Hearing Statement from Harry Brightwell on the Examination of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan regarding Matter 3 as identified below:

**Matter 3**
Area specific strategies – Development Allocations

The National Policy states
b) **a social objective** – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and **support communities’ health, social and cultural well-being**; and

Policy SCLP12.67: is contrary to the National Strategy as it does not support the Parish preferred sites, the villagers preferred sites, does not take account of local knowledge regarding traffic, safety, etc (which should be considered in line with National Policy), and clearly **does not support communities’ health, social and cultural well-being of the Tuddenham residents**.

There is no requirement for each village to take an allocated number of homes but that Tuddenham, in previous public meetings, has agreed to accept development but in a way that retains its culture by putting forward locally acceptable and preferred sites. Many sites across the district have been “rejected” and the reason given is “sites elsewhere in the District were more suitable for allocation.” Therefore it is not essential that Tuddenham has any sites approved, especially sites considered unsuitable..

The National Framework Policy states: 16. Plans should:

a) be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development10;  
b) be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable;  
c) be shaped by early, proportionate and **effective engagement between plan-makers and communities**, local organisations, businesses, infrastructure providers and operators and statutory consultees;

Representations made by Parish Council and villagers have been basically ignored so Policy is **not consistent with National Policy**.

**Matter 3.98**
In respect of access and potential effects on wider highway network is policy justified?

The Council have concentrated on car drivers, which seems to be the main concern of the Council, irrespective of the **Green agenda** being promoted at Government, County and one hopes District level. Access is for all types of users.

Promoting sustainable transport

NP 102. c) **opportunities to promote ..... public transport use are identified and pursued**;

SA Item 7 **Bus stop less than 400 metres away is a table top exercise which does not take into account specific difficulties and dangers involved in access or getting to the public transport.**

NP 108. **In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:**

b) **safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;** and (No assessment has been made for Public transport users, especially those with a disability to get to the site and preferred sites that achieve this are available)

NP 110. **Within this context, applications for development should:** b) **address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport;** (No assessment has been made for Public transport users, especially those with a disability to get to and from the site and preferred sites by Parish Council and villagers that achieve this are available)

“Bus stop less than 400 metres away.” The Council have not made any analysis of access for all users, which is contrary to NP 108 above.
There being no footpath from Keightley Way all the way to the bus stop forcing people to walk in a busy “rat run” road of only a car width (due to parked cars) which is highly dangerous for those with a disability, those with a push chair and for children and then requiring them to cross on a double bend to make their way to work or school etc. if heading towards Ipswich. Alternative sites to create better safer access is available.

For car users residents in Keightley Way have highlighted issues including: the dangerous junctions at Keightley Way and the junction on a double bend at bottom of The Hill; traffic fumes pollution caused by inevitable queing on single track roads; parking which reduces road width to single traffic; danger to pedestrians walking in the road each day to catch a bus; dangerous crossing point to catch a bus with traffic turning, etc. All or most of which can be avoided by an alternative site.

Why is the Council being allowed to create unsafe access and environment when it is not necessary?