

## **CHELMONDISTON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

### **INFORMAL CONSULTATION RESULTS UPDATE APRIL 2019**

This update note summarises the views expressed during the informal consultation held on the emerging Chelmondiston Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Firstly, a big thank you to everyone who took the time and trouble to get involved and make consultation responses. Overall 90 responses were received. All of your responses are highly valued, and they will help the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group in making refinements to the plan for the formal consultations it will have to undergo.

During the informal consultation we asked you a series of questions and the responses to these questions are summarised below. Numbers in parentheses indicate number of respondents highlighting a particular issue.

#### **What do you think of the Vision Statement?**

- Comprehensive but not sure what it is trying to say
- Not a lot
- **General Support (over 60 respondents were broadly supportive of the draft Vision Statement)**
- No need to make jobs a target, less worried about appearance of housing, surrounding environment more important
- Pin Mill shoreline – upkeep. Enforcement
- Not a vision
- Should mention development
- Resist urbanisation of village and Shotley peninsula
- Remove “thriving” could be used to justify endless development
- Not grammatically correct
- Should include sustainability concept
- ‘Unique’ may be overdoing it!

**Outcome:** respondents were generally supportive of the Vision Statement, although with a few suggested amendments. A revised Vision Statement will be produced for the next version of the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

#### **Future housing development and where should it be?**

- Adjacent Mill Lane, Richardsons Lane, Beside Hill Farm Lane
- **Affordable (13)**
- Bungalows
- Maisonettes
- Not too many big houses
- **No more (7)**
- No need
- Only within current village boundary
- **Limited (4 responses)**

- **Infill (15)**
- **Starter and retirement homes - 3 room houses for c£150K needed (4)**
- Not estates
- Adequate car parking
- No second homes
- **Small-scale - incremental build (26)**
- **High standard of energy efficiency (2)**
- Not executive home
- **Sympathetic to the surroundings (11)**
- **Social housing including 'council housing (6)**
- Small terraced houses
- Junction main road, beside Meadow Close, not whole area!
- **Not in AONB (26)**
- **No building in RAMSAR or SSSI (7)**
- Allow for downsizing
- Organic
- Fit with superfast broadband
- Traditional pitch roof and materials
- **No street lights (2)**
- Hill Farm development – sprawl
- Retain compactness
- In keeping with surroundings
- Already to many approved in pipeline
- Any large development should have amenity space
- Generic brick should be opposed
- Protect views
- Extend Meadow Close to White House Farm
- Electric charging points
- Less brick and block more timber and weather boarding
- No development in Conservation Area
- Eco-homes
- South of main road and east of village
- Low rise
- Build upwards
- Houses at 80% of market value – not affordable
- Enough is enough
- Hill Farm could be sensitively developed
- **Develop only brown fields (2)**
- Low density
- High density
- No hi-rise

**Outcome:** There was a clear majority view that any future development should be limited in scale and if at all possible limited to infill development that was affordable to meet local housing needs. There is also a very clear steer that there should be no building within the AONB. Truly affordable housing is also high on the agenda. The views expressed during the informal consultation will help to prepare the Neighbourhood Development Plan's housing policy, alongside emerging Babergh District planning policy.

### **Environment?**

- Recycling
- Litter
- Enforcement
- No visual impact on landscape
- Housing in keeping with local styles
- Protect AONB
- Development should include wildlife areas
- Encourage bird nesting
- **More trees (5)**
- **Hedges (2)**
- No development of agricultural land
- Encourage local area to foster pride
- Conservation of wildlife
- Environmentally friendly management of farmland
- Resist attempts to classify Chelmondiston as a core village
- Too many heritage assets
- Wildlife needs inter-connected areas
- Respect open spaces
- Manage footpaths

**Outcome:** Respondents clearly value the local environment and the views expressed will be used to refine the Neighbourhood Development Plan's environment policies.

### **Community Facilities?**

- Bus shelters
- **Footpaths (2)**
- Box in the commercial rubbish bins at Pin Mill
- **Maintain playing field (2)**
- **More Play areas (7)**
- **Increase use of village hall (2)**
- Update sports pavilion
- Better wheelchair access to local shops
- Holbrook Academy – need for expansion?
- Value of local shops
- Changing facilities/toilets at playing fields

- Post Office not a planning issue
- **Need a Post Office (4)**
- Protecting churches not political decisions
- Establish a team of helpers with a base to help keep the village tidy
- A more visible meeting place
- Something for older children e.g. skateboard area
- Better promotion of existing facilities
- More benches to sit on
- **Youth clubs (3)**
- Café
- **Public toilets on the Playing field (3)**
- Art in the Community

**Outcome:** Respondents clearly value the area's community and recreation facilities and the views expressed will be used to refine the Neighbourhood Development Plan's policies. Some of the issues raised are non-land use planning matters and the Parish Council will consider how these issues can be addressed in other ways.

### Infrastructure?

- **Bus service (16)**
- Road repairs
- Water and electric supply - *reduce outages*
- **Broadband (6)**
- Better car parking - in Meadow Close
- **Doctors (11)**
- **Improved mobile (3)**
- Generally fine
- **Traffic calming/management in village centre + Speeding and safety on B1456 through village (18)**
- Speed restrictions
- No need to increase local business
- Improve access to sports field
- **Extend school (7)**
- **Better Car parking in village (9)**
- **Cycling (6)**
- Pedestrian crossing
- Footpaths in village centre
- **Cycleway Ipswich to Shotley (4)**
- Traffic lights/mini-roundabouts at Woodlands and Pin Mill Lane
- Attracting tourists
- Put cars last – create pinch points through village
- By-pass around the village
- Dentist

- Ensure extended High School for children to go on to
- Upgrade the road to 'A' status to ensure better repairs

**Outcome:** Respondents have significant concerns about the ability of existing and future infrastructure to cope with new development. Volume and speed of traffic on the B1456 is a key concern, along with ability of the doctors' surgery and school to cope with any increase in population. The bus service, parking in the village, telecommunications and cycle facilities are main areas where improvements are sought. The Neighbourhood Development Plan will seek to incorporate a policy to address these issues. Some of the issues raised are non-land use planning matters and the Parish Council will consider how these issues can be addressed in other ways.

### **Other comments**

- Houseboats – poor state, enforcement required.
- The Community need to be advised well in advance on proposed development
- Suffolk being spoilt – because not enough thought being given to historical influences, agriculture and natural environment
- No street lighting
- See houseboats as a positive, and promote them
- Repair village signs
- Foresters is a lost opportunity and an eyesore
- Pavement outside Methodist Church should be widened - *unsafe*
- Take account of this survey!
- Better communication about the NDP - better signposting on the website

**Outcome:** Respondents raised a number of matters that will be incorporated into the Neighbourhood Development Plan. Some of the issues raised, however, are non-land use planning matters and therefore not applicable to the NDP. The Parish Council will be requested to consider how these issues can be addressed in other ways.

### **WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?**

Once again thank you for all your responses. These have been considered by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and will be used to refine the next version of the plan. This plan, known as the Regulation 14 Draft, will be subject to a minimum six-week formal consultation. We hope to start this consultation in the summer of 2019.