

## **SCDC Town Council planning workshops 2006**

The Following document contains a record of the Council's workshops with the district Town Councils over the period August to October 2006. The theme for these workshops was to discuss the specific local town issues for the Local Development Framework (LDF) and they formed part of the Council's continuing community engagement. The feedback gained from the workshops has been made publicly available and will be used to inform the production of the documents contained in the LDF.

The workshops included the following Town Councils:

Framlingham Town Council  
Felixstowe Town Council  
Kesgrave Town Council  
Leiston Town Council  
Saxmundham Town Council\*  
Aldeburgh Town Council  
Woodbridge Town Council

December 2006

## Framlingham Town Council LDF Workshop 22/08/06

### *Agenda items:*

#### *LDF allocations -*

- 1) New cemetery*
- 2) Drill Hall, New Road*
- 3) Bibbys/Walnes site redevelopment*
- 4) land at the former railway line, south Framlingham*
- 5) car parking and schools*
- 6) Station Road physical limits boundary*

- 1) The Town Council explained that there is a priority need in Framlingham for an additional cemetery. Two potential sites were identified by the Town Council which may have some relevance. The criteria which would be needed is that the site involves cheap land, within close proximity to both the church and the town centre to ensure it is accessible. An extension to the existing cemetery is not an option due to there being no suitable adjacent land available.

Firstly, the land parcel adjoining Brook Lane and Vyses Road was proposed although it was acknowledged that the presence of the flood zones here could be a significant constraint.

An alternative area was identified along Infirmary Lane, towards the south east of the existing cemetery. It was acknowledged that the access lane would probably need considerable improvements.

The Town Council are looking to the District Council to allocate a site for a new cemetery in the LDF to enable them to purchase the land at a practical cost. Alternatively, the Town Council may investigate the possibility of a Compulsory Purchase Order with the District Council to

- 2) The Drill Hall is situated along New Road towards the north of the town centre. This land is part of a previous Local Plan housing allocation in the town the majority of which has been built out. Currently the remainder of the site is occupied by a local business premises and the Hall itself which has been disused for approximately 6 months. The local business premises has been the subject of a withdrawn planning application (CO4/2003) in 2004 for housing development. Subsequently, a veterinary practice has moved in to part of the business premises.

The Framlingham District Development Trust had previously attempted to purchase the Drill Hall site with the intent to continue and promote a community facility use. However, the site was purchased by another developer and currently remains dormant. The Town Council maintain that the Drill Hall is a community facility which holds a lot of local demand which there is currently no substitute facility in the town.

Another significant issue within the town was car parking. The Town Council felt that there are currently inadequate provisions within the town and the growth resulting from the LDF will exacerbate this problem. It was felt that the Drill Hall is an exceptionally useful building and should be preserved for community use whilst the adjacent local business premises could be suitable for car parking.

The Town Council are looking to the District Council to retain the Local Plan policy protecting community facilities (AP88) into the LDF policies. In addition, the Town Council wishes the District Council to consider future car parking sites within the town including the Drill Hall site.

- 3) The Town Council acknowledged the need for the town to accommodate growth although expressed this should be done with some prudence. This is because there is some considerable concern regarding the infrastructure of the town to facilitate growth, as well as the danger of the dormitory effect which could adversely impact the town's self contained character. It was explained that the District Council will be in consultation with the relevant service providers throughout the LDF process.

The Town Council agreed that Framlingham would be best suited to an increase of up to 200 houses (including the 60+ proposed at Castle Brooks) under the LDF plan period. The vacant Bibbys/Walnes site represented a good brownfield site opportunity. The Town Council felt that the best use of the site would be a mixed use, phased development consisting of a 50/50 split between housing (including community use) and light industrial. The housing element should be located closest to the town centre. A more intensive industrial use would be unsuitable as the road network to/from the town from the A12 is inadequate. It was also expressed that the frontage of the site to Station Road should be of a good quality design as this is the main gateway route to the town.

***The Town Council expressed that Framlingham could accommodate up to 200 additional houses under the LDF plan period. Due to the nature of the site, it was agreed that the Bibbys/Walnes site was a good strategic development option under current policy and that a mixed use of housing/light industrial with a quality design would make best use of the site.***

- 4) The site is located at the southern most edge of Framlingham and is currently an unused employment allocation under the existing Local Plan. The issue is whether this employment allocation should be maintained in the LDF process. The Town Council felt that this location should not be considered unless there is an insufficient amount of employment provision created at the Bibbys/Walnes site redevelopment.

The Council felt that this employment provision is no longer necessary. However, it should be considered if there are limited amounts of employment space provided from the re-development of the Bibbys/Walnes site redevelopment.

- 5) The Town Council have raised the issue that car parking provision in the town is over capacity. This situation will likely worsen with the proposed LDF growth unless additional provision can be found. The School Governors are proposing a possible solution would be to relocate Sir Robert Hitchams Primary School at College Road. The School Governors are aware that this school is already operating over capacity and have proposed that relocation to land opposite Thomas Mills High School on Saxtead Road would enable the primary school to expand sufficiently.

It is suggested that moving the primary school from College Road would free up a parcel of land ideal for car parking in the town. The site is located in close proximity to both the existing town centre.

In addition, the Town Council has also suggested that the local business premises, adjacent to the Drill Hall, New Road has the potential to serve a suitable car parking purpose.

***The Town Council seek that the District Council look in to the issue of additional car parking within Framlingham. It is proposed that the LDF considers allocating the land opposite the high school at Saxtead Road for educational use and the existing primary school at College Road for car parking use.***

- 6) It was discussed as to whether the now built up employment area to the East of Station Road should be included within the physical limits boundary of Framlingham. The Town Council agreed that this area justifies inclusion within the boundary.

**The Town Council agreed the employment land to the East of Station Road, should be included within a revised physical limits boundary for Framlingham.**

## Felixstowe Town Council LDF Workshop 29/08/06

Agenda items:

- 1) *Future development issues*
- 2) *David Lock Felixstowe Strategy*
- 3) *Felixstowe Area Action Plan*
- 4) *Relationship to the Port*
- 5) *Town centre issues*
- 6) *Conservation areas*
- 7) *Sport and Leisure*

1. Discussion opened with an explanation of the levels of housing development required across the district from the emerging RSS. 3,200 for Ipswich Policy Area – 7000 remainder of district. Information provided in the context of the work on the Core Strategy the purpose of which is to look at the broad scale and distribution of development rather than individual sites.

Possible distribution of housing development explained in the context of the suggested settlement hierarchy i.e. that a measure of new development could be expected to be provided at all of the main settlements i.e. urban areas, market towns and key service centres. The bulk of the new provision likely to be concentrated at the main urban centres.

With regard to housing numbers, it is accepted that there is only limited scope for provision within/adjacent to Felixstowe itself and that it will inevitably affect the Trimleys. Proportional split not known at present.

It was a strongly held view that existing employment uses in and around the town should be retained in employment use.

The LDF will need to take on board the housing requirements set out in the RSS and development is accordingly expected across the district's main settlements. The majority of new provision is expected at the main urban centres and it is recognised that there is a limited scope for provision within/adjacent to Felixstowe itself. Also, existing employment allocations should continue to be protected/retained.

2. David Lock Study – The Council has accepted the findings of the study in relation to the need to look for higher levels of growth to support a strategy for regeneration. In relation to the LDF flexibility to look at planning for additional growth over and above that set in the RSS. LDF Task Group have indicated that this higher level of growth is what they would like to see. Additional growth linked to the two urban areas. In relation to Felixstowe maintaining development at RSS level roughly equates with David Lock scenario 3; additional growth above RSS level would roughly equate to David Lock

scenario 4. Progress with achieving housing numbers would need to be monitored and phased for example in relation to the provision of flood defence works.

Debate over possible loss of caravan parks if David Lock study accepted and whether alternative sites would need to be provided. Accepted economic assessment would need to be undertaken, to help determine this. Some concern also that any redevelopment of these sites would lead to a loss of open space.

The LDF will take into consideration the findings of the David Lock Felixstowe study. Higher levels of growth are expected to be needed in order to regenerate the town.

3. Taking study forward much of the detail of development will be dealt with by means of Felixstowe Action Plan. This will look at schools, health services, infrastructure etc also housing mix and employment. Agreement on levels of development being sought and their phasing may help to influence the thinking of those running education provision, health provision etc. With an ageing population needs will change.

The Felixstowe Area Action Plan will set out the detail of the more specific development issues and dialogue will need to be maintained with key service providers.

4. General agreement that more needs to be done to re-kindle links and contacts between the town and the Port at all levels. On the practical side a short range public transport link between the two might help. Also need agreement on shared vision for Felixstowe and the Port.

Port has physically encroached closer to the town over the last 20 years, but road links mean workers etc have no reason to visit town. Concern expressed at impact of Port on housing at Adastral Close and whether or not it would be practical, or desirable to relocate residents away from this environment and for site to be used for employment purposes. Applications for new housing in this area recently rejected due to unacceptable living environment. It was noted however that this community has a very strong and vibrant community spirit.

Further work will need investigation as to the potential to develop better links between the town and the Port.

5. The key issue on the town centre policies is that boundary has been drawn so tightly in adopted plan that the centre has no room to expand. Suggestions for new plan to allow inclusion of Highfield Road/Victoria Street area. Some acceptance that existing centre is somewhat disjointed.

More needs to be done to encourage an evening/night time culture. Could include extending shopping hours to say 8pm. Also introducing new uses into the centre. If Vision is to encourage younger people to stay and live in the town then more needs to be done to cater for their needs. The future of the cinema was one example raised.

Concern expressed at leakage of uses away from the town centre to neighbouring residential areas. Recent examples include vets, physiotherapists, solicitors etc. Cost of rents within and outside of town centre thought to be one reason why this is happening.

The Town Council felt that the town centre boundary would need extending to include Highfield Road/Victoria Street. There was also a need to promote the evening/night time culture in the town by introducing new uses into the area.

6. Conservation area boundary. No issues raised in relation to existing conservation area but some discussion as to the merits or otherwise of introducing Article 4 direction to further control replacement windows for example. No decision reached with regard to use of Article 4, but agreement that quality of design was more important than type of material in these situations.

Request for the District Council to investigate the modernist housing area at Cliff Road to see if it merits being designated a conservation area in its own right. Also to see if any of the remaining houses are worth listing. Concern expressed that the best example of a modernist house in the area had recently been demolished.

The Town Council would like to see investigation as to whether the housing area around Cliff Road would justify a conservation area designation.

7. Sport and Leisure. Would like new plan to identify a site for a major sport and leisure facility. Town is currently only reaches playing field standard through use of school facilities. View was taken that the town should not be reliant on this. Site that looks to combine clubs of different sports such as rugby and football rejected. Allocation of site would extinguish hope value for site for other uses making it more economic to provide.

Audit required for all sports pitches to ascertain need, and quality. Audit also required of quality of play equipment. Accepted that some new provision would be provided alongside new housing development.

The Town Council would seek the LDF to allocate a site for sport and leisure use at Felixstowe. There is an identified local need and an allocation would enable the playing field playspace standard to be enhanced in the town.

## **Kesgrave Town Council LDF Workshop 04/09/06**

*Agenda items:*

- 1) *Future Development*
- 2) *Infrastructure*
- 3) *Employment*
- 4) *Car parking*
- 5) *Open Space*
- 6) *Community Facilities*
- 7) *Energy policies*

1. Discussion opened with an explanation of the levels of housing development required across the district from the emerging RSS. 3,200 for Ipswich Policy Area – 7000 remainder of district, for the period to 2021.

Ipswich Policy Area includes land in a rough semi-circle around Ipswich as well as the town itself. Within SCDC it covers the parishes of Brightwell, Foxhall, Kesgrave, Little Bealings, Martlesham, Nacton, Playford, Purdis Farm, and Rushmere St Andrew.

The Council is in discussion on housing numbers and associated issues with colleagues in Ipswich Borough. No meetings have been held as yet with the other parishes within the IPA area. They will however be offered the chance of meetings with council officers once the Preferred Options document is published for consultation later this year.

With regard to possible Ipswich northern by-pass it was confirmed that a study was currently being undertaken of E-W traffic movements, but this is not due to report until early next year. If a by-pass scheme were considered to be the answer its provision would be long term and beyond the time frame for this plan.

KTC were advised to contact Ipswich BC direct to obtain a copy of that Council's Options Report published very recently and within time-scale for them to make formal response if they so wish.

If SCDC requirements remain the same as stated in RSS, then subtracting completions and outstanding planning permissions there remains a need to allocate land for approximately 900 new dwellings in the IPA, i.e. approximately 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of size of Grange Farm again. How and where those units are provided is up for discussion. No decisions taken as yet. Later discussion revealed preference by KTC for development south of Grange Farm over a northern expansion north of A1214.

It was confirmed that all sites put forward to the Council for consideration wherever they are located would need to be assessed, for the Council to then come to a decision on its Preferred Options.

It was confirmed that increasing numbers of units over and above the 3,200 (approx.) permitted at Grange Farm would require the KT Community Plan to be up-dated or re-written.

The housing and density mix of the new units would be based on a local assessment of what is required. 1/3<sup>rd</sup> could be expected to be affordable and would be distributed throughout the development – not concentrated in geographical terms.

Request made for additional housing provision for the elderly, including bungalows. Providing this type of accommodation will free up other housing in the locality for younger families. Using Bovis experience, there is a demand for this type of accommodation. Would rather see proper dwellings than “park home” type units.

If housing is to be provided at higher densities, then it is essential it is made easy for people to access the wider countryside.

It was agreed that new provision in a single large site rather than a series of small sites would be more likely to achieve a reasonable level of associated infrastructure provision. Increasing the numbers of units provided over and above, the 900 RSS requirement may bring additional benefits again i.e. critical mass for additional road improvements, other community services/facilities provision. 1200-1500 new units is generally considered sufficient to require the provision of a new primary school.

It was confirmed that the Foxhall household waste site is due to close in 2024 and be turned into a country park. It is logical to consider this longer-term facility as part of the growth scenarios currently under discussion.

On the wider situation, it was a general consensus that it will be important to provide a measure of new housing at other settlements such as the market towns at a level to meet their needs also.

The LDF will look towards the Ipswich Policy Area (IPA) including Kesgrave, to provide a key role in meeting the required housing levels set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy. It was also acknowledged that greater housing levels may be an option which can support improved

2. The additional 900 units would need to be accompanied by new or improved infrastructure provision. It would be up to the developer to pay for this and for its provision to be conditioned as part of the planning permission /legal agreement. LDF offers opportunity for SCDC, KTC and community to get the development right from the start, by listing local priorities. Development would be expected to comply with development brief (s) to be drawn up to ensure development took place in a co-ordinated fashion

Discussions known to be on-going at the moment in relation to High School provision across Ipswich given the growth proposed. Catchment areas including that for Kesgrave High School may well change over time. Suggestion for a new 6<sup>th</sup> Form college also being discussed.

Council confirmed that the new plan would be drawn up in consultation with the police, PCT and other bodies.

It is considered necessary that the local infrastructure will need improvement. The LDF will draw up development briefs for key sites in the area so that the local priorities can be set out from the outset.

3. Concern that any major expansion in the area should be accompanied by some associated employment provision. It was acknowledged that significant levels of employment exist at Martlesham and Ipswich. There is an outstanding allocation for an extension of the BT site. This is expected to remain in the new plan.

The difficulty of attracting small businesses or service uses into the existing Grange Farm development was acknowledged. Concern was expressed that these difficulties should not be used as an excuse not to try for employment provision in the future. May need to think about the range of uses attracted to the district centre and provide another smaller complementary centre as part of any new development.

The LDF will have to take into account employment issues for any future growth. A major housing expansion will need to be accompanied by some associated employment provision – perhaps attracting a whole

4. Concern expressed that insufficient parking is being provided. Parking courts are not used, people preferring to parking on-street. It is estimated that around 75% of properties on Grange Farm have had their garages converted to living accommodation so exacerbating parking problems. In some instances where shared drives have been provided this has resulted in practice with individuals having to reverse past their neighbours houses. Greater consideration needs to be given at the design stage to the practicalities of these types of layout. As the population matures and young children become youths there will be an increased requirement again for additional parking provision. Young children are willing to walk or bike. Once old enough they want cars

There is an identified need for greater car parking in the area and further consideration should be given to car parking issues in the design stage of any development schemes.

5. General consensus that when providing new open space, that a smaller number of larger sites is preferable to a greater number of small ones. Range and quality of facilities within larger sites is better. Suggestion was made for the new development that a single large site similar to the Millenium Sports Ground (MSG). Using SCDC standards, it is estimated that for a population the size of Kesgrave a further 21 acres of open space should be provided, in addition to any required to serve the new development. Extending the MSG could provide for one such large public open space area. The woodland areas/corridors should also be retained.

The Town Council feel that there is a current under-provision of open space in the local area. Additional open space should be provided particularly with any potential growth scenarios. It is felt that larger open space areas which offer a range of activities/facilities is more appropriate

6. Request also made to look for land for use as allotments and cemetery. Allocating land for these uses may help ensure their provision.

It was generally agreed that community integration to date was happening but it is a slow process. The provision of community facilities and careful routing of access ways could help speed up the process. Will be equally important in relation to new development. Kesgrave has been described as a town where no-one lives but only comes home to sleep. Concern that this image/reality needs to change by providing facilities to encourage people to integrate/get involved.

Some discussion in relation to Foxhall Stadium. Acknowledged it is a community facility that would be difficult to successfully re-locate.

The Town has asked that the LDF consider the potential for new allotment and cemetery provisions in the area. Provision of additional community facilities is also welcome and would be expect to contribute towards integrating the local community.

7. New homes should be more energy efficient. Suggestion for allowing solar panels etc. It was noted that RSS policy requires larger developments to reduce their carbon rating by 10% and to use a % of re-cycled materials. Most of these measures are however dealt with under the building regulations which are being updated all the time. Development brief could however include reference to these types of issues.

The Town Council was keen to see issues relating to energy efficiency and sustainable construction methods addressed in the LDF.

## Leiston Town Council LDF Meeting 12/9/06

### *Agenda Items:*

1. *Update on progress with Local Development Framework*
2. *Nuclear safeguarding zone*
3. *Potential LDF allocations – Sizewell*
  - Haylings Road*
  - St Margarets Crescent*
  - Aldeburgh Road*
  - Roberts Road Housing*
  - Employment*
  - Transport*
  - Sizewell*
  - Healthy Living Centre*
  - Schools*
  - Town Centre*
  - Tourism*

- 1) A quick update was discussed on the progress of the LDF. The first document to be produced will be the Core Strategy which will deal with strategic issues across the district, to be accompanied by a raft of generic development control policies.
- 2) Following an earlier presentation by Mike Robbins from the NII to a meeting of the Town Council, attended also by Council Officers, it was made clear that a safeguarding policy will remain in place for the foreseeable future. The extent to which this will limit new development within and around the town remains unclear. A recent application for 6 houses was rejected in response to comments from the HSE. No objection was raised in response to the much larger development at Colonial House. The Town Council have asked for this latter application to be referred for judicial review but no response received to date.
- 3) Potential LDF Allocations

When considering the future of the town and possible development options, the Town Council noted that its priorities for the next Plan period are to:

- concentrate on serving the needs of the existing population,
- improve the quality and range of community facilities and the vitality and viability of the town centre; and
- Improving the quality of the physical environment.

Tourism is not a use they would wish to see specifically promoted however, incremental growth in this sector would be welcomed.

*Sizewell* –The Town Council expressed an interest in getting the hamlet of Sizewell designated as a conservation area. It was explained that designation of such areas could

be pursued at any time either directly by the Town Council themselves, or through the District Council by applying direct to English Heritage. Officers had however previously looked at this area but noted that several of the properties had been extensively altered or extended. It was known that a number of property owners would be likely to object.

***The Town Council would wish to pursue the possibility of designating the hamlet of Sizewell a conservation area but preferably via the District rather than the Town Council.***

Sizewell A – A brief discussion was held regarding the future of this site following decommissioning. It was explained that whilst the site comprised brownfield land that it was sited within the AONB and therefore any built development would need to of “national interest”.

***No action required on this issue through the LDF***

*Former railway station area* - The Town Council support the idea of a new railway station being provided to serve the town. The Town Council suggested one such site for this may be the former gas works site on Carr Road. They would also wish to see a restriction on development on the former railway line given its historic interest linked to the Garrett era. A request was made to look at the possibility of extending the conservation area to incorporate adjacent houses some of which have remnants of historic walls.

***The Town Council would wish to see land allocated for a new railway station within the town; a restriction on development taking place on the former railway line; and a possible extension to the conservation area designation in the vicinity of the former railway station.***

*St Margarets Crescent* – This site comprises the existing recreation ground and open land adjacent to it, but located within the physical limits boundary of the town. The possible future use of this site was considered as part of a wider discussion on the potential of the town to provide additional housing within the plan period having regard to the nuclear safeguarding issues. It was concluded that if additional housing is to be provided within the town there would also be a need for additional recreation provision. On balance the Town Council would prefer to see this site allocated for recreational use/public open space use, building on that already provided by the existing recreation ground.

***The Town Council would wish to see land at St Margarets Crescent allocated for recreational/public open space use.***

*Roberts Road* – This is also a greenfield site set within the physical limits of the town, but considerably smaller than that at St Margarets Crescent. The Town Council considered

that this site did offer potential for residential development Their preference would be for a wholly affordable housing scheme but recognised that as a site in private ownership an element of market provision is likely to have to be included.

***Subject to safeguarding restraints, the Town Council would wish to see land at Roberts Road allocated for housing to include a substantial proportion of affordable housing.***

*Allotment site Haylings Road* – This site is currently used for allotments and lies outside the existing physical limits boundary of the town. It therefore comprises a greenfield site. Its potential for any form of development would require replacement allotments being provided. The potential of this site for housing development was considered having regard to the more stringent safeguarding limits which apply to other parts of the town. A strong justification would need to be put forward to allocate this site for market housing. If however the housing need is for affordable housing this site could be looked at as a possible exceptions site in accordance with policy.

***It is the view of the Town Council that they would not wish to promote this site for general market housing through the LDF***

*The former Caravan Park – King Georges Avenue.* This site is currently vacant. Located between the industrial estate and housing and within the physical limits of the town it represents an important brownfield site capable potentially of a range of development options. Housing was not considered to be an option however as the site is located within the main exclusion zone. Alternative options included lorry parking if access could be achieved via the industrial estate. In particular it was thought that the shower and toilet facilities remained on site. The option also provided for coaches to park here. The site was also considered suitable for some form of recreation use.

It was further noted that if the Haylings Road site were to be allocated for development this site provided a possible alternative siting for the allotments which would be lost.

***It is the view of the Town Council that the former caravan park be considered for use as either a lorry/coach park, subject to access being provided through the adjacent industrial park; or for some form of recreation use; or a mix of both.***

*Abbey Road Employment Allocation* – The Town Council considered it important that this allocation be retained.

***It is the view of the Town Council that this employment allocation should be continued into the new plan.***

The Town Council asked if an assessment could be done of The Old School Leiston and its wider setting to see if it could be listed for its architectural and/or historic interest. or for the conservation area to be extended via Recreation Cottages. The Town Council are happy to provide documentation to support this assessment.

***The Town Council requested that consideration be given to amending the conservation area boundary in the vicinity of the Old School and to the possible listing of The Old School.***

*Pocket Park* - No specific site was identified for this type of facility but as part of the Town Council's commitment to seeking to improve the local physical environment the provision of such a facility was supported. Should such a facility be provided it was accepted that long term maintenance was likely to fall to the Town Council.

***The Town Council requested that the District Council consider allocating a site for a pocket park.***

## **[informal] Saxmundham Town Council\* LDF Workshop 14/09/06**

*\*This meeting was conducted on the basis that the views of those members of the Town Council present were not to be taken as the formal views of Saxmundham Town Council.*

Agenda items:

- 1) Infrastructure
- 2) Land to the East of the River Fromus
- 3) The Old Bus Station site
- 4) Boundary of the town
- 5) Middle school

1. Councillors raised concerns that basic utility facilities have reached their maximum capacity. They were informed that, as part of the LDF process, there would be a meeting with the utility providers. This will influence the phasing and location of any new development. Elsewhere in the District development has had to be held back in the past until improvements to certain utilities had taken place.

In terms of the new residential development envisaged for market towns, a smaller scale of housing development e.g. 100-150 is envisaged. Potential benefits of such development could be open play space, more shopping, school extensions.

There is a need for the LDF to take into account the issues of local infrastructure to support development but it is expected that Saxmundham could accommodate a development of around 100-150 houses.

2. There is a current planning application. The Council has refused an application on the grounds of prematurity. Since this site was designated in the Local Plan, national policy on housing has changed. Local authorities are advised to look at brownfield sites (ie. previously development sites) before Greenfield sites. This is a greenfield site.

It is in the detail of the scheme the Town Council has concerns about. There is only one access to the site off Church Street. The possibility of access of Street Farm Road involving the provision of a mini roundabout at the junction with High Street was discussed. However, discussions with the Highway Authority indicate that, because of poor visibility to the north coming out of Street Farm Road, traffic lights would be a better option. The Town Council does feel that this is preferred option for any significant development at Saxmundham.

The LDF will need to look in more detail at the potential to allocate land to the East of the River Fromus as a future housing site. In particular, issues of site access will need further consideration. This site may be proposed as a preferred option at Saxmundham.

3. The old bus station site in Saxmundham is currently classified as a brownfield site. The Town Council members present felt it would be beneficial for the town if this site was developed for a community use such as a resource centre or library. There is a need for such a facility in the town.

The LDF should consider the need for an additional community resource in Saxmundham with the old bus station being a previously development potential site for this.

4. It was discussed that the town in the past 20 years has experienced a large amount of growth with development such as Brook Farm.

Members of the Town Council who were present felt that the physical limits of the town should remain the same as presented in the existing Local Plan. However, there is a discrepancy in that the employment site on the western side of the town and adjacent to the A12 is included within the defined physical limits. This area of land should be removed from Saxmundham physical limits boundary.

The LDF should ensure that the physical limits of Saxmundham are not changed from current with the exception of the Rendham Road employment site which has not been developed and should be removed from the boundary.

5. There was a brief discussion about the school whereby Town Council members present commented that they had not heard anything about the future of the school. They were advised that the County Council as the education authority was reviewing all Suffolk schools and that SCDC officers would be meeting them in the future as part of the LDF process.

It was noted that the LDF will need to take into consideration the plans for the revision of the education system in the local area.

## Aldeburgh Town Council LDF Workshop 18/09/06

Agenda items:

LDF allocations -

- 1) *Future development*
- 2) *Garrett Era Area*
- 3) *District Centres*
- 4) *Car parking*
- 5) *Employment*

1. An initial discussion was had more generally about the LDF process and the timings of document production. It was acknowledged that the LDF will need to set out the longer term relationship with regard to what happens to the east and west sides of the town. When discussion was had to the future physical limits boundary of Aldeburgh, it was expressed that that the existing boundary should be retained. The Town Council felt that development would only be considered as affordable housing 'exception' sites outside of the physical limits boundary.

The Town Council would like to see the physical limits boundary of Aldeburgh remain the same. The only exception being for affordable housing 'exception' sites.

2. Aldeburgh Town Council felt that the existing attractive area known as the 'Garrett Era Area' should be protected and is worth considering for designated conservation area status.

The LDF process should consider the merits of designating the 'Garrett Era Area' as a conservation area.

3. Discussion followed about the potential for the provision of a new district centre based around the existing CO-OP Solar store. It was suggested that a public realm square could be provided with shop units occupying the nearby garage and laundry sites. It was acknowledged that perhaps a form of mixed use development would make the project more viable but this would likely need some further investigation. There is an issue however, with not wanting to lose the existing utility shops.

The LDF should look at the potential for the creation of a new district centre in the area central to Aldeburgh near the existing supermarket.

4. The Town Council identified a car parking issue within the town as on-street car parking causes problems of access to carparks and re-cycling areas for lorries servicing the sites. The Town Council have suggested that perhaps an informal use of the frontage or the shingle area may alleviate the problem during the summer.

The LDF should take into the account the traffic and car parking issues within the town when considering any future development or enhancement options.

5. The Town Council felt that there was no scope for future development in the town but that new housing provision if it was provided could probably have access to employment within the nearby towns of Saxmundham and Leiston.

The LDF should consider the issues for local employment when considering new development. It is possible that there may not be new employment opportunities within Aldeburgh.

## Woodbridge Town Council LDF Workshop 02/10/06

Agenda items:

LDF allocations -

- 1) *Riverside*
- 2) *Future development of the town*
- 3) *Tourism (function of the town)*
- 4) *car parking*

1. A discussion was held with regard to the key role the Woodbridge Riverside area has to the town. The town Council felt strongly that the current emphasis on protection of employment (policy AP245) in the area should be maintained. The current policy allows for small scale B1 uses or leisure/recreational uses. In addition, B2 employment use will be acceptable where this relates to boat building or marine related activities.

It was also discussed that the Riverside area attracts a considerable amount of pedestrian activity to the south of the town. The Town Council therefore saw it appropriate that consideration should be given to enhancement of the link between the town centre and the Riverside area.

In recognition of the unique role the Riverside area has to Woodbridge and the surrounding area, the Town Council felt that the Woodbridge Riverside area should be identified as a key area, incorporating its own specific policies, in the Local Development Framework.

The Town Council would seek for the current employment protection of the Woodbridge Riverside area to remain. In addition, there could be enhanced through better links with the town centre and formally identified as a key area for the Local Development Framework.

2. It was acknowledged that the Local Development Framework is seeking to accommodate a proportion of the identified district housing requirements in market towns. It was also agreed that carefully located and appropriate development could provide a contribution into improving the vitality of the town. However, it was also recognised that physically, the town is very constrained in terms of development opportunity, without encroaching upon the historical A12 boundary.

The Town Council felt that perhaps a modest growth in housing numbers would be appropriate to the town. They indicated two possible areas where this might be possible. Firstly, there may be a small potential to extend the south-western edge of the town towards Martlesham village. However, it was important to maintain the 'green buffer' between the settlements. Secondly, it was highlighted that development may be appropriate in the north-eastern edge across Woods Lane but remaining enclosed by the A12. However, it was acknowledged that this area was more related to the village of Melton than Woodbridge town.

The Town Council felt that any future housing numbers to the town should be modest. There may be some potential to develop the south-west and north-east edges of the town however, this should not encroach over the A12 boundary nor encourage coalescence between

3. The Town Council felt that Woodbridge is in need of affordable housing but it was acknowledged that due to the nature of Woodbridge, there are limited opportunities. It was felt that Woodbridge should encourage and strengthen its existing community which may involve the process of attracting further small business / light industrial or leisure related activities to the area.

Woodbridge should seek to preserve and enhance its community strengths. This should involve attracting small business/industry and leisure related activities to strengthen the local economy. In addition, there is need for affordable housing provision within the town.

4. The issue of car parking in Woodbridge was briefly raised and it felt that this issue is something which needs further enhancement within the town.

The Local Development Framework process should take into consideration the issues for car parking when dealing with development in Woodbridge.