

# Response to Consultation re Issues and Options

---

## Campsea Ashe PC response to SCDC Public Consultation on Issues and Options for Review of the Local Plan

1. How the response was obtained
  - 1.1 Represents the interests of electors of Campsea Ashe PC
  - 1.2 Views obtained from HGV Working Party which has made many contacts of local residents regarding traffic related issues in the village including the impact of future developments on transport infrastructure.
  - 1.3 An Extraordinary Meeting of the PC on 11 October covering both this and the SCC Highways Consultation on Suffolk's Energy Gateway. Although attendance was sparse, they had been much information about the meeting provided and comments forwarded by electors were raised.
  
2. At the Extraordinary Meeting the parish council discussed their response to the consultation under two broad issues;
  - i) potential sites for development put forward within the parish,
  - ii) the potential traffic and infrastructure problems associated with potential developments identified in Campsea Ashe and surrounding towns & villages.
  - 2.1 A group of councillors together with the clerk had previously had a meeting with representatives of the SCDC planning team (on 10 October) to consider issues for Campsea Ashe contained in the consultation document.
  - 2.2 At this meeting there was some need to clarify with SCDC the 'Red Line' document which highlighted areas of potential development in the village. Following the last consultation in 2013/4 there had be no communication re changes to the 'Red Line'.
  - 2.3 The most important aspect of our conversation with SCDC planners was that the areas put forward in the document were all very hypothetical and were ideas only. Therefore some indication of the 'red line' was now important to clarify permitted development areas.
  
3. Potential Sites for development.
  - 3.1 The PC is not against sensitive and appropriate housing development in principle.
  - 3.2 However all sites identified in the Issues and Options Document lie outside the 'Red Line' drawn in the last consultation.
  - 3.3 There was some confusion regarding two of the sites.
  - 3.4 Site 129; the owner was unaware that his land had been put forward.
  - 3.5 Site 84; the PC had been trying to establish the registry of this and an adjacent site and had been informed by the Land Registry that the site was not registered.
  
4. Potential traffic and infrastructure problems associated with potential developments.
  - 4.1 The village does have amenities i.e. a shop, a station (with café, toilets and meeting rooms), a village hall and a public house providing amenities for resident of both the village and surrounding villages.
  - 4.3 The HGV/tractor/trailer problem is affecting the village generally with vehicle size and routes which are clearly designed to save time.
  - 4.4 The roads are not wide enough for the task which is resulting in safety concerns.
  - 4.5 The tractor/trailer is simply about getting to the new agricultural digesters at the Bentwaters site.

## Response to Consultation re Issues and Options

---

4.6 Ivy Lodge Road has become a short cut for this traffic and there are other small lanes such as Marlesford Road which are being used and are dangerous.

4.7 There are also numerous sharp bends on the B1078 through the village, particularly the junction with Mill Lane. This is not a good route for large vehicles meeting other large vehicles and cars and is a particular hazard for traffic entering and exiting Mill Lane.

### 5. Summary

Based on the information provided in the document re objectives and previous reports done by both Highways and the HGV Working Party regarding HGV and tractor/trailer traffic passing through the village it was decided that whilst the PC were not against development in Campsea Ashe in principle, the thought of inviting people to live in a village which is vibrant yet vibrating as a result of the traffic would be a mistake.