that development for a proposed container storage yard could be satisfactorily accommodated.

In acknowledging that the project amounted to 'EIA Development' by virtue of its significance, a Scoping Request was made to Suffolk Coastal District Council, with the Scoping Opinion received on 3 December 2008.

The proposed allocation would extend to approximately 27 acres for use by a single operator as a container storage/haulage yard with access from either Fagbury Road West, or Oysterbed Road.

Land at Innocence Farm:

The proposed site is located to the north of Trimley St. Martin and the A14. It is bounded by the A14 Felixstowe Road to the south and Croft Lane to the east (see attached location plan).

As part of the previous promotion of this site, a number of preparatory technical studies were prepared in 2008/2009 to seek to demonstrate that development for a strategic employment site as a next phase of the Trinity Distribution Park to service the Port of Felixstowe could be achieved at Innocence Farm.

An Engineering Assessment (for a developable area of approximately 85 hectares) appraised a range of matters to include access/egress to the site, on-site construction and earthworks, provision of service utilities, surface water drainage, landscaping measures to minimise/mitigate the impact of development, public rights of way and land ownership.

This report concluded that the site could be satisfactorily developed in principle.

Given the existing significant, commercial pressures from potential tenants, both new and displaced, the initial proposals seek an initial allocation (of approximately 40 acres) for multi-occupier use primarily for haulage and ancillary yard use, but also potentially some warehousing.

Conclusion:

Notwithstanding the representation made to the Preferred Options Consultation, and the Council's response to discount land at Christmasyards Wood and Innocence Farm in favour of their consideration as part of a future Local Plan Review supported by an up to date robust evidence base, considerable pressure for employment land remains.

As the premier UK Port, Felixstowe is critically important to not only the Town but also the District, and region, in the context of the competitive threat from London Gateway. Previous promotions and the associated technical work undertaken for the proposed employment sites at Christmasyards Wood and Innocence Farm has indicated that both can be delivered, and would address the unresolved premises enquiries experienced.

Whilst the Council's latest produced Local Development Scheme (16 October 2015) indicates that an 'Issues and Options' consultation is due to take place between October and November 2016 with eventual Adoption in November/December 2019, the Port of Felixstowe and Trinity's joint hinterland estate remains under huge pressure to secure employment land, given that no greenfield employment land allocations for third party logistics have been secured since the 1990s. This position will be exacerbated by the Port of Felixstowe Logistics Park planning application that was granted planning permission at the end of 2015.

will continue to work collaboratively with Suffolk Coastal District Council and other stakeholders, as appropriate, to collect robust evidence to inform both the Local Plan process, as well as any potential planning applications.

Summary:

Notwithstanding a representation made to the Preferred Options consultation, and the Council's response to discount land at Christmasyards Wood, Felixstowe and Innocence Farm, Trimley St Martin in favour of their consideration as part...
of a future Local Plan review supported by an up to date robust evidence base, considerable pressure for employment land remains. In light of the considerable period of time until the Aligned or Joint Local Plan Review is adopted, my clients will continue to work collaboratively with the Council and other stakeholders, as appropriate, to collect robust evidence to inform both the Local Plan process, as well as any potential planning applications.

**Change to Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land at Innocence Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scanned Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Christmasyards Wood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legal?** Yes  
**Sound?** Yes  
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**Soundness Tests** N/A
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed submission version of the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Whilst in principal we have no objections to raise we would request some modifications:

Policy FPP3: Land at Sea Road, Felixstowe,
Policy FPP5: Land north of Conway Close and Swallow Close, Felixstowe
Policy FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin
Policy FPP10: Land at Bridge Road, Felixstowe
Policy FPP11: Land at Carr Road/Langer Road, Felixstowe
Policy FPP12: Land at Haven Exchange Felixstowe

. Confirmation of adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or action to upgrade to create the required capacity.

3.81 The capacity of the foul sewerage network is a constraint that needs to be overcome to the satisfaction of Anglian Water.
Suffolk County Council have statutory responsibility for Surface Water Management. (Note: The subject of foul and surface water issues need to be separated)

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you wish to discuss the above comments,

Summary:
Whilst in principal we have no objections to raise we would request some modifications:

Policy FPP10: Land at Bridge Road, Felixstowe

. Confirmation of adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or action to upgrade to create the required capacity.

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Scanned Representation
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Whilst in principal we have no objections to raise we would request some modifications:

Policy FPP3: Land at Sea Road, Felixstowe,
Policy FPP5: Land north of Conway Close and Swallow Close, Felixstowe
Policy FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin
Policy FPP10: Land at Bridge Road, Felixstowe
Policy FPP11: Land at Carr Road/Langer Road, Felixstowe
Policy FPP12: Land at Haven Exchange, Felixstowe

. Confirmation of adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or action to upgrade to create the required capacity.

3.81 ...The capacity of the foul sewerage network is a constraint that needs to be overcome to the satisfaction of Anglian Water.
Suffolk County Council have statutory responsibility for Surface Water Management. (Note :The subject of foul and surface water issues need to be separated)

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you wish to discuss the above comments,

Summary: Whilst in principal we have no objections to raise we would request some modifications:
Policy FPP11: Land at Carr Road/Langer Road, Felixstowe

. Confirmation of adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or action to upgrade to create the required capacity.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed submission version of the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Whilst in principal we have no objections to raise we would request some modifications:

Policy FPP3: Land at Sea Road, Felixstowe,
Policy FPP5: Land north of Conway Close and Swallow Close , Felixstowe
Policy FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin
Policy FPP10 : Land at Bridge Road, Felixstowe
Policy FPP11: Land at Carr Road/Langer Road, Felixstowe
Policy FPP12: Land at Haven Exchange Felixstowe
- Confirmation of adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or action to upgrade to create the required capacity.

3.81 The capacity of the foul sewerage network is a constraint that needs to be overcome to the satisfaction of Anglian Water.
Suffolk County Council have statutory responsibility for Surface Water Management. (Note :The subject of foul and surface water issues need to be separated)

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you wish to discuss the above comments,

Summary:
Whilst in principal we have no objections to raise we would request some modifications:
Policy FPP12: Land at Haven Exchange Felixstowe
- Confirmation of adequate capacity in the foul sewerage network or action to upgrade to create the required capacity.

Change to Plan
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Scanned Representation
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Policy FPP12: Land at Haven Exchange, Felixstowe

Respondent: Amec Foster Wheeler (Mr Robert Deanwood) [4184]  
Agent: N/A

Full Text:

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

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

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).
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.

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.

* TRSP/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.

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).
8012 Support

Policy FPP12: Land at Haven Exchange, Felixstowe

* 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 Spencer Jefferies
Development Liaison Officer, National Grid
n.grid@amecfw.com
box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com

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

Summary:
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. Site FPP12 'Land at Haven Exchange' is identified as being crossed by or within close proximity to IP / HP apparatus.

Change to Plan N/A

Not Specified Not Specified Not Specified Not Specified N/A
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Full Text:

Re: Proposed Submission Documents - Publication for Representations in Relation to Soundness (18 April - 31 May 2016)
Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan

Thank you for your letter dated 14th April 2016 regarding the above consultation. We have had the opportunity to assess the letter and consultation documents and can offer the following advice. Please note we have provided comments on the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies within a separate letter to you dated the same. This follows two previous consultations and our comments dated 25th February 2015 and 24th November 2015.

In terms of our general comments:
Recent Guidance from Historic England

We have recently published guidance on The Historic Environment in Local Plans and the Historic Environment and Site Allocations. Where we have not made comment below some additional guidance on ensuring a positive strategy for the historic environment is secured within the Felixstowe Area Action Plan can be seen by following these links
<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa1-historic-environment-local-plans/> and

In terms of our site specific comments:
Housing Sites
FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe (451g)

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the possible impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II* Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We highlighted that the principal elevation of Walton Hall faces north and overlooks site 451g. It was considered that development here would urbanise the setting of this important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance. It was expressed that harm would also be caused to the Grade II lodge and we strongly advised that an alternative site was found for development, though it was thought that there may be scope for some limited development at the eastern end of this site.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfil the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words ‘and their setting’ in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

FPP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe (502e)
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be preserved.

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).
Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed. At Preferred Options stage, we considered 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 note that the policy still does not include this requirement (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.88.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

**FPF7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin (451c and 451d)**
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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 references in paragraph 3.104 and Policy FPP7 bullet point 7 to the setting of the churches and high quality developments, sympathetic to the character of the area and Listed Buildings.

**FPF8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary (383f and 451f)**
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

**Town Centre**
FPFP13: Felixstowe Town Centre and FFP14: Retail Frontages
As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FFP13 and FFP14.

**District Centres**
FPFP16: District Centres
As above in previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.

**Tourism and Sea Front Activities**

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).
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word ‘on’ with ‘to’.

FFP18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point, FPP20: Cobbolds Point to Spa, FFP21: Spa to Martello Park and FFP22 Martello Park to Landguard
We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FFP23: Car Parking
At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the ‘high quality of design’ requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe’s archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: “local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment”. The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the “positive strategy” required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council’s approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area
We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report ‘Felixstowe South Conservation Area’ commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to
identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment. The conservation area survey identified the loss of architectural detail as a significant problem, and consideration might therefore be given to applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a Townscape Heritage programme for the area, or a smaller partnership scheme with Historic England to reinstate lost architectural details on key buildings etc.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: “local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment”. The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the “positive strategy” required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden
We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Other Issues
Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding
At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary:
As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FPP13 and FPP14.
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Policy FPP13: Felixstowe Town Centre

Attachments:
Scanned Representation

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).
The ES team welcomes the emphasis placed on safeguarding port-related businesses and on providing conditions to stimulate a wide business base in Felixstowe. We note the associated emphasis placed on the retention of land for appropriate employment purposes.

We concur with the report's statements on the retail zones (town centre, neighbourhood service areas etc) and support the objective of maintaining and enhancing a strong town centre economy. We recognise the need to safeguard the town centre's distinctiveness and therefore support the aim of retaining features of architectural interest in the retail area. We are currently looking to develop 'pop up' retail opportunities on the seafront during major events and festivals and therefore suggest that the report references the need to be open to encouraging new retail opportunities (Jim, you may wish to liaise with Laura Hack or Catherine Thornber on this point).

We support the aspiration of maintaining and enhancing the town's tourism economy. We would suggest that as well as facilitating provision of new accommodation in the resort and town centre, we are also open to the possibility of new tourist accommodation in the rural parts of the peninsula. Interestingly, the current trend on the Suffolk Coast is for the growth of 'niche' tourist accommodation in rural areas, often farm cottages or 'themed' accommodation such as static 1950's caravans, static yurts etc.

We have no comments relating to beach huts but would suggest that you seek comments from Gayle Hart who now manages the council's beachhuts and is currently looking at development options.

We concur with the report's statements on the retail zones (town centre, neighbourhood service areas etc) and support the objective of maintaining and enhancing a strong town centre economy. We recognise the need to safeguard the town centre's distinctiveness and therefore support the aim of retaining features of architectural interest in the retail area. We are currently looking to develop 'pop up' retail opportunities on the seafront during major events and festivals and therefore suggest that the report references the need to be open to encouraging new retail opportunities.
7812 Support

Retail Policy FPP14: Retail frontages

Responder: Historic England (Debbie Mack) [4189]   Agent: N/A

Full Text: Re: Proposed Submission Documents - Publication for Representations in Relation to Soundness (18 April - 31 May 2016)
Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan

Thank you for your letter dated 14th April 2016 regarding the above consultation. We have had the opportunity to assess the letter and consultation documents and can offer the following advice. Please note we have provided comments on the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies within a separate letter to you dated the same. This follows two previous consultations and our comments dated 25th February 2015 and 24th November 2015.

In terms of our general comments:
Recent Guidance from Historic England

We have recently published guidance on The Historic Environment in Local Plans and the Historic Environment and Site Allocations. Where we have not made comment below some additional guidance on ensuring a positive strategy for the historic environment is secured within the Felixstowe Area Action Plan can be seen by following these links <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa1-historic-environment-local-plans/> and <http://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/>.

In terms of our site specific comments:
Housing Sites
FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe (451g)

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the possible impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We highlighted that the principal elevation of Walton Hall faces north and overlooks site 451g. It was considered that development here would urbanise the setting of this important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance.

Conservation of the historic environment is a core planning principle (Paragraph 17) and Local Plans should set out an indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan. 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).

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfilling the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words 'and their setting' in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

FPP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe (502e)

At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be...
Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed. At Preferred Options stage, we considered 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 Listed Buildings. We note that the policy still does not include this requirement (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.88.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency with the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

FPFP7: Land off Howllett Way, Trimley St Martin (451c and 451d)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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 references in paragraph 3.104 and Policy FPP7 bullet point 7 to the setting of the churches and high quality developments, sympathetic to the character of the area and Listed Buildings.

FPFP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary (383f and 451f)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency with the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

Town Centre
FPFP13: Felixstowe Town Centre and FFP14: Retail Frontages
As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FFP13 and FFP14.

District Centres
FPFP16: District Centres
As above in previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.

Tourism and Sea Front Activities
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word ‘on’ with ‘to’.

FPFP18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point, FPP20: Cobbolds Point to Spa, FPP21: Spa to Martello Park and FFP22 Martello Park to Landguard
We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FPFP23: Car Parking
At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the ‘high quality of design’ requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FPFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe's archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: “local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment”. The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the “positive strategy” required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council’s approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area
We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report 'Felixstowe South Conservation Area' commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to...
identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment. The conservation area survey identified the loss of architectural detail as a significant problem, and consideration might therefore be given to applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a Townscape Heritage programme for the area, or a smaller partnership scheme with Historic England to reinstate lost architectural details on key buildings etc.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: “local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment”. The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the “positive strategy” required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden
We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Other Issues
Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding
At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary: As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FPP13 and FPP14.
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Thank you for consulting Suffolk County Council on submission version for development in Felixstowe.

Suffolk County Council responded previously to the preferred options stage in November 2015. This response does not rehearse all the issues as Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) has responded well to the points that the county council made at the time.

The following response relates to the ways in which the development of these sites affects county council responsibilities, and how our authorities will need to work together to bring these sites forward in a successful way.

This letter does not take into account the impact of sites which may come forward as windfall development, which may have significant impacts on local infrastructure.

Archaeology

Additional text has been systematically added in general information about archaeology, using the county council's previous comments. It introduces archaeology throughout the document and gives the plan a sound approach to archaeology.

Suffolk County Council Archaeology has reviewed the document and the only minor outstanding matters relate to suggested amendments and the terminology used in the following paragraphs:

Para. 3.74 (FPP4) - the site will require archaeological excavation rather than assessment, as it has already been assessed. Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service can provide a brief for the works and also discuss options for preservation in situ.

Paras. 3.82 (FPP5), 3.94 (FPP6), 3.101 (FPP7), 3.109 (FPP8) - Change the reference to archaeological assessment “prior to the development of the site” to “at an appropriate design stage prior to the granting of outline, technical details or full planning permission.” This will allow for preservation in situ, where appropriate, of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed, for which conditions may or may not be sufficient.

With regard to FFP12 (Land at Haven Exchange), which is an enabling policy, archaeological investigation will be required, particularly for larger schemes.

Education

Early Education

The document reflects advice provided by the county council on the need for at least one additional facility for early years education (excluding the Candlet Road site subject to an appeal). The detail provided is paragraphs 3.39 to 3.41 is welcomed. During the previous stage, the county council highlighted ways in which policy FPP15 could be more supportive of early education in retail centres, as part of a balanced policy which also protects the vitality and viability of retail centres. The county raised the point that policy FPP16 (previously FPP17) would support early years provision, which SCDC has considered. Therefore, our councils agree that early years facilities can be considered as "other local services" within FPP16.

Primary Education

The challenge presented by the distribution of housing proposed for ensuring sufficient additional primary school places has been recognised in the submission version. Land needs to be identified for a new primary school in order to ensure that there can be confidence of a long term solution for primary school provision. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in identifying options for sites based on the pattern of development coming forward and the need to find a location that promotes sustainable travel choices. The two locations identified and other alternatives as stated in para. 3.44 provide a clear indication of how a site could be identified. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in keeping the expected size of school and the area of land required under review.

Transport

A report by AECOM, on behalf of Highways England and Suffolk County Council (SCC), to assess the cumulative impact of development proposed in the Area Action Plan on the local and strategic road networks is attached to this response. In addition to the sites identified, this report implicitly includes background growth port-related traffic and the growth throughout the district.

The Suffolk County Council supports the creation of a link road between Candlet Road and High Street Walton. The intention of this link is that it is designed to serve local journeys so that the impacts from rerouting are localised.

I hope that these comments are helpful. Please contact me via the details at the top of this letter, if we or any of our colleagues can be of assistance.
Summary: The document reflects advice provided by the county council on the need for at least one additional facility for early years education (excluding the Candlet Road site subject to an appeal). The detail provided is paragraphs 3.39 to 3.41 is welcomed. During the previous stage, the county council highlighted ways in which policy FPP15 could be more supportive of early education in retail centres, as part of a balanced policy which also protects the vitality and viability of retail centres. The county raised the point that policy FPP16 (previously FPP17) would support early years provision, which SCDC has considered. Therefore, our councils agree that early years facilities can be considered as “other local services” within FPP16.

Change to Plan: N/A
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Thank you for your letter dated 14th April 2016 regarding the above consultation. We have had the opportunity to assess the letter and consultation documents and can offer the following advice. Please note we have provided comments on the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies within a separate letter to you dated the same. This follows two previous consultations and our comments dated 25th February 2015 and 24th November 2015.

In terms of our general comments:
Recent Guidance from Historic England

We have recently published guidance on The Historic Environment in Local Plans and the Historic Environment and Site Allocations. Where we have not made comment below some additional guidance on ensuring a positive strategy for the historic environment is secured within the Felixstowe Area Action Plan can be seen by following these links <http://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpas1-historic-environment-local-plans/> and <http://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/>.

In terms of our site specific comments:

**Housing Sites**

**FFP4: Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe (451g)**

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the possible impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II* Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We highlighted that the principal elevation of Walton Hall faces north and overlooks site 451g. It was considered that development here would urbanise the setting of this important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance. It was expressed that harm would also be caused to the Grade II lodge and we strongly advised that an alternative site was found for development, though it was thought that there may be scope for some limited development at the eastern end of this site.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfil the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words 'and their setting' in bullet point 11 of policy FFP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

**FFP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe (502e)**

At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

**FFP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)**

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be...
Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed. At Preferred Options stage, we considered 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 note that the policy still does not include this requirement (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.88.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

FPF7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin (451c and 451d)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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 references in paragraph 3.104 and Policy FPP7 bullet point 7 to the setting of the churches and high quality developments, sympathetic to the character of the area and Listed Buildings.

FPF8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary (383f and 451f)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

Town Centre
FPF13: Felixstowe Town Centre and FFP14: Retail Frontages
As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FPF13 and FFP14.

District Centres
FPF16: District Centres
As above in previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word 'on' with 'to'.

**FFP18:** Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, **FFP19:** Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point, **FPP20:** Cobbolds Point to Spa, **FFP21:** Spa to Martello Park and **FFP22** Martello Park to Landguard

We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

**FPP23:** Car Parking

At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the 'high quality of design' requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FPP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

**The Environment**

At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the inclusion of Local Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe's archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council’s approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

**Felixstowe South Conservation Area**

We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report ‘Felixstowe South Conservation Area’ commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to
identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment. The conservation area survey identified the loss of architectural detail as a significant problem, and consideration might therefore be given to applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a Townscape Heritage programme for the area, or a smaller partnership scheme with Historic England to reinstate lost architectural details on key buildings etc.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To that end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden
We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Other Issues
Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding
At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary:
In previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.
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Thank you for consulting Suffolk County Council on submission version for development in Felixstowe.

Suffolk County Council responded previously to the preferred options stage in November 2015. This response does not rehearse all the issues as Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) has responded well to the points that the county council made at the time.

The following response relates to the ways in which the development of these sites affects county council responsibilities, and how our authorities will need to work together to bring these sites forward in a successful way.

This letter does not take into account the impact of sites which may come forward as windfall development, which may have significant impacts on local infrastructure.

Archaeology

Additional text has been systematically added in general information about archaeology, using the county council's previous comments. It introduces archaeology throughout the document and gives the plan a sound approach to archaeology.

Suffolk County Council Archaeology has reviewed the document and the only minor outstanding matters relate to suggested amendments and the terminology used in the following paragraphs:

Para. 3.74 (FPP4) - the site will require archaeological excavation rather than assessment, as it has already been assessed. Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service can provide a brief for the works and also discuss options for preservation in situ.

Paras. 3.82 (FPP5), 3.94 (FPP6), 3.101 (FPP7), 3.109 (FPP8) - Change the reference to archaeological assessment “prior to the development of the site” to “at an appropriate design stage prior to the granting of outline, technical details or full planning permission.” This will allow for preservation in situ, where appropriate, of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed, for which conditions may or may not be sufficient.

With regard to FFP12 (Land at Haven Exchange), which is an enabling policy, archaeological investigation will be required, particularly for larger schemes.

Education

Early Education

The document reflects advice provided by the county council on the need for at least one additional facility for early years education (excluding the Candlet Road site subject to an appeal). The detail provided is paragraphs 3.39 to 3.41 is welcomed. During the previous stage, the county council highlighted ways in which policy FPP15 could be more supportive of early education in retail centres, as part of a balanced policy which also protects the vitality and viability of retail centres. The county raised the point that policy FPP16 (previously FPP17) would support early years provision, which SCDC has considered. Therefore, our councils agree that early years facilities can be considered as “other local services” within FPP16.

Primary Education

The challenge presented by the distribution of housing proposed for ensuring sufficient additional primary school places has been recognised in the submission version. Land needs to be identified for a new primary school in order to ensure that there can be confidence of a long term solution for primary school provision. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in identifying options for sites based on the pattern of development coming forward and the need to find a location that promotes sustainable travel choices. The two locations identified and other alternatives as stated in para. 3.44 provide a clear indication of how a site could be identified. The county council will continue to work with SCDC in keeping the expected size of school and the area of land required under review.

Transport

A report by AECOM, on behalf of Highways England and Suffolk County Council (SCC), to assess the cumulative impact of development proposed in the Area Action Plan on the local and strategic road networks is attached to this response. In addition to the sites identified, this report implicitly includes background growth port-related traffic and the growth throughout the district.

The Suffolk County Council supports the creation of a link road between Candlet Road and High Street Walton. The intention of this link is that it is designed to serve local journeys so that the impacts from rerouting are localised.

I hope that these comments are helpful. Please contact me via the details at the top of this letter, if we or any of our colleagues can be of assistance.
The document reflects advice provided by the county council on the need for at least one additional facility for early years education (excluding the Candlet Road site subject to an appeal). SCC previously highlighted ways in which FPP15 could be more supportive of early education in retail centres, as part of a balanced policy which also protects the vitality and viability of retail centres. The county raised the point that policy FPP16 (previously FPP17) would support early years provision, which SCDC has considered. Therefore, our councils agree that early years facilities can be considered as "other local services" within FPP16.
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore welcome the amended wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

We have recently published guidance on The Historic Environment in Local Plans and the Historic Environment and Site Allocations. Where we have not made comment below some additional guidance on ensuring a positive strategy for the historic environment is secured within the Felixstowe Area Action Plan can be seen by following these links <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa1-historic-environment-local-plans/> and <http://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/>.

In terms of our site specific comments:

**Housing Sites**

**FFP4: Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe (451g)**

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the possible impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II* Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We highlighted that the principal elevation of Walton Hall faces north and overlooks site 451g. It was considered that development here would urbanise the setting of this important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance. It was expressed that harm would also be caused to the Grade II lodge and we strongly advised that an alternative site was found for development, though it was thought that there may be scope for some limited development at the eastern end of this site.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfill the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words 'and their setting' in bullet point 11 of policy FFP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

**FFP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe (502e)**

At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

**FFP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)**

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be
As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

FFP7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin (451c and 451d)

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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 references in paragraph 3.104 and Policy FFP7 bullet point 7 to the setting of the churches and high quality developments, sympathetic to the character of the area and Listed Buildings.

FFP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary (383f and 451f)

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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 references in paragraph 3.104 and Policy FFP7 bullet point 7 to the setting of the churches and high quality developments, sympathetic to the character of the area and Listed Buildings.

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

Town Centre

FFP13: Felixstowe Town Centre and FFP14: Retail Frontages

As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FFP13 and FFP14.

District Centres

FFP16: District Centres

As above in previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.

Tourism and Sea Front Activities
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word 'on' with 'to'.

FFP18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point, FPP20: Cobbolds Point to Spa, FPP21: Spa to Martello Park and FFP22 Martello Park to Landguard
We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FFP23: Car Parking
At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the 'high quality of design' requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe's archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council's approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area
We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report 'Felixstowe South Conservation Area' commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to
identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment. The conservation area survey identified the loss of architectural detail as a significant problem, and consideration might therefore be given to applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a Townscape Heritage programme for the area, or a smaller partnership scheme with Historic England to reinstate lost architectural details on key buildings etc.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: “local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment”. The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the “positive strategy” required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden

We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Other Issues
Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding

At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary:

We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word ‘on’ with ‘to’.
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Full Text:

Re: Proposed Submission Documents - Publication for Representations in Relation to Soundness (18 April - 31 May 2016)
Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan

Thank you for your letter dated 14th April 2016 regarding the above consultation. We have had the opportunity to assess the letter and consultation documents and can offer the following advice. Please note we have provided comments on the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies within a separate letter to you dated the same. This follows two previous consultations and our comments dated 25th February 2015 and 24th November 2015.

In terms of our general comments:
Recent Guidance from Historic England

We have recently published guidance on The Historic Environment in Local Plans and the Historic Environment and Site Allocations. Where we have not made comment below some additional guidance on ensuring a positive strategy for the historic environment is secured within the Felixstowe Area Action Plan can be seen by following these links<br>https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa1-historic-environment-local-plans/> and<br>http://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/.

In terms of our site specific comments:

Housing Sites
FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe (451g)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the possible impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II* Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We highlighted that the principal elevation of Walton Hall faces north and overlooks site 451g. It was considered that development here would urbanise the setting of this important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance. It was expressed that harm would also be caused to the Grade II lodge and we strongly advised that an alternative site was found for development, though it was thought that there may be scope for some limited development at the eastern end of this site.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfill the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words 'and their setting' in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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 NPF 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).

In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

FPP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe (502e)
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be
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We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word 'on' with 'to'.

FFP18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point, FPP20: Cobbolds Point to Spa, FFP21: Spa to Martello Park and FFP22 Martello Park to Landguard
We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FFP23: Car Parking
At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the 'high quality of design' requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe's archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council's approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area
We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report 'Felixstowe South Conservation Area' commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to...
identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment. The conservation area survey identified the loss of architectural detail as a significant problem, and consideration might therefore be given to applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a Townscape Heritage programme for the area, or a smaller partnership scheme with Historic England to reinstate lost architectural details on key buildings etc.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden
We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Other Issues
Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding
At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary:
We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

Change to Plan
N/A

Not Specified Not Specified Not Specified Not Specified N/A
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Tourism and Sea Front

Policy FPP17: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course

Attachments:
Scanned Representation

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).
Re: Proposed Submission Documents - Publication for Representations in Relation to Soundness (18 April - 31 May 2016)
Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan

Thank you for your letter dated 14th April 2016 regarding the above consultation. We have had the opportunity to assess the letter and consultation documents and can offer the following advice. Please note we have provided comments on the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies within a separate letter to you dated the same. This follows two previous consultations and our comments dated 25th February 2015 and 24th November 2015.

In terms of our general comments:
Recent Guidance from Historic England

We have recently published guidance on The Historic Environment in Local Plans and the Historic Environment and Site Allocations. Where we have not made comment below some additional guidance on ensuring a positive strategy for the historic environment is secured within the Felixstowe Area Action Plan can be seen by following these links: https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa1-historic-environment-local-plans/ and <http://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/>.

In terms of our specific comments:
Housing Sites
FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe (451g)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the possible impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II* Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We highlighted that the principal elevation of Walton Hall faces north and overlooks site 451g. It was considered that development here would urbanise the setting of this important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance. It was expressed that harm would also be caused to the Grade II lodge and we strongly advised that an alternative site was found for development, though it was thought that there may be scope for some limited development at the eastern end of this site.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfil the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words ‘and their setting’ in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

FPP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe (502e)
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be
Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this area it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed. At Preferred Options stage, we considered 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 note that the policy still does not include this requirement (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.88.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

**FPF7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin (451c and 451d)**

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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 references in paragraph 3.104 and Policy FPF7 bullet point 7 to the setting of the churches and high quality developments, sympathetic to the character of the area and Listed Buildings.

**FPF8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary (383f and 451f)**

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

**Town Centre**

**FPF13: Felixstowe Town Centre and FFP14: Retail Frontages**

As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FPF13 and FPP14.

**District Centres**

**FPF16: District Centres**

As above in previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.

**Tourism and Sea Front Activities**

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).
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word 'on' with 'to'.

FPF18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point, FPP20: Cobbolds Point to Spa, FFP21: Spa to Martello Park and FFP22 Martello Park to Landguard
We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FPFP23: Car Parking
At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the 'high quality of design' requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe's archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council's approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area
We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report 'Felixstowe South Conservation Area' commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to
identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment. The conservation area survey identified the loss of architectural detail as a significant problem, and consideration might therefore be given to applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a Townscape Heritage programme for the area, or a smaller partnership scheme with Historic England to reinstate lost architectural details on key buildings etc.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: “local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment”. The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the “positive strategy” required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden
We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Other Issues
Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding
At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary:
We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

Change to Plan
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Tourism and Sea Front

Policy FPP18: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point

Attachments:
Scanned Representation

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).
The letter begins with a thank you message for the previous consultation and a request to assess the letter and consultation documents. It then proceeds to discuss the site's development potential and its impact on the Listed Buildings within the policy. The letter highlights that development here would urbanise the setting of the important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance. It was considered that harm would also be caused to the Grade II lodge and the Grade II Listed Walton Hall and 362 High Street.

The letter also addresses the need to consider the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. It expresses concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remaining within the plan at the Preferred Options stage, and the addition of the words 'and their setting' in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.

The letter further discusses the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. It also welcomes the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout.

The letter concludes by expressing concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remaining within the plan at the Preferred Options stage, and the addition of the words 'and their setting' in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.
Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to be front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed. At Preferred Options stage, we considered 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 note that the policy still does not include this requirement (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.88.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

FFP7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin (451c and 451d)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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 references in paragraph 3.104 and Policy FFP7 bullet point 7 to the setting of the churches and high quality developments, sympathetic to the character of the area and Listed Buildings.

FFP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary (383f and 451f)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

Town Centre
FFP13: Felixstowe Town Centre and FFP14: Retail Frontages
As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FFP13 and FFP14.

District Centres
FFP16: District Centres
As above in previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.

Tourism and Sea Front Activities

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).
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word 'on' with 'to'.

FFP18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point, FPP20: Cobbolds Point to Spa, FPP21: Spa to Martello Park and FFP22 Martello Park to Landguard
We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FPP23: Car Parking
At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the 'high quality of design' requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe's archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council’s approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area
We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report 'Felixstowe South Conservation Area' commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to
identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment. The conservation area survey identified the loss of architectural detail as a significant problem, and consideration might therefore be given to applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a Townscape Heritage programme for the area, or a smaller partnership scheme with Historic England to reinstate lost architectural details on key buildings etc.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: “local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment”. The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the “positive strategy” required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden
We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Other Issues
Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding
At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary: We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

Change to Plan N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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7818 Support
Tourism and Sea Front
Policy FPP19: Cobbolds Point to Spa Pavilion

Attachments:
Scanned Representation
Thank you for your letter dated 14th April 2016 regarding the above consultation. We have had the opportunity to assess the letter and consultation documents and can offer the following advice. Please note we have provided comments on the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies within a separate letter to you dated the same. This follows two previous consultations and our comments dated 25th February 2015 and 24th November 2015.

In terms of our general comments:
Recent Guidance from Historic England

We have recently published guidance on The Historic Environment in Local Plans and the Historic Environment and Site Allocations. Where we have not made comment below some additional guidance on ensuring a positive strategy for the historic environment is secured within the Felixstowe Area Action Plan can be seen by following these links:
https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa1-historic-environment-local-plans/ and

In terms of our site specific comments:

Housing Sites

FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe (451g)

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the possible impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II* Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We highlighted that the principal elevation of Walton Hall faces north and overlooks site 451g. It was considered that development here would urbanise the setting of this important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance. It was expressed that harm would also be caused to the Grade II lodge and we strongly advised that an alternative site was found for development, though it was thought that there may be scope for some limited development at the eastern end of this site.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfil the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words 'and their setting' in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

FPP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe (502e)
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be considered.
protected.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed. At Preferred Options stage, we considered that the policy should also state that any new development should be of a high quality and sympathetic to the setting of the area and existing Listed Buildings. We note that the policy still does not include this requirement (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.88.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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). In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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). In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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). In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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). In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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). In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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). In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word 'on' with 'to'.

FFP18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point, FPP20: Cobbolds Point to Spa, FFP21: Spa to Martello Park and FFP22 Martello Park to Landguard
We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FFP23: Car Parking
At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the 'high quality of design' requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe's archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council's approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area
We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report 'Felixstowe South Conservation Area' commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to...
identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment. The conservation area survey identified the loss of architectural detail as a significant problem, and consideration might therefore be given to applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a Townscape Heritage programme for the area, or a smaller partnership scheme with Historic England to reinstate lost architectural details on key buildings etc.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden
We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy. 

Other Issues
Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding
At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we would like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary: We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

Change to Plan N/A

<table>
<thead>
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<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
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<td>N/A</td>
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</table>
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7819 Support
Tourism and Sea Front  Policy FPP20: Spa Pavilion to Martello Park

Attachments:
Scanned Representation

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).
Thank you for your letter dated 14th April 2016 regarding the above consultation. We have had the opportunity to assess the letter and consultation documents and can offer the following advice. Please note we have provided comments on the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies within a separate letter to you dated the same. This follows two previous consultations and our comments dated 25th February 2015 and 24th November 2015.

In terms of our general comments:
Recent Guidance from Historic England

We have recently published guidance on The Historic Environment in Local Plans and the Historic Environment and Site Allocations. Where we have not made comment below some additional guidance on ensuring a positive strategy for the historic environment is secured within the Felixstowe Area Action Plan can be seen by following these links <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa1-historic-environment-local-plans/> and <http://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/>.

In terms of our site specific comments:

Housing Sites
FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe (451g)

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the possible impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We highlighted that the principal elevation of Walton Hall faces north and overlooks site 451g. It was considered that development here would urbanise the setting of this important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance. It was expressed that harm would also be caused to the Grade II lodge and we strongly advised that an alternative site was found for development, though it was thought that there may be scope for some limited development at the eastern end of this site.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfill the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words 'and their setting' in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

FPP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe (502e)

At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be
Tourism and Sea Front Activities

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed. At Preferred Options stage, we considered 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 note that the policy still does not include this requirement (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.88.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

FPFP7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin (451c and 451d)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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 references in paragraph 3.104 and Policy FPP7 bullet point 7 to the setting of the churches and high quality developments, sympathetic to the character of the area and Listed Buildings.

FPFP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary (383f and 451f)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

Town Centre
FPFP13: Felixstowe Town Centre and FFP14: Retail Frontages
As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FPP13 and FPP14.

District Centres
FPFP16: District Centres
As above in previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.

Tourism and Sea Front Activities
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word 'on' with 'to'.

FFP18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point, FPP20: Cobbolds Point to Spa, FPP21: Spa to Martello Park and FFP22 Martello Park to Landguard

We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FFP23: Car Parking
At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the 'high quality of design' requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe's archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council's approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area
We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report 'Felixstowe South Conservation Area' commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to...
identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment. The conservation area survey identified the loss of architectural detail as a significant problem, and consideration might therefore be given to applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a Townscape Heritage programme for the area, or a smaller partnership scheme with Historic England to reinstate lost architectural details on key buildings etc.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden
We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Other Issues
Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding
At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary:
We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

Change to Plan
N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).
Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan Proposed Submission Document

Support
Tourism and Sea Front
Policy FPP21: Martello Park to Landguard

Attachments:
Scanned Representation

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).
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II* Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We considered that development here would urbanise the setting of this important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance. It was expressed that harm would also be caused to the Grade II lodge and we strongly advised that an alternative site was found for development, though it was thought that there may be scope for some limited development at the eastern end of this site.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfilling the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words ‘and their setting’ in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

FFP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe (502e)
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

FFP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be
protected.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed. At Preferred Options stage, we considered 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 note that the policy still does not include this requirement (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.88.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

FPF7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin (451c and 451d)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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 references in paragraph 3.104 and Policy FPP7 bullet point 7 to the setting of the churches and high quality developments, sympathetic to the character of the area and Listed Buildings.

FPF8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary (383f and 451f)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

Town Centre
FPF13: Felixstowe Town Centre and FFP14: Retail Frontages
As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FPP13 and FFP14.

District Centres
FPF16: District Centres
As above in previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.

Tourism and Sea Front Activities

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).
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word 'on' with 'to'.

FFP18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point, FPP20: Cobbolds Point to Spa, FFP21: Spa to Martello Park and FFP22 Martello Park to Landguard
We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FFP23: Car Parking
At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the 'high quality of design' requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe's archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council's approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area
We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report 'Felixstowe South Conservation Area' commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to...
identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment. The conservation area survey identified the loss of architectural detail as a significant problem, and consideration might therefore be given to applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a Townscape Heritage programme for the area, or a smaller partnership scheme with Historic England to reinstate lost architectural details on key buildings etc.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden
We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Other Issues
Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding
At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary:
At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the 'high quality of design' requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FPP23 of the Proposed Submission document.
### Support

**Tourism and Sea Front**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appearance</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Sound</th>
<th>Duty to Cooperate</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachments:**

Scanned Representation
We also note that you have referenced the need for flood mitigation to be considered in policy FFP24; the policy relating to holiday accommodation. We welcome this but also point out that proposals will need to be compatible with the flood zone they are proposed in. For example, caravans intended for permanent residential use would not be acceptable in Flood Zone 3a according to the National Planning Policy Framework. We do not propose any amendments to address this, but wish our comments to be noted.
The ES team welcomes the emphasis placed on safeguarding port-related businesses and on providing conditions to stimulate a wide business base in Felixstowe. We note the associated emphasis placed on the retention of land for appropriate employment purposes.

* We concur with the report's statements on the retail zones (town centre, neighbourhood service areas etc) and support the objective of maintaining and enhancing a strong town centre economy. We recognise the need to safeguard the town centre's distinctiveness and therefore support the aim of retaining features of architectural interest in the retail area. We are currently looking to develop 'pop up' retail opportunities on the seafront during major events and festivals and therefore suggest that the report references the need to be open to encouraging new retail opportunities (Jim, you may wish to liaise with Laura Hack or Catherine Thornber on this point).

* We support the aspiration of maintaining and enhancing the town's tourism economy. We would suggest that as well as facilitating provision of new accommodation in the resort and town centre, we are also open to the possibility of new tourist accommodation in the rural parts of the peninsula. Interestingly, the current trend on the Suffolk Coast is for the growth of 'niche' tourist accommodation in rural areas, often farm cottages or 'themed' accommodation such as static 1950's caravans, static yurts etc.

* We have no comments relating to beach huts but would suggest that you seek comments from Gayle Hart who now manages the council's beach huts and is currently looking at development options.

We support the aspiration of maintaining and enhancing the town's tourism economy. We would suggest that as well as facilitating provision of new accommodation in the resort and town centre, we are also open to the possibility of new tourist accommodation in the rural parts of the peninsula. Interestingly, the current trend on the Suffolk Coast is for the growth of 'niche' tourist accommodation in rural areas, often farm cottages or 'themed' accommodation such as static 1950's caravans, static yurts etc.
Thank you for your letter dated 14th April 2016 regarding the above consultation. We have had the opportunity to assess the letter and consultation documents and can offer the following advice. Please note we have provided comments on the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies within a separate letter to you dated the same. This follows two previous consultations and our comments dated 25th February 2015 and 24th November 2015.

In terms of our general comments:
Recent Guidance from Historic England

We have recently published guidance on The Historic Environment in Local Plans and the Historic Environment and Site Allocations. Where we have not made comment below some additional guidance on ensuring a positive strategy for the historic environment is secured within the Felixstowe Area Action Plan can be seen by following these links
<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa1-historic-environment-local-plans/> and

In terms of our site specific comments:

Housing Sites
FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe (451g)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the possible impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II* Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We highlighted that the principal elevation of Walton Hall faces north and overlooks site 451g. It was considered that development here would urbanise the setting of this important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance. It was expressed that harm would also be caused to the Grade II lodge and we strongly advised that an alternative site was found for development, though it was thought that there may be scope for some limited development at the eastern end of this site.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfil the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words 'and their setting' in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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 strategic approach to it (Paragraph 126).

In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

FPP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe (502e)
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be
protected.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hands and Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed. At Preferred Options stage, we considered 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 note that the policy still does not include this requirement (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.88.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

FFP7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin (451c and 451d)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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 references in paragraph 3.104 and Policy FPP7 bullet point 7 to the setting of the churches and high quality developments, sympathetic to the character of the area and Listed Buildings.

FFP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary (383f and 451f)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

Town Centre
FFP13: Felixstowe Town Centre and FFP14: Retail Frontages
As outlined in our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FPP13 and FFP14.

District Centres
FFP16: District Centres
As above in previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.

Tourism and Sea Front Activities

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).
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word 'on' with 'to'.

FFP18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point, FPP20: Cobbolds Point to Spa, FFP21: Spa to Martello Park and FFP22 Martello Park to Landguard We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FFP23: Car Parking
At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the 'high quality of design' requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe's archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council's approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area
We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report 'Felixstowe South Conservation Area' commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to
Object
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Identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment. The conservation area survey identified the loss of architectural detail as a significant problem, and consideration might therefore be given to applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a Townscape Heritage programme for the area, or a smaller partnership scheme with Historic England to reinstate lost architectural details on key buildings etc.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden
We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Other Issues
Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding
At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary:

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.
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Thank you for your letter dated 14th April 2016 regarding the above consultation. We have had the opportunity to assess the letter and consultation documents and can offer the following advice. Please note we have provided comments on the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies within a separate letter to you dated the same. This follows two previous consultations and our comments dated 25th February 2015 and 24th November 2015.

In terms of our general comments:
Recent Guidance from Historic England

We have recently published guidance on The Historic Environment in Local Plans and the Historic Environment and Site Allocations. Where we have not made comment below some additional guidance on ensuring a positive strategy for the historic environment is secured within the Felixstowe Area Action Plan can be seen by following these links <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa1-historic-environment-local-plans/> and <http://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/>.

In terms of our specific comments:

Housing Sites
FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe (451g)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the possible impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II* Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We highlighted that the principal elevation of Walton Hall faces north and overlooks site 451g. It was considered that development here would urbanise the setting of this important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance. It was expressed that harm would also be caused to the Grade II lodge and we strongly advised that an alternative site was found for development, though it was thought that there may be scope for some limited development at the eastern end of this site.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfil the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words ‘and their setting’ in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

FPP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe (502e)
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be better considered.
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Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed. At Preferred Options stage, we considered 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 note that the policy still does not include this requirement (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.88.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

FPFP7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin (451c and 451d)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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. Therefore welcome the references in paragraph 3.104 and Policy FPP7 bullet point 7 to the setting of the churches and high quality developments, sympathetic to the character of the area and Listed Buildings.

FPFP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary (383f and 451f)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

Town Centre
FPFP13: Felixstowe Town Centre and FFP14: Retail Frontages
As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FPP13 and FPP14.

District Centres
FPFP16: District Centres
As above in previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.

Tourism and Sea Front Activities
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word ‘on’ with ‘to’.

FFP18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobolds Point, FPP20: Cobolds Point to Spa, FFP21: Spa to Martello Park and FFP22 Martello Park to Landguard
We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FFP23: Car Parking
At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the ‘high quality of design’ requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe’s archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: “local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment”. The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the “positive strategy” required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council’s approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area
We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report 'Felixstowe South Conservation Area' commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to...
identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment. The conservation area survey identified the loss of architectural detail as a significant problem, and consideration might therefore be given to applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a Townscape Heritage programme for the area, or a smaller partnership scheme with Historic England to reinstate lost architectural details on key buildings etc.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden
We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Other Issues
Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding
At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary:
In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area. We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment.
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Thank you for your letter dated 14th April 2016 regarding the above consultation. We have had the opportunity to assess the letter and consultation documents and can offer the following advice. Please note we have provided comments on the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies within a separate letter to you dated the same. This follows two previous consultations and our comments dated 25th February 2015 and 24th November 2015.

In terms of our general comments:
Recent Guidance from Historic England

We have recently published guidance on The Historic Environment in Local Plans and the Historic Environment and Site Allocations. Where we have not made comment below some additional guidance on ensuring a positive strategy for the historic environment is secured within the Felixstowe Area Action Plan can be seen by following these links:<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa1-historic-environment-local-plans/> and <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/>.

In terms of our site specific comments:

Housing Sites

FFP4: Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe (451g)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the possible impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II* Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We highlighted that the principal elevation of Walton Hall faces north and overlooks site 451g. It was considered that development here would urbanise the setting of this important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance. It was expressed that harm would also be caused to the Grade II lodge and we strongly advised that an alternative site was found for development, though it was thought that there may be scope for some limited development at the eastern end of this site.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfil the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words 'and their setting' in bullet point 11 of policy FFP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

FFP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe (502e)
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FFP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

FFP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be
Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed. At Preferred Options stage, we considered 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 note that the policy still does not include this requirement (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.88.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

FPFP7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin (451c and 451d)

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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 references in paragraph 3.104 and Policy FPP7 bullet point 7 to the setting of the churches and high quality developments, sympathetic to the character of the area and Listed Buildings.

FPFP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary (383f and 451f)

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

Town Centre
FPFP13: Felixstowe Town Centre and FFP14: Retail Frontages

As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FPP13 and FFP14.

District Centres
FPFP16: District Centres

As above in previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.

Tourism and Sea Front Activities

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).
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word 'on' with 'to'.

FFP18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point, FPP20: Cobbolds Point to Spa, FPP21: Spa to Martello Park and FFP22 Martello Park to Landguard

We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FFP23: Car Parking

At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the 'high quality of design' requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment

At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe's archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council's approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area

We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report 'Felixstowe South Conservation Area' commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to
identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment. The conservation area survey identified the loss of architectural detail as a significant problem, and consideration might therefore be given to applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a Townscape Heritage programme for the area, or a smaller partnership scheme with Historic England to reinstate lost architectural details on key buildings etc.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden

We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Other Issues

Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding

At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary:

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council’s approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled.
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Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan

Thank you for your letter dated 14th April 2016 regarding the above consultation. We have had the opportunity to assess the letter and consultation documents and can offer the following advice. Please note we have provided comments on the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies within a separate letter to you dated the same. This follows two previous consultations and our comments dated 25th February 2015 and 24th November 2015.

In terms of our general comments:

Recent Guidance from Historic England

We have recently published guidance on The Historic Environment in Local Plans and the Historic Environment and Site Allocations. Where we have not made comment below some additional guidance on ensuring a positive strategy for the historic environment is secured within the Felixstowe Area Action Plan can be seen by following these links: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa1-historic-environment-local-plans/> and <http://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/>.

In terms of our site specific comments:

Housing Sites

FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe (451g)

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the possible impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II* Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We highlighted that the principal elevation of Walton Hall faces north and overlooks site 451g. It was considered that development here would urbanise the setting of this important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance. It was expressed that harm would also be caused to the Grade II lodge and we strongly advised that an alternative site was found for development, though it was thought that there may be scope for some limited development at the eastern end of this site.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfil the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words 'and their setting' in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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, when, where 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).

In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

FPP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe (502e)

At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be...
protected.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed. At Preferred Options stage, we considered 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 note that the policy still does not include this requirement (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.88.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

**FPF7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin (451c and 451d)**

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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 references in paragraph 3.104 and Policy FFP7 bullet point 7 to the setting of the churches and high quality developments, sympathetic to the character of the area and Listed Buildings.

**FPF8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary (383f and 451f)**

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

**Town Centre**

FPF13: Felixstowe Town Centre and FFP14: Retail Frontages

As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FPP13 and FFP14.

**District Centres**

FPF16: District Centres

As above in previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.

**Tourism and Sea Front Activities**

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).
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word 'on' with 'to'.

FFP18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point, FPP20: Cobbolds Point to Spa, FFP21: Spa to Martello Park and FFP22 Martello Park to Landguard
We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FFP23: Car Parking
At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the 'high quality of design' requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe's archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council's approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area
We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report "Felixstowe South Conservation Area" commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to...
identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment. The conservation area survey identified the loss of architectural detail as a significant problem, and consideration might therefore be given to applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a Townscape Heritage programme for the area, or a smaller partnership scheme with Historic England to reinstate lost architectural details on key buildings etc.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment”. The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy” required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

**FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development**

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

**FPP27: Historic Park and Garden**

We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

**Other Issues**

**Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding**

At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

**Summary:**

At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe’s archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

**Change to Plan**

N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>7.04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Attachments:
- Scanned Representation

### Notes:
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).
In our response to your letter dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfilling the Public Open Space requirement. Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfilling the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words 'and their setting' in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. Paragraph 157 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Plans to provide ‘detailed 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).

In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

FFP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe (502e)
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

FFP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)
In our response to your letter dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be protected.
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protected.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed. At Preferred Options stage, we considered 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 note that the policy still does not include this requirement (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.88.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

FPP7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin (451c and 451d)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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 references in paragraph 3.104 and Policy FPP7 bullet point 7 to the setting of the churches and high quality developments, sympathetic to the character of the area and Listed Buildings.

FPP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary (383f and 451f)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

Town Centre
FFP13: Felixstowe Town Centre and FFP14: Retail Frontages
As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FFP13 and FFP14.

District Centres
FFP16: District Centres
As above in previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.

Tourism and Sea Front Activities

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).
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word 'on' with 'to'.

FFP18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point, FPP20: Cobbolds Point to Spa, FPP21: Spa to Martello Park and FPP22 Martello Park to Landguard
We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FFP23: Car Parking
At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the 'high quality of design' requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe's archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council's approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area
We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report 'Felixstowe South Conservation Area' commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to...
identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment. The conservation area survey identified the loss of architectural detail as a significant problem, and consideration might therefore be given to applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a Townscape Heritage programme for the area, or a smaller partnership scheme with Historic England to reinstate lost architectural details on key buildings etc.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: “local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment”. The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the “positive strategy” required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden
We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Other Issues
Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding
At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary:
We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Change to Plan
N/A

Not Specified Not Specified Not Specified 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).
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Scanned Representation

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).
This letter is in response to the above consultations and provides Gladman Developments’ representation. Gladman specialise in the promotion of strategic land for residential development with associated community infrastructure. From this experience, Gladman understand the need for the planning system to ensure that local communities have access to both decent homes and local employment opportunities.

The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has brought about fundamental changes to the planning process since its inception. One such change relates to the need to significantly boost the supply of housing and how this fundamental requirement of the Framework should be reflected in the plan making process. Gladman, who operate on a national basis, have considerable experience in contributing to the Local Plan preparation process since the Framework came into effect.

What continues to be clear from this experience is that many local authorities are not fully addressing the requirements of the Framework when preparing their Local Plans, this has led to significant concerns being expressed by Inspectors on the soundness of their plans in their current form. The main concerns centre upon the requirement addressed by paragraph 47 of the Framework to ‘use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) for market and affordable housing in the housing market area’.

Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD

Suffolk Coastal's Core Strategy was adopted in July 2013 and sets the overall vision and strategic objectives for the district, including a target to deliver at least 7,900 dwellings between 2010 and 2027. It is intended that the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD (together with the Felixstowe Area Action Plan (FAAP)) defines sites for various types of development (including housing), defines the boundaries of built up areas and identifies local infrastructure requirements. The documents do not cover areas of the district that are advancing Neighbourhood Plans.

Gladman's response to specific policies is set out below.

Policy SSP1: New Housing Delivery 2015-2027

The policy, with reference to the data set out in Table 2, sets out new housing delivery for the period 2015-2027 to meet the minimum requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy. The policy makes allocations in a number settlements.

Table 2 sets out, across the major centres, market towns, key service centres and local service centres, the amount of housing that has already been delivered between 2010 and 2015, extant permissions (including resolutions to grant as of 31/03/15), and new allocations to be delivered between 2015 and 2027. Whilst policy SP2 of the adopted Core Strategy makes provision for ‘at least’ 7,900 dwellings over the plan period, the figures presented in Table 2 are not expressed in the same terms but rather appear to be development ceilings. The Site Allocations Plan needs to make it clear that the figures in Table 2 are minimum figures to ensure consistency with Core Strategy Policy SP2. It is interesting to note that the FAAP document does include recognition that the housing figures it allocates to settlements are minima, and there should be consistency across the two documents.

Objectively Assessed Need

Gladman have fundamental concerns that the Council is progressing with a Site Allocations document based on an out-of-date housing target from the Core Strategy that does not properly reflect the district's full Objectively Assessed Need (OAN). When the Core Strategy was adopted, the Inspector at the time noted that the Council had to undertake a review of its OAN by 2015. This is acknowledged by the Council at paragraph 1.12 of the consultation document, which states the adopted figure of 7,900 was lower than the full OAN and therefore the Council made a commitment to undertake an early review to address the level of housing provision. The review has yet to be undertaken.

Despite this commitment, paragraph 1.13 goes on to state that the Site Allocations DPD and FAAP are important to completing the current phase of plan making based on the Core Strategy. The Council consider that both documents positively seek to boost the supply of housing with a ‘carefully planned’ over provision included as a contingency. Table 1 provides an overview of the housing numbers over the plan period and compared to the Core Strategy target of 7,900 allows for a total of 8,620 homes to come forward, a small oversupply of approximately 9%.

Gladman can see no reason as to why a full review of the Core Strategy, including its housing target, cannot be undertaken now. Failure do so means that the Council must accept that the Site Allocations DPD and FAAP will be out of date as soon as they are adopted.

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).
The situation which has arisen in Suffolk Coastal is similar to other positions taken by Councils in Wokingham, Hinckley and Bosworth, Preston and Tunbridge Wells, where Site Allocations documents have proceeded on the back of either pre NPPF Core Strategies or on principal planning documents which do not contain an assessment of full OAN. The Wokingham judgement ([2014] EWHC 2320 (Admin)) confirms such an approach may be lawful, but made clear it did nothing more than allocate sufficient sites for a housing requirement from a previous generation of planning policy. The reasons behind this have recently been upheld by the Court of Appeal in Oxed Residential v Tandridge District Council ([2016] EWCA Civ 414).

It should be noted that the issue of Suffolk Coastal’s OAN was considered at the Fairfield Road, Framlingham appeal [APP/J3530/W/15/3011466] where evidence was presented by the appellants in that case that suggested the OAN could be 11,000 dwellings between 2010 and 2027, a significant increase on the adopted requirement; the Council's own witness in that appeal conceded that they would have expected the OAN to have increased. This evidence suggests a requirement far in excess of the 'carefully planned over provision' allowed through the Site Allocations and FAAP.

Gladman contend that the Council's document cannot be seen to be positively prepared. Despite the availability of more recent evidence on housing need and an admission that the OAN is likely to have gone up, the Council is still proceeding with producing a Site Allocations Plan based on a lower figure, and only at the next stage will new housing evidence be considered in a review of the whole development plan. The consequences of this approach (assuming that the Allocations Plan is otherwise sound) would be to have an adopted Allocations Plan which would have to be reviewed in short order to take account of the emerging and subsequently adopted housing requirement. Moreover, even if sites were allocated in the Allocations Plan, it is highly likely that they would be insufficient to meet the updated OAN, as required by paragraph 47 of the Framework.

We do not therefore see how the delay in properly dealing with the full OAN for the district can be seen as positive planning. The Council have had since July 2013 to address this and in the time elapsed a full plan review could have been completed.

The process of undertaking an objective assessment is clearly set out in the Framework principally in paragraph 14, paragraph 47, paragraph 152 and paragraph 159 and should be undertaken in a systematic and transparent way to ensure that the plan is based on a robust evidence base.

The starting point for this assessment is set out in paragraph 159 which requires local planning authorities to have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. This involves the preparation of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative areas. The Framework goes on to set out the factors that should be included in a SHMA including identifying 'the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period when: * Meets household and population projections taking account of migration and demographic change; * Addresses the need for all types of housing including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and * Caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand.'

Key points that are worth noting from the above is that the objective assessment should identify the full need for housing before you consider undertaking any process of assessing the ability to deliver this figure. In addition, paragraph 159 specifically relates to catering for both housing need and housing demand within the authority area. It is worth pointing out that any assessment of housing need and demand within a SHMA must also consider the following factors; falling household formation rates, net inward migration, the need to address the under provision of housing from the previous local plan period, the results of the Census 2011, housing vacancy rates including the need to factor in a 3% housing vacancy rate for churn in the housing market, economic factors to ensure that the economic forecasts for an area are supported by sufficient housing to deliver economic growth, off-setting a falling working age population by providing enough housing vacancy rates including the need to factor in a 3% housing vacancy rate for churn in the housing delivering the full need for affordable housing in an area.

It is our understanding that a majority of the SHMAs that were prepared under the current guidance on SHMA preparation are not Framework compliant and do not consider the full range of factors that are outlined in paragraph 159. This is causing significant problems for authorities currently at Examination and therefore, to avoid this issue, SHMAs should be updated to take account of the Framework and ensure plans are based on robust and up-to-date evidence. Indeed, the Government have noted the deficiency in SHMAs and are updating the guidance on SHMA preparation to fully reflect the guidance given in the Framework.

Following the exercise to identify the full, objectively assessed need for housing in an area, the local planning authority should then seek to undertake the assessment outlined in paragraph 152 of the Framework. This states that

Local planning authorities should seek opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, and net gains across all three. Significant adverse impacts on any of these dimensions should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued.

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).
Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. This statement clearly sets out that local planning authorities should seek to deliver the full, objectively assessed need and that this should be tested through the evidence base. Only where the evidence shows that this is not achievable should they then test other options to see if any significant adverse impacts could be reduced or eliminated by pursuing these options. If this is not possible then they should test if the significant adverse impacts could be mitigated and where this is not possible, where compensatory measures may be appropriate.

The final stage of the process is outlined in paragraph 14 and involves a planning judgement as to whether, following all of the stages of the process outlined above, ‘any adverse impacts of meeting the objectively assessed needs would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole or specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.’ It is also worth noting that the final part of this sentence refers to footnote 9 which sets out the types of policies that the Government consider to be restrictive. These include ‘sites protected under the Birds and Habitat Directive (see paragraph 119) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Heritage Coast or within a National Park (or the Broads Authority); designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion’. Although this list is not exhaustive it is clear that local landscape designations, intrinsic value of the countryside, the character of areas, green gaps etc. are not specifically mentioned as constraints.

Assessment of Housing and Economic Development Needs - Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

As Suffolk Coastal will be aware, the Government issued a guidance note to support local authorities in objectively assessing and evidencing development needs for housing (both market and affordable) and economic development. This document supports and provides further guidance on the process of undertaking such assessments as set out in the Framework. Gladman highlight the following key points from this document:

- Plan makers should not apply constraints to the overall assessment of need, such as limitations imposed by the supply of land for new development, historic under performance, infrastructure or environmental constraints.
- Household projections published by the Department for Communities and Local Government should provide the starting point estimate of overall housing need.
- Household projection based estimates of housing need may need adjusting to reflect factors affecting local demography and household formation rates which are not captured by past trends, for example historic suppression by under supply and worsening affordability of housing. The assessment will need to reflect the consequences of past under delivery and the extent to which household formation rates have been constrained by supply.
- Plan makers need to consider increasing their housing numbers where the supply of working age population is less than projected job growth, to prevent unsustainable commuting patterns and reduced local business resilience.
- If the historic rate of development shows that actual supply falls below planned supply, future supply should be increased to reflect the likelihood of under-delivery of a plan.
- Plan makers should take account of concealed households.
- Housing needs indicated by household projections should be adjusted to reflect appropriate market signals, as well as other market indicators of the balance between the demand for and supply of dwellings. Appropriate comparisons of indicators (land prices, house prices etc.) should be made - with longer term trends in the HMA, similar demographic and economic areas, and nationally. Divergence under any of these circumstances will require upward adjustment to planned housing numbers.
- The more significant the affordability constraints (as reflected in rising prices and rents, and worsening affordability ratio) and the stronger other indicators of high demand (e.g. the differential between land prices), the larger the improvement in affordability needed, and the larger the additional supply response should be.
- Market signals are affected by a number of economic factors. Plan makers should increase planned supply by an amount that, on reasonable assumptions and consistent with principles of sustainable development, could be expected to improve affordability.

The Framework is clear that Local Planning Authorities must consider market signals. It is one of the core planning principles considered in paragraph 17. The Framework states:

‘Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities.

Of critical importance is what the Framework goes onto say in paragraph 158 in the section discussing Plan Making. It states here:

Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals.

Market signals are therefore at the very core of what the Framework is trying to achieve in promoting sustainable development and boosting the supply of housing land.'
The formal publication of the PPG in March 2014 gives further explanation to what the Framework means with regard to market signals, and sets out, in a range of paragraphs, the way in which local planning authorities should go about factoring in relevant market signals in arriving at their objectively assessed need. Paragraphs 19 and 20 of the PPG gives guidance on what market signals should be taken into account and how plan makers should respond to these market signals. The below extracts identify some particularly pertinent points.

The housing need number suggested by household projections (the starting point) should be adjusted to reflect appropriate market signals, as well as other market indicators of the balance between the demand for and supply of dwellings. Prices of rents rising faster than the national/local average may well indicate particular market undersupply relative to demand.

The paragraph goes on to indicate that these factors would include, but should not be limited to, land prices, house prices, rents, affordability, rates of development and overcrowding. However, given what the Framework says at paragraph 17, quoted above, it seems clear that particular consideration should be given to affordability.

In order to consider how market signals should be taken forward paragraph 20 identifies some key concepts:

Appropriate comparisons of indicators should be made. This includes comparison with longer term trends (both in absolute levels and rates of change) in the: housing market area; similar demographic and economic areas; and nationally. A worsening trend in any of these indicators will require upward adjustment to planned housing numbers compared to ones based solely on household projections.

It is therefore clear that where market signals are apparent there is an absolute and clear direction that an upward adjustment to housing numbers is required. It is also clear that both the absolute level of change and the rates of change are considerations, and that local planning authorities need to carefully bench mark themselves against other areas. This should not simply be a case of considering neighbouring authorities but should look at, as well as these, local authorities on a national basis, if the demographic and economic indicators are relevant. Gladman are firmly of the view that considering comparisons purely against neighbouring authorities is not sufficiently robust and does not address the underlying issues which both the Framework and PPG are trying to tackle with regard to housing.

What is of further importance when considering these issues is the period of time analysed when considering both relative and absolute change. It has become apparent, in our consideration of a number of plans that many local authorities choose to look at periods of time which are not fully representative of the depth of the housing crisis which we are currently within.

The problems are noted in Fixing the Foundations: Creating a more prosperous nation published by HM Treasury in July 2015. In paragraph 9.7 the report states:

There remains more to do. As the London School of Economics (LSE) Growth Commission found, ‘under supply of housing, especially in high-growth areas of the country has pushed up house prices. The UK has been incapable of building enough homes to keep up with growing demand.’

Gladman are therefore of the view that local planning authorities must take a long term view when considering affordability and consider the relative and absolute change over a long term 15-20 year period, which coincides with the normal time span of a Local Plan. Authorities should assess, as a constituent part of their OAN, how they can improve affordability over the life time of a plan to a point where affordability is more in line with average earnings and affordable mortgage lending rates. They should assess a level of housing over the 15-20 year plan period which would enable this step change and consider its deliverability in the plan. Only through planning for significant housing growth can local authorities realistically tackle market signals in the way advocated by the PPG and tackle the affordability and housing crisis.

Gladman reserve the right to adduce further evidence on OAN at the appropriate time.

Location of New Housing

Gladman would point out that Suffolk Coastal has a number of different and distinct housing market areas. Each of these distinct areas will have their own requirement for housing and this should be reflected in the spatial distribution of housing supply within the Local Plan. This decision should be based on the findings of the evidence base and should not be a politically driven spatial strategy to put a disproportionate amount of housing in areas where people don’t want to [and will not] live. If the spatial distribution does not reflect need/demand as shown by the evidence base, then housing will not be delivered and the Plan will not be implemented.

Gladman would suggest a hybrid approach should be taken, with more sustainable settlements taking a greater proportion of growth than less sustainable locations. We would caution against too prescriptive a development strategy based solely on a development hierarchy that is itself based on too simplistic an understanding of sustainability (i.e. the number of services available). Whilst level of services is obviously an important criterion, the Framework is clear that development should be allowed where it is sustainable, when measured against the Framework as a whole and the three strands of sustainability (economic, social and environmental) in particular. When considering development in rural areas, Paragraph 55 of the Framework states that ‘housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the
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vitality of rural communities.’ Furthermore paragraph 17 states that planning should ‘focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable’.

Para 55 of the Framework seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas to maintain and enhance rural vitality and viability. It is essential therefore, that the needs of the sustainable rural settlements across the district are assessed and a meaningful level of growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing vitality and viability. This will help to preserve and enhance rural services and facilities and allow local rural communities to meet their own needs for housing whilst providing much needed affordable housing in the parts of the district that suffer with the greatest affordable housing need.

In allocating sites, the Council should be mindful that to maximize housing supply the widest possible range of sites, by size and market location are required so that house builders of all types and sizes have access to suitable land in order to offer the widest possible range of products. The key to increased housing supply is the number of sales outlets. For any given time period, all else being equal, overall sales and build out rates are faster from 20 sites of 50 units than 10 sites of 100 units or 1 site of 1,000 units. The maximum delivery is achieved not just because there are more sales outlets but because the widest possible range of products and locations are available to meet the widest possible range of demand. In summary, a wider variety of sites in the widest possible range of locations ensures all types of house builder have access to suitable land which in turn increases housing delivery.

New homes should be distributed in a way that enables the full OAN for the district to be met, rather than based too rigidly on percentages allocated to each town and village. This should take into account factors such as market conditions and viability - it is after all the private sector that will be expected to deliver the majority of the district’s housing need and so it is important that the chosen distribution enables this to happen.

Regardless of the approach a sufficient range of sites need to be allocated (taking into account viability and market conditions) to ensure continuity of housing supply; more sites than needed to deliver the OAN should be allocated to account for slippage and delays. Whichever development strategy is adopted it is vital that the new Local Plan addresses this and that housing figures and distribution are aligned fully with economic growth aspirations.

Delivery Rates
The Council will have to ensure that they have applied realistic assumptions around lead-in times and build-out rates for the sites with permissions and especially for the sites with a resolution to grant, as there is a chance that some of these sites may never sign the s 106 agreement and begin to deliver.

Table 1 shows that 600 of the dwellings needed over the plan period will come through a windfall allowance (50dpa). The Council must be satisfied that, in line with Paragraph 48 of the Framework, they have ‘compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply’. It is also important that ‘any allowance should be realistic having regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens’.

Housing Allocations in Areas with Neighbourhood Plans
The plan sets out at paragraph 1.17 that several Neighbourhood Plans in the district have reached an advanced stage and cover a wide range of policy issues and therefore the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies document does not include allocations or additional policies covering these areas. This means that no sites are allocated for housing through the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD in settlements covered by an advanced Neighbourhood Plan. Gladman have some concerns with this approach.

There needs to be a mechanism in place to address situations where these Neighbourhood Plans fail and therefore do allocate the appropriate amount of housing as required by the Core Strategy. Should these Neighbourhood Plans not come forward as anticipated then the Council will be in danger of not having enough allocated housing land and therefore would be unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply. The Inspector for the Torbay Local Plan required Main Modifications that inserted wording that addressed this issue. The modification read ‘In Neighbourhood Plans do not identify sufficient sites to provide the growth requirement of the Local Plan, the Council will bring forward sites through site allocations development plan documents. If it appears that a shortfall in five year supply of deliverable sites is likely to arise, the Council will bring forward additional sites’. The Council should consider inserting a similar provision into the Site Allocations Document.

Another danger of this approach is that if other sites elsewhere in the district fail to come forward in a timely fashion or do not deliver the number of units expected, then the Council will not have the flexibility to release land in sustainable locations that are covered by a Neighbourhood Plan to make up the shortfall, regain a robust housing supply and retain control of housing delivery in the district.

Finally, given the likelihood that the full OAN for the district will increase markedly once the review is finally carried out, there needs to be a process to ensure that areas with adopted Neighbourhood Plans do not prevent increased levels of growth coming forward in future. PPG is clear [Paragraph:084 Reference ID:41-084-201605 19] that ‘policies in a neighbourhood plan may become out of date, for exam ple if they conflict with policies in a Local Plan that is adopted after the making of the neighbourhood plan. In such cases, the more recent plan policy takes precedence.’
Policy SSP2: Physical Limits Boundaries

The policy sets boundaries for all settlements listed as Major Centres, Town, Key and Local Service Centres in accordance with Core Strategy policy SP19. The policy allows for development including housing within these limits, subject to proposals being in accordance with other policies, including Neighbourhood Plans. It notes that ‘proposals for new residential development outside physical limits boundaries will be strictly controlled’.

As outlined above, Gladman consider the housing target in the adopted Core Strategy to be out of date as it does not represent the district's full OAN. Since the settlement boundaries are set to accommodate the out of date level of housing growth contained in the adopted Core Strategy, the boundary policies are also out of date. Many of the settlement boundaries remain from the old Local Plan and are therefore time-expired. Furthermore, the Core Strategy policy upon which SSP2 relies (SP19) was found to be out of date in the Fairfield Road, Framlingham appeal as the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land.

Setting strict settlement boundaries does not allow adequate flexibility for development to come forward outside the settlement boundary if this is required (for example due to a shortfall of housing land).

Gladman would object to the use of settlement limits if these would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. The Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead. The use of settlement limits to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements would not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework.

Gladman would be opposed to the definition of an urban edge if this would preclude appropriately sited and sustainable development coming forward to meet the district’s housing needs, in accordance with the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development. Proposals that are sustainable should go ahead without delay. An overly restrictive approach could result in a plan that is not positively prepared or effective.

Policies SSP3 - SSP19

Gladman have no specific comments to make on the individual allocations within the plan except to note that many of the allocation policies place additional requirements on the delivery of sites, for example by requiring Development Briefs to be agreed or certain infrastructure to be provided before development can come forward. Gladman remind the Council of the guidance set out in Paragraph 173 of the Framework, which states that ‘Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened’. This should be tested through a full plan viability assessment. Realistic and cautious delivery trajectories should be applied by the Council to sites requiring such infrastructure provisions.

In light of the judgement in FODC v. SSCLG and Gladman Developments Ltd [(2016) EWHC 421 Admin ], Gladman consider it is necessary for the Site Allocations DPD to carry out an assessment of the potential impact of proposed development on heritage assets, as set out in paragraph 129 of the Framework. The judgement concerns the interaction between paragraph 14 and paragraph 134 of the Framework, and the issues of the balancing exercise to be undertaken to assess the harm of any proposals against the benefits of the identified proposed development in accordance with paragraphs 133, 134 and 135 of the Framework. Gladman consider that the implications of the judgement apply equally to both the decision making process and the plan making process. Paragraph 134 is clear in talking about ‘development proposals’, a phrase which can apply equally to planning applications and proposed allocations. Furthermore, footnote 29 of the Framework clearly states that ‘The principles and policies set out in this section apply to the heritage-related consent regimes for which local planning authorities are responsible under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as well as to plan-making and decision-taking’. It is therefore essential that the implications of the above judgment are fully considered in the context of both decision-taking and plan-making.

The table on page 133 of the consultation document sets out the expected completions per year of the sites allocated in these policies. The Council will have to ensure that they have applied realistic assumptions around lead-in times and build-out rates for these sites.

Policy SSP39: Areas to be Protected from Development

Gladman would query whether such a blanket protection policy is compliant with the Framework.

Gladman submit that new development can often be located in countryside gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character. In such circumstances we would question the purpose of a gap designation, particularly if this would prevent the development of otherwise sustainable and deliverable housing sites to meet the borough's needs. Gladman note that there appears to be no robust evidence supporting the extent of the current countryside gap designations.

Para 55 of the Framework seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas to maintain and enhance rural vitality and viability. It is essential therefore, that the needs of the sustainable rural settlements across the district are assessed and a meaningful level of growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing vitality and viability. This will
help to preserve and enhance rural services and facilities and allow local rural communities to meet their own needs for housing whilst providing much needed affordable housing in the parts of the district that suffer with the greatest affordable housing need.

Gladman would be opposed to the use of Local Gaps if these would only serve to act as an arbitrary tool to prevent sustainable development. In this regard we submit that new development can often be located in local gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character.

Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan

The FAAP is intended to implement the adopted Core Strategy and will serve as a tool that can be used to direct sustainable development and investment in the FAAP area and identify land required to meet the level of growth identified in the Core Strategy. Table 1 summarises that 2,123 homes will come forward in the FAAP area, 1,120 from new allocations.

FPP1: New Housing Allocations

The policy distributes, with reference to Table 2, new housing allocations across the FAAP area. 590 are in Felixstowe itself whilst 430 are in Trimley St Martin and 100 in Trimley St Mary. Gladman are pleased that paragraph 3.22 makes clear that the figures in the policy are to be read as minima but wonder whether the wording of the policy itself should make this clearer. The fact the policy is for a minima allows for the possibility of further sustainable development to come forward.

Paragraph 3.23 states that the Council 'consider it necessary to over-allocate sites across the district to ensure that a five year land supply is maintained' and that this provides a range of sites, sizes and locations for development. We welcome the recognition that it takes into account the likely increase in the district’s OAN in future. As Major Centres, areas like Felixstowe are inherently sustainable and its continued growth will make an important contribution to meeting the district's housing needs now and in the future; it is important that sustainable development can continue to take place here and is not arbitrarily constrained.

FPP2: Physical Limits Boundaries

As with policy SSP 2 in the Site Allocations DPD, this policy sets boundaries for all settlements listed as Major Centres, Town, Key and Local Service Centres in accordance with Core Strategy policy SP19. The policy allows for development including housing within these limits, subject to proposals being in accordance with other policies, including Neighbourhood Plans. It notes that 'proposals for new residential development outside physical limits boundaries will be strictly controlled'.

As outlined above Gladman consider the housing target in the adopted Core Strategy to be out of date as it does not represent the district's full OAN. Since the settlement boundaries are set to accommodate the out of date level of housing growth outlined in the adopted Core Strategy, the boundary policies are also out of date. Furthermore, the Core Strategy policy upon which SSP2 relies (SP19) was found out of date in the Fairfield Road, Framlingham appeal as the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land.

Setting strict settlement boundaries does not allow adequate flexibility for development to come forward outside the settlement boundary if this is required (for example due to a shortfall of housing land).

Gladman would object to the use of settlement limits if these would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. The Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead. The use of settlement limits to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements would not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework.

Gladman would be opposed to the definition of an urban edge if this would preclude appropriately sited and sustainable development coming forward to meet the borough's housing needs, in accordance with the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development. Proposals that are sustainable should go ahead without delay. An overly restrictive approach could result in a plan that is not positively prepared or effective.

Policy FPPS: Land North of Conway Close and Swallow Close, Felixstowe

Gladman support the allocation of land for new housing in this area. We welcome the recognition that 'the land to the north of Conway Close and Swallow Close can provide a natural extension to the built form of Felixstowe without causing a detrimental impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or important views of the Deben Estuary'.

Gladman also welcome the recognition that the presence of the Grade II listed Park Farm Cottages to the west of the site does not preclude development in the area provided that it is sympathetic to the heritage asset.

We note that there are potential capacity issues regarding the foul sewerage network that need to be overcome. Gladman submit that it is the responsibility of Anglian Water to provide sufficient capacity to serve the needs of housing...
in the area and that this should not be used as an excuse to prevent or delay development coming forward. Anglian Water are consulted through the plan process and so must be aware of the capacity issue and should be putting funding in place to resolve it.

Gladman recognise that the area may have some archaeological potential. It is our view and experience that full archaeological investigations are not necessary prior to the grant of planning permission and that appropriately-worded pre-commencement conditions attached to planning applications are effective at securing any archaeological remains on site without delaying the granting of planning permission.

Gladman would caution against being too prescriptive regarding the mix of housing, the design and layout, or the route of the footpath through the site, as these will need to be established and refined through a thorough analysis of the constraints and opportunities of the site and through engagement with the public and stakeholders. The Council will need to be aware of the requirements set out in paragraph 59 of the Framework, which states:

Local planning authorities should consider using design codes where they could help deliver high quality outcomes. However, design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.

Furthermore, paragraph 60 goes on to add:

Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

Finally, paragraph 65 makes it clear that

Local planning authorities should not refuse planning permission for buildings or infrastructure which promote high levels of sustainability because of concerns about incompatibility with on existing townscape, if those concerns have been mitigated by good design (unless the concern relates to a designated heritage asset and the impact would cause material harm to the asset or its setting which is not outweighed by the proposal's economic, social and environmental benefits).

In general Gladman remind the Council of the guidance set out in Paragraph 173 of the Framework, which states that 'Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened'.

Gladman submit that policies which seek developer contributions should be properly tested for their effects on development viability and supported by an adequate evidence base. The Council should not set onerous policy obligations that could place an undue burden on the ability of developers to deliver sustainable development.

Gladman submit that a site larger than the proposed allocation is suitable, available and deliverable. A larger allocation in this area could contribute to the over-provision of housing across the district and provide a buffer/reserve should other sites within the FAAP or across the district not come forward as anticipated, enabling the district to maintain a robust five year supply of housing land. Given the recognition that the OAN for the district is likely to increase in future, a larger allocation here could make a valuable contribution to an increased housing requirement in an area outside the AONB, reducing pressure for development within the AONB.

Policies FPP1 - FPP8

Gladman have no specific comments to make on the individual allocations within the plan except to note that many of the allocations policies place burdens upon the delivery of sites, for example by requiring Development Briefs to be agreed or certain infrastructure to be provided before development can come forward. Gladman remind the Council of the guidance set out in Paragraph 173 of the Framework, which states that 'Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened'.

In light of the judgement in FODC v. SSCLG and Gladman Developments Ltd [[2016] EWHC 421 Admin]. Gladman consider it is necessary for the FAAP to carry out an assessment of the potential impact of proposed development on heritage assets, as set out in paragraph 129 of the Framework. The judgement concerns the interaction between paragraph 14 and paragraph 134 of the Framework, and the issues of the balancing exercise to be undertaken to assess the harm of any proposals against the benefits of the identified proposed development in accordance with paragraphs 133, 134 and 135 of the Framework. Gladman consider that the implications of the judgement apply equally to both the decision making process and the plan making process. Paragraph 134 is clear in talking about 'development proposals'; a phrase which can apply equally to planning applications and proposed allocations. Furthermore footnote 29 of the Framework clearly states that "The principles and policies set out in this section apply to the heritage-related consent regimes for which local planning authorities are responsible under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as well as to plan-making and decision-taking." It is therefore essential that the implications of the above judgment are fully considered in the context of both decision-taking and plan-making.
Policy FPP27: Access to the Countryside

The policy requires new residential developments in the Felixstowe Peninsular to make provision of accessible natural green spaces as agreed by the Council in conjunction with Natural England. Gladman would urge the Council to take a flexible and realistic approach to such provision, recognising that it could take a variety of forms. The Council should even consider payment of offsite contributions if this would be more appropriate given the constraints of a site and issues of viability.

Paragraph 173 of the Framework states that ‘Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened’.

Policy FPP28: Areas to be Protected from Development

As with our comments on the Site Allocations DPD, Gladman would query whether such a blanket protection policy is compliant with the Framework.

Gladman submit that new development can often be located in countryside gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character. In such circumstances we would question the purpose of a gap designation, particularly if this would prevent the development of otherwise sustainable and deliverable housing sites to meet the borough's needs. Gladman note that there appears to be no robust evidence supporting the extent of the current countryside gap designations.

Para 55 of the Framework seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas to maintain and enhance rural vitality and viability. It is essential therefore, that the needs of the sustainable rural settlements across the district are assessed and a meaningful level of growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing vitality and viability. This will help to preserve and enhance rural services and facilities and allow local rural communities to meet their own needs for housing whilst providing much needed affordable housing in the parts of the district that suffer with the greatest affordable housing need.

Gladman would be opposed to the use of Local Gaps if these would only serve to act as an arbitrary tool to prevent sustainable development. In this regard we submit that new development can often be located in local gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character.

General Comments

In addition to the above comments on the FAAP policies, Gladman have the following general points to make about the FAAP.

Delivery Rates

The table on page 105 of the FAAP consultation document sets out the expected completions per year of the sites allocated in these policies. The Council will have to ensure that they have applied realistic assumptions around lead-in times and build-out rates for these sites.

Location of New Housing

Gladman would point out that Suffolk Coastal has a number of different and distinct housing market areas. Each of these distinct areas will have their own requirement for housing and this should be reflected in the spatial distribution of housing supply within the Local Plan. This decision should be based on the findings of the evidence base and should not be a politically driven spatial strategy to put a disproportionate amount of housing in areas where people don’t want to (and will not) live. If the spatial distribution does not reflect need/demand as shown by the evidence base, then housing will not be delivered and the Plan will not be implemented. Following a dispersed spatial distribution pattern across a large number of settlements is also undesirable as this approach is not likely to be sustainable, will not be delivered and cannot generate the level of community benefits that larger sites can to help make settlements more sustainable and fill important gaps in community provision.

Gladman would suggest a hybrid approach should be taken, with more sustainable settlements taking a greater proportion of growth than less sustainable locations. We would caution against too prescriptive a development strategy based solely on a development hierarchy that is itself based on too simplistic an understanding of sustainability (i.e. the number of services available). Whilst level of services is obviously an important criterion, the Framework is clear that development should be allowed where it is sustainable, when measured against the Framework as a whole and the three strands of sustainability (economic, social and environmental) in particular. When considering development in rural areas, Paragraph 55 of the Framework states that ‘housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.’ Furthermore paragraph 17 states that planning should ‘focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable’.
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New homes should be distributed in a way that enables the full OAN for the district to be met, rather than based too rigidly on percentages allocated to each town and village. This should take into account factors such as market conditions and viability - it is after all the private sector that will be expected to deliver the majority of the district’s housing need and so it is important that the chosen distribution enables this to happen.

Regardless of the approach a sufficient range of sites need to be allocated (taking into account viability and market conditions) to ensure continuity of housing supply; more sites than needed to deliver the OAN should be allocated to account for slippage and delays. Whichever development strategy is adopted it is vital that the new Local Plan addresses this and that housing figures and distribution are aligned fully with economic growth aspirations.

Other Comments on Site Allocations and FAAP

Gladman have the following comments to make that apply to both the Site Allocations DPD and the FAAP document.

NPPF Changes

It is vital that the Site Allocations and FAAP fully reflect any revisions to the Framework, the recommendations of the Local Plan Expert Group when implemented, and any requirements relating to Starter Homes once these come into effect. Of particular importance will be the need to address possible changes to the Framework around ensuring housing is delivered on land allocated in plans through the introduction of a ‘housing delivery test’. The consultation document on the proposed changes set out that ‘where significant under-delivery is identified over a sustained period, action needs to be taken to address this and that one approach ‘could be to identify additional sustainable sites if the existing approach is demonstrably not delivering the housing required’. The Site Allocations DPD and FAAP will need to include a mechanism for dealing with any sustained under-delivery in a timely fashion.

Another area that the LAPP should consider is the widening of the definition of affordable housing ‘so that it encompasses a fuller range of products that can support people to access home ownership’. It is proposed that the wider definition includes Starter Homes and the Housing and Planning Act has introduced provisions to make regulations to require all suitable reasonably-sized housing developments to include a proportion of Starter Homes. The Plans will need to address how this requirement will impact on the amount of more traditional types of affordable housing that could be delivered, which may entail an adjustment of the housing target to ensure the district’s full OAN can be met.

Duty to Cooperate

The development of the Site Allocations DPD and FAAP represents another opportunity to consider and address cross-boundary issues.

Paragraph 178 of the Framework states that ‘public bodies have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries’ and paragraph 179 states that ‘local planning authorities should work collaboratively with other bodies to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual Local Plans’. It goes on to say that ‘joint working should enable local planning authorities to work together to meet development requirements which cannot wholly be met within their own areas - for instance, because of a lack of physical capacity.

Paragraph 181 of the Framework further sets out that ‘cooperation should be a continuous process of engagement from initial thinking through to implementation, resulting in a final position where plans are in place to provide the land and infrastructure necessary to support current and projected future levels of development’.

PPG provides further explanation of how the policies contained within the Framework should be interpreted and applied. In terms of the Duty to Cooperate, PPG sets out that ‘local planning authorities should make every effort to secure the necessary cooperation on strategic cross boundary matters BEFORE they submit their Local Plans for examination’*(my emphasis).

Suffolk Coastal clearly needs to consider the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate. It is something that needs to be built into the entire plan-making process from the very beginning and failure to do so is not something that can be rectified retrospectively.

Sustainability Appraisal Interim Report and Sustainability Appraisal of Policies

Gladman have the following comments regarding the Sustainability Appraisal:

In accordance with Section 19 of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, policies set out in Local Plans must be subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Incorporating the requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, SA is a systematic process that should be undertaken at each stage of the Plan’s preparation, assessing the effects of the Local Plan’s proposals on sustainable development when judged against all reasonable alternatives.

The Council should ensure that the results of the SA process clearly justify its policy choices. In meeting the
development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of the assessment why some policy options have been progressed, and others have been rejected. Undertaking a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, in the same level of detail for both chosen and rejected alternatives, the Council’s decision making and scoring should be robust, justified and transparent.

Gladman remind the Council that there have now been a number of instances where the failure to undertake a satisfactory SA has resulted in Plans failing the test of legal compliance at Examination (South Somerset) or being subjected to later legal challenge (Heard vs Greater Norwich Development Plan)

Conclusions

What is clear from the Framework, and from the Government’s agenda to boost significantly the supply of housing, is that the premise of the whole process is the assessment and delivery of the full OAN for housing in an area unless there are adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. If the process set out in the Framework and PPG is not followed then the Council run the real risk of the plan being found unsound and this will create significant delay and uncertainty in the process.

All of our best interests are served by your authority getting a Local Plan found sound at the earliest possible opportunity, rather than utilising considerable resources on preparing for and attending EIPs, preparing Judicial Reviews etc. This approach will put the authority back in control of planning in their area and will give the Members comfort and certainty over the level and location of development that will take place over the lifetime of the Plan.

Gladman have raised concerns in relation to the issues and options being considered by the Council which will fundamentally affect the ‘soundness’ of the Local Plan (with reference to tests of soundness outlined in paragraph 182 of the Framework). If the Local Plan is approached in such a way as presented it will not provide a positive policy approach and in a number of cases it is not consistent with national policy.

Gladman hope that you have found this representation constructive. If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact myself or a member of the Gladman team.

Summary: The policy requires new residential developments in the Felixstowe Peninsular to make provision of accessible natural green spaces as agreed by the Council in conjunction with Natural England. Gladman would urge the Council to take a flexible and realistic approach to such provision, recognising that it could take a variety of forms. The Council should even consider payment of offsite contributions if this would be more appropriate given the constraints of a site and issues of viability.

Paragraph 173 of the Framework states that ‘Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened’.

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>i, ii, iii, iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments:
Scanned Representation
Thank you for your letter dated 14th April 2016 regarding the above consultation. We have had the opportunity to assess the letter and consultation documents and can offer the following advice. Please note we have provided comments on the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies within a separate letter to you dated the same. This follows two previous consultations and our comments dated 25th February 2015 and 24th November 2015.

In terms of our general comments:
Recent Guidance from Historic England

We have recently published guidance on The Historic Environment in Local Plans and the Historic Environment and Site Allocations. Where we have not made comment below some additional guidance on ensuring a positive strategy for the historic environment is secured within the Felixstowe Area Action Plan can be seen by following these links <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa1-historic-environment-local-plans/> and <https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/>.

In terms of our site specific comments:
Housing Sites
FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe (451g)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the possible impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II* Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We highlighted that the principal elevation of Walton Hall faces north and overlooks site 451g. It was considered that development here would urbanise the setting of this important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance. It was expressed that harm would also be caused to the Grade II lodge and we strongly advised that an alternative site was found for development, though it was thought that there may be scope for some limited development at the eastern end of this site.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfill the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words 'and their setting' in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

FFP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe (502e)
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

FFP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be...
Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed. At Preferred Options stage, we considered 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 note that the policy still does not include this requirement (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.88.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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). In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the policy, we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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). In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FPP13 and FPP14.

As above in previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word 'on' with 'to'.

FFP18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point, FPP20: Cobbolds Point to Spa, FFP21: Spa to Martello Park and FFP22 Martello Park to Landguard

We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FFP23: Car Parking

At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the 'high quality of design' requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment

At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowes's archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council's approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area

We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report 'Felixstowe South Conservation Area' commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley
particularly welcomed and supported.

To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is
listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden
We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Other Issues
Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding
At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary:
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

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).
### 7826 Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Policy FPP28: Areas to be protected from development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachments:**

- Scanned Representation

---
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Full Text: RE: Suffolk Coastal Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD and Felixstowe Area Action Plan Proposed Submission Consultations

(Representation submitted via email to suffolkcoastallocalplan@eastsuffolk.gov.uk)

Introduction

This letter is in response to the above consultations and provides Gladman Developments' representation. Gladman specialise in the promotion of strategic land for residential development with associated community infrastructure. From this experience, Gladman understand the need for the planning system to ensure that local communities have access to both decent homes and local employment opportunities.

The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has brought about fundamental changes to the planning process since its inception. One such change relates to the need to significantly boost the supply of housing and how this fundamental requirement of the Framework should be reflected in the plan making process. Gladman, who operate on a national basis, have considerable experience in contributing to the Local Plan preparation process since the Framework came into effect.

What continues to be clear from this experience is that many local authorities are not fully addressing the requirements of the Framework when preparing their Local Plans, this has led to significant concerns being expressed by Inspectors on the soundness of their plans in their current form. The main concerns centre upon the requirement addressed by paragraph 47 of the Framework to 'use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) for market and affordable housing in the housing market area'.

Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD

Suffolk Coastal's Core Strategy was adopted in July 2013 and sets the overall vision and strategic objectives for the district, including a target to deliver at least 7,900 dwellings between 2010 and 2027. It is intended that the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD (together with the Felixstowe Area Action Plan (FAAP)) defines sites for various types of development (including housing), defines the boundaries of built up areas and identifies local infrastructure requirements. The documents do not cover areas of the district that are advancing Neighbourhood Plans.

Gladman's response to specific policies is set out below.

Policy SSP1: New Housing Delivery 2015-2027

The policy, with reference to the data set out in Table 2, sets out new housing delivery for the period 2015-2027 to meet the minimum requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy. The policy makes allocations in a number of settlements.

Table 2 sets out, across the major centres, market towns, key service centres and local service centres, the amount of housing that has already been delivered between 2010 and 2015, extant permissions (including resolutions to grant as of 31/03/15), and new allocations to be delivered between 2015 and 2027. Whilst policy SP2 of the adopted Core Strategy makes provision for 'at least' 7,900 dwellings over the plan period, the figures presented in Table 2 are not expressed in the same terms but rather appear to be development ceilings. The Site Allocations Plan needs to make it clear that the figures in Table 2 are minimum figures to ensure consistency with Core Strategy Policy SP2. It is interesting to note that the FAAP document does include recognition that the housing figures it allocates to settlements are minima, and there should be consistency across the two documents.

Objectively Assessed Need

Gladman have fundamental concerns that the Council is progressing with a Site Allocations document based on an out-of-date housing target from the Core Strategy that does not properly reflect the district's full Objectively Assessed Need (OAN). When the Core Strategy was adopted, the Inspector at the time noted that the Council had to undertake a review of its OAN by 2015. This is acknowledged by the Council at paragraph 1.12 of the consultation document, which states the adopted figure of 7,900 was lower than the full OAN and therefore the Council made a commitment to undertake an early review to address the level of housing provision. The review has yet to be undertaken.

Despite this commitment, paragraph 1.13 goes on to state that the Site Allocations DPD and FAAP are important to completing the current phase of plan making based on the Core Strategy. The Council consider that both documents positively seek to boost the supply of housing with a 'carefully planned' over provision included as a contingency. Table 1 provides an overview of the housing numbers over the plan period and compared to the Core Strategy target of 7,900 allows for a total of 8,620 homes to come forward, a small oversupply of approximately 9%.

Gladman can see no reason as to why a full review of the Core Strategy, including its housing target, cannot be undertaken now. Failure do so means that the Council must accept that the Site Allocations DPD and FAAP will be out of date as soon as they are adopted.

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).
The situation which has arisen in Suffolk Coastal is similar to other positions taken by Councils in Wokingham, Hinckley and Bosworth, Preston and Tunbridge Wells, where Site Allocations documents have proceeded on the back of either pre NPPF Core Strategies or on principal planning documents which do not contain an assessment of full OAN. The Wokingham judgement [[2014] EWHC 2320 (Admin)] confirms such an approach may be lawful, but made clear it did nothing more than allocate sufficient sites for a housing requirement from a previous generation of planning policy. The reasons behind this have recently been upheld by the Court of Appeal in Oxted Residential v Tandridge District Council [[2016] EWCA Civ 414].

It should be noted that the issue of Suffolk Coastal's OAN was considered at the Fairfield Road, Framlingham appeal [APP/J3530/W/15/3011466] where evidence was presented by the appellants in that case that suggested the OAN could be 11,000 dwellings between 2010 and 2027, a significant increase on the adopted requirement; the council's own witness in that appeal conceded that they would have expected the OAN to have increased. This evidence suggests a requirement far in excess of the 'carefully planned over provision' allowed through the Site Allocations and FAAP.

Gladman contend that the Council's document cannot be seen to be positively prepared. Despite the availability of more recent evidence on housing need and an admission that the OAN is likely to have gone up, the Council is still proceeding with producing a Site Allocations Plan based on a lower figure, and only at the next stage will new housing evidence be considered in a review of the whole development plan. The consequences of this approach (assuming that the Allocations Plan is otherwise sound) would be to have an adopted Allocations Plan which would have to be reviewed in short order to take account of the emerging and subsequently adopted housing requirement. Moreover, even if sites were allocated in the Allocations Plan, it is highly likely that they would be insufficient to meet the updated OAN, as required by paragraph 47 of the Framework.

We do not therefore see how the delay in properly dealing with the full OAN for the district can be seen as positive planning. The Council have had since July 2013 to address this and in the time elapsed a full plan review could have been completed.

The process of undertaking an objective assessment is clearly set out in the Framework principally in paragraph 14, paragraph 47, paragraph 152 and paragraph 159 and should be undertaken in a systematic and transparent way to ensure that the plan is based on a robust evidence base.

The starting point for this assessment is set out in paragraph 159 which requires local planning authorities to have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. This involves the preparation of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative areas. The Framework goes on to set out the factors that should be included in a SHMA including identifying 'the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period which:

* Meets household and population projections taking account of migration and demographic change;
* Addresses the need for all types of housing including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and
* Caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand.'

Key points that are worth noting from the above is that the objective assessment should identify the full need for housing before you consider undertaking any process of assessing the ability to deliver this figure. In addition, paragraph 159 specifically relates to catering for both housing need and housing demand within the authority area. It is worth pointing out that any assessment of housing need and demand within a SHMA must also consider the following factors: falling household formation rates, net inward migration, the need to address the under provision of housing from the previous local plan period, the results of the Census 2011, housing vacancy rates including the need to factor in a 3% housing vacancy rate for churn in the housing market, economic factors to ensure that the economic forecasts for an area are supported by sufficient housing to deliver economic growth, off-setting a falling working age population by providing enough housing vacancy rates including the need to factor in a 3% housing vacancy rate for churn in the housing delivering the full need for affordable housing in an area.

It is our understanding that a majority of the SHMAs that were prepared under the current guidance on SHMA preparation are not Framework compliant and do not consider the full range of factors that are outlined in paragraph 159. This is causing significant problems for authorities currently at Examination and therefore, to avoid this issue, SHMAs should be updated to take account of the Framework and ensure plans are based on robust and up-to-date evidence. Indeed, the Government have noted the deficiency in SHMAs and are updating the guidance on SHMA preparation to fully reflect the guidance given in the Framework.

Following the exercise to identify the full, objectively assessed need for housing in an area, the local planning authority should then seek to undertake the assessment outlined in paragraph 152 of the Framework. This states that

Local planning authorities should seek opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, and net gains across all three. Significant adverse impacts on any of these dimensions should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued.
Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. This statement clearly sets out that local planning authorities should seek to deliver the full, objectively assessed need and that this should be tested through the evidence base. Only where the evidence shows that this is not achievable should they then test other options to see if any significant adverse impacts could be reduced or eliminated by pursuing these options. If this is not possible then they should test if the significant adverse impacts could be mitigated and where this is not possible, where compensatory measures may be appropriate.

The final stage of the process is outlined in paragraph 14 and involves a planning judgement as to whether, following all of the stages of the process outlined above, 'any adverse impacts of meeting the objectively assessed needs would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole or specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.' It is also worth noting that the final part of this sentence refers to footnote 9 which sets out the types of policies that the Government consider to be restrictive. These include sites protected under the Birds and Habitat Directive (see paragraph 119) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Heritage Coast or within a National Park (or the Broads Authority); designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion. Although this list is not exhaustive it is clear that local landscape designations, intrinsic value of the countryside, the character of areas, green gaps etc. are not specifically mentioned as constraints.

Assessment of Housing and Economic Development Needs - Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

As Suffolk Coastal will be aware, the Government issued a guidance note to support local authorities in objectively assessing and evidencing development needs for housing (both market and affordable) and economic development. This document supports and provides further guidance on the process of undertaking such assessments as set out in the Framework. Gladman highlight the following key points from this document:

* Plan makers should not apply constraints to the overall assessment of need, such as limitations imposed by the supply of land for new development, historic under performance, infrastructure or environmental constraints.
* Household projections published by the Department for Communities and Local Government should provide the starting point estimate of overall housing need.
* Household projections based estimates of housing need may need adjusting to reflect factors affecting local demography and household formation rates which are not captured by past trends, for example historic suppression by under supply and worsening affordability of housing. The assessment will need to reflect the consequences of past under delivery and the extent to which household formation rates have been constrained by supply.
* Plan makers need to consider increasing their housing numbers where the supply of working age population is less than projected job growth, to prevent unsustainable commuting patterns and reduced local business resilience.
* If the historic rate of development shows that actual supply falls below planned supply, future supply should be increased to reflect the likelihood of under-delivery of a plan.
* Plan makers should take account of concealed households.
* Housing needs indicated by household projections should be adjusted to reflect appropriate market signals, as well as other market indicators of the balance between the demand for and supply of dwellings. Appropriate comparisons of indicators (land prices, house prices etc.) should be made - with longer term trends in the HMA, similar demographic and economic areas, and nationally. Divergence under any of these circumstances will require upward adjustment to planned housing numbers.
* The more significant the affordability constraints (as reflected in rising prices and rents, and worsening affordability ratio) and the stronger other indicators of high demand (e.g. the differential between land prices), the larger the improvement in affordability needed, and the larger the additional supply response should be.
* Market signals are affected by a number of economic factors. Plan makers should increase planned supply by an amount that, on reasonable assumptions and consistent with principles of sustainable development, could be expected to improve affordability.

The Framework is clear that Local Planning Authorities must consider market signals. It is one of the core planning principles considered in paragraph 17. The Framework states:

"...Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities."

Of critical importance is what the Framework goes onto say in paragraph 158 in the section discussing Plan Making. It states here:

"Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals."

Market signals are therefore at the very core of what the Framework is trying to achieve in promoting sustainable development and boosting the supply of housing land.

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).
The formal publication of the PPG in March 2014 gives further explanation to what the Framework means with regard to market signals, and sets out, in a range of paragraphs, the way in which local planning authorities should go about factoring in relevant market signals in arriving at their objectively assessed need. Paragraphs 19 and 20 of the PPG gives guidance on what market signals should be taken into account and how plan makers should respond to these market signals. The below extracts identify some particularly pertinent points.

The housing need number suggested by household projections (the starting point) should be adjusted to reflect appropriate market signals, as well as other market indicators of the balance between the demand for and supply of dwellings. Prices of rents rising faster than the national/local average may well indicate particular market undersupply relative to demand.

The paragraph goes on to indicate that these factors would include, but should not be limited to, land prices, house prices, rents, affordability, rates of development and overcrowding. However, given what the Framework says at paragraph 17, quoted above, it seems clear that particular consideration should be given to affordability.

In order to consider how market signals should be taken forward paragraph 20 identifies some key concepts:

Appropriate comparisons of indicators should be made. This includes comparison with longer term trends (both in absolute levels and rates of change) in the: housing market area; similar demographic and economic areas; and nationally. A worsening trend in any of these indicators will require upward adjustment to planned housing numbers compared to ones based solely on household projections.

It is therefore clear that where market signals are apparent there is an absolute and clear direction that an upward adjustment to housing numbers is required. It is also clear that both the absolute level of change and the rates of change are considerations, and that local planning authorities need to carefully bench mark themselves against other areas. This should not simply be a case of considering neighbouring authorities but should look at, as well as these, local authorities on a national basis, if the demographic and economic indicators are relevant. Gladman are firmly of the view that considering comparisons purely against neighbouring authorities is not sufficiently robust and does not address the underlying issues which both the Framework and PPG are trying to tackle with regard to housing.

What is of further importance when considering these issues is the period of time analysed when considering both relative and absolute change. It has become apparent, in our consideration of a number of plans that many local authorities choose to look at periods of time which are not fully representative of the depth of the housing crisis which we are currently within.

The problems are noted in Fixing the Foundations: Creating a more prosperous nation published by HM Treasury in July 2015. In paragraph 9.7 the report states:

There remains more to do. As the London School of Economics (LSE) Growth Commission found, ‘under supply of housing, especially in high-growth areas of the country has pushed up house prices. The UK has been incapable of building enough homes to keep up with growing demand.’

Gladman are therefore of the view that local planning authorities must take a long term view when considering affordability and consider the relative and absolute change over a long term 15-20 year period, which coincides with the normal time span of a Local Plan. Authorities should assess, as a constituent part of their OAN, how they can improve affordability over the life time of a plan to a point where affordability is more in line with average earnings and affordable mortgage lending rates. They should assess a level of housing over the 15-20 year plan period which would enable this step change and consider its deliverability in the plan. Only through planning for significant housing growth can local authorities realistically tackle market signals in the way advocated by the PPG and tackle the affordability and housing crisis.

Gladman reserve the right to adduce further evidence on OAN at the appropriate time.

Location of New Housing

Gladman would point out that Suffolk Coastal has a number of different and distinct housing market areas. Each of these distinct areas will have their own requirement for housing and this should be reflected in the spatial distribution of housing supply within the Local Plan. This decision should be based on the findings of the evidence base and should not be a politically driven spatial strategy to put a disproportionate amount of housing in areas where people don’t want to [and will not] live. If the spatial distribution does not reflect need/demand as shown by the evidence base, then housing will not be delivered and the Plan will not be implemented.

Gladman would suggest a hybrid approach should be taken, with more sustainable settlements taking a greater proportion of growth than less sustainable locations. We would caution against too prescriptive a development strategy based solely on a development hierarchy that is itself based on too simplistic an understanding of sustainability (i.e. the number of services available). Whilst level of services is obviously an important criterion, the Framework is clear that development should be allowed where it is sustainable, when measured against the Framework as a whole and the three strands of sustainability (economic, social and environmental) in particular. When considering development in rural areas, Paragraph 55 of the Framework states 'housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the
vitality of rural communities.' Furthermore paragraph 17 states that planning should 'focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable'.

Para 55 of the Framework seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas to maintain and enhance rural vitality and viability. It is essential therefore, that the needs of the sustainable rural settlements across the district are assessed and a meaningful level of growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing vitality and viability. This will help to preserve and enhance rural services and facilities and allow local rural communities to meet their own needs for housing whilst providing much needed affordable housing in the parts of the district that suffer with the greatest affordable housing need.

In allocating sites, the Council should be mindful that to maximize housing supply the widest possible range of sites, by size and market location are required so that house builders of all types and sizes have access to suitable land in order to offer the widest possible range of products. The key to increased housing supply is the number of sales outlets. For any given time period, all else being equal, overall sales and build out rates are faster from 20 sites of 50 units than 10 sites of 100 units or 1 site of 1,000 units. The maximum delivery is achieved not just because there are more sales outlets but because the widest possible range of products and locations are available to meet the widest possible range of demand. In summary, a wider variety of sites in the widest possible range of locations ensures all types of house builder have access to suitable land which in turn increases housing delivery.

New homes should be distributed in a way that enables the full OAN for the district to be met, rather than based too rigidly on percentages allocated to each town and village. This should take into account factors such as market conditions and viability - it is after all the private sector that will be expected to deliver the majority of the district's housing need and so it is important that the chosen distribution enables this to happen.

Regardless of the approach a sufficient range of sites need to be allocated (taking into account viability and market conditions) to ensure continuity of housing supply; more sites than needed to deliver the OAN should be allocated to account for slippage and delays. Whichever development strategy is adopted it is vital that the new Local Plan addresses this and that housing figures and distribution are aligned fully with economic growth aspirations.

Delivery Rates

The Council will have to ensure that they have applied realistic assumptions around lead-in times and build-out rates for the sites with permissions and especially for the sites with a resolution to grant, as there is a chance that some of these sites may never sign the s 106 agreement and begin to deliver.

Table 1 shows that 600 of the dwellings needed over the plan period will come through a windfall allowance (50dpa). The Council must be satisfied that, in line with Paragraph 48 of the Framework, they have 'compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply'. It is also important that 'any allowance should be realistic having regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens'.

Housing Allocations in Areas with Neighbourhood Plans

The plan sets out at paragraph 1.17 that several Neighbourhood Plans in the district have reached an advanced stage and cover a wide range of policy issues and therefore the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies document does not include allocations or additional policies covering these areas. This means that no sites are allocated for housing through the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD in settlements covered by an advanced Neighbourhood Plan. Gladman have some concerns with this approach.

There needs to be a mechanism in place to address situations where these Neighbourhood Plans fail and therefore do allocate the appropriate amount of housing as required by the Core Strategy. Should these Neighbourhood Plans not come forward as anticipated then the Council will be in danger of not having enough allocated housing land and therefore would be unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply. The Inspector for the Torbay Local Plan required Main Modifications that inserted wording that addressed this issue. The modification read 'If Neighbourhood Plans do not identify sufficient sites to provide the growth requirement of the Local Plan, the Council will bring forward sites through site allocations development plan documents. If it appears that a shortfall in five year supply of deliverable sites is likely to arise, the Council will bring forward additional sites'. The Council should consider inserting a similar provision into the Site Allocations Document.

Another danger of this approach is that if other sites elsewhere in the district fail to come forward in a timely fashion or do not deliver the number of units expected, then the Council will not have the flexibility to release land in sustainable locations that are covered by a Neighbourhood Plan to make up the shortfall, regain a robust housing supply and retain control of housing delivery in the district.

Finally, given the likelihood that the full OAN for the district will increase markedly once the review is finally carried out, there needs to be a process to ensure that areas with adopted Neighbourhood Plans do not prevent increased levels of growth coming forward in future. PPG is clear [Paragraph:084 Reference ID:41-084-201605 19] that 'policies in a neighbourhood plan may become out of date, for example if they conflict with policies in a Local Plan that is adopted after the making of the neighbourhood plan. In such cases, the more recent plan policy takes precedence.'
Policy SSP2: Physical Limits Boundaries

The policy sets boundaries for all settlements listed as Major Centres, Town, Key and Local Service Centres in accordance with Core Strategy policy SP19. The policy allows for development including housing within these limits, subject to proposals being in accordance with other policies, including Neighbourhood Plans. It notes that ‘proposals for new residential development outside physical limits boundaries will be strictly controlled’.

As outlined above, Gladman consider the housing target in the adopted Core Strategy to be out of date as it does not represent the district's full OAN. Since the settlement boundaries are set to accommodate the out of date level of housing growth contained in the adopted Core Strategy, the boundary policies are also out of date. Many of the settlement boundaries remain from the old Local Plan and are therefore time-expired. Furthermore, the Core Strategy policy upon which SSP2 relies (SP19) was found to be out of date in the Fairfield Road, Framlingham appeal as the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land.

Setting strict settlement boundaries does not allow adequate flexibility for development to come forward outside the settlement boundary if this is required (for example due to a shortfall of housing land).

Gladman would object to the use of settlement limits if these would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. The Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead. The use of settlement limits to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements would not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework.

Gladman would be opposed to the definition of an urban edge if this would preclude appropriately sited and sustainable development coming forward to meet the district’s housing needs, in accordance with the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development. Proposals that are sustainable should go ahead without delay. An overly restrictive approach could result in a plan that is not positively prepared or effective.

Policies SSP3 - SSP19

Gladman have no specific comments to make on the individual allocations within the plan except to note that many of the allocation policies place additional requirements on the delivery of sites, for example by requiring Development Briefs to be agreed or certain infrastructure to be provided before development can come forward. Gladman remind the Council of the guidance set out in Paragraph 173 of the Framework, which states that ‘Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened’. This should be tested through a full plan viability assessment. Realistic and cautious delivery trajectories should be applied by the Council to sites requiring such infrastructure provisions.

In light of the judgement in FODC v. SSCLG and Gladman Developments Ltd [[2016] EWHC 421 Admin ], Gladman consider it is necessary for the Site Allocations DPD to carry out an assessment of the potential impact of proposed development on heritage assets, as set out in paragraph 129 of the Framework. The judgement concerns the interaction between paragraph 14 and paragraph 134 of the Framework, and the issues of the balancing exercise to be undertaken to assess the harm of any proposals against the benefits of the identified proposed development in accordance with paragraphs 133, 134 and 135 of the Framework. Gladman consider that the implications of the judgement apply equally to both the decision making process and the plan making process. Paragraph 134 is clear in talking about ‘development proposals’, a phrase which can apply equally to planning applications and proposed allocations. Furthermore, footnote 29 of the Framework clearly states that ‘The principles and policies set out in this section apply to the heritage-related consent regimes for which local planning authorities are responsible under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as well as to plan-making and decision-taking”. It is therefore essential that the implications of the above judgment are fully considered in the context of both decision-taking and plan-making.

The table on page 133 of the consultation document sets out the expected completions per year of the sites allocated in these policies. The Council will have to ensure that they have applied realistic assumptions around lead-in times and build-out rates for these sites.

Policy SSP39: Areas to be Protected from Development

Gladman would query whether such a blanket protection policy is compliant with the Framework.

Gladman submit that new development can often be located in countryside gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character. In such circumstances we would question the purpose of a gap designation, particularly if this would prevent the development of otherwise sustainable and deliverable housing sites to meet the borough’s needs. Gladman note that there appears to be no robust evidence supporting the extent of the current countryside gap designations.

Para 55 of the Framework seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas to maintain and enhance rural vitality and viability. It is essential therefore, that the needs of the sustainable rural settlements across the district are assessed and a meaningful level of growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing vitality and viability. This will
help to preserve and enhance rural services and facilities and allow local rural communities to meet their own needs for housing whilst providing much needed affordable housing in the parts of the district that suffer with the greatest affordable housing need.

Gladman would be opposed to the use of Local Gaps if these would only serve to act as an arbitrary tool to prevent sustainable development. In this regard we submit that new development can often be located in local gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character.

Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan

The FAAP is intended to implement the adopted Core Strategy and will serve as a tool that can be used to direct sustainable development and investment in the FAAP area and identify land required to meet the level of growth identified in the Core Strategy. Table 1 summarises that 2,123 homes will come forward in the FAAP area, 1,120 from new allocations.

FPP1: New Housing Allocations

The policy distributes, with reference to Table 2, new housing allocations across the FAAP area. 590 are in Felixstowe itself whilst 430 are in Trimley St Martin and 100 in Trimley St Mary. Gladman are pleased that paragraph 3.22 makes clear that the figures in the policy are to be read as minima but wonder whether the wording of the policy itself should make this clearer. The fact the policy is for a minima allows for the possibility of further sustainable development to come forward.

Paragraph 3.23 states that the Council 'consider it necessary to over-allocate sites across the district to ensure that a five year land supply is maintained' and that this provides a range of sites, sizes and locations for development. We welcome the recognition that it takes into account the likely increase in the district's OAN in future. As Major Centres, areas like Felixstowe are inherently sustainable and its continued growth will make an important contribution to meeting the district's housing needs now and in the future; it is important that sustainable development can continue to take place here and is not arbitrarily constrained.

FPP2: Physical Limits Boundaries

As with policy SSP 2 in the Site Allocations DPD, this policy sets boundaries for all settlements listed as Major Centres, Town, Key and Local Service Centres in accordance with Core Strategy policy SP19. The policy allows for development including housing within these limits, subject to proposals being in accordance with other policies, including Neighbourhood Plans. It notes that 'proposals for new residential development outside physical limits boundaries will be strictly controlled'.

As outlined above Gladman consider the housing target in the adopted Core Strategy to be out of date as it does not represent the district's full OAN. Since the settlement boundaries are set to accommodate the out of date level of housing growth outlined in the adopted Core Strategy, the boundary policies are also out of date. Furthermore, the Core Strategy policy upon which SSP2 relies (SP19) was found out of date in the Fairfield Road, Framlingham appeal as the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land.

Setting strict settlement boundaries does not allow adequate flexibility for development to come forward outside the settlement boundary if this is required (for example due to a shortfall of housing land).

Gladman would object to the use of settlement limits if these would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. The Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead. The use of settlement limits to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements would not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework.

Gladman would be opposed to the definition of an urban edge if this would preclude appropriately sited and sustainable development coming forward to meet the borough's housing needs, in accordance with the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development. Proposals that are sustainable should go ahead without delay. An overly restrictive approach could result in a plan that is not positively prepared or effective.

Policy FPPS: Land North of Conway Close and Swallow Close, Felixstowe

Gladman support the allocation of land for new housing in this area. We welcome the recognition that 'the land to the north of Conway Close and Swallow Close can provide a natural extension to the built form of Felixstowe without causing a detrimental impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or important views of the Deben Estuary'.

Gladman also welcome the recognition that the presence of the Grade II listed Park Farm Cottages to the west of the site does not preclude development in the area provided that it is sympathetic to the heritage asset.

We note that there are potential capacity issues regarding the foul sewerage network that need to be overcome. Gladman submit that it is the responsibility of Anglian Water to provide sufficient capacity to serve the needs of housing.
in the area and that this should not be used as an excuse to prevent or delay development coming forward. Anglian Water are consulted through the plan process and so must be aware of the capacity issue and should be putting funding in place to resolve it.

Gladman recognise that the area may have some archaeological potential. It is our view and experience that full archaeological investigations are not necessary prior to the grant of planning permission and that appropriately-worded pre-commencement conditions attached to planning applications are effective at securing any archaeological remains on site without delaying the granting of planning permission.

Gladman would caution against being too prescriptive regarding the mix of housing, the design and layout, or the route of the footpath through the site, as these will need to be established and refined through a thorough analysis of the constraints and opportunities of the site and through engagement with the public and stakeholders. The Council will no doubt be aware of the requirements set out in paragraph 59 of the Framework, which states:

Local planning authorities should consider using design codes where they could help deliver high quality outcomes. However, design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.

Furthermore, paragraph 60 goes on to add:

Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

Finally, paragraph 65 makes it clear that

Local planning authorities should not refuse planning permission for buildings or infrastructure which promote high levels of sustainability because of concerns about incompatibility with on existing townscape, if those concerns have been mitigated by good design (unless the concern relates to a designated heritage asset and the impact would cause material harm to the asset or its setting which is not outweighed by the proposal's economic, social and environmental benefits).

In general Gladman remind the Council of the guidance set out in Paragraph 173 of the Framework, which states that 'Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened'.

Gladman submit that policies which seek developer contributions should be properly tested for their effects on development viability and supported by an adequate evidence base. The Council should not set onerous policy obligations that could place an undue burden on the ability of developers to deliver sustainable development.

Gladman submit that a site larger than the proposed allocation is suitable, available and deliverable. A larger allocation in this area could contribute to the over-provision of housing across the district and provide a buffer/reserve should other sites within the FAAP or across the district not come forward as anticipated, enabling the district to maintain a robust five year supply of housing land. Given the recognition that the OAN for the district is likely to increase in future, a larger allocation here could make a valuable contribution to an increased housing requirement in an area outside the AONB, reducing pressure for development within the AONB.

Policies FPP1 - FPP8

Gladman have no specific comments to make on the individual allocations within the plan except to note that many of the allocations policies place burdens upon the delivery of sites, for example by requiring Development Briefs to be agreed or certain infrastructure to be provided before development can come forward. Gladman remind the Council of the guidance set out in Paragraph 173 of the Framework, which states that 'Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened'.

In light of the judgement in FODC v. SSCLG and Gladman Developments Ltd [[2016] EWHC 421 Admin], Gladman consider it is necessary for the FAAP to carry out an assessment of the potential impact of proposed development on heritage assets, as set out in paragraph 129 of the Framework. The judgement concerns the interaction between paragraph 14 and paragraph 134 of the Framework, and the issues of the balancing exercise to be undertaken to assess the harm of any proposals against the benefits of the identified proposed development in accordance with paragraphs 133, 134 and 135 of the Framework. Gladman consider that the implications of the judgement apply equally to both the decision making process and the plan making process. Paragraph 134 is clear in talking about 'development proposals', a phrase which can apply equally to planning applications and proposed allocations. Furthermore footnote 29 of the Framework clearly states that "The principles and policies set out in this section apply to the heritage-related consent regimes for which local planning authorities are responsible under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as well as to plan-making and decision-taking". It is therefore essential that the implications of the above judgment are fully considered in the context of both decision-taking and plan-making.
Object
Environment

Policy FPP27: Access to the Countryside

The policy requires new residential developments in the Felixstowe Peninsular to make provision of accessible natural green spaces as agreed by the Council in conjunction with Natural England. Gladman would urge the Council to take a flexible and realistic approach to such provision, recognising that it could take a variety of forms. The Council should even consider payment of offsite contributions if this would be more appropriate given the constraints of a site and issues of viability.

Paragraph 173 of the Framework states that 'Plans should be deliverable. Therefore the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened'.

Policy FPP28: Areas to be Protected from Development

As with our comments on the Site Allocations DPD, Gladman would query whether such a blanket protection policy is compliant with the Framework.

Gladman submit that new development can often be located in countryside gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character. In such circumstances we would question the purpose of a gap designation, particularly if this would prevent the development of otherwise sustainable and deliverable housing sites to meet the borough's needs. Gladman note that there appears to be no robust evidence supporting the extent of the current countryside gap designations.

Para 55 of the Framework seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas to maintain and enhance rural vitality and viability. It is essential therefore, that the needs of the sustainable rural settlements across the district are assessed and a meaningful level of growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing vitality and viability. This will help to preserve and enhance rural services and facilities and allow local rural communities to meet their own needs for housing whilst providing much needed affordable housing in the parts of the district that suffer with the greatest affordable housing need.

Gladman would be opposed to the use of Local Gaps if these would only serve to act as an arbitrary tool to prevent sustainable development. In this regard we submit that new development can often be located in local gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character.

General Comments

In addition to the above comments on the FAAP policies, Gladman have the following general points to make about the FAAP.

Delivery Rates

The table on page 105 of the FAAP consultation document sets out the expected completions per year of the sites allocated in these policies. The Council will have to ensure that they have applied realistic assumptions around lead-in times and build-out rates for these sites.

Location of New Housing

Gladman would point out that Suffolk Coastal has a number of different and distinct housing market areas. Each of these distinct areas will have their own requirement for housing and this should be reflected in the spatial distribution of housing supply within the Local Plan. This decision should be based on the findings of the evidence base and should not be a politically driven spatial strategy to put a disproportionate amount of housing in areas where people don't want to (and will not) live. If the spatial distribution does not reflect need/demand as shown by the evidence base, then housing will not be delivered and the Plan will not be implemented. Following a dispersed spatial distribution pattern across a large number of settlements is also undesirable as this approach is not likely to be sustainable, will not be delivered and cannot generate the level of community benefits that larger sites can to help make settlements more sustainable and fill important gaps in community provision.

Gladman would suggest a hybrid approach should be taken, with more sustainable settlements taking a greater proportion of growth than less sustainable locations. We would caution against too prescriptive a development strategy based solely on a development hierarchy that is itself based on too simplistic an understanding of sustainability (i.e. the number of services available). Whilst level of services is obviously an important criterion, the Framework is clear that development should be allowed where it is sustainable, when measured against the Framework as a whole and the three strands of sustainability (economic, social and environmental) in particular. When considering development in rural areas, Paragraph 55 of the Framework states that 'housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.' Furthermore paragraph 17 states that planning should 'focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable'.
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New homes should be distributed in a way that enables the full OAN for the district to be met, rather than based too rigidly on percentages allocated to each town and village. This should take into account factors such as market conditions and viability - it is after all the private sector that will be expected to deliver the majority of the district’s housing need and so it is important that the chosen distribution enables this to happen.

Regardless of the approach a sufficient range of sites need to be allocated (taking into account viability and market conditions) to ensure continuity of housing supply; more sites than needed to deliver the OAN should be allocated to account for slippage and delays. Whichever development strategy is adopted it is vital that the new Local Plan addresses this and that housing figures and distribution are aligned fully with economic growth aspirations.

Other Comments on Site Allocations and FAAP

Gladman have the following comments to make that apply to both the Site Allocations DPD and the FAAP document.

NPPF Changes

It is vital that the Site Allocations and FAAP fully reflect any revisions to the Framework, the recommendations of the Local Plan Expert Group when implemented, and any requirements relating to Starter Homes once these come into effect. Of particular importance will be the need to address possible changes to the Framework around ensuring housing is delivered on land allocated in plans through the introduction of a ‘housing delivery test’. The consultation document on the proposed changes set out that ‘where significant under-delivery is identified over a sustained period, action needs to be taken to address this’ and that one approach ‘could be to identify additional sustainable sites if the existing approach is demonstrably not delivering the housing required’. The Site Allocations DPD and FAAP will need to include a mechanism for dealing with any sustained under-delivery in a timely fashion.

Another area that the LAPP should consider is the widening of the definition of affordable housing ‘so that it encompasses a fuller range of products that can support people to access home ownership’. It is proposed that the wider definition includes Starter Homes and the Housing and Planning Act has introduced provisions to make regulations to require all suitable reasonably-sized housing developments to include a proportion of Starter Homes. The Plans will need to address how this requirement will impact on the amount of more traditional types of affordable housing that could be delivered, which may entail an adjustment of the housing target to ensure the district’s full OAN can be met.

Duty to Cooperate

The development of the Site Allocations DPD and FAAP represents another opportunity to consider and address cross-boundary issues.

Paragraph 178 of the Framework states that ‘public bodies have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries’ and paragraph 179 states that ‘local planning authorities should work collaboratively with other bodies to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual Local Plans’. It goes on to say that ‘joint working should enable local planning authorities to work together to meet development requirements which cannot wholly be met within their own areas - for instance, because of a lack of physical capacity.

Paragraph 181 of the Framework further sets out that ‘cooperation should be a continuous process of engagement from initial thinking through to implementation, resulting in a final position where plans are in place to provide the land and infrastructure necessary to support current and projected future levels of development’.

PPG provides further explanation of how the policies contained within the Framework should be interpreted and applied. In terms of the Duty to Cooperate, PPG sets out that ‘local planning authorities should make every effort to secure the necessary cooperation on strategic cross boundary matters BEFORE they submit their Local Plans for examination” (my emphasis).

Suffolk Coastal clearly needs to consider the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate. It is something that needs to be built into the entire plan-making process from the very beginning and failure to do so is not something that can be rectified retrospectively.

Sustainability Appraisal Interim Report and Sustainability Appraisal of Policies

Gladman have the following comments regarding the Sustainability Appraisal:

In accordance with Section 19 of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, policies set out in Local Plans must be subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Incorporating the requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, SA is a systematic process that should be undertaken at each stage of the Plan’s preparation, assessing the effects of the Local Plan’s proposals on sustainable development when judged against all reasonable alternatives.

The Council should ensure that the results of the SA process clearly justify its policy choices. In meeting the...
development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of the assessment why some policy options have been progressed, and others have been rejected. Undertaking a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, in the same level of detail for both chosen and rejected alternatives, the Council’s decision making and scoring should be robust, justified and transparent.

Gladman remind the Council that there have now been a number of instances where the failure to undertake a satisfactory SA has resulted in Plans failing the test of legal compliance at Examination (South Somerset) or being subjected to later legal challenge (Heard vs Greater Norwich Development Plan)

Conclusions

What is clear from the Framework, and from the Government’s agenda to boost significantly the supply of housing, is that the premise of the whole process is the assessment and delivery of the full OAN for housing in an area unless there are adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. If the process set out in the Framework and PPG is not followed then the Council run the real risk of the plan being found unsound and this will create significant delay and uncertainty in the process.

All of our best interests are served by your authority getting a Local Plan found sound at the earliest possible opportunity, rather than us utilising considerable resources on preparing for and attending EIPs, preparing Judicial Reviews etc. This approach will put the authority back in control of planning in their area and will give the Members comfort and certainty over the level and location of development that will take place over the lifetime of the Plan.

Gladman have raised concerns in relation to the issues and options being considered by the Council which will fundamentally affect the ‘soundness’ of the Local Plan (with reference to tests of soundness outlined in paragraph 182 of the Framework). If the Local Plan is approached in such a way as presented it will not provide a positive policy approach and in a number of cases it is not consistent with national policy.

Gladman hope that you have found this representation constructive. If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact myself or a member of the Gladman team.

Summary: Gladman would be opposed to the use of Local Gaps if these would only serve to act as an arbitrary tool to prevent sustainable development. In this regard we submit that new development can often be located in local gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character.

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>i, ii, iii, iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments:

Scanned Representation

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).
As the marine planning authority for England the MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for English inshore and offshore waters. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the mean high water springs mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine plan boundaries extend up to the level of the mean high water spring tide mark, there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans which generally extend to the mean low water springs mark. Marine plans will inform and guide decision makers on development in marine and coastal areas. On 2 April 2014 the East Inshore and Offshore marine plans were published, becoming a material consideration for public authorities with decision making functions. The East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans cover the coast and seas from Flamborough Head to Felixstowe. For further information on how to apply the East Inshore and Offshore Plans please visit our Marine Information System. The MMO is currently in the process of developing marine plans for the South Inshore and Offshore Plan Areas and has a requirement to develop plans for the remaining 7 marine plan areas by 2021. Planning documents for areas with a coastal influence may wish to make reference to the MMO’s licensing requirements and any relevant marine plans to ensure that necessary regulations are adhered to. For marine and coastal areas where a marine plan is not currently in place, we advise local authorities to refer to the Marine Policy Statement for guidance on any planning activity that includes a section of coastline or tidal river. All public authorities taking authorisation or enforcement decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area must do so in accordance with the Marine and Coastal Access Act and the UK Marine Policy Statement unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise. Local authorities may also wish to refer to our online guidance and the Planning Advisory Service soundness self-assessment checklist.

Minerals and waste plans and local aggregate assessments

If you are consulting on a mineral/waste plan or local aggregate assessment, the MMO recommend reference to marine aggregates is included and reference to be made to the documents below:

- The Marine Policy Statement (MPS), section 3.5 which highlights the importance of marine aggregates and its supply to England's (and the UK) construction industry.
- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which sets out policies for national (England) construction minerals supply.
- The Managed Aggregate Supply System (MASS) which includes specific references to the role of marine aggregates in the wider portfolio of supply.
- The National and regional guidelines for aggregates provision in England 2005-2020 predict likely aggregate demand over this period including marine supply.

The NPPF informed MASS guidance requires local mineral planning authorities to prepare Local Aggregate Assessments, these assessments have to consider the opportunities and constraints of all mineral supplies into their planning regions - including marine. This means that even land-locked counties, may have to consider the role that marine sourced supplies (delivered by rail or river) play - particularly where land based resources are becoming increasingly constrained.

If you wish to contact the MMO regarding our response please email us at consultations.mmo@marinemanagement.org.uk or telephone us on 0300 123 1032.

Summary:

As the marine planning authority for England the MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for English inshore and offshore waters. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the mean high water springs mark, which includes...
the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine plan boundaries extend up to the level of the mean high water spring tides mark, there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans which generally extend to the mean low water springs mark. Marine plans will inform and guide decision makers on development in marine and coastal areas. On 2 April 2014 the East Inshore and Offshore marine plans were published, becoming a material consideration for public authorities with decision making functions. The East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans cover the coast and seas from Flamborough Head to Felixstowe. For further information on how to apply the East Inshore and Offshore Plans please visit our Marine Information System. The MMO is currently in the process of developing marine plans for the South Inshore and Offshore Plan Areas and has a requirement to develop plans for the remaining 7 marine plan areas by 2021. Planning documents for areas with a coastal influence may wish to make reference to the MMO's licensing requirements and any relevant marine plans to ensure that necessary regulations are adhered to. For marine and coastal areas where a marine plan is not currently in place, we advise local authorities to refer to the Marine Policy Statement for guidance on any planning activity that includes a section of coastline or tidal river. All public authorities taking authorisation or enforcement decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area must do so in accordance with the Marine and Coastal Access Act and the UK Marine Policy Statement unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise. Local authorities may also wish to refer to our online guidance and the Planning Advisory Service soundness self-assessment checklist.

Change to Plan  N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).
Re: Proposed Submission Documents - Publication for Representations in Relation to Soundness (18 April - 31 May 2016)

Thank you for your letter dated 14th April 2016 regarding the above consultation. We have had the opportunity to assess the letter and consultation documents and can offer the following advice. Please note we have provided comments on the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies within a separate letter to you dated the same. This follows two previous consultations and our comments dated 25th February 2015 and 24th November 2015.

In terms of our general comments:
Recent Guidance from Historic England

We have recently published guidance on The Historic Environment in Local Plans and the Historic Environment and Site Allocations. Where we have not made comment below some additional guidance on ensuring a positive strategy for the historic environment is secured within the Felixstowe Area Action Plan can be seen by following these links:


In terms of our specific comments:

### Housing Sites

**FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street, Felixstowe (451g)**

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the possible impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings, Grade II* Listed Walton Hall and Grade II Listed 362 High Street. We highlighted that the principal elevation of Walton Hall faces north and overlooks site 451g. It was considered that development here would urbanise the setting of this important, highly designated heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance. It was expressed that harm would also be caused to the Grade II lodge and we strongly advised that an alternative site was found for development, though it was thought that there may be scope for some limited development at the eastern end of this site.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site, the site remained within the plan at the Preferred Options stage. The policy however was amended and highlighted that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street. Whilst this went some way to allay our concerns we recommended that whilst it is considered the site can take a level of development there would be detrimental harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings if the whole site is developed. To that end, we advised that if the site remained in the Plan that the western end of the site is left relatively undeveloped to help protect the setting and it is considered that this side of the site might lend itself to fulfil the Public Open Space requirement.

We very much welcome the additional text at paragraph 3.75, second sentence which highlights the need to take account of the heritage assets and their setting through an appropriate design and layout. We also welcome the addition of the words ‘and their setting’ in bullet point 11 of policy FPP4.

However, given the fact that no reference is made to the need to leave the western end of the site undeveloped, as currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy.

Paragraph 157 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Plans to provide “detailed 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).

In order to provide greater clarity, there should be wording in the Policy that requires Open Space to be located at the western end of the site to help protect the setting of the Listed buildings, or, at the very least, this should be considered as part of the Masterplanning process.

**FPP5: Land north of Conway Close, Felixstowe (502e)**

At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the acknowledgment of the Listed Buildings and the requirement that development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings within the policy. We also suggested 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 wording in Policy FPP5 bullet point 4 to this effect.

**FPP6: Land opposite Hand in Hand Public House, Trimley St Martin (451b)**

In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Hand in Hand public house and Nos 251 and 253 High Road). We therefore encouraged you to identify alternative sites if at all possible so that the setting of these two buildings might be...
protected.

Although Historic England raised concerns regarding the development of this site it is acknowledged that this site remains within the plan. However, it is also acknowledged that the policy requires a village green to be included within the scheme. The village green is to front High Road in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the Hand in Hand public house and this is particularly welcomed. At Preferred Options stage, we considered 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 note that the policy still does not include this requirement (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.88.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

FPFP7: Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin (451c and 451d)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of the two Grade II listed churches and the Grade II listed Old Rectory. Whilst we welcomed the inclusion of the consideration of the setting of the rectory within the Preferred Options policy, we advised that the setting of the churches should also be included. We also considered 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 references in paragraph 3.104 and Policy FFP7 bullet point 7 to the setting of the churches and high quality developments, sympathetic to the character of the area and Listed Buildings.

FPFP8: Land off Thurmans Lane, Trimley St Mary (383f and 451f)
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns in respect of the site due to the impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. At the Preferred Options stage we considered 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 note that this has not been included in the policy (this is inconsistent with many of the other policies in the Plan) although the text does include some reference to design elements at paragraph 3.111.

As currently drafted, the plan is unsound in terms of its effectiveness, deliverability and consistency with national policy. 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).

In order to make the plan sound and to ensure internal consistency within the document, the policy should include wording that requires development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area and existing Listed Buildings.

Town Centre
FPFP13: Felixstowe Town Centre and FFP14: Retail Frontages
As outlined within our response to you dated 25th February 2015 it is considered these policies should cover conservation and design issues. It is considered the policies should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. We are therefore very pleased to note the inclusion of this in both policy FFP13 and FFP14.

District Centres
FPFP16: District Centres
As above in previous consultations we advised that this policy should cover conservation and design issues. It should highlight the contribution the Historic Environment makes to the economic success of district centres and seek to protect and enhance both the setting of historic assets and assets themselves. Although no mention is made of the contribution of the Historic Environment to the economic success of centres, we do note that the policy does now include reference to the retention and restoration of historic shopfronts which is to be welcomed.

Tourism and Sea Front Activities

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).
We welcome the inclusion of a section which covers tourism and seafront activities. Following our recommendation to include reference to heritage tourism at the Preferred Options stage, we welcome the inclusion of the final sentence of Paragraph 6.03 which addresses this point. On a very minor grammatical point, we would suggest the replacement of the word 'on' with 'to'.

FFP18: Felixstowe Ferry and Golf Course, FFP19: Felixstowe Ferry Golf Club to Cobbolds Point, FPP20: Cobbolds Point to Spa, FPP21: Spa to Martello Park and FFP22 Martello Park to Landguard
We continue to welcome and support the acknowledgement and required protection of the historic qualities of these sections of the coast and agree that separate policies are helpful to cater for the varied requirements of these different stretches of coastline.

FFP23: Car Parking
At the Preferred Options stage we welcomed the 'high quality of design' requirement relating to replacement car parking at point 6.36 on page 72 but recommended that this requirement should be included within the policy itself to give it more weight in decision making. We therefore welcome the inclusion of reference to high quality design within Policy FFP23 of the Proposed Submission document.

The Environment
At the Preferred Options stage, we welcomed the inclusion of a section on the Historic Environment which sits separately from landscape and ecological elements. We also welcomed the section on Locally Listed Buildings and Features. We suggested that the Historic Environment section should also highlight Felixstowe's archaeology and so we very much welcome the addition of paragraphs 7.04 and 7.05 concerning archaeology.

As we raised in the consultation on the Preferred Options, we note that there are still no individual policies on the Historic Environment proposed for the Area Action Plan itself, relying instead on saved policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy does not have a specific historic environment policy, with certain aspects covered in other policies such as SP15 (Landscape and Townscape) and DM21 (Design Aesthetics) and policies for specific settlements. It is considered that there still is a lack of a clear strategy relating to the Historic Environment, relating to local issues, at present, and we would encourage greater clarity.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend that the District Council provides clarification on its position towards the historic environment within this document and the overall Local Plan. A background paper for the Submission stage of the Plan might be helpful in this respect, but more importantly the drafting of a specific heritage policy that helps with decision-making on development proposals. This should set out the Council’s approach to the management of designated and non-designated heritage assets (including archaeology) and how issues such as heritage at risk will be tackled. It is considered that a Historic Environment Policy could be locally specific to cover the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan.

Felixstowe South Conservation Area
We continue to have concerns regarding the lack of an inclusion of a policy or even text to address Felixstowe South Conservation Area which is At Risk. We would refer you to the conservation area survey carried out by Historic England in 2015 and subsequent report 'Felixstowe South Conservation Area' commissioned by Historic England and undertaken by Place Services which highlights some of the issues and possible strategies for addressing the issues.

We therefore reiterate our previous comments as follows, it would be advantageous if the Area Action Plan identified specific policies to help remove it from the register. These might include utilising the conservation area appraisal to...
identify locally important buildings that contribute positively to the conservation area, and introduction Article 4 directives to protect such buildings. There may also be sites which are considered negative contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the preparation of development briefs for such sites might help bring forward positive redevelopment. The conservation area survey identified the loss of architectural detail as a significant problem, and consideration might therefore be given to applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a Townscape Heritage programme for the area, or a smaller partnership scheme with Historic England to reinstate lost architectural details on key buildings etc.

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment". The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157).

The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing, regeneration, town centres or employment development. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary. At the same time, a specific historic environment policy is encouraged as it helps to emphasise and implement the "positive strategy" required by the NPPF. Such a policy should be locally specific and reflect the historic environment of the local area, mindful that the Planning Policy Guidance advises against repetition and reiteration of national policy.

There are references to the historic environment in a number of site specific policies. The Core Strategy provides a broad overview of heritage issues. However, there are still matters that are not adequately addressed. There is currently a lack of clarity in terms of how decision-makers should consider development proposals in light of historic environment issues, other than in relation to specific sites.

As it currently stands, we consider that the plan is lacking in soundness with regards to its approach to the historic environment and is not consistent with national policy including paragraphs 17, 126 and 156.

In order to make the AAP sound, we recommend the inclusion of a policy which tackles the issues at Felixstowe South Conservation Area.

FPP26: Areas to be Protected from Development
In our response to you dated 25th February 2015 we expressed concerns regard the inclusion of all the sites in Trimley St Martin which would in effect surround a number of Listed Buildings including Grade II listed churches, the Grade II listed Old Rectory and Grade II Listed Building Mill Farmhouse. We recommended the inclusion of an area to be protected from development which would protect the remaining green wedge and as a result protect the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. To this end, the green wedge within Trimley St Martin identified at the Preferred Options stage and still included within the Proposed Submission Document as an Area to be Protected from Development is particularly welcomed and supported.

FPP27: Historic Park and Garden
We welcome the inclusion and the content of this policy.

Other Issues
Coastal Change Management and Areas of Flooding
At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

For information and for further policy consultation please note our new consultation email address for the East of England, eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk <mailto:eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk>.

Summary: At Preferred Options stage we welcomed the inclusion of this section but suggested further reference to flooding and the historic environment. To that end, we welcome the addition of the last sentence in paragraph 8.07 of the Proposed Submission document.

Change to Plan N/A

Legal? Not Specified
Sound? Not Specified
Duty to Cooperate? Not Specified
Soundness Tests 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).
### 7828 Support

| Other Issues | 8.07 |

**Attachments:**
Scanned Representation

---

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).
The document does not appear to have considered the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) issued in May 2014. As reference to this plan is made in para. 156 of the NPPF, we consider that the IDP is relevant to consider in context of the AAP.

Summary:
The document does not appear to have considered the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) issued in May 2014. As reference to this plan is made in para. 156 of the NPPF, we consider that the IDP is relevant to consider in context of the AAP.

Change to Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments:
the proposed physical limits boundary of Bucklesham village or indeed any settlement within the Suffolk Coastal District could not possibly have been appropriately reviewed and re-drawn given the Council's failure to provide for full, objectively assessed housing needs over the Plan period. Moreover, the 'sustainability' assessment carried out by the Council and carried through into text as paras 3.113-3.115 (inclusive) of the Plan, was superficial, incorrect and bore no relation to the facts as they exist on the ground.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Christchurch Land and Estates (Felixstowe) Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Christchurch") are the promoters of the land at Candlet Road Felixstowe (hereinafter referred to as "the site") edged red on the plan attached as Annexure 1. A planning application reference DC/15/1128/OUT was refused by the Council on 12th June 2015 and is now the subject of an appeal.

1.2 It is confirmed in paragraph 4.28 of the adopted Local Plan (July 2013) with our emphasis added that "4.28 Felixstowe with Walton is by far the largest town within the District and includes the port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, being of both regional and national significance....."

It is considered that the site is a potential urban extension to Felixstowe ("the largest town within the District").

1.3 The site is in a highly sustainable location for the growth of Felixstowe (to address housing need), and should therefore, in our opinion, be allocated as part of the preferred strategy in accordance with the principles of sustainability set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

1.4 Christchurch consider that the Council is failing to address the full objective assessment of housing need (FOAN) for the District, which contention is supported by the land at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, Suffolk appeal decision letter, appeal reference 3011466, paragraphs 14 to 28 (attached as Annexure 3).

1.5 Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework considers that for a plan to be considered "sound" it should be "positively prepared", and that it should meet objectively assessed development needs. In failing to address the objectively assessed need, the Area Action Plan is not "positively prepared".

1.6 The approach to distributing the growth of Felixstowe (one of dispersal), as the strategy in the Area Action Plan document, is not considered the appropriate strategy for the future development needs in the Peninsular. The Council has failed to advance any proper or sufficient analysis to support its proposed approach as opposed to allocation of a significant (and sustainable) urban extension such as the Candlet Road growth area (abutting the Felixstowe settlement boundary).

1.7 Accordingly, and by reference to paragraph 182 of the Framework, it cannot be concluded that the Area Action Plan is;

"justified",
"the most appropriate strategy",
"consistent with national policy" (paragraph 52).

1.8 The submissions made by Christchurch earlier this year relating to the site also contained a detailed response to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (31st March 2014) and the corresponding consideration of site suitability in the emerging Plan.

1.9 The Candlet Road site has not been allocated in the Area Action Plan, therefore in terms of the emerging Plan, the site is an "omission site".

It is submitted that the Council has failed to properly assess appropriate alternative sites in their Sustainability Appraisal Report Proposed Submission Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Development Plan Document (April 2016) to ensure that the most sustainable sites come forward.

1.10 Thereby compounding our concern that the Area Action Plan is not "justified".

2. FULL OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED HOUSING NEED

2.1 The requirement of 7,900 dwellings as set out in Policy SP2 of the adopted Core Strategy is now considered to be out of date as the process of review stipulated within the policy (to review the Core Strategy by 2015 at the latest) has not been commenced. Given that the requirement of 7,900 is both out of date, and fails to reflect the full objectively assessed need for housing (FOAN), the emerging plan should be proceeding on the basis of an up to date review of housing need (as recognised by the Core Strategy itself). That the figure of 7,900 is out of date has been recognised by the Inspector in the Framlingham appeal decision. It is considered that the current FOAN for the District is between 15,000 (750 per annum) and 22,360 dwellings (1,118 per annum) for the period 2011 to 2031.

2.2 Sustainably located sites need to be identified to ensure that the FOAN is met.
2.3 The proposed approach in the Area Action Plan is neither justified nor positively prepared. The development needs of the District will not be met.

3. THE GROWTH STRATEGY IN THE AREA ACTION PLAN

3.1 The growth of Felixstowe, as proposed in the Area Action Plan, is not considered the most appropriate strategy for the future development needs in the Peninsular, and there is no proper or sufficient analysis to support the dispersed approach adopted by the Plan.

3.2 The site at Candlet Road, together with other land holdings, should be considered the most sustainable growth option for the town.

3.3 The adopted Local Plan (July 2013) confirms at paragraph 4.28;

"4.28 Felixstowe with Walton is by far the largest town within the District and includes the port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, being of both regional and national significance....."

3.4 Paragraph 4.31 of the adopted Local Plan confirms;

"4.31 The growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one...."

3.5 The site at Candlet Road Felixstowe (as part of a sustainable urban extension) is in a position to "redress" this imbalance identified at paragraph 4.31 of the adopted Local Plan.

3.6 It is, further acknowledged, at paragraph 4.35 of the adopted Local Plan that;

"4.35 Long term, it is likely that additional housing will need to be provided......"

3.7 Strategic Policy SP21 of the adopted Local Plan confirms (with our emphasis added);

"The strategy for Felixstowe will be to reverse the recent trends towards a population in balance, threats to local services and a decline in the fortunes of the town in order to enable it to fulfil its role as a major centre......."

"Additional housing will be created. In the short to medium term, this will represent organic and evolutionary growth in the Felixstowe and Trimleys area over a mixture of sites immediately abutting existing built up areas......"

3.8 Whilst adopted Local Plan policy SP21 refers to a "strategy for a dispersed pattern of future development" it is submitted that such an approach is not sustainable and also does not accord with the thrust of strategic policy SP21 by recommending development "immediately abutting existing built up areas....".

3.9 Policies SP1 and SP1A of the adopted Local Plan seek the achievement of sustainable development.

3.10 With regard to Felixstowe, the 2013 Local Plan confirms:

"4.28 Felixstowe with Walton is by far the largest town within the district and includes the Port of Felixstowe, a strategic employment site, being of both regional and national significance....." (with emphasis added).

"4.29 Felixstowe has more people of retirement age and fewer people of working age than the norm, either in the rest of Suffolk or across the UK......"

"Younger generations already have to look outside Felixstowe for careers and housing" (with emphasis added).

"4.30 The population of Felixstowe is increasing slowly although household size is falling. Despite slow population growth there are, therefore, even more people looking for homes, and Felixstowe has more small households - single people or couples - particularly those that are key workers or first time buyers. The number and type of new homes provided in the town over recent years has not matched this increase in demand".

"4.31 The growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one......" (with emphasis added).

3.11 On the 27th February 2015, Christchurch made submissions to the then emerging Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies and the Felixstowe Peninsula Area Action Plan, relating to the site.
3.12 The February submissions referred to a Council report to the Local Development Framework Task Group on the 4th August 2008 (LPTG11/08). The Council's consideration of the ("option 4") land north of Candlet Road Felixstowe stated:

"on the whole option 4 has significant merit. It represents a good sustainable option that benefits from existing formal and informal recreational areas to the east as well as access to the town centre. It is also the closest area to the town centre and development might also ensure a stronger and more viable town centre given the increased usage of facilities there...the landscape, particularly the western part, is the least sensitive of all of the option and the existing wildlife corridor in the east can be built upon as part of a strategy of enhancing green infrastructure".

3.13 The 2008 Council Report confirms Christchurch's contention that the site (combined with other land holdings) is a highly sustainable location for growth, being immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary and close to a range of services and facilities within walking and cycling distance, therefore should be an allocated site.

3.14 The site (combined with other land holdings) is not a preferred allocation for residential development despite Core Strategy Policy SP21 confirming that (with our emphasis added)

"additional housing will be created"

"over a mixture of sites immediately abutting existing built up areas" and to

"create a more sustainable balance between housing and employment thereby providing an opportunity to reduce commuting"

3.15 Paragraph 4.31 of the adopted 2013 Local Plan confirms:

"4.31 The growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, means that employment is now out of balance with the availability of housing. As a result, more of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe, even if they would like one.

The 2001 Census revealed that there was a daily net inflow to Felixstowe of 2,719 workers. This comprised an outflow of 3,600 Felixstowe residents to jobs in Ipswich and elsewhere and an inflow of 6,319 who work in Felixstowe but live elsewhere".

3.16 The site (combined with other land holdings) abuts the urban area of Felixstowe, complies with the aims and objectives of adopted Local Plan and creates additional housing to address the "imbalance" set out in paragraph 4.31 (above), constituting "organic and evolutionary growth".

3.17 Whilst adopted Policy SP21 confirms;

"a strategy for a dispersed pattern of future development"

which is continued in the Area Action Plan (the site is not identified as a preferred allocation) it is considered that a "dispersed pattern" is not the most sustainable growth option for Felixstowe.

4. RESPONSE TO THE STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT ("SHLAA") (SITE SUITABILITY)

4.1 The site (potentially part of a larger land assembly) has previously been considered by the Local Planning Authority and with particular regard to the 'Core Strategy - Proposed location of strategic housing growth in Felixstowe and the Trimley villages'.

4.2 As noted above, a Report on this matter was presented to the Local Development Framework Task Group on 4th August 2008 (LPTG 11/08). A copy of the Report is attached as Annexure 2 to these Submissions.

4.3 The site formed one part of a number of recommendations as to which sites should be the preference to the Council for the location of housing growth, indicating a preference toward larger developments, with related infrastructure incorporated into those schemes.

4.4 Appendix 1 to LPTG 11/08 provided some background in reaching that conclusion. Within this Appendix, it is stated that the landscape

't is not particularly attractive. It is, however, visible from a number of locations. Most are close distance and with the introduction of mitigation planting are not significant. The exception will be from the east where the close proximity viewpoints are in elevated locations and the topography would still allow views in to the area'.

4.5 The Appendix also states that

'the landscape in the part of the area to the east of Gulpher Road is more sensitive and shows a lower capacity to
absorb development than the west. It also already has some recreational/green infrastructure value. In an area of current and predicted deficiencies of accessible natural greenspace, this part of area 4 may provide opportunities to address this.

4.6 Whilst only referenced in the Executive Summary to the Appendix, the report states that the site is ‘separated from Felixstowe by the single carriageways of Candlet Road, but has Gulpher Road passing beneath it and the ability for crossings to be created. Development would be close to the town centre. Road access to the Port is easy although sustainable means of travel by cycle or on foot could need to be created’.

4.7 The Council’s summary acknowledged that;

‘on the whole option 4 has significant merit. It represents a good sustainable option that benefits from existing formal and informal recreational areas to the east as well as access to the town centre. It is also the closest area to the town centre and development might also ensure a stronger and more viable town centre given the increased usage of facilities there...the landscape, particularly the western part, is the least sensitive of all of the option and the existing wildlife corridor in the east can be built upon as part of a strategy of enhancing green infrastructure’.

4.8 The conclusion of the SHLAA and the (site suitability) emerging Plan and the Sustainability Report is clearly at odds with the Council’s previous assessment of the site’s merits.

5. THE SUSTAINABILITY OF THE CANDLET ROAD SITE/AREA AND THE COUNCIL’S SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

5.1 Christchurch commissioned Turley to carry out a detailed Sustainability Appraisal of the land north of Candlet Road (February 2015).

5.2 The Sustainability Appraisal confirms that this location is a highly sustainable location for residential development, abutting the main area of Felixstowe, the largest town in the District.

5.3 The Turley Sustainability Appraisal also references the recommendations contained in the 2008 Report where the current Head of Planning Services at the Council confirmed that the land north of Candlet Road Felixstowe presented the most appropriate and sustainable option for the growth of the town.

5.4 It is particularly noted, that officers did not favour the "dispersed pattern of development" as advocated by both the Local Plan (July 2013) and the emerging Plan.

5.5 The Council have prepared a Sustainability Appraisal Report. The Sustainability Appraisal is not adequate, particularly with regard to the way that the Sustainability Appraisal appraises the strategic alternatives. The reasons for selection of the Preferred Options (as opposed to alternatives) are not clear.

5.6 It cannot be concluded that the Council have properly taken into account reasonable alternatives, thereby undermining the soundness of the Plan.

6. ALTERNATIVE SITES (PREFERRED OPTIONS)

6.1 The focusing of housing growth adjacent to Felixstowe represents the most sustainable growth option.

6.2 The most sustainable strategy for accommodation of housing growth at Felixstowe is for new development to be accommodated within the existing limits of the urban area, and then sustainable urban extensions.

6.3 We have raised concerns with regard to the adequacy of the preferred options site selection procedure.

6.4 In addition, there is a concern that certain allocations may, in reality, be undelivered due to heritage constraints Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") obliges the decision maker, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

6.5 In R (on the application of Forge Field Society) v Sevenoaks District Council [2014] EWHC 1896 (Admin), Lindblom J referred to this duty - and the parallel duty under Section 72(1) of the 1990 Act in relation to development within a conservation area - in the following terms with our emphasis added:

"... it is to recognise, as the Court of Appeal emphasised in [East Northamptonshire District Council v Secretary of

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).
State for Communities and Local Government [2014] EWCA Civ 137], that a finding of harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area gives rise to a strong presumption against planning permission being granted. The presumption is a statutory one. It is not irrebuttable. It can be outweighed by material considerations powerful enough to do so.

But an authority can only properly strike the balance between harm to a heritage asset on the one hand and planning benefits on the other if it is conscious of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation and if it demonstrably applies that presumption to the proposal it is considering”.

6.6 Furthermore, paragraph 169 of the Framework requires the Local Planning Authority to have
“up to date evidence about the historic environment in their area and use it to assess the significance of heritage assets and the contribution they make to the environment.....”

6.7 The following allocations suffer from serious constraints associated with designated heritage assets. We have seen no clear evidence which shows that those constraints can be overcome in respect of the following sites;
(a) Policy FPP4: Land north of Walton High Street Felixstowe
"development will need to be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings found at Walton Hall and 362 High Street and their setting"
(b) Policy FPP5 Land north of Conway Close and Swallow Close Felixstowe
(c) Policy FPP7 Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin

7. CONCLUSIONS

7.1 It is considered, for the reasons outlined in this submission, that the land at Candlet Road should be allocated in the Area Action Plan.

7.2 By omitting the site, the Plan would fail to significantly boost housing supply and fail to meet the objectively assessed housing needs of the District (paragraphs 14 and 47 of the Framework).

7.3 It is submitted that the AAP document would be sound - in securing the necessary delivery for infrastructure, and an appropriate delivery of new housing - if land at Candlet Road is allocated for housing as part of an urban extension for Felixstowe.

7.4 The proposed release of land at Candlet Road represents the most sustainable, viable and ultimately deliverable option to achieve the required housing and infrastructure needs for Felixstowe and the surrounding area.

7.5 It is submitted, therefore, that the Candlet Road site should be a preferred location for housing, being an appropriate urban extension to Felixstowe where the other competing sites do not relate as well in terms of connections and accessibility to the town, that against this criteria the Candlet Road site is the most sustainable and appropriate option for the extension (growth) of Felixstowe.

Richard Brown MSc
27th May 2016

Annexures

1. Site plan
2. Local Development Framework Task Group Report on 04/08/08 (LPTG 11/08), together with Appendix 8
3. Land at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, Suffolk IP13 9LH, appeal reference 3011466

Summary: The conclusion of the SHLAA and the (site suitability) emerging Plan and the Sustainability Report is clearly at odds with the Council’s previous assessment of the site’s merits.

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).
It is particularly noted, that council officers did not favour the "dispersed pattern of development" as advocated by both the Local Plan (July 2013) and the emerging Plan. Council have prepared a Sustainability Appraisal Report. The Sustainability Appraisal is not adequate, particularly with regard to the way that the Sustainability Appraisal appraises the strategic alternatives. The reasons for selection of the Preferred Options (as opposed to alternatives) are not clear. It cannot be concluded that the Council have properly taken into account reasonable alternatives, thereby undermining the soundness of the Plan.

Attachments:
- Appeal decision
- Apx8 Appraisal of each option
- Recommended Preferred Options Report Aug2008
- Site Plan
- Scanned Representation
- Representation Form
This representation has been prepared by Strutt Parker LLP on behalf of Pigeon (Trimley) Ltd in respect of land at High Road, Trimley St Martin, also referred to as Alternative Option Site 3022a and now the subject of a planning application to Suffolk Coastal District Council (ref. DC/16/1919/FUL).

The land was put forward in the call for sites and identified as suitable for development in the SHLAA 2014. Representations were made to the earlier drafts of the Felixstowe Peninsular Area Action Plan on the basis that the site is sustainable, available and deliverable, would represent a logical extension to the development limits of the settlement and as such should be included as a Preferred Allocation. Significant site specific information was provided in support of the representation submitted in November 2015 which included the following documents:

* Site Plan;
* Indicative Layout Plan;
* Preliminary Drainage Appraisal October 2015;
* Desk-based Archaeological Assessment;
* Landscape and Visual Assessment;
* Preliminary Ecological Appraisal; and
* Transport Report
* Phase 1 Contamination Report

However, whilst the local planning authority has "noted" the representation they commented that:

"The site has been discounted in the AAP it is not appropriate to show this on the Policies Map which supports the written text."

We consider that this does not adequately assess the previous representation or provide sufficient justification why the Council considered that the site was not a sustainable location and should not be included as an additional allocation in the AAP.

Current Planning Proposal

A planning application for the site has now been submitted (DC/16/1919/FUL). It was made valid on 10th May 2016. The application is a full planning application for the erection of 69 new homes with associated access, landscaping and amenity space on land adjacent to High Road, Trimley St Martin, Suffolk. The application is supported by a series of documents including:

* Planning Statement (PS) prepared by Strutt & Parker;
* Design & Access Statement (DAS) prepared by Strutt & Parker;
* Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) prepared by Liz Lake Associates;
* Transport Statement (TS) prepared by MLM Consulting Engineers Ltd;
* Travel Plan (TP) prepared by MLM Consulting Engineers Ltd;
* Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA), Tree Survey Plan and Tree Protection Plan prepared by Hayden's Arboricultural Consultants;
* Preliminary Ecological Assessment prepared by Basecology;
* Plans and other drawings relevant to the planning application prepared by Parc Design Solutions;
* Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Drainage Strategy prepared by MLM Consulting Engineers Ltd;
* Utility Services Report prepared by MLM Consulting Engineers Ltd;
* Phase 1 Contamination Assessment Report prepared by MLM Consulting Engineers Ltd;
* Archaeological Assessment prepared by Archaeological Risk Management;
* Noise and Vibration Technical Report prepared by MLM Consulting Engineers Ltd;

These demonstrate that as the site is located adjacent to the north western edge of Trimley St Martin it will form a natural extension to the settlement with the proposals for structural landscaping enhancing the countryside edge of Trimley St Martin. Overall, the site lies in a sustainable location which is demonstrably suitable and appropriate to host new housing development.

There are no access or traffic issues identified that would prevent the proposed development coming forward. The application proposals can be accommodated without having an adverse impact on the local highway network in terms of road safety and capacity.

Information provided with the application confirms there are no other adverse impacts arising from development at this site. In fact, the planning application demonstrates that development would bring forward:

* Economic benefits;
* Much needed affordable housing, (41%) in excess of the policy requirement;
* Two large areas of publicly accessible open space, totalling 0.6 hectares, well in excess of the required standard, helping to meet a current deficiency in the area;
* Traffic calming measures in the form of a new pedestrian refuge island that will help to encourage sustainable movement; and
* Possible improvements to an adjacent area of open space that has been the subject of anti-social behaviour.

The Development as proposed clearly constitutes sustainable development; the site is available, deliverable and developable.

On this basis it is considered that the site should be included as an additional site allocation in Table 2, and as an addition to those sites identified in Policies FPP3 to FPP8. Further justification to support this position is set out below.

### Framlingham Appeal

For the purpose of these representations, since the publication of the Proposed Submission Documents, on 25th of April 2016 an Appeal Decision in respect of land at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, Suffolk was issued (APP/J3530/W/15/3011466). This decision related to a residential development of 163 dwellings and was allowed.

Paragraphs 13 to 28 of the decision are considered of particular relevance, in that they established that Core Strategy Policy SP2 is out of date and that, with a housing requirement based on an 0AN of 11,000 dwellings, the district has a housing land supply of less than 3.7 years. This is an important appeal decision and should be afforded significant weight as part of the consideration of these representations. It provides up-to-date evidence that the Proposed Submission Documents are fundamentally flawed and do not seek to allocate sufficient housing sites, to significantly boost the supply of housing over the plan period.

### Legally Compliant

Section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, requires that a local planning authority must only submit a document to the Secretary of State for independent examination where:

a) they have complied with any relevant requirements contained in the regulations under this part, and
b) they think the document is ready for independent examination.

Firstly, the Council is required to demonstrate evidence of having effectively cooperated to plan for cross boundary issues with neighbouring authorities under the "duty to cooperate". It is unclear what evidence the Council has to demonstrate that there has been effective co-operation at this stage of the plan making process.

Secondly, for the reasons set out below in this representation, in respect of housing allocations the Proposed Submission Documents rely on Policy SP2 of the Core Strategy. This is considered to be out-of-date and not based on an up-to-date Objectively Assessed Housing Need for the Suffolk Coastal Council district. More detail on this specific point is set out below. We therefore question whether the proposed strategy is sound and whether the documents are ready for independent examination.

### Soundness

For a local plan to be found sound at examination by an independent inspector the NPPF at paragraph 182 advises that it should satisfy a series of tests which are considered in turn below:

**Positively Prepared**

For a local plan to be considered positively prepared it must be based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed housing development requirements, including the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities.

At the strategic level housing numbers and distribution are set out in the Core Strategy. Objective 2 states:

To meet the minimum locally identified housing needs of the district for the period 2010 to 2027, taking into account existing and future economic, environmental and social opportunities and constraints

In respect of this objective there are two important points to note. Firstly, that the Core Strategy seeks to meet the minimum locally identified housing need, and secondly, that it is a locally identified housing need for the plan period.

Currently, Policy SP2 of the Core Strategy states that provision will be made for at least 7,900 new homes, distributed in accordance with the settlement hierarchy set out in policy SP19. The policy then goes on to commit to an early review in order to identify the full objectively assessed housing needs for the District, to ensure this is met in so far as this is consistent with the policies of the NPPF.

The Examining Inspector's report in respect of the Core Strategy Examination (June 2013) made it clear that an early review was essential because at the time:
"On available evidence at this point the 11,000 new dwellings should be taken as the full, objectively assessed housing need OAN for the District between 2010 and 2027."

At paragraph 46 of the Report the Inspector commented that:

"Even if the theoretical capacity of all the sites included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability assessment (SHLAA), existing commitments, potential brownfield opportunities, allocations carried forward from the previous Local Plan and a windfall allowance were taken into account, the provision would fall some way short of the 11,000 dwellings required."

At this point, the Inspector concluded that, as none of the adjoining Councils had objected to the scale of housing proposed, having a core strategy in place with an early review would be preferable to the alternative of suspension of the examination and the likely withdrawal of the plan.

While it is noted that the Site Allocations and Area Specific DPD Issues and Options consultation commenced in 2015, it is of significant concern that this occurred ahead of the objectively assessed housing needs for the District being reviewed, updated and firmly established. Policy CS2 states:

"An early review of the Core Strategy will be undertaken, commencing with the publication of an Issues and Options Report by 2015 at the latest. The review will identify the full, objectively assessed need for the District and proposals to ensure that this is met in so far as this is consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework."

This review has not been undertaken and we therefore consider that Policy CS2 is out of date and not a sound basis for the Proposed Submission Documents. In addition to Paragraph 47 of the NPPF, paragraph 158 requires that the Local Plan is "...based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence..."

Table 3.1 of the Core Strategy references the need for an extra 11,000 dwellings as identified in the work commission by Oxford Economics (OE) in 2010. It goes on to suggest that the review should identify land to meet the current acknowledged shortfall between the locally assessed requirement and the OE objectively assessed need (OAN). However, this information remains unavailable and the Council does not appear to have published its understanding of the current OAN.

A more recent SHMA was produced in 2012 for the sub-region. This suggested that the need figure for Suffolk Coastal was greater still at 14,200. As a result, there is clearly some uncertainty about what the OAN is for the District.

These concerns were born out at the recent Framlingham Appeal (APP/3530/W/15/3011466). In considering the Council's five-year housing land supply, the Inspector commented that:

"...not to accept that the requirement of 7900 dwellings over the plan period is out of date would be contrary to the clear message in paragraph 47 of the NPPF that local planning authorities should seek to boost significantly the supply of housing."

"The 7,900 dwelling housing requirement is not based on an assessment of the OAN for the District, contrary to paragraph 47 of the NPPF, and is artificially low..."

The Inspector also noted that there was a persistent undersupply of housing against the core strategy requirement over the first five years of the plan period and it was therefore entirely appropriate to apply a 20% buffer to the housing requirement.

The Inspector also commented that:

"...the future for housing growth in the district is seriously uncertain and is not following the plan approach that is advocated in the first 12 core planning principle set out in the NPPF."

The examining Inspector's final conclusion was that:

"...based on an OAN of 11,000 dwellings, as established in the core strategy, or any other realistic prediction of what an OAN for the District is likely to be, housing land supply is less than 3.7 years."

We therefore consider that the Proposed Submission Document's reliance on Policy CS2 is unsound as it does not objectively address the development needs of the District, or neighbouring authorities, and as such cannot be considered to be positively prepared.

Justified

For the plan to be justified it should be the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence. As set out above the Proposed Submission Documents are not considered to be
based on the most appropriate strategy. The plan also appears to be at odds with paragraph 47 of the NPPF, as it will not boost significantly the supply of housing and does not meet the full objectively assessed needs of the district. As such, the publication of the Proposed Submission Documents would appear to be premature in the absence of an agreed assessment.

We consider that it would be appropriate for a focused review of the housing chapter and of the Core Strategy Policy SP2 to set out updated housing numbers and distribution should have occurred, as the Council had committed to at the Core Strategy Examination. This review should be based on a thorough understanding of the OAN, which would then allow sufficient additional, available and deliverable sites; such as our client's land at High Road, Trimley St Martin, which is available now to make a contribution to the delivery of housing within a five year period to be allocated. We therefore consider that Tables 1 & 2 of the AAP should be updated to show the additional contribution that the site could make to housing supply and that the site should be included as an additional allocation in addition to those sites identified in Policies FPP3 to FPP8.

As the Inspector noted in the Framlingham Appeal, an OAN of 11,000 was established in the Core Strategy and currently there is no other published review of what a realistic OAN for the District is likely to be. We therefore consider that at the very least, the Proposed Submission Documents should as a minimum be seeking to allocate sufficient sites to meet the 11,000 dwellings and not the 6,620 as set out in Table 1.

Effective

To be considered effective the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working and cross boundary strategic priorities. Currently, the plan does not include any allowance for cross boundary housing delivery. The unmet need of Ipswich is already known to be in the region of 3,300 dwellings, the Proposed Submission Documents are silent on how this evidenced short fall can be addressed. A 'Draft Memorandum of Understanding has been prepared for the Ipswich Housing Market Area and Ipswich Functional Economic Area. However, there does not appear to be any evidence on negotiations and progress towards completion of this agreement which demonstrates compliance with the duty to co-operate.

Whilst the Council has engaged in discussions with neighbouring councils in the Ipswich Housing Market Area these discussions still appear to be at an early stage. The Local Development Scheme 2015 (LDS) indicates that an Aligned or Joint Local Plan Review will commence in October 2016, with adoption in December 2020. The LDS actually indicated that background evidence gathering started in 2014. This LDS strategy is therefore considered to acknowledge that the adoption of the Proposed Submission Documents is not an effective, deliverable strategy for the plan period, as they are to be immediately replaced by Aligned or Joint Local Plan Review which it is anticipated will be adopted in 2019.

Consistent with National Policy

Paragraph 14 sets out that a ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ is at the heart of the Framework and describes this as 'a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision taking.’ It goes on to state that for plan-making this means:

* Local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area;
* Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change...

There does not appear to be evidence which demonstrates that the Council has sought to positively meet the development needs of the area or to meet its objectively assessed needs.

These requirements are repeated in more detail throughout the Framework. Paragraph 15 requires the presumption in favour of sustainable development to be applied to local plan policies so that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay. We consider that failure to allocate land at High Road, Trimley St Martin, is at odds with this requirement.

The Core Planning Principles set out at paragraph 17 include a set of overarching objectives which should underpin plan making. Of particular relevance to this consultation response are that planning should be:

* Plan-led with up to date plans providing a practical framework for predictable and efficient decisions.
* Not be about scrutiny but be a creative exercise.
* Proactively drive sustainable development to deliver the homes the country needs.

Every effort should be taken to objectively identify and meet the needs of the area. Sufficient land suitable for development, having regard to market signals, should be allocated and we consider that this should include our client’s site.

The reliance on the Core Strategy Policy CS2 and in turn the housing allocations identified in Table 1 and Policy SSP1 does not appear to have full regard to the Core Planning Principles of the Framework.

Paragraph 47 sets out a clear challenge to local planning authorities ‘to boost significantly the supply of housing...’ In
order to achieve this they should ensure that their Local Plan meets the full objectively assessed needs for the area and they should identify and annually update their five year housing supply.

For plan making paragraph 159 reminds local planning authorities that they ‘...should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area.’

The Proposed Submission Documents as currently drafted do not appear to meet these national policy requirements. Actually, they restrict the supply of housing land; and by not taking the opportunity to identify further sites, such as our client's land in Trimley St Martin, risk not fully addressing the District's current lack of 5 year housing land supply.

For the reasons set out above it is considered that paragraphs 1.12, 1.1, 1.14, 3.01, 3.03, 3.04, 3.05, 3.06 and 3.07, Table 1: Housing Provision 2010 - 2027 for the District & Table 2 Housing Contribution 2010 -2015 & Proposed New Housing Delivery and Policy FPP1: New Housing Delivery 2015 - 2027 of the Proposed Submission Document, as currently drafted, are inconsistent with the NPPF.

It is therefore contended that Tables 1 & 2 of the AAP, should be updated to show the additional contribution that land at High Road, Trimley St Martin (Alternative Option Site 3022a) could make to housing supply and that the site should be included as an allocation in addition to those sites identified in Policies FPP3 to FPP8.

As set out above it is considered that the current strategy set out in the Proposed Submission Documents are unsound. The proposed submission of the document would appear to be premature and we consider that the Council should instead consider focusing its efforts on delivering its new Aligned or Joint Local Plan Review. We consider that the Council's priority should be to progress an up-to-date assessment of the objectively assessed housing needs within the Ipswich Housing Market Area so that the District’s OAN, and the requirements to accommodate any unmet need of neighbouring authorities, can be fully quantified.

We consider that if the Proposed Submission Documents are to be progressed, then they should seek to allocate, as a minimum, sufficient sites to meet an OAN of 11,000 dwellings as established in the core strategy. This could be achieved by way of the allocation of further sites, such as our client's land at High Road, Trimley St Martin (Alternative Option Site 3022a), which is clearly available and deliverable as evidenced by the submission of the current planning application DC/16/1919/FUL.

Tables 1 & 2 of the AAP should therefore be updated to show the additional contribution that the site could make to housing supply and that the site should be included as an additional allocation in addition to those sites identified in Policies FPP3 to FPP8.

Summary:

In Appendix 5: The Full SA proformas of all Alternative Options Considered of the Proposed Submission Plan, the proforma for Alternative Option Site 3022a is identical to that contained in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report. It is therefore difficult to see how the Council has addressed our Client’s concerns about the way the site has been scored and the consistency of the scoring compared with those sites identified in Policies FPP3 to FPP8.

As previously submitted we consider the site Alternative Option Site 3022a scores well against the sustainability criteria. The conclusion of the SA states: "The site scores well in terms of economic effects due to its close proximity to employment opportunities and given relatively good public transport provision. The loss of Grade 2 agricultural soil results in a major negative environmental effect. However, there may be scope for mitigation."

The only significant negative effects relate to 'conserving soil resources and quality'. However, it is noted that sites FPP5 to FPP9 also score the same negative effect. It is therefore difficult to understand why our Client's site has not been reassessed and included as an allocation.

Change to Plan
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Attachments:

Scanned Representation

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).
This representation has been prepared in respect of land adjacent to Reeve Lodge, 1 High Road, Trimley St Martin, Alternative Option Site 383b, together with adjoining land (identified on the attached plan).

Alternative Option Site 383b was the subject of representations to the Preferred Options consultation in 2015 and has been dismissed by the Council as a housing allocation in the current proposed submission Area Action Plan (AAP) document.

However, in light of the need for the Council to significantly boost housing supply, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), it is considered that a more ambitious approach to growth within the AAP area would be appropriate, and that this land should be reconsidered within this context.

Alternative Option Site 383b (and surrounding land) is located approximately 1.8 miles from strategic employment opportunities at the Port of Felixstowe as well as other local services and facilities. It is well served by public transport and new homes in this location and has the potential to reduce the need for car journeys and encourage sustainable transport behaviour.

The land also has many characteristics in common with sites that have been proposed for housing allocation within the submission version AAP and it is considered that the site is capable of contributing towards sustainable development. It is considered that the AAP should be more ambitious in order to meet local housing need and it would be appropriate for the site to be reconsidered based on the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the fact that the AAP, as currently drafted, will not fully meet the District's objectively assessed housing needs.

Since the publication of the Proposed Submission Documents, on 25th of April 2016, an Appeal Decision in respect of land at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, Suffolk was issued (APP/J3530/W/15/3011466). This decision related to a residential development of 163 dwellings and was allowed.

Paragraphs 13 to 28 of the decision are considered of particular relevance, in that they established that Core Strategy Policy SP2 is out of date and that, with a housing requirement based on an OAN of 11,000 dwellings, the district has a housing land supply of less than 3.7 years. This is an important appeal decision and should be afforded significant weight as part of the consideration of these representations. It provides up-to-date evidence that the Proposed Submission Documents allocate sufficient housing sites, to significantly boost the supply of housing over the plan period.

For a local plan to be found sound at examination by an independent inspector it should satisfy a series of tests which are considered in turn below:

Positively Prepared

For a local plan to be considered positively prepared it must be based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed housing development requirements, including the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities.

At the strategic level housing numbers and distribution are set out in the Core Strategy. Objective 2 states:

To meet the minimum locally identified housing needs of the district for the period 2010 to 2027, taking into account existing and future economic, environmental and social opportunities and constraints

In respect of this objective there are two important points to note. Firstly, that the Core Strategy seeks to meet the minimum locally identified housing need, and secondly, that it is a locally identified housing need for the plan period.

Currently, Policy SP2 of the Core Strategy states that provision will be made for at least 7,900 new homes, distributed in accordance with the settlement hierarchy set out in policy SP19. The policy then goes on to commit to an early review in order to identify the full objectively assessed housing needs for the District, to ensure this is met in so far as this is consistent with the policies of the NPPF.

The Examining Inspector's report in respect of the Core Strategy Examination (June 2013) made it clear that an early review was essential because at the time:

"On available evidence at this point the 11,000 new dwellings should be taken as the full, objectively assessed housing need OAN for the District between 2010 and 2027."

At paragraph 46 of the Report the Inspector commented that:

"Even if the theoretical capacity of all the sites included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability assessment (SHLAA), existing commitments, potential brownfield opportunities, allocations carried forward from the previous Local Plan and a windfall allowance were taken into account, the provision would fall some way short of the 11,000 dwellings required."
At this point, the Inspector gave consideration to suspending the Examination. However, he concluded that, as none of
the adjoining Councils had objected to the scale of housing proposed, having a core strategy in place with an early
review would be preferable to the alternative of suspension of the examination and the likely withdrawal of the plan.

While it is noted that the Site Allocations and Area Specific DPD Issues and Options consultation commenced in 2015,
this occurred ahead of the objectively assessed housing needs for the District being reviewed, updated and firmly
established. Policy CS2 states:

"An early review of the Core Strategy will be undertaken, commencing with the publication of an Issues and Options
Report by 2015 at the latest. The review will identify the full, objectively assessed need for the District and proposals to
ensure that this is met in so far as this is consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework."

This review has not been undertaken and Policy CS2 would therefore appear to be out of date and not a sound basis for
the Proposed Submission Documents. In addition to Paragraph 47 of the NPPF, paragraph 158 requires that the Local
Plan is "...based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence..."

Table 3.1 of the Core Strategy references the need for an extra 11,000 dwellings as identified in the work commissioned
by Oxford Economics (OE) in 2010. It goes on to suggest that the review should identify land to meet the current
acknowledged shortfall between the locally assessed requirement and the OE objectively assessed need (OAN).
However, this information remains unavailable and the Council does not appear to have published its understanding of
the current OAN.

A more recent SHMA was produced in 2012 for the sub-region. This suggested that the need figure for Suffolk Coastal
was greater still at 14,200. As a result, there is clearly some uncertainty about what the OAN is for the District.

These concerns were born out at the recent Framlingham Appeal (APPJ3530/W/15/3011466). In considering the
Council's five-year housing land supply, the Inspector commented that:

"...not to accept that the requirement of 7,900 dwellings over the plan period is out of date would be contrary to the clear
message in paragraph 47 of the NPPF that local planning authorities should seek to boost significantly the supply of
housing."

"The 7,900 dwelling housing requirement is not based on an assessment of the OAN for the District, contrary to
paragraph 47 of the NPPF, and is artificially low...."

The Inspector also noted that there was a persistent undersupply of housing against the core strategy requirement over
the first five years of the plan period and it was therefore entirely appropriate to apply a 20% buffer to the housing
requirement.

The Inspector also commented that:

"...the future for housing growth in the district is seriously uncertain and is not following the plan approach that is
advocated in the first 12 core planning principle set out in the NPPF."

The examining Inspector's final conclusion was that:

"...based on an OAN of 11,000 dwellings, as established in the core strategy, or any other realistic prediction of what an
OAN for the District is likely to be, housing land supply is less than 3.7 years."

It is therefore considered that the Proposed Submission Document's reliance on Policy CS2 is unsound as it does not
objectively assess the development needs of the District, or neighbouring authorities, and as such cannot be considered
to be positively prepared.

Justified

For the plan to be justified it should be the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives,
based on proportionate evidence. As set out above the Proposed Submission Documents are not considered to be
based on the most appropriate strategy. The plan also appears to be at odds with paragraph 47 of the NPPF, as it will
not boost significantly the supply of housing and does not meet the full objectively assessed needs of the district. As
such, the publication of the Proposed Submission Documents would appear to be premature in the absence of an
agreed assessment.

We consider that it would be appropriate for a focused review of the housing chapter and of the Core Strategy Policy
SP2 to set out updated housing numbers and distribution, as the Council had committed to at the Core Strategy
Examination. This review should be based on a thorough understanding of the OAN, which would then allow sufficient
additional, available and deliverable sites; such as Alternative Option Site 383b, together with adjoining land, to be
considered for allocation.

As the Inspector noted in the Framlingham Appeal, an OAN of 11,000 was established in the Core Strategy and currently there is no other published review of what a realistic OAN for the District is likely to be. We therefore consider that at the very least, the Proposed Submission Documents should as a minimum be seeking to allocate sufficient sites to meet the 11,000 dwellings and not the 8,620 as set out in Table 1.

Effective

To be considered effective the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working and cross boundary strategic priorities. Currently, the plan does not include any allowance for cross boundary housing delivery. The unmet need of Ipswich is already known to be in the region of 3,300 dwellings, the Proposed Submission Documents are silent on how this evidenced short fall can be addressed. A 'Draft Memorandum of Understanding has been prepared for the Ipswich Housing Market Area and Ipswich Functional Economic Area. However, there does not appear to be any evidence on negotiations and progress towards completion of this agreement which demonstrates compliance with the duty to co-operate.

Whilst the Council has engaged in discussions with neighbouring councils in the Ipswich Housing Market Area these discussions still appear to be at an early stage. The Local Development Scheme 2015 (LDS) indicates that an Aligned or Joint Local Plan Review will commence in October 2016, with adoption in December 2020. The LDS actually indicated that background evidence gathering started in 2014. This LDS strategy is therefore considered to acknowledge that the adoption of the Proposed Submission Documents is not an effective, deliverable strategy for the plan period, as they are to be immediately replaced by an Aligned or Joint Local Plan Review which it is anticipated will be adopted in 2019.

Consistent with National Policy

Paragraph 14 sets out that 'a presumption in favour of sustainable development' is at the heart of the Framework and describes this as 'a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision taking.' It goes on to state that for plan-making this means:

* "Local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area;
* " Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change..."

There does not appear to be evidence which demonstrates that the Council has sought to positively meet the development needs of the area or to meet its objectively assessed needs.

The Core Planning Principles set out at paragraph 17 include a set of overarching objectives which should underpin plan making. Of particular relevance to this consultation response are that planning should be:

* "Plan-led with up to date plans providing a practical framework for predictable and efficient decisions.
* " Not be about scrutiny but be a creative exercise.
* "Proactively drive sustainable development to deliver the homes the country needs."

Every effort should be taken to objectively identify and meet the needs of the area. Sufficient land suitable for development, having regard to market signals, should be allocated and this could include Alternative Option Site 383b, together with adjoining land.

The reliance on the Core Strategy Policy CS2 and in turn the housing allocations identified in Table 1 and Policy SSP1 does not appear to have full regard to the Core Planning Principles of the Framework.

Paragraph 47 sets out a clear challenge to local planning authorities ‘to boost significantly the supply of housing...’ In order to achieve this they should ensure that their Local Plan meets the full objectively assessed needs for the area and they should identify and annually update their five year housing supply.’

For plan making paragraph 159 reminds local planning authorities that they ‘...should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area.’

The Proposed Submission Documents as currently drafted do not appear to meet these national policy requirements. Actually, they restrict the supply of housing land; and by not taking the opportunity to identify further sites, such as Alternative Option Site 383b, together with adjoining land, risk not fully addressing the District’s current lack of 5 year housing land supply.

For the reasons set out above it is considered that the AAP, as currently drafted, is not consistent with the NPPF. As set out above it is considered that the proposed submission of the AAP document would appear to be premature and we consider that the Council should instead consider focusing its efforts on delivering its new Aligned or Joint Local Plan Review. We consider that the Council’s priority should be to progress an up-to-date assessment of the objectively assessed housing needs within the Ipswich Housing Market Area so that the District’s OAN, and the requirements to
We consider that if the Proposed Submission Documents are to be progressed, then they should seek to allocate, as a minimum, sufficient sites to meet an OAN of 11,000 dwellings as established in the core strategy. This could be achieved by way of the allocation of further sites, such as Alternative Option Site 383b, together with adjoining land. It is considered necessary that we attend the examination hearing session to contribute to the debate in respect of the soundness of the strategy set out in the LDS and discussions regarding the appropriate OAN for the District. In addition, we would want to be able to contribute to discussions around the necessary modifications to the AAP.

Finally, we would wish to be able to present evidence to the Inspector to demonstrate that Alternative Option Site 383b, together with adjoining land, represents a sustainable location for development, is available and deliverable.

Yes, assessment of Alternative Option 383b within the SA does not adequately assess the site, which has the potential to contribute towards meeting the District's objectively assessed housing needs and help boost housing supply.

Summary: Assessment of Alternative Option 383b within the SA does not adequately assess the site, which has the potential to contribute towards meeting the District's objectively assessed housing needs and help boost housing supply.
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Attachments:
Full Text: Developing SA objectives, Page 50
It will not increase the affordability for all social groups.
8. It will not improve the satisfaction of people with their neighbourhood as a place to live or increase access to natural green spaces.
14. It will affect traffic volumes and will not reduce greenhouse gases.
It will not improve the landscape.

AAP Objectives, Page 56
12. It does not enhance the countryside.
14. There will be a reduction in air quality.

It is not justified because the density of the proposed homes in the Trimleys is not sustainable. In addition it increases greenhouse gases and valuable arable land is lost to the nation.

It is unsound because with the passage of time the residential area of the Trimleys will be completely urbanized and surrounded by road / rail links to the Port of Felixstowe emitting nitrogen dioxide 24/7 with a busy main road running through the centre. the villages will lose their individual identity and to all intents and purposes merged with Felixstowe. The Trimleys do not deserve the foregoing and the proposed number of homes should be spread across the District.

Summary: The density / scale of the proposed homes in the Trimleys is not sustainable in terms of some specific SA and APP objectives.

Change to Plan

No No No No ii

Attachments:
Unjustified - Census 2001 - 2011 show a reduction in population on the Peninsula of 384. This was never considered -
despite promises to do so. Housing figures represent 108% inward migration to the area.
Felixstowe area already has a 5 year plan, other areas do not and FPAAP merely seeks to "mop up" shortfalls in other
areas, where affordable houses are in greater need. Felixstowe is cheaper housing than in many other areas.
This is a policy of no proven justification and should be stopped in its entirety.
Councillors and officials have cherry-picked findings, many of them going against their desire to build, have been
ignored. Consultees, with provable reasons to not support the LDF and Core Strategy have been ignored or treated with
contempt.
Poor representation by our elected and unelected officials has been rife.
Sustainability Appraisal - see all comments on page 6.
Air pollution from congestion has not been properly examined re the "creeping baseline" of so many new houses and
their cars, etc.
Loss of greenfield areas do not "enhance" an area. Neither does traffic congestion and air pollution "promote" it - both of
which the FPAAP and SCDC state as an objective of new developments.

Councillors and officials have cherry picked findings, many of them going against their desire to build, have been
ignored. Consultees, with provable reasons to not support the LDF and Core Strategy have been ignored or treated
with contempt. Poor representation by our elected and unelected officials has been rife.
Policy FPP1: New Housing Delivery 2015 - 2027, and supporting text (paragraphs 3.01 - 3.23)

This representation is submitted, on behalf of the landowners, in respect of land at High Road, Trimley St Martin, Alternative Option Site 3022b.

Alternative Option Site 3022b was the subject of representations to the Proposed Submission consultation in 2015. The representations to the earlier drafts of the Felixstowe Peninsular Area Action Plan were made on the basis that the site is sustainable, available and deliverable, and that it should be included within the Area Action Plan (AAP) either as an allocation or as a reserve site to come forward in the event that other identified sites fail to deliver housing during the plan period.

In response to these earlier representations, the authority has commented that: 'the site has been discounted in the AAP it is not appropriate to show this on the Policies Map which supports the written text'. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) report accompanying the AAP comments that the site is 'poorly related to existing settlement boundaries' and that 'allocation of the site would constitute development in the countryside'. However, it is considered that this assessment provides insufficient justification for why the site has been omitted from the AAP, it does not accurately assess the site, and crucially it is based upon the housing growth requirements set out in the adopted Core Strategy, which do not provide the District's full objectively assessed housing need.

Site 3022b is in close proximity to employment opportunities and good public transport provision, a fact that is acknowledged in the SA, which scores the site well against SA objective 14. 'to reduce the effects of traffic on the environment'. The SA comments that the site scores well in terms of major positive effects due to its 'potential to encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth', reflecting its good access to local services and facilities. The SA identifies that the main negative effect associated with the site is that it 'appears remote from Trimley St Martin being surrounded by agricultural land and lying outside the built area'. However, this fails to acknowledge that the site lies opposite existing residential development (Nos. 410-414, High Road) and has well defined landscape boundaries.

It is clear from the SA that the site has many advantages over some of the proposed allocations, and it is considered that there are no known obstacles to it coming forward for development. It is in a sustainable location and could deliver much needed housing, including affordable housing.

It is therefore considered that site 3022b should be included on the basis that it is both sustainable and available. It is also considered that the AAP should be more ambitious in order to fully meet the District's objectively assessed housing need and in order to help boost housing supply in the area.

We consider that site 3022b has the potential to make a positive contribution towards housing delivery either as an additional allocation to help boost local housing supply, or alternatively as a reserve site to be brought forward in the event that other sites identified within the AAP fail to deliver the requisite amount of housing during the Plan period. On this basis it is considered that the site should be included as an additional site allocation in Table 2 (or alternatively as a reserve site), and as an addition to those sites identified in Policies FPP3 to FPP8. Further justification to support this position is set out below.

Since the publication of the Proposed Submission Documents, on 25th of April 2016, an appeal in respect of land at Fairfield Road, Framlingham, Suffolk has been allowed (APP/J3530/W/15/3011466), relating to a residential development of 163 dwellings.

Paragraphs 13 to 28 of the appeal decision are considered of particular relevance, in that they established that Core Strategy Policy SP2 is out of date and that, based upon the Core Strategy housing target, the district has a housing land supply of 3.7 years. This highlights that the AAP does not seek to allocate sufficient housing sites to boost the supply of housing over the plan period. The decision also highlights that the Core Strategy does not provide for the District's full objectively assessed housing need.

For a local plan to be found sound at examination it should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy.

For a local plan to be positively prepared it must be based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed housing development requirements, including the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities.

Policy SP2 of the Core Strategy states that provision will be made for at least 7,900 new homes, distributed in accordance with the settlement hierarchy set out in policy SP19. The policy also commits to an early review in order to identify the full objectively assessed housing needs for the District, to ensure this is met in so far as this is consistent with the policies of the NPPF. However, at the time that these representations are submitted no such review has been undertaken and it is therefore considered that the plan, as currently drafted, has not been positively prepared.

This point was echoed at the recent Framlingham Appeal (APP/J3530/W/15/3011466) where the Inspector also noted that there was a persistent undersupply of housing against the core strategy requirement over the first five years of the plan period and it was therefore entirely appropriate to apply a 20% buffer to the housing requirement. This point reinforces the need to allocate additional sites to help boost housing supply and ensure that housing need is met in the event of under delivery.

For the plan to be justified it should be the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence. As set out above the Proposed Submission Documents are not considered to be based on the most appropriate strategy as they will not boost housing supply, as required by paragraph 47 of the NPPF, and are not based upon an up-to-date assessment of housing need in the District.
To be considered effective the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working and cross boundary strategic priorities. Whilst the Council has engaged in discussions with neighbouring councils in the Ipswich Housing Market Area these discussions still appear to be at an early stage. The Local Development Scheme 2015 (LDS) indicates that an Aligned or Joint Local Plan Review will commence in October 2016, with adoption in December 2020. The LDS strategy would therefore appear to reinforce that the adoption of the Proposed Submission Documents is not an effective, deliverable strategy, as they are proposed to be replaced by an Aligned or Joint Local Plan Review which it is anticipated will be adopted in 2019.

Paragraph 14 of the NPPF sets out that ‘a presumption in favour of sustainable development’ is at the heart of the Framework and describes this as ‘a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision taking.’ It goes on to state that for plan-making this means:

* "Local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area;"

* "Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change..."

As stated above it does not appear that the AAP as currently drafted will meet the development needs of the area or the District's objectively assessed needs.

We do not therefore consider that the Proposed Submission Documents can be considered to be consistent with national planning policy. The AAP as currently drafted appears to be restricting the supply of housing land; and by not taking the opportunity to identify further sites, such as site reference 3022b, will not resolve the Districts current lack of 5 year housing land supply.

In light of the above, it is considered that Policy FPP1: New Housing Delivery 2015 - 2027 of the Proposed Submission AAP, should be updated to show the additional contribution that land at High Road, Trimley St Martin (Alternative Option Site 3022b) could make to housing supply and that the site should either be included as an allocation in addition to those sites identified in Policies FPP3 to FPP8, or identified as a reserve housing site.

As set out above it is considered that the current Proposed Submission Documents are unsound.

If the Proposed Submission Documents are to be progressed, then they should seek to allocate, as a minimum, sufficient sites to meet an OAN of 11,000 dwellings as established in the Core Strategy. This could be achieved by way of the allocation of further sites, such as Alternative Option Site 3022b.

The AAP should therefore be updated to show the additional contribution that the site could make to housing supply and that the site should either be included as an allocation in addition to those sites identified in Policies FPP3 to FPP8, or identified as a reserve housing site.

It is considered necessary that we attend the examination hearing session so that we can contribute to discussions around the necessary modifications to the AAP that are referred to within this representation.

Finally, we would wish to be able to present evidence to the Inspector to demonstrate that land at High Road, Trimley St Martin (Alternative Option Site 3022b) represents a sustainable location for development, and that it is both available and deliverable.

The Sustainability Appraisal fails to adequately assess Alternative Option Site 3022b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change to Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appear at exam?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** The Sustainability Appraisal fails to adequately assess Alternative Option Site 3022b.