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Matter 3: Area Specific Strategies - Development Allocations
Policy SCLP12.3: North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood
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3.5 Would the Policy be effective in achieving the comprehensive development of the allocated area and integrating the development with the existing community of Felixstowe?

Internal vehicular access:

FTC refers to our comment on the final draft on this matter. We take the view that Policy SCLP 12.3, its supporting text and indicative mapping fail to address the issue of the Garden Neighbourhood having the necessary good internal vehicular accesses so that it can function as a coherent whole and develop as a recognisable community in its own right. We believe therefore that the concept, while admirable in many other respects, cannot be considered sound in regard to this issue. We therefore request the Inspector to propose a Main Modification requiring that good internal vehicular access across and linking each of the developed areas (including the land previously referred to as land north of Conway Close allocated for development in Policy FPP5 of the FAAP), be required as the Master Plan is further refined and detailed.

This could logically be inserted as a new criterion following criterion (m), worded thus:
“n) Good internal vehicular access across and linking each of the developed areas such that the new Neighbourhood can function as a coherent whole and develop as a recognisable community in its own right.”

Country Park:

Since the publication and submission of the final draft, with its welcome significant emphasis on green infrastructure, significant proposals have been formulated by volunteer groups supported by the Woodland Trust for a Country Park to be integrated into the development, based around the existing Millennium Wood and adjacent areas. We would request that East Suffolk Council propose a Minor Modification to SCLP12.3 (c) to expedite this initiative.

We propose added wording to criterion (c), after “…. the development” thus:
“including the potential creation of a Country Park including but not limited to the area around the Millennium Wood;”
3.7 In terms of vehicular access, is the proposed Garden Neighbourhood deliverable or developable?

**Vehicular access to the site**

This question raises a closely parallel issue to that contained in our comment on 3.5 in Hearing Statement 2. It is clearly unsustainable that the only access to the eastern element of the Garden Neighbourhood (the FPP5 land), and possibly also the two areas adjacent to the west, shown in the indicative mapping is for traffic to progress eastward along the full extent of Colneis Road, Northward on Ferry Road and then Westwards again as the only access to that area. This issue would be fully addressed by the Main Modification proposed in Hearing Statement 2.

3.10 Would the policy be effective in mitigating any potential significant effects on the Deben Estuary SPA?

**Effects on the Deben Estuary**

The incorporation of the Country Park referred to in Hearing Statement 2 and an ambitious interpretation of policy SCLP12.3 (m) in respect of pedestrian and cycle routes, and of green infrastructure under policy SCLP12.3 (c), as amended as proposed in Hearing Statement 2, supported by dedicated local access to the funds generated by the RAMS process from the development could provide excellent mitigation, if fully implemented throughout the entire development. We would seek an assurance from East Suffolk Council that this concept would be fully espoused as the Master Plan is developed.

3.11 Would the proposed allocation safeguard the character and appearance of North Felixstowe?

**Character and appearance of North Felixstowe**

The further development of the Master Plan can and should pay particular attention to the relationship and boundary treatment with Candlet Road, and if this is done imaginatively then the necessary safeguarding of the character and appearance of the area could be successful.
H6 The Inspector’s Initial Matters, Issues and Questions

Hearing Statements submitted by Felixstowe Town Council (FTC)
in respect of selected Main Issues and Questions

Policy SCLP12.16: Felixstowe Leisure Centre
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3.21 Are criteria b) and i) which relate to the town centre and residential accommodation respectively clear as to how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

A tourism icon to replace Felixstowe leisure Centre

FTC believes that it is critical to the continued health and expansion of the seafront tourism experience that the site potentially vacated by the Leisure Centre does provide a major new attraction to the resort – an icon of the town’s modern tourism offer. We believe that Policy SCLP12.16 (i) – residential use on the upper floors - is fundamentally incompatible with that objective and indeed therefore with the opening paragraph of the policy. The daytime and nighttime (tourist) economy under paragraph (h), and residential uses, are clearly intrinsically incompatible. We believe therefore that the retention of para. (i) renders the policy unsound and request the Inspector to propose a Main Modification accordingly to remove paragraph (i).