

Public Meeting Thursday 19th July 2018

To discuss Future Planning Matters in Kelsale-cum-Carlton

Notes from the meeting

Cllr Revell thanked everyone for attending. He explained that this was to be an informal meeting. The first part of the meeting consisted of a presentation given by Ian Galloway regarding the newly published Draft Local Plan.

Firstly, Ian stated that he is a member of the public (not a Councillor) who has taken an interest in and given time over to studying the contents of the Draft Local Plan the consultation period of which started the next day. He explained that the consultation period will last for 8 weeks commencing 20th July 2018. It would be likely that the final version of the draft plan will be available in January 2019.

Issues raised by the public:

1. What percentage increase will the erection of 45 new dwellings constitute? It was explained that around an increase of 10% for allocated building only not including Carlton Meres.
2. What is the status of any potential 'call for sites'? It was explained that most have been deemed unsuitable for development. There are 4 remaining sites left that are deemed suitable, Ambleside being one of them.
3. Is there anywhere in the proposals regarding existing redundant buildings being converted into habitable dwellings? It was explained that all applications are judged on their merit. Existing buildings will not reduce the quota for new builds.
4. The strain on infrastructure as a result of building new dwellings was a worry for many present at the meeting. This was discussed several times during the meeting. Worries concerning the strain on medical provision, school places, sewerage and water provision were all raised. There were also comments made concerning the potential danger of the planned access roads to the village and issues around there not being enough parking available.
5. Queries regarding the relationship between the Neighbourhood Plan and SCDC Planning department were put forward. It was explained that the NP cannot overwrite the local plan, but new policies not included in the plan can be stated and adopted in the NP.
6. Will Carlton Meres be taken into consideration? It was explained that a reply from the local MP regarding the PC's concerns regarding Carlton Meres had been received. In the response it was confirmed that if the expansion of Carlton Meres was deemed to be a big development, then SCDC can lobby to make it CIL compliant. However, there is no power to control whether people buy second or holiday homes in the village at present.
7. Kelsale-cum-Carlton is deemed to be a 'small' village based on the number of amenities. To be deemed a 'large' village it would need to contain amenities that can service other centres as well. There is nothing in the draft plan to suggest that the classification will change.

8. What influence will the PC have on how the new houses will look? It was explained that greater influence can be achieved by stating preferred styles of house in the NP.
9. Why is Kelsale being paired with Yoxford (and not Saxmundham) after the boundary changes have been approved? It was explained that the idea is to pair like with like rural communities.
10. Does the PC currently have enough information regarding housing in the village? It was explained that an extensive survey will be undertaken to analyse actual housing needs in the village. This survey will be fed into the formation of the NP.
11. How can the PC guarantee that large property developments like the proposed Ambleside development will provide housing for the local population rather than becoming second homes? It was explained that there is currently no power available to stop people from buying second homes. However, a suggestion of setting up partnerships with Housing Associations could provide a certain amount of social housing.
12. Ian's presentation ended with a strawman proposal designed to discover if a majority view could be agreed regarding the future planning needs in the village. Around 85 people were in favour of the strawman proposal. Those that were against it, opposed on the following grounds:
 - An outright ban on 4 bed houses was wrong on the grounds that there will be some families who require social housing and also may need a 4-bed house.
 - Family connections as well as residency should be considered.
13. Everyone present at the meeting was encouraged to make comments directly onto the planning portal. It was agreed to upload the link to the planning portal onto the website, together with the name of the planning officer and application number.
14. Lessons learnt – for future meetings on this scale, microphones need to be used as some members of the public found it difficult to follow the discussion. Also, people should introduce themselves when they speak.

Meeting ended at 20:50

